

ANNA DRZAZGA

Institute of Linguistics

University of Silesia, Katowice, Poland

ORCID: 0000-0001-6121-9294

anna.drzazga@us.edu.pl

SHAKESPEARE'S AGENTIVE NEOLOGISMS IN SUFFIX -ER AND THEIR TRANSLATIONS INTO POLISH

The present paper is an empirical, corpus-based study of the Polish translations of Shakespeare's agentive neologisms in *-er* in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The inspiration for the analysis was Kalaga's book *Nomina Agentis in the Language of Shakespearean Drama* (2016), where the author selects 39 Shakespeare's agentive neologisms in *-er*. The paper surveys qualitative and quantitative tendencies of translation techniques adopted by nineteenth and twentieth-century translators occurring in the corpus placed against the context of general discussion on the translation of neologisms. A brief discussion concerning word formation processes with the suffix *-er* in the current and Early Modern English systems of word formation precedes the analysis.

Keywords: neologisms, *nomina agentis*, Shakespeare, translation

1. Introduction

Shakespeare is credited for the first recorded use of 1,700 words (Tousignant 2016), and even if he was not the first user of some of the words, he furthered their popularity and circulation via their usage in his plays. Some of his coinages were *hapax legomena*, and some were picked up and reused. In his experimentation with the resources of the lexicon, Shakespeare employed three types of word-formation processes: 1) affixation (e.g. *reveller*, *unlettered*). 2) conversion (window, v. (N→V): *Would'st thou be window'd in great Rome, and see Thy master thus...?* (Ant. and Cl. 4.14.72) and 3) the use of hyphenated compounds (e.g. *giant-world*). Hope (2010) states that Shakespeare coined new words primarily by adding suffixes or prefixes. One of his favourite prefixes was the prefix *-un* to negate concepts suggesting, at the same time, a process of 'undoing something', e.g. in the following:

*Yet I,
A dull and muddy-melted rascal, peak,
Like John-a-dreams, unpregnant of my cause,
And can say nothing; [...]* (Hamlet, Act 2, Scene 2, Lines 601-604)

Unpregnant means here that Hamlet is unresourceful or unimaginative. In other words, he is not full of or pregnant with motivation or resources. According to Brook (1976: 132), there are more than 600 instances of using this prefix in Shakespeare's corpus. Also, Barber (1997: 239) found 164 words with the prefix *-un-*, of which Shakespeare was the first recorded user. *Un-* is described as the most productive prefix in Early Modern English and was often preferred to the Latin *in-* or *dis-* prefixes. Another affix Shakespeare was particularly fond of is the agentive *-er* suffix, which he added to a verb to coin a noun meaning *one who does* [verb]. For example,

appearer, i.e. one who appears (Pericles, Act 5, Scene 3, Line 18),
moraler, i.e. a moralizer (Othello, Act 2, Scene 3, Line 294), or
torturer, i.e. one who inflicts or causes torture (Richard II, Act 3, Scene 2, Line 198).

Of course, these are not the only affixes Shakespeare used to form new words. His derivational style of coinage is best described in terms of 'morphological liberties' (Garner 1987: 216) because Shakespeare freely mixed bases and a large variety of affixes of native and foreign origin to reach the desired dramatic effect, which is the manifestation of the independent character of his creativity.

The present paper is an empirical, corpus-based study of the Polish translations of Shakespeare's agentive neologisms in *-er* in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The inspiration for the analysis was Kalaga's book *Nomina Agentis in the Language of Shakespearean Drama* (2016), where the author selects 39 Shakespeare's agentive neologisms in *-er*. The paper surveys qualitative and quantitative tendencies of translation techniques adopted by nineteenth and twentieth-century translators occurring in the corpus placed against the context of general discussion on the translation of neologisms. A brief discussion concerning word formation processes with the suffix *-er* in the current and Early Modern English systems of word formation precedes the analysis.

2. Source material and data collection

As the group of neologisms selected for the present analysis is retrieved from Kalaga's study (2016), consequently, in the present paper, we follow the choices and assumptions that she has made concerning such aspects as the choice of the

source material and data collection, adopted definition and classification of agent nouns, and finally the selection of Shakespearean agentive neologisms in *-er*. For her analysis, the data are extracted manually from the *Arden Edition of the Works of William Shakespeare* and consulted with the *Norton Facsimile of the First Folio of Shakespeare's Plays*. The etymological information and glosses are cited after the *OED*, 2nd edition on CD-ROM, version 3.0. As far as the translations of the selected neologisms are concerned, they are collected from:

Polski Szekspir. Repozytorium polskich przekładów Szekspira w XIX wieku. Zasoby, strategie, recepcja (Polish Shakespeare. A repository of Polish translations of Shakespeare in the 19th century. Resources, strategies, reception.), created as part of the project under the same title implemented in the years 2016-2019 at the Faculty of Modern Languages at the University of Warsaw. The project aimed to create a collection that, on the one hand, would offer electronic access to the 19th-century translations of Shakespeare and, on the other hand, would serve as studies reconstructing the circumstances of the creation and reception of the collected texts. The collection includes in its repository as many as twenty-seven translators. Out of this large group, fourteen translated only one play, and six translated less than four plays. Only a few translated more: Ignacy Hołowiński – six, Stanisław Egbert Koźmian – seven, Jan Komierowski – ten, Józef Paszkowski – thirteen and Leon Ulrich – all thirty-seven plays (considered at the time to be the complete works of Shakespeare). In our analysis, we consider all the translations included in the collection.

William Shakespeare, komedie w przekładzie Stanisława Barańczaka (William Shakespeare, comedies translated by Stanisław Barańczak), *William Shakespeare, tragedie w przekładzie Stanisława Barańczaka* (William Shakespeare, tragedies translated by Stanisław Barańczak), and *William Shakespeare, dzieła w przekładzie Macieja Słomczyńskiego* (William Shakespeare, works translated by Maciej Słomczyński).

