

HANNA SALICH 



<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8106-6762>

University of Warsaw

hanna.salich@uw.edu.pl

STANISŁAW LEM’S SPACE FLORA AND FAUNA TRANSLATED INTO ENGLISH*

Abstract

The article discusses authorial neologisms coined by Stanisław Lem and their translation into English on the example of 37 plant and animal names excerpted from the short story entitled “Let Us Save the Universe (An Open Letter from Ijon Tichy)”, which, together with their English equivalents, were subject to comparative analysis. Since these names may create translation problems, the purpose of the analysis was primarily to determine the problem-solving techniques used by the translators, Maria Święcicka-Ziemianek and Joel Stern. Another goal was to make an attempt at explaining their translation choices and to determine the impact of these choices on the way in which the equivalents expressed with neologisms perform their naming function and the function through which they create the narrative world in the target text. Therefore, the article lists the possible causes of translation problems evoked by neologisms and presents the characteristics of the analysed names in terms of translation difficulties they may pose. The analytical material is presented taking into account the relationship between neologisms and their equivalents with the accompanying context and/or illustration. The article provides conclusions on the impact of the techniques used and the elements that determined the final shape of equivalents on the way the naming and creative function of authorial neologisms are reflected in the target text. It also shows the methods of overcoming problems related to translating neologisms into a foreign language.

Keywords: literary translation, authorial neologism, translation techniques, science fiction literature

* Originally published in Polish in “Przekładaniec” vol. 40/2020. Open access for this publication has been supported by a grant from the Priority Research Area Heritage under the Strategic Programme Excellence Initiative at Jagiellonian University.

1. Introduction

The statement that authorial neologisms, that is – in the broadest sense of the term – new words coined by an author specifically for a given piece of work (cf. Skubalanka 1962: 43; Dziwisz 2013: 120; Goral 2015: 301), are one of the source text components that pose translation difficulties, is commonly found in literature on translation (Hejwowski 2009: 113; Pleciński 2010: 146; Skibińska, Rzeszutnik 2010: 287–300). The primary cause of these difficulties is that neologisms are characterised by non-equivalence, which enforces an even greater degree of creativity on the part of the translator than is normally required for lexicalised words with established equivalents in other languages (Hejwowski 2009: 112, 113; Pleciński 2010: 147, 148). When intending to render a neologism with a neologism, which is consistent with the principle advocated by theoreticians of translation (cf. Newmark 1988: 149; Hejwowski 2009: 113), apart from the skills of interpreting the source text and making use of various sources of linguistic, general, and specialised knowledge, the translator must display word-formation abilities and inventiveness in this area (cf. Hejwowski 2009: 113; Pleciński 2010: 147, 148). As regards specific causes of translational issues arising from authorial neologisms, although – being always motivated by a particular literary work – they are diverse in nature (Skibińska, Rzeszutnik 2010: 287–300), they usually result from characteristics of the neologisms themselves, which necessarily need to be reflected in translation. They include atypicality of form and diversity of types, level of transparency, as well as their number, distribution, and density. In addition, there are the relationships neologisms establish with other components of a given piece of literature: for example with the context and illustrations, as well as the functions they serve in a particular text – for instance, the naming function and the function through which they create the represented fantasy world (Handke 1989). These are covered by the analysis carried out from the viewpoint of translation studies presented in this article, as well as the level of the productivity of the neologisms in terms of their actualisation. The aim of this analysis is to determine whether equivalents perform the abovementioned functions in the same way authorial (source) neologisms do, and if not, why.

The neologisms forming the subject matter of this analysis, coined by Stanisław Lem specifically for the short story entitled “Ratujmy kosmos (List otwarty Ijona Tichego)” [“Let Us Save the Universe (An Open Letter

from Ijon Tichy)”, which is one in a series of short stories about the title character, can be examined from the angle of all of the abovementioned characteristics, relationships, and functions as criteria to be taken into consideration during the translation process. As far as their characteristics are concerned, the reader notices firstly the atypicality of the new names. The short story “Ratujmy kosmos...” is, as its full title indicates, an open letter from Ijon Tichy to the interplanetary community, in which he tries to make it see the adverse consequences of “cosmic tourism”, including, in particular, its impact on life in the Great Preserve. Hence, the majority of the neologisms are the strange names of the representatives of the space flora and fauna that are either endangered, on the brink of extinction, or already extinct, and modelled on authentic, sometimes startling vernacular (common) names of animals, such as “lśniś nawapnik” [heliophanus aeneus] (a jumping spider) and “zdradnica śmiercionośna” [common death adder] (a snake), as well as plants such as “groszek niepozorny” [inconspicuous pea] (a flower) and “psianka słodkogórz” [bittersweet nightshade] (a flower). This is why the neologisms, like the names on which they may have been modelled,¹ are usually composed of two words; however, the author did not limit himself to one type of neologism only – indeed, the issue concerning types of neologisms will be touched upon later in the article when discussing specific examples, since it is vital in the context of analysing translation problems and the creative function as well as its reflection in the target text.² Individual types of neologisms can be described as follows: **absolute** (which do not resemble common words, and even if they do, to such a small extent as to prevent the recognition of the base word, i.e., the word from which they were coined), **structural** (resembling common words and arising from typical morphological processes), **semantic** (existing words used in a new, unestablished meaning, explained only by the context of the literary work), **collocational** (atypical word combination) (cf. Handke 1989: 233–235, 238, 240, 243; Hejwowski 2009: 112; Stockwell 2000: 112–118), and **mixed** (various hybrids of the abovementioned types, e.g., collocational neologisms being combinations of an absolute and a structural neologism, a common

¹ They might have been modelled on unspecified common names or ones presented in specific sources: Anna Baranowa (2008: 115) puts forward a very interesting hypothesis according to which the names could have been motivated by the zoological nomenclature demonstrated in books by Emil Wyróbek.

