CrossRoads
A Journal of English Studies

ISSUE 2/2013

Editor-in-chief:
Agata Rozumko

Editorial Board:
Zdzisław Głębocki, Jerzy Kamionowski, Ewa Lewicka-Mroczek,
Nadzieja Monachowicz, Grzegorz Moroz, Kirk Palmer, Jacek Partyka,
Dorota Potocka, Dorota Szymaniuk, Anna Tomczak

Editorial Assistants:
Weronika Łaszkiewicz, Ewa Tołoczko

Language editors:
Kirk Palmer, Peter Foulds

Advisory Board:
Pirjo Ahokas (University of Turku), Lucyna Aleksandrowicz-Pędich
(SWPS: University of Social Sciences and Humanities), Xinren Chen
(Nanjing University), Marianna Chodorowska-Pilch (University of Southern
California), Zinaida Charytończyk (University of Białystok / Minsk State
Linguistic University), Gasparyan Gayane (Yerevan State Linguistic University
"Bryusov"), Marek Gołębiowski (University of Warsaw), Anne-Line Graedler
(Hedmark University College), Cristiano Furiassi (Università degli Studi
di Torino), Jarosław Krajka (Maria Curie-Skłodowska University / University
of Social Sciences and Humanities), Marcin Krygier (Adam Mickiewicz
University), A. Robert Lee (Nihon University), Elżbieta Mańczak-
-Wohlfeld (Jagiellonian University), Zbigniew Maszewski (University
of Łódź / University of Białystok), Sanae Tokizane (Chiba University),
Peter Unseth (Graduate Institute of Applied Linguistics, Dallas)

Contents

Agata Rozumko
The University of Bialystok

Lexicographic representations of English epistemic adverbs

An overview of problems based on selected monolingual and bilingual (English-Polish) dictionaries

Abstract. Polish students often have problems identifying the contexts in which English epistemic adverbs such as *arguably, conceivably, presumably* can be used because their uses and functions tend to be culture- and language specific. In consequence, their repertoire of English epistemic adverbs is rather narrow. The aim of this paper is to establish whether the definitions offered by commonly used dictionaries are helpful in learning the meanings and uses of English epistemics. It demonstrates that while the meanings of epistemic verbs and adjectives are usually defined at length, the meanings of the corresponding adverbs are often described very briefly or even omitted.
Keywords: adverb, epistemic, English, Polish, dictionary

Introduction

The term *epistemic adverb* refers to such adverbs as *conceivably*, *obviously*, *possibly*, *presumably* and *unquestionably,* i.e. adverbs used to express probability, possibility and certainty. The meanings and functions of such adverbs tend to be both language- and culture specific. As noted by numerous scholars, learning to speak with the appropriate degree of conviction is often a problem for non-native speakers of English (c.f. e.g. Holmes 1983). "They have to learn that the need to qualify one's statements and differentiate one's degree of "epistemic commitment" is greater in English than in most other languages" (Wierzbicka 2006: 251). Polish learners of English are no exception here. While both scholars and teachers pay quite a lot of attention to modal verbs, modal adverbs

are considerably understudied and poorly described in the literature. The following analysis is an attempt to examine the extent to which commonly used dictionaries are helpful in explaining the meanings and uses of English epistemic adverbs. Dictionaries are the most immediate and the most accessible sources of information about foreign lexical items, therefore the quality of the descriptions they offer is very important. Both traditional and on-line dictionaries will be studied, with an attempt to outline the tendencies in the lexicographic description of epistemic adverbs.

The scope of the study and the method

The relative scarcity of publications concerning epistemic adverbs results from the fact that their cultural and linguistic significance has been noticed only rather recently. In 2006, Wierzbicka devoted a chapter of her book *English: Meaning and Culture* to an analysis of the role of epistemic adverbs in English. Her study provides important insights into cross-cultural and cross-linguistic differences in the use of epistemics and prepares the ground for further research. A number of significant problems connected with the description of epistemic adverbs, which in Polish linguistic tradition are usually referred to as modulators, modal particles or modal operators, have recently been raised by Danielewiczowa (2008a, 2008b, 2012), whose works offer important methodological suggestions in this area.