Shakespeare, Complete Works (1971) has also been consulted in the present analysis.

In the case of selecting Polish equivalents of the studied corpus traditional method, i.e. reading texts and text fragments, was employed. The chosen neologisms are collected from 26 plays. The number of neologisms included in each play varies from one to five.

3. Definition and classification of agent nouns

According to Kalaga (2016: 98), a noun categorised as an agent is "somebody who performs the action specified by, or connected with, the base [...] irrespective of its status in the synchronic word-formational system". Such a rather general definition of agency results from adopting the Cognitive Linguistics approach to categorisation - a prototype categorization model in which prototypical categories exhibit degrees of category membership; not every member is equally representative of a category (Geeraerts 1989). Thus, the prototypical and less prototypical members may be identified as agent nouns. The prototypical agent is a [+Human] entity that "is conscious, acts with volition (on purpose), and performs an action that has a physical, visible effect in the discourse world" (Payne 2010: 224). According to Luschützky and Rainer (2011: 290), a prototypical deverbal agent noun is typically glossed as 'one who Vs'. The category of agents also includes less prototypical members provided that their agentive reading is contextually evident (e.g. inanimate objects in metaphorical extensions, even though they lack [+Human] feature). Based on the adopted model, Kalaga includes the following into the category of agent nouns: 1) derivatives with a transparent, compositional meaning, 2) derivatives with additional semantic features, e.g. [+Habitual], [+Professional], 3) denominal formations (see her discussion in Chapter 4). She organises agent nouns into classes depending on the level of their analysability:

unanalysable agent nouns, i.e. *wholesale borrowings* from Latin or French that have agentive meanings; these nouns can not be treated as *Nomina Agentis*, i.e. names of agents of actions (Drzazga and Kakietek 2021), from a derivational point of view, but they are derived agent nouns in their donor languages; some of them, later on, through the process of backformation, gained the status of analysable agent nouns,

analysable agent nouns that occur in the corpus with twelve agent-forming suffixes: *-er*, *-ess*, *-man*, *-or*, *-ster*, *-ist*, *-ian*, *-eer*, *-ary*, *-ard*, *-ar*, *-ant*.

4. The suffix *-er*

In the current system of English word formation, the suffix *-er* is regarded as the "principal agentive suffix" and "the first choice when it comes to deriving an Agent Noun from a verb" (Szymanek 1989: 176). A very high degree of productivity of the suffix may be attested by the fact that native speakers of English often add it to newly coined verbs, e.g. *to xerox* – *a xeroxer* and the receiver of the message understands the new coinage based on the context and their linguistic knowledge (Akmajian et al. 1979: 117). Jespersen (1965: 229)

claims that the suffix may be attached to almost any verb to form new words of this type. Also, Quirk and Greenbaum (1980: 436) argue that the *-er* suffix is fully productive and that it is almost always possible to coin an ad hoc agent noun in the frame: (*regular*)-er *N*, for instance:

*John flouts authority. (*John is a flouter.)*
John is a regular flouter of authority.

-Er is also often used to coin nonce formations and ad hoc structures, which supports the claim that the suffix is highly productive. Thanks to its semantic transparency and phonological regularity, native speakers of English have no difficulties in understanding new *-er* coinages. According to Szymanek (1989: 177), it occurs most frequently with most verbs, including native monosyllabic verbs and bisyllabic and Latinate bases. The suffix is also attached to nominal bases to form agent nouns. According to Bauer (1979), it cooccurs with simplex forms and compound bases. In the case of compound bases, Bauer (1979) suggests two patterns. In the first pattern, the *-er* suffix is attached to the compound word as a whole, e.g. *blockbuster*, *skateboarder*, *wild-lifer*, etc. In the second pattern, the suffix is attached to the second element of the compound, e.g. *end-consumer*, *impulse buyer*, *whistle blower*, etc. The compound bases of the agentive nouns in Bauer's corpus include verbs (*moon-walker*) and nouns (*skibobber*), with the difference that the number of agent nouns derived from compound nouns is more significant than those derived from compound verbs. The agentive suffix *-er* can also be added to phrases to form agent nouns: *big banger*, *free speaker*, *do-it-yourselfer*, *free-for-aller*, etc. (Bauer 1979: 27-29).

Although the suffix is often regarded as fully productive, there are certain limitations or preferences about its use. According to Szymanek (1989), the suffix usually occurs with transitive verb-bases. However, the obligatorily transitive verbs can take an *-er* agentive suffix only when its obligatory object is formally expressed in the post-verbal object position or as a member of a compound (Randall 1984: 317, in Szymanek 1989: 176), for example,

- a. *maker of coffee* b. *coffee-maker* c. **maker*

There are also restrictions concerning applying the *-er* suffix to intransitive verbs. Namely, some intransitive verbs do not combine with the suffix, e.g. **faller*, **dier*, which Randal (1984: 317, in Szymanek 1989: 176-177) attributes to their semantic constitution. Following his argument, only those intransitive verbs related to protracted or repeated actions can form *-er* nouns. Another limitation enumerated by Szymanek (1989: 175) follows Marchand's (1969: 273 in Szymanek 1989: 175) argument that *-er* agent nouns cannot be derived from verbs that cannot undergo passivization, which explains the nonexistence of agentive nouns derived from verbs like *belong* or *cost* (**belonger*, **coster*).