² It will not, however, serve as a starting point for the classification of the research material.

word and two structural neologisms). They all differ in productivity when it comes to creating the fantasy world and the degree to which they provide a sense of strangeness (Handke 1989: 238, 243; Suvin 1979). The more similar they are to existing words and the more information about them is provided by the context, the greater is their productivity in terms of recreating the represented world. Conversely, the less they resemble existing words, the greater is the impression of strangeness they invoke. If such an impression is excessively strong, neologisms are not creatively productive (since they do not permit the reader to imagine anything about them); therefore, structural and collocational neologisms are the most frequent, whereas absolute and semantic ones are the least commonly found in science fiction (Handke 1989: 238, 239, 243). At the same time, absolute neologisms are the easiest to translate into a foreign language, while structural and semantic ones could be the most problematic, since to a large extent they restrict the translator's freedom (Pleciński 2010: 148).

2. Preliminary description of the analysed authorial neologisms

The neologisms referring to animals and plants with which the author created the fantasy world seem real (cf. Hejwowski 2009: 113); they are not only atypical and diverse but also numerous, which intensifies the impression of strangeness. In the short story "Ratujmy kosmos...", these neologisms name 37 elements of the represented world (cf. Krajewska 2006). 13 of them have additional synonyms which claim to be scientific (Latin) names, and moreover these are not the only neologisms in this short story of less than 20 pages containing relatively large illustrations (5 in the Polish edition of 2008 and 8 in the first English edition of 1982). This confirms Peter Stockwell's thesis that short literary forms of this kind can be expected to contain a larger number of authorial neologisms (2000: 108), leading to the observation that the neologisms analysed here are characterised by high density. The density varies depending on the fragment of text analysed, as well as the distribution of neologisms: there are fragments with a "sudden condensation of neologisms", as described by Krzysztof Hejwowski (2009: 114, 115), in the short story "Ratujmy kosmos...", e.g., the passage concerning other representatives of flora and fauna (see Lem 2008: 145; Lem 1982: 151). Krzysztof Hejwowski (2009: 114, 115) points to such fragments as places which, while being intricate

in terms of translation, allow the translator to display inventiveness, even if excessive at times.

Returning to the types of neologisms noted above, they also involve the issue of name transparency outside the given context (cf. Handke 1989: 234, 237, 238, 241). The transparency may differ, which is in fact the case with the names analysed in this article: for instance, the neologism *mrówka krzesławka dręczypupa* (“mrówka” – ant) reveals a good deal: first and foremost, it informs the reader that its designatum is an insect, whereas the name *warłaj modry* (“modry” – cornflower blue, deep blue) does not allow the reader to decipher much by way of detail. The fewer details a given name discloses, the more hypotheses on its meaning it generates, to be further verified based on additional information, such as context, if available (cf. Handke 1989: 234). Indeed, the context is so silent concerning *warłaj modry* that it is impossible to discern whether it is an animal or a plant, while *mrówka krzesławka dręczypupa*, on the other hand, is described there in minute detail. Additional information can also be provided for the reader through illustrations, that is to say signs expressed via another (iconic) code (cf. Kaźmierczak 2017: 17, 18). In the translation of the short story “Ratujmy kosmos...”, illustrations accompany eight neologisms referring to animals, which will be discussed in greater detail below. Given the relationship that might occur between a neologism and its contextual description as part of the creative function performed by both linguistic devices, i.e., shifts along the neologism–context and context–neologism lines (Handke 1989: 234, 238, 241), as well as – by way of analogy – the relationship between a neologism and its illustration, and between a neologism, its illustration and context, certain shifts along the source neologism–context/illustration line, and thus changes in the manner in which equivalents create the represented world within the text of the translation, can be expected, depending on the motivation of a given equivalent (the source neologism, its contextual description, illustration, or their combination).³

³ In order to trace the shifts thoroughly and determine how equivalents perform the creative function in the target text, the examples discussed in this article (presented in detail in sections 4–8) are classified in terms of the motivation of the equivalents, i.e., an illustration, all or some components of an authorial (source) neologism, a contextual description, or a combination of the above. Certainly, there are also equivalents with unclear motivations, which will be described separately (section 9).