Wierzbicka (2006) argues that in comparison with other languages English possesses an extended class of epistemic adverbs, a property which she refers to as "a fact of great cultural significance" (2006: 249). She considers the frequent use of epistemic adverbs (and epistemic verbs) in English to be a consequence of the penetration of English speech patterns by the ideals of the Enlightenment. She writes: "[t]he cultural concerns reflected in the two [adverbs and verbs] categories are essentially the same, and in both cases they can be linked with the post-Lockean emphasis on the limitations of human knowledge, on the need to distinguish knowledge from judgement, and on differentiating between different degrees of assent" (Wierzbicka 2006: 247). It remains to be verified whether the class of epistemic adverbs is indeed so extended in modern English. However, even a brief study of the inventories of epistemic adverbs in English and Polish shows that the task of identifying equivalents within the two sets is not simple, e.g. Polish has no positive speech-act adverbs, such as *arguably* and *admittedly* (c.f. Rozumko 2012). Neither does it have equivalents of such adverbs as *conceivably* and *reportedly*: there are no adverbs derived from the Polish equivalents of *conceive/conceivable* and *report*. As a result, it is difficult for Polish learners to identify the contexts in which such adverbs should be used, and, as I have demonstrated elsewhere, their repertoire of English epistemic adverbs tends to be rather narrow (Rozumko 2008).

The dictionaries used in the present study include *The Great English-Polish Dictionary* by Stanisławski (1999), *Collins English-Polish Dictionary* (1996), *The Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* (1990), and two online dictionaries: bab.la (http://pl.bab.la/slownik) and The Free Dictionary (www.thefreedictionary.com). They are all commonly used dictionaries which

Polish learners of English are likely to consult. Bab.la was conceived as a dynamic project, open to contributions from its users, which is why its definitions are sometimes problematic. Its founders take no responsibility for the examples coming from external sources. Instead, they encourage the users of bab.la to suggest corrections and improvements. Despite these shortcomings, the dictionary is useful because it contains numerous examples illustrating the use of epistemic adverbs (and other lexical items) in different contexts. The English examples contain references to the sources from which they have been excerpted and links to the websites where they can be found in wider contexts. The Free Dictionary offers definitions which come from a number of traditional dictionaries, such as: *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language* (2009), *Collins English Dictionary – Complete and Unabridged* (2003), *Collins Thesaurus of the English Language – Complete and Unabridged* (2009), as well as the electronic lexical database of English WordNet 3.0.

It is beyond the scope of the present paper to analyze the ways all English epistemic adverbs are defined in the dictionaries. Such a task would also require establishing their exact number in English because no satisfactory classification or selection criteria have been proposed for this category so far. Those singled out for the analysis include the adverbs which Wierzbicka (2006: 262) lists as the most central ones in English: *allegedly, apparently, arguably, clearly, conceivably, evidently, obviously, possibly, presumably, probably, reportedly, seemingly, supposedly, undoubtedly* and *unquestionably*, as well as two less frequent ones: *avowedly* and *manifestly* in order to examine the correlation between the frequencies of the adverbs and their treatment in the dictionaries. Whenever the frequencies of the adverbs are given, reference is made to their occurrences in the British National Corpus (100 million words).

The omission of epistemic adverbs from dictionaries

The most characteristic tendency in the lexicographic sources analyzed in the present study is that epistemic adverbs tend to be given less attention than other lexical means of expressing epistemic modality, i.e. the verbs and adjectives which they derive from. Some of the adverbs under analysis do not even have separate entries in the dictionaries. It is particularly characteristic of one of the biggest English-Polish (and Polish-English) dictionaries: Stanisławski (1999). Among its 200,000 entries there are no entries for: *allegedly, arguably, evidently, manifestly, obviously, presumably, probably* or *reportedly*. While their existence in English is ignored by the dictionary, the adjectives and verbs which they derive from: *alleged, arguable, evident, obvious, probable, manifest, presume* and *report* are all defined. Interestingly, Stanisławski defines the adverb *presumedly*, which is marginal in English in comparison with *presumably*. *Presumedly* is not evidenced in the British National Corpus, while *presumably* has 3,198 occurrences in it. The lexicographer clearly focused on the patterns of word formation rather than the function and frequency of the word in English: *presumedly* is likely to have been listed because of its morphological similarity to *presumed,* which precedes it in the dictionary. The hierarchy of Stanisławski's lexicographic descrip-

tion is clear: verbal meanings are given most attention, then nominal ones, followed by adjectival meanings. Adverbial meanings are clearly thought to be of secondary importance or even omissible. Sometimes, as in the case of the adverbs listed above, even their forms are not registered in the dictionary.