Additionally, the current system of English word formation does not allow to derive agent nouns from modal verbs (**muster*, **canner*) and quasi-copulas, e.g. *appear*, *grow*, *seem*, etc., as well as from verbs which are themselves derived from primary agent nouns (Kastovsky 1982: 195 in Szymanek 1989: 175), e.g. *doctor* – to *doctor* – **doctorer*, which is the manifestation of pragmatic limitations on agent nouns formation. Kastovsky (1982) argues that the existence of simple words like *doctor* or *fool* blocks the derivation of agentives, although the derivation is structurally possible. The present discussion is only superfluous, and its aim is just a brief introduction to the topic of word-formation processes employing the agentive suffix *-er*. For a more detailed discussion, refer, among others, to Levin and Rappaport (1988), Rappaport Hovav and Levin (1992), Ryder (1999), Marchand (1969), and Bauer (1979).

5. The suffix *-er* in Shakespeare's English

Kalaga's (2016: 105-108) analysis of the word-formation processes employing the suffix *-er* suggests that this suffix was the major agent-forming morpheme in Shakespeare's period. The aspects indicative of the high level of *-er* productivity are, among others, a large number of derivatives in *-er* selected from the corpus, including several neologisms coined by Shakespeare, a considerable number of hapax legomena, and the combinatorial flexibility of the suffix. Moreover, some restrictions concerning the application of the *-er* suffix in Modern English do not seem to have been operative in Shakespearean English. Consider the derivative *stealer* where the blocking constraint is violated, or, e.g. *liver* ('one who lives) and *breather* ('one who breathes'), which are agent nouns derived from verbs denoting activities general to all human beings and, as such, according to Szymanek (1993: 177-178), can not constitute bases for agent noun formation. The principle of the unacceptability of a derivative in *-er* because it is homophonous with some other unrelated word also seems to be violated, which may be exemplified by the word *liver* meaning either 'one who lives' or 'one who is alive'.

6. Shakespeare's agentive neologisms in *-er*

Newmark's (1985: 139) definition of a neologism is adopted for the analysis: "Neologisms can be defined as newly coined lexical units or existing lexical units that acquire a new sense". For the present analysis, a given word is considered a Shakespearean coinage – a neologism – if it is recorded by OED as first used by him. The total number of neologisms in *-er* selected by Kalaga (2016: 113-114) is 39. Mostly, these are deverbal agentive neologisms that

follow the pattern: one who does [verb], e.g. *all-seer*, *appearer*, *boggler*, *breather*, *breeder*, *candle-holder*, *cheerer*, *confirmer*, *counter-caster*, *employer*, *fortune-teller*, *injurer*, *interceptor*, *interposer*, *king-killer*, *manager*, *opposer*, *pauser*, *plodder*, *ratifier*, *torturer*, *undeserver*, *waverer*, *thunder-bearer*. Three derivatives contain an additional semantic feature [+Professional]: *hare-finder*, *perfumer*, and *rat-catcher*. The group also includes denominal agentive neologisms, e.g. *truncheoner*, *correctioner*, *sworder*. According to Kalaga's survey, most Shakespearean neologisms have been institutionalised, and some (e.g. *employer*, *manager*) are further lexicalised with more specialised meanings. Some of his coinages remained nonce-formations (*boggler*, *candle-holder*, *correctioner*, *counter-caster*, *pauser*, *moraler*, *perfumer*), and the noun *protester*, meaning 'one who makes a protestation,' is the only citation in this meaning.

7. Neologisms in translation

It goes without saying that translating neologisms is one of the most critical problems for translators, or as Newmark (1985: 139) puts it, "Neologisms are perhaps ... translator's biggest problem." First, a neologism as a new word usually does not exist in a dictionary. Naturally, it often does not have its equivalent in a target language, so the translator needs to infer its meaning from the context. Secondly, the translator must decide how to approach the problem of translating a new coinage. There are not many possibilities. One of them is to keep the original word, as in the case of Rowling's neologism *quidditch* (a fictional sport invented by J.K. Rowling for her fantasy book series *Harry Potter*) which has the same form in Polish as in English. The second possibility is to adopt a new word to the target language (TL). And this possibility opens a couple of options for translators: a neologism may be translated by finding an equivalent word or a word with a similar meaning in the TL (selection of an appropriate analog in the TL), using transcription or transliteration (i.e. adopting the word in its original form, with or without adjusting it to the pronunciation and morphology systems of the TL), by creating calques (i.e. translating the elements of the word literally) or using description (explanatory translation and descriptive translation). Translators deal with this problem differently, taking different approaches and translation techniques. Newmark (1985: 141-149) has analysed the translation of neologisms in detail by proposing groups of neologisms that include "old words with new senses", "new coinages", "derived words", "abbreviations", "collocations", "eponyms", "phrasal words", "transferred words" and "acronyms". For each type of a neologism, Newmark proposes a corresponding translation technique according to his theoretical framework and so, for example: old words with new senses are usually translated either by a word that already exists in the target language, or by a short functional or

descriptive term; new coinages (nowadays, they are usually brand or trade names) are typically transferred or replaced by a functional or generic term; derived words are usually translated by means of through-translation or transference with inverted commas; abbreviations generally are written out in the target language; collocations are given recognized translation or they are transferred and added a functional descriptive term; eponyms are translated with respect to the type of eponym, for example, if they refer to the referent's ideas or qualities, the translator needs to add these, when eponyms are derived from objects (these are usually brand names) they are transferred only when they are equally well-known and accepted in the TL; phrasal words are translated by their semantic equivalents; transferred words are usually given a functional descriptive equivalent; finally, acronyms in translation are replaced by either a standard equivalent term or, if it does not exist, a descriptive term. Epstein (2012: 29-66), on the other hand, conducted an analysis of the translation of neologisms in children's literature and concluded that translators first have to understand how the word is made and then decide whether the component parts of a coinage should be broken down and recreated in the TL or whether a different strategy should be applied. Still, another approach to translating neologisms is represented by Niska (1998), who proposes using a near equivalent (a more general or more specific word) in the TL, providing an explanation of the neologism and loan translation, where the elements of the word are directly translated into the TL. Considering various approaches to translating neologisms, four main strategies may be selected: near equivalent, explanation, loan translation and standard/recognized translation. Many translators resort to omitting neologisms in translation, which is frequently applied as a solution for overcoming non-equivalence (including neologisms) among languages.