3. Authorial neologisms and their translation into English – general notes

For the above reasons, translating the neologisms present in the short story “Ratujmy kosmos...” into English undoubtedly posed quite a challenge for its translators, Joel Stern and Maria Świącicka-Ziemianek,⁴ as they had to take the issues outlined above into consideration. The relevant neologisms referred to names of animal species, including: 1) predators: *czajaki polkliwe* [*swallurkers*],⁵ *wędlowiec* [*herpeton*]; 2) insects: *mrówka krzesławka dręczypupa* [*bottombiter chair ant*], *przebizad uporek* [*drillbeaked borbit*]⁶; 3) arthropods: *moczyścier przeprzaśny* [*scrooch*], *rzęsula niedołazka* [*frip-ples*], *woczykij brutalik* [*brutalacean rollipede*]; 4) reptiles: *przewrotnik podstawiec* [*trippersneak*], *wężonóg teleskopek* [*the snakefooted telescoper*]; 5) birds: *pismaczek przedrzeźniaczek*, *pismaczek przedrzeźniak* [*scribble-mock*]; 6) other animals: *fetorówka obrzydlnica* [*foul-tailedfetido*], *zmyłek oczajduszny* [*deadly deceptorite*], *mściwiec bezdrożnik* [*vengerix*], *ostro-bodziec tyłowlóki* [*spiny slothodile*], *rozkęsprzytajnik* [*morselone*], *wyjec elektryczny* [*electric howler*], *zatapiacz bulgotny* [*maraudola*]. The neologisms naming space plants, in turn, included names of: 1) thickets: *cieplaki* [*warmstrels*], *zimniaki* [*chillips*]; 2) trees: *cichlust* [*solinthia*], *miażdżycza kamienuła* [*brainbasher*]; 3) herbs: *krotowrzask* [*yellwort*]; 4) other plants: *echońpyskatek* [*echoloon*], *goryczka rozumna* [*sentient gentian*], *goryczka szalona* [*crazy gentian*], *okrucytia cudawka* [*cruella*], *paśowa róża* [*crimson rose*],⁷ *wściekłoja* [*furiol*]. Apart from the names where the context or illustrations leave no doubt as to their reference to plants or animals, there are also

⁴ The translation, entitled “Let Us Save the Universe (An Open Letter from Ijon Tichy)”, was published by Harcourt Brace Jovanovich (HBJ) in the collection *Memoirs of a Space Traveler. Further Reminiscences of Ijon Tichy* in 1981. The collection contains translations of selected short stories composing *Dzienniki gwiazdowe* released by Czytelnik in 1911. The selection of other translations of the short stories coming from the same, fourth, edition of *Dzienniki...*, including the major part of *Podróże*, is available in the collection entitled *The Star Diaries*. The author of the translations included in *The Star Diaries* is Michael Kandel.

⁵ The neologisms accompanied by illustrations in the English version are marked in bold in this section of the article. These are exclusively neologisms referring to fauna.

⁶ The fact that *przebizad uporek* is an insect similar to a beetle with a drill instead of a mouthpiece is made clear to the reader only by an illustration, since the context does not specify the meaning of this neologism.

⁷ The combination *paśowa róża* is a neosematism, as the plant is endowed with new properties in the short story: it lives on the tail of a *wędlowiec*, thus becoming a lure for tourists it probably devours.

“other extraterrestrial animals and plants”, including: *ćpacz smakowniczek* [geekling], *drwacz wyprzastek brzeszczozgrzębny* [–],⁸ *mordelia wyżwawka* [carnivamp], *poślądkówka otwornica* [dementia], *rozrabień wrzaskotek* [–], *trupawka niedoćmawka* [marshmucker], *tryblas druzgotek* [saprohoid], *warłaj modry* [blue wizzom], and *wszechjadek bylepas* [–]. As indicated above, some of the aforementioned names that claim to be vernacular (common) are accompanied by Latin-styled names. This is the case with the following names (listed chronologically): *mrówka krzesławka dręczypupa* (*Multipodium pseudostellatum Trylopii*), *wężonóg teleskopek* (*Anencephalus pseudoopticus tripedius Klaczkiniensis*), *przewrotnik podstawiec* (*Serpens vitiosus Reichenmantlii*), *okrucytia cudawka* (*Pliximiglaquia bombardans L*), *pąsowa róża* (*Rosa mendatrix Tichiana*), *goryczka rozumna* (*Gentiana sapiens suicidalis Pruck*), *goryczka szalona* (*Gentiana mentecapta*), *pis-maczek przedrzeźniak* (*Graphomanus spasmodicus Essenbachii*), *cieplak odmiany barowej* (*Thermomendax spirituosus halucinogenes*), *drwacz wyprzastek brzeszczozgrzębny* (***Gauleiterium Flagellans***), *rozrabień wrzaskotek* (*Syphonophiles Pruritualis*), *stróżyczka pieścidlawka* (*Lingula stranguloides Erdmenglerbeyeri*), *echoń pyskatek* (*Echolalium impudicum Schwamps*). The names provided in parentheses – which allude to “common” ones (e.g., through the use of the word “sapiens” with reference to *goryczka rozumna*) or, more frequently, to the contextual information about them (e.g., through the use of the word “tripedius” with reference to *teleskopek*, which is known to have three legs, the word “serpens” with reference to *przewrotnik podstawiec*, which is a snake, and the word “halucinogenes” with reference to *cieplaki*, which produce mirages) – were transferred to the target text, as a result of which they serve a similar creative function as in the original text.

Returning to “common” names, firstly the atypicality of their formulation method is noticeable. Names of animals are normally combinations of two structural neologisms (e.g., *czajaki polkliwe*) – an exception is the absolute neologism *wędlowiec* and the mixed neologism *mrówka krzesławka dręczypupa* (a combination of two structural neologisms and a common word). Most plant names are formed in a similar manner, but there a greater diversity of types of neologisms can be observed. Apart from the predominant combinations of structural neologisms (e.g., *rzęsula niedoładzka*), these types also encompass neosematisms (*pąsowa róża*) and collocational

⁸ A dash in square brackets means that there is no equivalent of given neologism in the translation.

neologisms (*goryczka rozumna*, *goryczka szalona*). Also conspicuous is a greater diversity of mixed neologisms (e.g., *miażdżycza kamienula*, which is a combination of a structural and a semantic neologism), and the fact that one-word neologisms are more frequent among space plant names (these are structural neologisms, such as *zimniaki*, *cieplaki*, *cichlust*, *ktotowrzask*, *wściekłoja*) than among animal names. The translators endeavoured to reflect the various types of neologisms in their translation, that is to form word combinations similar to the original ones, yet a considerable increase in the number of one-word neologisms referring to animals is noticeable (structural neologisms, such as *swallurkers*, *fripples*, *scrooch*, *trippersneak*, *scribblemock*). In the case of names of plants, the equivalents are chiefly one-word neologisms, with the exception of the combinations *crimson rose*, *sentient gentian*, and *crazy gentian*, the first of which is a neosematism and the other two are collocational neologisms, as in the original text. A similar reversal of the ratio of two- and multi-word names to one-word names in the translation is also observable in the case of names of “other extraterrestrial animals and plants”, where the only combination is *blue wizzom*. Apart from the tendency to replace two-word names with one-word names, the technique of omission regarding neologisms in the translation can be noticed in names such as *drwacz wyprzastek brzeszczozgrzębny*, *rozrabień wrzaskotek*, and *wszehjadek bylepas*. In principle, this technique should not be employed in literary translation (cf. Hejwowski 2015: 96), but the translators’ decision can be explained with the distribution of the relevant neologisms in the text – they occur in a passage characterised by accumulation and condensation of neologisms (see Lem 2008: 145; Lem 1982: 151). The consequences of applying the technique of omission are not always drastic, as can be illustrated with neologisms such as *drwacz wyprzastek brzeszczozgrzębny* and *rozrabień wrzaskotek*. These neologisms, as already mentioned, have their quasi-Latin names, which were transferred to the text of the translation (one of the names was additionally accompanied by an illustration, and hence its omission would require removal of the illustration, too⁹). As a result, the represented world was not deprived of its space elements, only the name

⁹ In fact, removing the illustration would not be surprising. From among the Polish editions of *Dzienniki...*, the fourth edition (of 1971) was the first and only one to contain all 25 illustrations – their number is lower in the subsequent editions (Baranowa 2008: 112). There are also fewer illustrations in the English translation of the fourth edition if considering the volumes *Memoirs of a Space Traveler...* and *The Star Diaries* as a package – the total number of 20 illustrations can be found there.

resource was reduced. The same cannot be said about the effects of leaving out the neologism *wszechjadek bylepas*, which occurs in one sentence along with five other neologisms (*ćpacz smakowniczek*, *mordelia wyżwawka*, *pośladowka otwornica*, *trupawka niedośćmawa*, *tryblas druzgotek*), the meanings of which were not specified by the context. Fortunately, omitting this neologism is not perceivable – due to such a high condensation of neologisms, an average reader is not likely to notice that one of them is missing. This means that the translators used the technique of omission very cautiously. As regards the remaining five neologisms, the same factor (condensation) and the nature of their relationship with the context might explain the greater freedom the translators enjoyed, as mentioned by Jacek Pleciński, with respect to absolute neologisms (2010: 148): the equivalents *carnivamp*, *dementeria*, *geekling*, *marshmucker*, and *saprophoid* do not display any semantic resemblance to their prototypes (they were coined arbitrarily), just like the equivalents *frippl* and *scrooch*, which correspond to the neologisms *rzęsula niedośćmawa* and *moczyścier przeprażny*, which occurred in circumstances similar to the ones described above (see Lem 2008: 138; Lem 1982: 144), accompanied by one more neologism.

4. Equivalents motivated by illustrations

The neologism in question, *woczykij brutalik*, was translated with the equivalent *brutalacean rollipede*. The second component of the combination of two structural neologisms: *rollipede* (roll, centipede), might also seem to be coined arbitrarily, but in reality it alludes to the author's illustration. The prototype of this equivalent, the neologism *woczykij brutalik*, is – like the equivalent – a combination of two structural neologisms, the former of which might be associated with the expression “kij w oczy” [a stick into the eyes] (the connotation is not transparent in the target name) and the latter – with the words “brutal” [a brute] and “brutalny” [brutal] (similar associations are invoked by its equivalent “brutalacean”). The discussed source neologism is not described in the context, but it is accompanied by the author's illustration presenting a figure similar to a centaur, which – unlike a centaur – is a hybrid of a man and a tank, moving on continuous tracks and holding a sharp stick in its hand. A similar situation occurs with the neologism *przebizad uporek* (from “przebijać” [to bore], “zad” [a backside], “upór” [stubbornness]), which refers to an insect resembling a beetle,

with a mouthpiece in the form of a drill, which is made known only by the illustration (see Lem 1982: 152) – without it, it is difficult for the reader of the Polish version to determine whether the designatum is an animal at all. While the equivalent *drillbeaked borbit* renders the meaning of only one of the possible base words of the authorial neologism (bore) with the second component, it alludes to the illustration using the first of them (*drillbeaked*) in a very curious way. In this case, the equivalent–illustration relationship resembles the neologism–context relationship, as described by Ryszard Handke (1989: 234) – the reader of the translation confronts any initial ideas about the potential meanings of the structural neologism with the illustration, which conclusively specifies the meaning.¹⁰ This arises from the fact that the neologism *drillbeaked* was formed based on the words “drill” and “beak”, the former of which is a reference to the illustration, while the latter might indeed relate to a beetle’s mouthpiece and to its counterpart found in another animal, but the first thing it brings to mind is a bird’s beak.