8. Shakespeare in translation

Much has been written so far about various translations of Shakespeare's works. Barańczak (2004: 195) claims that it is not an easy task to translate Shakespeare and that the translator should follow four guidelines: 1. the translation should not violate the inviolable meanings of the original, 2. the translation should sound clear and understandable, 3. at the same time, it should be poetically dazzling and, 4. in addition, it should be successfully performed on stage. At the same time, Barańczak admits that the balance between all four guidelines is very rare and that translators always strive to follow one or two of them at the expense of the others. Following Barańczak's suggestions, the translation of Shakespeare's works must be faithful to the original in a functional way; that is, it should produce informational, poetic, and scenic consequences that are as close as possible to those designed and thought over by the author

when he wrote them. All his works, as well as every literary text, are endowed with unique individuality, including several layers: the semantic layer, the layer of verbal sounds, and sound-linguistic phenomena, such as rhythm, melody, and emotional nature (Ingarden 1955, 1975). All these layers should be considered and appropriately balanced in the translation process. Krysztofiak (1996: 31) adds some more elements that the translator should consider, i.e. certain structural elements of translation, which are, among others, aesthetic and poetic norms of the original and their place in the target language and culture, also an epoch in which the original appears, as well as perception and reception of the target text. When it comes to translations of Shakespeare, the passage of time must also be considered. The language and the theatrical and poetic conventions of the original era and its translations have grown old. Also, Shakespeare's extraordinary talent for expressing complex poetic imagery, mixed metaphors, and clever puns does not make translators' work easy. It can not be denied that Shakespeare was an "experimenter with language" (Brewer 2017: 345), "the supreme coiner of words" (Hope 2010: 11) and that his works show "a desire to experiment with the resources of the language and, in particular with the lexicon" (Damascelli 2007: 2). It is also an undeniable fact that the specific genius of Shakespeare lays in his creative ability, unusual intelligence, skills, and sensitivity. Thus, Shakespeare's language is of a very complex nature, at times even difficult to understand. As such, it constitutes a rich corpus that can be analysed from different points of view, considering aspects such as Shakespearean rhetoric, semantics, pragmatics, stylistics, syntax, and in particular, the lexicon. There is also much research done on the ground of translation of his works.

All in all, the ultimate goal of translating a literary text, including Shakespeare's output, seems to preserve the uniqueness of this text. For this purpose, the translator can use specific translation techniques and, above all, their knowledge, artistic sensitivity, creativity, and intuition. Literary critics, theatre critics, and translators analysed various translations of Shakespeare, paying particular attention to one or several aspects mentioned above (e.g. Barańczak 2004, Polski Szekspir 2016-2019). And, in all this thicket of many analyses focusing on various aspects of translations of Shakespeare, the present paper aims to examine a selected group of Shakespearean neologisms and their translations into Polish in the nineteenth and twenty centuries.

9. The analysis

The studied sample contains 39 neologisms in suffix *-er* (Appendix A: Shakespeare's agentive neologisms in *-er*) collected from 26 William Shakespeare's plays (Appendix B: List of William Shakespeare's plays).

The present analysis shows that the translators of selected for the study corpus employed only four translation techniques, which are the following: synonymy (the use of near equivalent), calque (word-for-word translation), explanatory translation, and omission. For the present analysis, it may seem appropriate to briefly describe the four techniques. According to Newmark (1988), *synonymy*, or *the use of near equivalent*, consists in the use of a near target language equivalent to a source language word in a context where a precise equivalent does not exist. *Calque*, or *through-translation*, is a word-for-word translation of well-known words, common collocations, names of organizations and components of compounds. *Explanatory translation* or providing a *descriptive term* is close to the interpretation of the word and explains essential elements of the meaning of the translated word. Finally, *omission* as a translation technique is used by translators to delete words, phrases, sentences or even longer parts of translated texts to solve a translation problem at the word level or above.

The use of synonyms was the most often chosen translation technique by nineteenth and twentieth-century translators. Consider some examples:

sin-absolver – Pol. *rozgrześca, spowiednik*
waverer – Pol. *wietrznik, wiatropęd, latawiec, zmiennik, lekkoduch*
fortune-teller – Pol. *wróż, prorok, wróżbita*
ratifier – Pol. *potwierdziciel*
sworder – Pol. *bandyta, zabijaka*

In many examples, the translational equivalent was quite evident as there was/is a synonym functioning in Polish, e.g. Eng. *sin-absolver*- ‘spowiednik’, Eng. *fortune-teller*- ‘wróżbita’, ‘prorok’. Some other similar examples might be Eng. *opposer* – ‘przeciwnik’, ‘wróg’, Eng. *torturer* – ‘oprawca’, ‘kat’, Eng. *night-brawler* – ‘hałaburda’, Eng. *cheerer* – ‘pocieszycielka’. In some other cases, e.g. *waverer* or *boggler*, Pol. ‘obłudnica’, ‘wietrznica’, the translator had to rely on the meaning of the verbs serving as the base for the derivatives and the context. In both cases, the quality of being susceptible to change and being erratic was considered and translated into Polish, referring to the wind as a very changeable weather phenomenon or to a kite (Pol. ‘latawiec’), which changes the direction of its flight depending on the wind. Here, Polish *latawiec* is an inanimate object in metaphorical extension functioning as *nomina agentis*. Another similar example is Polish *plus minus* (Eng. ‘plus minus’), the translational equivalent of *counter-caster*, or *candle-holder* translated into *świecznik* (Eng. ‘candlestick’), meaning a person who holds a candle. The Shakespearean *sworder*, referring to a person who kills others with a sword, loses some of its meaning in Polish as its translations are *bandyta*, *zbój*, or *zabijaka*, in which case the instrument used to kill is not indicated. Interestingly, the word *truncheoner*, a person that carries a truncheon, has its Polish equivalent indicating the instrument held by a person: *palkonośca* (‘one who holds a truncheon’).