The influence of an illustration on the final form of an equivalent is also visible in neologisms described in context, sometimes quite specifically. The neologism *fetorówka obrzydlnica* can serve as an example here. The name of this animal does not suggest any characteristics, which are revealed only by the context, i.e., the production of an unpleasant odour (the disgusting stench [*fetor*] implied by the name) as a defence reflex (“the lenticular-subcaudal reflex”) to being photographed. Such a context does not make clear what the origin of the bad smell is – this can be established only based on the accompanying illustration depicting an animal surrounded by the fumes coming from its tail (see Lem 2008: 147; Lem 1982: 150). The equivalent *foul-tailed fetido*, which is a combination of the structural neologisms *foul-tailed* (foul, tail) and *fetido* (from “fetid”), renders the meanings implied by the name while making an appropriate reference to the context and the illustration, but – due to the presence of the component *-tailed* – it discloses much more to the reader than the original authorial neologism.

An equivalent might also be motivated to an extent by an illustration referring to a different neologism than the translated one. This is the case with the translation of the neologism *ostrobodziec tyłowloki* with the equivalent *spiny slothodile*. The first component of the equivalent, the common

¹⁰ The neologism – illustration relationship is different in the original text: having no initial ideas about the potential meanings of this neologism, its reader will likely be astonished that *przebizad uporek* looks like it is presented in the illustration.

word “spiny”, alludes to the bases of the structural neologism *ostrobodziec* (“ostry” [sharp], “bóść”, “ubóść” [to gore]), and the second one is an attempt at rendering the structural neologism *tyłowłoki*, which the translators probably associated with the expression “wlec się w tyle” [to drag behind], by using the base words *sloth* and *crocodile*, the latter of which was selected seemingly arbitrarily – probably a reference to the illustration presenting a completely different animal, i.e., *czajak polkliwy* (see Lem 1982: 142), where it resembles a crocodile with the open mouth of a hippopotamus. The translation of the name is all the more apt as it harmonises with the context: according to the author’s description, *ostrobodziec*, like the crocodile, is oviparous. Hence, the reader of the translation might receive the impression that *czajak* and *ostrobodziec* are alike – yet the two representatives of the space fauna cannot be confused while reading, since the English name of the depicted animal is provided under each illustration (in the Polish edition of 2008, only selected illustrations are labelled).

5. Equivalents motivated by all components of authorial neologisms

With regard to the equivalent of the neologism *czajak polkliwy*, which was not only drawn but also quite specifically described by the author, the equivalents of the base words of both components of the original combination, i.e., swallow and lurk, were used in the translation to form the structural neologism *swallurker*. The same technique was employed in the translation of another neologism, which was provided with an illustration and an even more comprehensive description, i.e., the neologism *pismaczek przedrzeźniaczek* (see Lem 2008: 143; Lem 1982: 147), which is associated with the word “pismak” [hack, newshawk, newshound], a contemptuous name for a journalist, and the word “przedrzeźniacz” [mimic, mocker], which might allude to a person mocking someone else (a colloquial usage), to a specific bird species [Pol. *przedrzeźniacz północny*, Lat. *Mimus polyglottos*, Eng. northern mockingbird] or a bird family [Pol. *przedrzeźniacze*, Lat. *Mimidae*, Eng. mimids]. The equivalent *scribblemock* can also invoke associations with a bird – through its resemblance to the word “peacock” – and therefore it provides an appropriate reference to the illustration and contextual description, which inform the reader that *pismaczek* is indeed a bird. Equivalents of base words were applied also in the translation of the neologism *wężonóg*

teleskopek (from “wąż” – snake; “noga” – leg, foot; “teleskop” – telescope), which – although not illustrated – was described in the context. In this case, the equivalent *snakefooted telescope*, which is based on the corresponding base words of both components of the combination, like the source neologism, does not disclose the contextual information.

In order to faithfully represent the combinations in the text of the translation, the translators also used dictionary equivalents of both components. The technique was employed for the mixed neologism *wyjec elektryczny* [*electric howler*], the semantic neologism *pałowa róża* [*crimson rose*], and the collocational neologisms *gorczyzka rozumna* [*sentient gentian*] and *gorczyzka szalona* [*crazy gentian*]. Their equivalents, save one, serve the creative function, like the original names. The exception here is the equivalent *electric howler*, which refers to an animal deafening the sounds of rock and roll rather than jazz, unlike in the original. In this case, the change concerning the manner in which the equivalent performs the creative function results from the modification introduced to the context rather than the translation technique applied to the name.

6. Equivalents motivated by selected components of authorial neologisms

There were, however, instances where combinations of techniques were employed: they consisted in using the corresponding base words for translating selected components of neologisms, while others were translated by means of other techniques. One such instance was the omission of a component of a neologism. Its application is illustrated with the translation of the neologism *okrucyżcia cudawka* with the neologism *cruella*, which was formed from the word “cruel” and which ignored the miraculousness of this plant’s flowers as a less important piece of information, which can still be inferred from its description. Another example of the employment of this technique is the translation of the name *mściwiec bezdrożnik* (from “mściwy” [vengeful], “bezdroża” [wilderness]) with the equivalent *vengerix* (from *revenge*; Lat. *-ix*, a suffix found in names of plants and animals).

Although the target neologisms *cruella* and *vengerix* do not deserve much criticism, the application of the combination of a dictionary equivalent of a base word together with an omission may lead to unexpected results, which can be exemplified by the translation of the one-word structural neologism

wściekłoja. This neologism, as mentioned before, refers to a plant, but the context does not indicate it specifically – due to the clear similarity of the neologism with the word “*sekwoja*” [sequoia, redwood], it may be assumed to be a name of a tree. In this context, the equivalent making use of the most obvious equivalent of the second base word (from “*wściekłość*” – rage, fury; “*wściekły*” – furious, mad, raging), i.e., the neologism *furiol*, does not harmonise with the context, since the suffix *-ol* makes it resemble the name of a chemical from the world of *The Futurological Congress* rather than a plant.

As mentioned above, while some components of the original name were translated with equivalents of their base words, others were translated using different techniques. This can be illustrated by the translation of the mixed neologism *mrówka krzesławka dręczypupa*, which is a combination of the common word “*mrówka*” [ant] and structural neologisms coined from the words “*krzesło*” [chair], “*dręczyć*” [torment, plague, nag], and “*pupa*” [bottom], respectively. The authorial neologism was described quite specifically in the context and is accompanied by an illustration (see Lem 2008: 139; Lem 1982: 143), where numerous ants form an armchair. Its equivalent, the neologism *bottombiter chair ant*, renders the meaning of all components, but the use of a hyponym is noticeable in this case – the English name explains how ants torture their victims (they bite them), although the original context is silent on that matter.

As part of employing a combination of techniques, the use of an equivalent of a base word could have been accompanied by the replacement of one component with another one, selected arbitrarily, as in the case of the neologism *echoń pyskatek* [*echoloon*]. This neologism, formed from the words “*echo*” [echo] and “*pyskować*” [to talk back], most likely refers to a plant – the designatum of the name grows under the influence of sounds coming from its surroundings, usually curses spoken by tourists, which explains the presence of the second component. It was translated with the component *-loon*, which might invoke associations with a bird species (loon) or the word “*loony*”. Another example of using this combination of techniques is the translation of the neologism *rokęs przytajnik*, which was coined based on the words “*kęsek*” [a morsel] and “*tajny*” [secret]. Its equivalent (*morselone*) renders the meaning of one of the bases (morsel) and at the same time resembles the word “*chelone*”, which refers to a plant belonging to the family *Plantaginaceae*, but the context, as in the case of the source neologism, makes its meaning clear.

7. Equivalents motivated by selected components of authorial neologisms and context

There are also equivalents where one component was translated with an equivalent of the base word and the other was replaced with yet another equivalent, with the decision on using a component semantically unrelated to the original name being motivated by the context. This was the case with the translation of the neologism *zmyłek oczajduszny*, formed using the words “zmylić” [to confuse] and “oczajdusza” [a scamp]. The equivalent *deadly deceptorite*, which makes use of the word “deceive” as the base of the second component, renders only one of the possible meanings expressed with the authorial neologism. Its first component (the word “deadly”), alliterative to the second one (the neologism *deceptorite*), is rooted in the context in turn – *zmyłek* is an animal resembling a signpost, which directs tourists to a precipice in order to eat the corpses of its ambushed victims afterwards. A similar procedure is noticeable in the example of the neologism *krotowrzask* [*yellwort*], where one component of the combination was translated literally (“wrzask” – yell), while the other was replaced with the component *-wort*, which can be found in common names of medicinal plants (e.g., bellwort, lungwort). The same applies to the neologism *cieplaki* [*warmstrels*] – the base word (“ciepły” – warm) was translated using a dictionary equivalent with the addition of a component present, among others, in names of flying animals (e.g., kestrel, pipistrel), since *cieplaki* are plants producing mirages perceivable in the heated air above them. A slightly different situation occurs with the neologism *zimniaki*, which might be associated with the words “zimno” [cold] and “ziemniaki” [potatoes] – the fact that the first connotation is correct is made known to the reader only by the context. This is probably the reason why the translators chose the equivalent *chillips*, which renders the meaning of the correct base (chill) and introduces a new connotation (tulip), thus changing the nature of the idea.

Another pair, the mixed neologism *wartaj modry*, which was not described in the context, and its equivalent *blue wizzom*, illustrates the employment of the combination of an equivalent motivated by a very general piece of contextual information (other representatives of flora or fauna) and a hypernym. The first component of this neologism could invoke associations with the name “wałtlik charłaj” [speckled bush-cricket] (which refers to an insect) or the word “wartki” [rapid], and its equivalent (*wizzom*) – with the

word “whiz”, whereas the second component, which alludes to a shade of blue, was translated with the hypernym *blue*, which makes a fine reference to the authentic common names of living (e.g., blue duiker) and extinct (e.g., bluebuck, blue antelope) mammal species.