In many cases, it is difficult to find an appropriate Polish equivalent in the form of a synonym for many reasons: it may sound awkward, unnatural, or odd, and it may be challenging to think up a word that would convey the meaning of the original. Finally, stylistic considerations, the rhythm of the poem, or the phonetic layer of the word, line, or the whole stanza may play a decisive role in the choice of translation technique, or in some cases, it may as well be a pure coincidence or creative inspiration. Let us consider some examples:

truncheoners – Pol. *ludzie z kijami*

all-seer – Pol. *ten co wszystko przegląda z wysoka*

candle-holder – Pol. *Jam dziś skazany wśród gwaru zabawy stać i przyświecać, Ze u mnie w duszy ciemno, wiec poniosę światło, Ja będę jak ten pacholek z przysłowia, co trzymał lichtarz i stał na uboczu*

cheerer – Pol. *winorośl, której sok raduje serca, jej wino, które serca rozwesela*

injurer – Pol. *potwornie ranisz niebiosa i ziemię, Potworo! krzywdzisz niebo i ziemię*

employer – *ani Troilus, który pierwszy w historii skorzystał z usług rajfura, i Troilus, który pierwszy zatrudnił rajfura, Troilus, który pierwszy postugiwał się stręczycielami*

boggler – Pol. *zawsze byłaś zmienna*

plodder – Pol. *A mędrzec, który w księgach się zagrzebie, jedynie prawdę cudzą w nich odłoni, umysły ślęczące*

breather – Pol. *żywa istota, żywa dusza*

In many instances, translators describe/explain a given neologism by including in the description a Polish verb or adjective corresponding to the meaning of the verbal base of the translated coinage. Thus, we have the following Polish verbs included in the descriptive translation: *ranić*, *krzywdzić* ('to injure', 'to harm') in example 10, *skorzystać*, *zatrudnić*, *postugiwać się* ('to use', 'to employ', 'to use sb to do sth') in example 11, *radować*, *rozweselać* ('to rejoice', 'to cheer up') in example 9, and adjectives, for instance, *zmienna* ('changeable') in example 12. The word *breather* means 'he who breathes' and is rendered into Polish descriptively as *żywa dusza* or *żywa istota* ('a living being'), where the adjective *żywa* referring to a person is associated with the process of breathing. In the case of the word *plodder*, the whole sentence renders the meaning intended by the author as the expressions *w księgach się zagrzebie* and *umysły ślęczące* refer to the hard work of studying. *Candle-holder* is a person who holds a candle or an attendant/assistant who lights those who are engaged in any work by night. The meaning in Polish is rendered by the description of the duties of such a person, i.e. *przyświecać* ('to light one's way with a torch'), *ponieść światło* ('to carry the light') and finally, *trzymać lichtarz* ('hold a candlestick'). *Truncheoners* are rendered in Polish as *ludzie z kijami* meaning people carrying sticks, clubs.

The third most frequent translation technique is a calque, i.e. word-for-word translation. Consider some examples of the use of this technique:

all-seer – Pol. *Wszystkowidzący*
rat-catcher – Pol. *szczurów łowca*
sin-absolver – Pol. *z grzechów wybawca*
gull-catcher – Pol. *dudko-łowczyni*,
moraler – Pol. *moralista*
night-brawler – Pol. *burda nocny*
king-killer – Pol. *królobójca*
thunder-bearer – Pol. *gromonosca*

Based on the collected samples, it may be observed that Polish equivalents of English hyphenated neologisms are spelt differently, i.e. they are not hyphenated, except for *dudko-łowczyni*. *Dudko-łowczyni* is not a typical example of a calque as the first element of the word is not literally translated into Polish – the bird species is changed into a hoopoe. Similarly, *burda nocny* deviates from a typical calque as the order of elements within the translational equivalent is reversed. *Z grzechów wybawca*, on the other hand, retains the structure of the original English word, but it is preceded by the prepositional phrase in Polish.

Finally, the translators decided to omit the translation of words that could be problematic for them. *Protester* is the only neologism omitted by all the translators selected for the study. The majority of them decided to omit the translation of the word *cutter-off*, except for one case where it is translated descriptively: *Fortuna jest bez miłosierdzia dla Natury, gdy naturalnemu głupstwu każe naturalny dowcip przecinać*. The Polish verb *przecinać* refers to the verb *cut off*, thus conveying the intended meaning.