8. Equivalents motivated by context

Other equivalents were even less similar or completely dissimilar to the base words of authorial neologisms, but they were motivated by context. This is illustrated with the translation of the neologism *przewrotnik podstawiec* (from “przewracać” [to knock over], “podstawiać” [to trip]), which refers to a reptile hiding in the bushes and hunting tourists by tripping them up with its tail in order to then eat the fallen prey. The equivalent *trippersneak* (from “tripper”, “trip”, “sneak”, “sneakily”) reveals a piece of information other than the source name, clarified in the context. Another example of such an equivalent is the neologism *brainbasher* (brain, bash) as the equivalent of the neologism *miażdżycza kamienula*, which refers to a tree bearing “pumpkin-sized” fruit in the original and “melon-sized” fruit in the translation, which fall down on tourists (killing them) if they pick up a flower of *okrucytia*, which lives in symbiosis with *miażdżycza*.

9. Equivalents with an unclear motivation (coined arbitrarily)

The motivation of the equivalents of the neologisms *wędlowiec* and *cichlust*¹¹, in turn, is difficult to establish. The equivalent of the absolute neologism *wędlowiec* (i.e., the structural neologism *herpeton*), which invokes associations with the word “herpetology”, suggests that the word refers to a reptile, which is in fact untrue, since the only thing known about *wędlowiec*, which has a tail and long fangs, is that it is a predator. The equivalent of the structural neologism *cichlust* (from “cichy” [quiet], “chlustać” [to gush, to throw]), which refers to a tall tree capable of blinding a tourist by propel-

¹¹ This group also encompasses the neologisms *mordelia wyżwawka* [*carnivamp*], *pośladkówka otwornica* [*dementeria*], *trupawka niedośćmawka* [*marshmucker*], *tryblas druzgotek* [*saprophoid*], *moczyścier przeprzaśny* [*scrooch*], *rzęsula niedołażka* [*fripples*], and *zatapiacz bulgotny* [*maraudola*], which are discussed in section 3 of the article.

ling a venomous juice into their eyes if they cut its bark, is the structural neologism *solinthia*, which invokes associations with the words “solitary” and “forsythia”.

Conclusions

The above observations on the translated names of space flora and fauna support a range of conclusions. Firstly, the motivation of a given equivalent (neologism, context, illustration, or their combination) does not have to, and in this case does not, influence how the naming function of neologisms is actualised in translation. The equivalents, regardless of whether there were shifts along the neologism–context–illustration line or not, name exactly the same designata in the translation as they do in the original, that is, plants, animals, and elements with an unclear definition: the equivalent *furiol* used for the neologism *wściekłoja*, which – as in the original – names a tree (although it does not altogether suit this purpose), might give rise to some doubts. Doubts of a different kind arise from the equivalents *herpeton* (the equivalent of the neologism *wędlowiec*, which still refers to an animal, but implies that it is a reptile, thus enriching the represented world with another one) and *chillips* (the equivalent of the neologism *zimniaki*, which invokes associations with flowers rather than bushes), since their use results in the creation of elements with characteristics different from the original ones. In other cases, the differences in the manner in which names are presented (i.e., an increase in the number of one-word names in the text of the translation), have no effect on how they perform the naming function – indeed, one-word names of plants and animals expressed with neologisms seem natural. Such a manner of presentation influences, however, the creation of the represented world in the translation – the impression of strangeness experienced by the reader is diminished by reducing the number of structural neologisms, thus making the text more intelligible and preventing the situation where the proposed equivalents, being excessively literal, could be awkward (cf. Hejwowski 2009: 114). The sense of strangeness in the translation is also lessened by reducing the supply of neologisms simply by omitting them, as illustrated in the example of the neologisms *rozrabień wrzaskotek* and *drwacz wyprzastek brzeszczozgrzębny*. The application of this translation technique when translating neologisms could result in removing not only a name from the text but also the element to which the name referred

from the represented world, as demonstrated by the neologism *wszechjadek bylepas*. A broader context of the omissions described in the article (neologisms or their components) shows, however, that the translators were most probably aware of the potential risks and consequences of employing this translation technique. This is evidenced by the fact that they applied it sparingly and as a last resort, usually in combination with another technique, to make the equivalents expressed with neologisms sound natural (i.e., forming one-word structural neologisms instead of combinations), and if they did decide to leave out a given neologism or its component, they did it very cautiously, and only in circumstances where the outcomes of the decision would be the least noticeable, that is, in fragments with a sudden condensation of neologisms, where the translators could allow themselves greater translation freedom by creating neologisms with unclear derivations (*fripples*, *scrooch*; *carnivamp*, *dementia*, *geekling*, *maraudola*, *marshmucker*, *saprophoid*). The technique of omission employed as a supplementary one sometimes leads to a weaker sense of strangeness, illustrated by the translation of the neologism *mściwiec bezdrożnik* [*vengerix*], but it can be balanced if adding a component which is non-existent in the original and which implies the meaning the reader rejects when confronted by the name alongside the context (the context reveals that the equivalent *morselone* referring to the neologism *rozkęs przytajnik* is an animal rather than a plant), or if the information concerning the components omitted from the translation is still readable based on the context (as in the case of the neologisms *okrucytia cudawka* [*cruella*] and *echoń pyskatek* [*echoloon*], the equivalents of which disclose less contextual information, which makes them stranger).

Shifts in the opposite direction are also possible: in such a case, an equivalent expressed with a neologism reveals additional information presented in the context or in the illustration accompanying the neologism, which makes it more recognisable. This kind of reduction in the impression of strangeness is observable in the example of equivalents motivated by:

1. an illustration and selected components of the source neologism, i.e., *przebizad uporek* [*drillbeaked borbit*];
2. selected components of the source neologism and the illustration accompanying another neologism, i.e., *ostrobodziec tyłowłoki* [*spiny slothodile*];
3. selected components of the neologism, an illustration, plus context, i.e., *fetorówka obrzydlnica* [*foul-tailed fetido*];

4. selected components of the neologism and context, i.e., *krotowrzask* [*yellwort*];
5. all components of the neologism and context, i.e., *zimniaki* [*chillips*], *cieplaki* [*warmstrels*].

The sense of strangeness, however, is not diminished if the information suggested in the name and present in the illustration is replaced with something else (*rollipede* instead of *woczykij*) – the same applies to equivalents motivated by context, i.e., *miażdżycza kamienuła* [*brainbasher*], *przewrotnik podstawić* [*trippersneak*], and *zmyłek oczajduszny* [*deadly deceptorite*]. The reduction of the sense of strangeness can also be prevented by translating the components of source neologisms by means of their dictionary equivalents (*paśowa róża* – *crimson rose*, *goryczka rozumna* – *sentient gentian*, *goryczka szalona* – *crazy gentian*, *wyjec elektryczny* – *electric howler*), dictionary equivalents of their (possible) base words (*czajak polkliwy* – *swallurker*, *wężonóg teleskoppek* – *snakefooted telescoper*, *pismaczek przedrzeźniak* – *scribblemock*, *wartaj modry* – *blue wizzom*), and equivalents of their base words used in combination with a hyponym (*mrówka krzesławka dręczypupa* – *bottombiter chair ant*). Nevertheless, when applying the above-mentioned techniques, the creative function sometimes changes in the event of an interference with the contextual description, as demonstrated in the example of the neologism *wyjec elektryczny* [*electric howler*].

Trans. by Monika Czarnecka

References

- Baranowa A. 2008. *Śmieszne i straszne. Rysunki Stanisława Lema. Na marginesie wystawy w Galerii dylag.pl. Kraków, 13 March–26 April 2008*, “Quart” 2(8), pp. 110–115.
- Dziwiz M. 2013. Językowe mechanizmy tworzenia autorskich neologizmów w utworach z gatunku *fantasy* (na przykładzie opowiadań *Andrzeja Sapkowskiego*), “Acta Humana” 4(1), pp. 119–125.
- Goral A. 2015. *Neologizmy autorskie w powieści “Rzeczy uprzyjemniające. Utopia” T. Bóldak-Janowskiej*, “Studia Wschodniosłowiańskie” 15, pp. 299–313.
- Handke R. 1989. Językowe sposoby kreowania składników fantastycznych, in: R. Handke, L. Jęczynek, B. Okólska (eds.), *Spór o science fiction. Antologia szkiców i esejów o science fiction*, Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie, pp. 228–248.
- Hejwowski K. 2015. *Iluzja przekładu*, Katowice: Śląsk.
- 2009. *Kognitywno-komunikacyjna teoria przekładu*, Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

- Kaźmierczak M. 2017. *Od przekładu intersemiotycznego do intersemiotycznych aspektów tłumaczenia*, "Przekładaniec" 34, pp. 7–35.
- Krajewska M. 2006. *Polsko-rosyjski słownik Lemowych neologizmów*, Toruń: TNT.
- Lem S. 2008. *Ratujmy kosmos (List otwarty Ijona Tichego)*, in: S. Lem, *Kongres futurologiczny: opowiadania Ijona Tichego*, Warsaw: Agora, pp. 135–148.
- 1982. *Let Us Save the Universe (An Open Letter from Ijon Tichy)*, in: S. Lem, *Memoirs of a Space Traveler: Further Reminiscences of Ijon Tichy*, trans. M. Świącicka-Ziemianek, J. Stern, New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, pp. 139–153.
- Newmark P. 1988. *A Textbook Translation*, London-New York: Prentice-Hall International.
- Pleciński J. 2010. *Neologizmy autorskie w przekładzie. Vítorio Kali: "Terramoto" ("Trzęsienie ziemi")*, in: K. Hejwowski, (ed.), *Tłumaczenie – leksyka, frazeologia, styl*, Warsaw: Instytut Lingwistyki Stosowanej UW, pp. 146–151.
- Skibińska E., Rzeszutnik J. (eds.) 2010. *Lem i tłumacze*, Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka.
- Skubalanka T. 1962. *Neologizmy w polskiej poezji romantycznej*, Toruń: TNT.
- Stockwell P. 2000. *The Poetics of Science Fiction*, http://www.academia.edu/724531/The_Poetics_of_Science_Fiction (access: 25.05.2019).
- Suvin D. 1979. *The State of the Art in Science Fiction Theory: Determining and Delineating the Genre*, "Science Fiction Studies" 17(6), part 1, March.