Except for the word *protester* which is the only one in the corpus that was omitted in translation by all translators, there is a group of words that are translated with the use of only one translation technique; these are the following:

synonym in TL: *breeder* (Pol. *dziecko*), *counter-caster* (Pol. *księgowy, rachmistrz, rachmistrzyną, matematyk, plus minus*), *opposer* (Pol. *przeciwnik, wróg*), *torturer* (Pol. *oprawca, kat*), *sworder* (Pol. *bandyta, zbój, zabijaka*),
 explanatory translation: *gibbet-maker* (Pol. *cieśla szubieniczny, cieśla szubienicy*), *perfumer* (Pol. *zatrudniono mnie przy wykadzaniu pomieszczeń, kazano mi perfumować powietrze, paliłem kadzidło, użyto mnie do okadzania pokojów, jestem do wykadzania pokoi*), *hare-finder* (Pol. *naganiacz zajęcy, łowca zajęcy*)
 calque: *king-killer* (Pol. *królobójca*)

On the other extreme, there is the word *all-seer*, which is translated with the use of all four techniques: synonym – *Bóg wszechmogący*, calque – *Wszystkowidzący*, explanatory translation – *ten, co wszystko przegląda z wysoka*,

and finally omission. The rest of the neologisms are translated using more than one translation technique. For example, *rat-catcher* is also translated employing a synonym – *dusiszczur*, *trapi-szczur*. Some translators showed much creativity in translating *rat-catcher* as *źbik* ('wild cat'), *kot* ('cat') and *myszolów* ('buzzard'), which are animals that hunt or prey on other animals, for example, rats. In Table 1, all the analysed neologisms are organised into sets according to the number of translation techniques employed to render each of them into Polish. In most cases, the translators used two or three translation techniques, making it possible to conclude that a perfect technique or solution does not exist while translating neologisms. Each translator handled the problem of individual neologisms in different ways relying on their linguistic knowledge, intuition, and, probably most important, creativity.

Table 1 Number of translation techniques applied in the translation of the selected neologisms

Number of translation techniques applied to translate each neologism			
1	2	3	4
breeder	appearer	candle-holder	all-seer
gibbet-maker	breather	rat-catcher	
counter-caster	boggler	sin-absolver	
hare-finder	interceptor	waverer	
perfumer	confirmer	cheerer	
king-killer	injurer	gull-catcher	
opposer	correctioner	moraler	
sworder	underserver	night-brawler	
torturer	cutter-off	ratifier	
	employer	thunder-bearer	
	fortune-teller		
	interposer		
	manager		
	plodder		
	pauser		
	protester		
	rumourer		
	truncheoner		

On the other hand, Table 2 shows the distribution of particular translation techniques in the selected corpus. As can be seen, the translation technique most often employed is the use of synonyms in TL and explanatory translation. Omissions were used less frequently and calques the least often.

Table 2 Distribution of translation techniques in the selected corpus

Translation technique	Number of instances out of a total of 200	%
Synonym	80	40
Calque	20	10
Explanatory translation	76	38
Omission	24	12

Table 3 shows the distribution of translation techniques used by translators in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Table 3 Distribution of translation techniques used by translators in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries

Translation Technique	Number of instances out of a total of 200		%	
	19th century	20th century	19th century	20th century
Synonym	52	28	39	43
Calque	16	4	12	6
Explanatory Translation	49	27	36	42
Omission	18	6	13	9

The data in Table 3 show that there is a tendency to translate Shakespearean neologisms employing their synonyms in Polish and explanatory translation and that word-for-word translation and omission are rarely used in the studied corpus, no matter whether nineteenth or twentieth-century translators are taken into consideration. When calque is used, translators often create a neologism in the target language because of adopting the structure of the source language. The risk of this technique is that the newly coined word may sound unnatural or indicate the translator's lack of TL knowledge. Thus, at the same time, poor use of calques may distort the reception of the translated text, and probably no translator would want it, which is proved by the collected data. Consequently, the question is how many calques and synonyms used in the Polish translations are neologisms too.

Only a few. The group of Polish neologisms includes only sixteen such formations. For example, two are established words in Polish with new meanings: *świecznik* and *plus minus*. *Świecznik* is an inanimate object in metaphorical extension; although it lacks [+Human] feature, its agentive meaning is contextually evident for the reader. *Plus minus* is a quantifier meaning 'more or less', and as in the case of *świecznik*, it is given a clear agentive meaning in the context it appears. The second group of Polish neologisms is formed from an existing root or prefix. Consider the following ones: *dudko-łowczyni*, *trapiszczur*, *palkonośca*, *gromonośca*, *potwierdziciel*, etc. *Błuźnierka* ('injurer') derives from *błuźnierca* ('blasphemer'), where the feminine suffix *-ka* replaces the masculine suffix *-ca*. Moreover, the form *błuźnierca* may be easily found in dictionaries of the Polish language, but its feminine form seems to be coined by a skilful translator, and it does not appear in dictionaries. Similarly, in the case of *rachmistrzyna* ('counter-caster'), the suffix *-yna* is added, which changes the meaning of the word giving it a slightly pejorative sense. And here again, as in the case of *błuźnierka*, the word cannot be found in the dictionaries taken into consideration in the present study, which allows the assumption that it is a neologism. On the other hand, the suffix *-yna* added to the names of professions carries a slightly pejorative meaning. For example, *kucharzyna* is a bad cook, or *pisarzyna* is a bad writer. Some of these formations may be found in dictionaries (*pisarzyna*), some not, which means that the words ending with this suffix are not fully established formations in Polish and, in many cases, function as neologisms. Such a small number of neologisms in Polish means that translators avoided coining new words. What is also interesting is the fact that nineteenth-century translators coined all the discussed neologisms and that the neologisms did not enter the Polish lexicon. Words like, for example *gromonośca*, *palkonośca*, *trapiszczur*, *rozgrześca* or *potwierdziciel* are not in use. It seems that they were words used once only to render the meaning intended by the author as well as possible. Table 4 shows the list of Shakespearean neologisms whose Polish translations are neologisms too.

Table 4 Polish neologisms as translational equivalents of Shakespearean *-er* neologisms

Shakespearean neologism	Polish translational equivalent in the form of neologism
candle-holder	świecznik
counter-caster	plus minus
counter-caster	rachmistrzyna
gull-catcher	dudko-łowczyni
injurer	błuźnierka
rat-catcher	dusiszczur

Shakespearean neologism	Polish translational equivalent in the form of neologism
rat-catcher	myszolap
rat-catcher	myszy-lapka
rat-catcher	trapiszczur
ratifier	potwierdziciel
sin-absolver	rozgrześca
sin-absolver	rozgrzeszca
thunder-bearer	gromonośca
thunder-bearer	gromowładzca
truncheoner	pałkonośca
waverer	zmiennik

Similarly, omission in translation is not the best choice. When the translator decides to leave out a given word or fragment in the translation process, they risk changing or distorting the meaning of the translated text. Indeed, when this technique is used too often, it can impoverish the translated text. The statistical study shows that translators tend to avoid calques and omissions in favour of using synonyms and explanatory translations. This tendency proves very effective, especially in translating Shakespeare, whose choice of words and grammar structures is not accidental. First of all, when neologism is spotted in a line or a verse, it is worth asking what the role of this word in this particular place is, what effect Shakespeare wanted to convey, and what would have been conveyed if some other word had been used. Thus, the choice of a linguistic form that would convey the meaning of the original is a crucial problem for translators. The results of the analysis show that the group of translators taken into consideration was aware of the importance of their choices in translating neologisms. To avoid violating the original's inviolable meanings, they strived to convey the sense of Shakespearean neologisms, either taking up the challenge of finding a word of similar meaning in Polish or describing the meaning as shown in the cited examples. The rule concerning the clarity of the translation of neologisms seems not to be violated either, since from the point of view of a modern reader of Shakespeare, the translated neologisms are understandable, and those that sound a little bit awkward are easily understood, taking into consideration their context. Finally, it would be worth adding that it seems rather difficult to judge whether Barańczak's principle of the translation being poetically dazzling and successfully performed on stage is implemented. It is tough to objectively assess the poetic quality of the translation as it is a subjective feeling, and as such, it was not the subject of the present analysis.

10. Conclusions

To conclude, the present analysis shows that: 1) there are no significant differences in the choice of translational techniques between the nineteenth and twentieth-century translators; 2) the translators made use of the selection of an equivalent/synonym in the TL, explanatory translation, calque, and omission; 3) the most common translation technique is the use of a synonym in the TL, almost on par with explanatory translation; 4) the use of calques and omissions are techniques that are relatively rarely used in the corpus material.

This study attempted to investigate translations of Shakespeare's works from a different viewpoint, which was to reveal translation techniques applied by various translators in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in translating Shakespearean neologisms.

References:

- Akmajian, A., R.A. Demers, R.M. Harnish 1979. *Linguistics: An Introduction to Language and Communication*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Barańczak, S. 2004. *Ocalone w tłumaczeniu*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo A5.
- Barber, Ch. 1997. *Early Modern English*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Bauer, L. 1979. Patterns of productivity in new formations denoting persons using the suffix *-er* in Modern English. *Cahiers de Lexicologie* 35: 26-31.
- Brewer, Ch. 2017. Shakespeare, Word-coining, and the OED. Retrieved from <https://www.cambridge.org/core>. Oxford University Museum of Natural History, on 22 Dec 2017.
- Brook, G.L. 1976. *Word Formation. The Language of Shakespeare*. London: Andre Deutsch.
- Damascelli, A.T. 2007. Shakespeare: The Power of Language and the Language of Power. Retrieved: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/242264023_Shakespeare_The_Power_of_Language_and_the_Language_of_Power
- Drzazga, A., P. Kakietek 2021. *An English-Polish Dictionary of Linguistic Terms*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.
- Epstein, B.J. 2012. *Translating Expressive Language in Children's Literature: Problems and Solutions*. Oxford: Peter Lang.
- Garner, B.A. 1987. Shakespeare's Latinate neologisms. In V. Salmon, E. Burness (eds.), *A Reader in the Language of Shakespearean Drama*, 207-28. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Geeraerts, D. 1989. Introduction: Prospectus and problems of prototype theory. *Linguistics* 27(4): 587-612.
- Hope, J. 2010. Shakespeare and Language. In *The New Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare. Cambridge Companions to Literature*, 77-90. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Ingarden, R. 1955. O tłumaczeniach. In S. Pollak (ed.), 1975, *Przekład artystyczny. O sztuce tłumaczenia, księga druga*, 127-190. Wrocław, Warszawa, Kraków, Gdańsk, Ossolineum.
- Jespersen, O. 1965. *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles. Part VI: Morphology*. Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard.
- Kalaga, A. 2016. *Nomina Agentis in the Language of Shakespearean Drama*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.
- Kastovsky, D. 1982. Word-formation: a functional view. *Folia Linguistica* 16: 181-190.
- Krysztofiak, M. 1996. *Przekład literacki we współczesnej translatoryce*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo UAM.
- Levin, B., and M. Rappaport 1988. Non-event *-er* nominals: A probe into argument structure. *Linguistics* 26: 1067-1083.
- Luschützky, H.C., and F. Reiner 2011. Agent-noun polysemy in a cross-linguistic perspective. *Language Typology and Universals* 64(4): 287-338.
- Marchand, H. 1969. *The Categories and Types of Present-Day English Word-Formation. A Synchronic-Diachronic Approach*. München: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung (Second, completely revised and enlarged edition).
- Newmark, P. 1985. *A Textbook of Translation*. Shanghai: Foreign Language Education Press.
- Newmark, P. 1988. *Approaches to Translation*. Hertfordshire: Prentice Hall.
- Niska, H. 1998. Explorations in translational creativity: Strategies for interpreting neologisms. Workshop paper, 8th Aug, Stockholm University. Retrieved February 09, 2022.
- Oxford English Dictionary*. 2nd edition on CD-ROM, version 3.0.
- Payne, T.E. 2010. *Understanding English Grammar: A Linguistic Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Quirk, R., and S. Greenbaum 1980. *A University Grammar of English*. London: Longman.
- Randal, J.H. 1984. Grammatical information in word structure. *Quaderni di Semantica* 5: 313-330.
- Rappaport H., and B. Levin 1992. *-Er* nominals: implications for the theory of argument structure. *Syntax and Semantics* 26: 127-153.
- Ryder, M.E. 1999. Bankers and blue-chippers: An account of *-er* formations in present-day English. *English Language and Linguistics* 3(2): 269-297.
- Szymanek, B. 1989, 1993. *Introduction to Morphological Analysis*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwa Naukowe.
- Tousignant, M. 2016. How did Shakespeare shape the English language? *The Washington Post*, April 17, Retrieved: https://www.washingtonpost.com/lifestyle/kidspost/can-you-spot-words-and-phrases-shakespeare-invented/2016/04/15/0a6c8f04-fff5-11e5-9203-7b8670959b88_story.html
- Wielki słownik języka polskiego*, 2006. Świat Książki, Bertelsmann Media sp. z o.o., Warszawa.
- Wielki słownik języka polskiego*, <http://www.wsjp.pl>
- Słownik języka polskiego*, 1958-1969. W. Doroszewski (ed.), Warszawa.

Primary sources:

The First Folio of Shakespeare. The Norton facsimile (2nd ed.).

The Arden Shakespeare, second and third series.

Polski Szekspir. Repozytorium polskich przekładów Szekspira w XIX wieku. Zasoby, strategie, recepcja. Retrieved from: <http://polskieszekspir.uw.edu.pl/>.

William Shakespeare, komedie w przekładzie Stanisława Barańczaka. 2012. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Znak.

William Shakespeare, tragedie i kroniki w przekładzie Stanisława Barańczaka. 2013. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Znak.

William Shakespeare, dzieła w przekładzie Macieja Słomczyńskiego. 1979-88. Wydawnictwo Literackie, Kraków.

Shakespeare, W. 1971. *Complete Works*. London: Oxford University Press.

Appendix A

- all-seer* ('one who sees all'; Rich.III)
appearer ('one who appears'; Per)
boggler ('one who boggles or hesitates'; Ant.and Cl.)
breather ('he who breathes'; Ant.and Cl.)
breeder ('that who breeds or produces offspring'; Tit.A.)
candle-holder ('one who holds a candle; an attendant or assistant who lights those who are engaged in any work or ceremony by night'; Rom.andJul.)
cheerer ('one who cheers'; Hen.V)
confirmer ('one who confirms'; John)
counter-caster ('one who casts with counters'; Oth.)
correctioner ('one who administers corrections'; 2Hen.IV)
cutter-off ('one who cuts off'; A.Y.L.)
employer ('one who employs'; Much Ado)
fortune-teller ('one who tells fortunes'; Com.Err.)
gibbet-maker ('one who makes gibbets'; Tit.A.)
gull-catcher ('one who catches gulls'; Twel.N.)
hare-finder ('a man whose business is to find or espy a hare in form'; Much Ado)
injurer ('one who injures'; John)
interceptor ('one who intercepts'; Twel.N.)
interposer ('one who interposes'; Merch.V.)
king-killer ('one who kills a king'; Timon)
- manager* ('one who manages (something specified); L.L.L.)
moraler ('a moralizer'; Oth.)
night-brawler ('one who brawls during the night'; Oth.)
opposer ('one who opposes'; All.Well)
pauser ('one who pauses'; Macb.)
perfumer ('one employed to fumigate or perfume rooms'; Much Ado)
plodder ('one who plodds'; L.L.L.)
protester ('one who makes a protestation or a solemn affirmation'; Jul.C.)
rat-catcher ('one whose business is to catch rats'; Rom.andJul.)
ratifier ('one who ratifies'; Ham.)
rumourer ('one who disseminates rumours'; Cor.)
sin-absolver ('one who absolves sins'; Rom.andJul.)
sworder ('one who kills another with a sword'; 2Hen.VI)
thunder-bearer ('the bearer of thunders'; Lear)
torturer ('one who inflicts or causes torture'; Rich.II)
truncheoner ('one who bears a truncheon'; Hen.VIII)
undeserver ('one who is not deserving (of sth)'; 2He.IV)
waverer ('one who wavers'; Rom.andJul.)

Appendix B

William Shakespeare's plays and the abbreviations of their titles

<i>All's Well That Ends Well</i> (All.Well.)	<i>King Henry VI Part 2</i> (2Hen.VI)
<i>Antony and Cleopatra</i> (Ant.and Cl.)	<i>King Henry VIII</i> (Hen.VIII)
<i>As You Like It</i> (A.Y.L.)	<i>King John</i> (John)
<i>Coriolanus</i> (Cor.)	<i>King Lear</i> (Lear)
<i>Hamlet</i> (Ham.)	<i>King Richard II</i> (Rich.II)
<i>Julius Caesar</i> (Jul.C.)	<i>King Richard III</i> (Rich.III)
<i>King Henry IV Part 2</i> (2Hen.IV)	<i>Love's Labour's Lost</i> (L.L.L.)
<i>King Henry V</i> (Hen.V)	<i>Macbeth</i> (Macb.)
<i>Much Ado About Nothing</i> (Much Ado)	<i>The Merchant of Venice</i> (Merch.V.)
<i>Othello</i> (Oth.)	<i>Timon of Athens</i> (Timon)
<i>Pericles</i> (Per.)	<i>Titus Andronicus</i> (Tit.A.)
<i>Romeo and Juliet</i> (Rom.andJul.)	<i>Twelfth Night</i> (Twel.N.)
<i>The Comedy of Errors</i> (Com.Err.)	