Collins English-Polish Dictionary (1996) is smaller in size than Stanisławski (1999) – it has 80,000 entries – but it lists all the adverbs from Wierzbicka's (2006) list; it does not include the less frequent *avowedly* and *manifestly*. Contrary to Stanisławski, it does not list *presumedly*, which suggests that, at least in the case of epistemic adverbs, its compilers were to a greater extent guided by the frequency of the adverbs in English. Stanisławski's dictionary is much older than suggested by the year of the publication of the edition analyzed in this study, and as such it belongs to an older lexicographic tradition than Collins. It was written in the years 1955-1964, and revised in the 1970s. It contains numerous specialist terms (botanical, zoological), at the same time omitting many everyday words, such as the epistemic adverbs mentioned above. Collins is less specialist in its choice of terminology and more comprehensive in its coverage of the general lexicon.

The monolingual *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* (1990) does not define *avowedly*, *conceivably* or *manifestly*. It does not have separate entries for *allegedly*, *arguably, undoubtedly* or *unquestionably,* though these adverbs are defined briefly in the entries for the adjectives or verbs which they are derived from. A short definition of *allegedly* is included in the entry for *allege; arguably* is defined briefly in the entry for *arguable*; *undoubtedly* is included in the entry for *undoubted*, and a definition of *unquestionably* can be found in the entry for *unquestionable*. In Longman, the focus is clearly on the most frequent ones, such as *probably* (26,552 occurrences in the British National Corpus) and *obviously* (10,658 occurrences). The less frequent adverbs, i.e. *avowedly* (37 occurrences), *manifestly* (199), *conceivably* (266), and *unquestionably* (219) are given less or no attention.

Online dictionaries are more comprehensive. The online English-Polish dictionary bab.la defines all the adverbs under analysis with the exception of *conceivably*. The monolingual Free Dictionary lists and defines all of them.

The use of synonyms and multiple equivalents to explain the meanings of epistemic adverbs

One of the most significant problems connected with the description of epistemic adverbs is that lexicographers tend to define them by providing their synonyms, i.e. they give other epistemic adverbs as their equivalents. This problem has already been noted by Danielewiczowa (2008b) with reference to monolingual dictionaries of Polish. In this way, individual properties of each of the adverbs are ignored and, as a result, none of them is properly defined. In the case of bilingual dictionaries, such treatment is to be expected because their users usually look for equivalents of English words in their native language. The problem is, however, that dictionaries often provide

several Polish equivalents of each of the English epistemic adverbs, thus losing the specific qualities of both the defined item and each of the equivalents. Stanisławski usually gives three or even four Polish counterparts for each of the English epistemic adverbs under analysis:

apparently: (1) *widocznie, najwidoczniej, najwyraźniej,* (2) *pozornie, na pozór*

avowedly – jawnie, otwarcie

clearly – oczywiście, najoczywiściej, najwyraźniej, bezspornie

conceivably – możliwie, it may conceivably have been so – to jest do pomyślenia, nie jest wykluczone

possibly – możliwie, być może

seemingly – pozornie, na pozór, widocznie

undoubtedly – niewątpliwie, z pewnością, zapewne

supposedly – przypuszczalnie, podobno, rzekomo

unquestionably – niewątpliwie, z pewnością, niechybnie, bezsprzecznie.

Such treatment suggests that either all the Polish equivalents have the same meanings and functions as their English counterparts or that none of them is in fact a direct equivalent of the English adverb. When four or five words, each having its own meanings and uses, are given as equivalents of one English adverb it is particularly difficult to identify the characteristic properties of the defined adverb. For example, the inclusion of *bezspornie* as one of the equivalents of *clearly* – alongside *oczywiście, najoczywiściej,* and *najwyraźniej* – obscures rather than clarifies the meaning of the English adverb. *Bezspornie* is semantically and morphologically close to *unquestionably* or *indisputably.* It derives from the verb *spierać się* (Eng. 'dispute, argue') in the same way as *indisputably* derives from the verb *dispute.* Neither of them refers to a statement based on available evidence the way *clearly* (and *najoczywiściej* and *najwyraźniej*) does.

Moreover, when one Polish adverb appears as an equivalent of several English adverbs the implication seems to be that those English adverbs also mean the same, e.g. *niewątpliwie* is given as an equivalent of both *undoubtedly* and *unquestionably,* and *możliwie* is given as an equivalent of *conceivably* and *possibly.* The choice of *możliwie* as an equivalent of the two adverbs is also problematic since, despite its morphological form, which suggests a similarity in meaning to the adjective *możliwy* ('possible'), the relation between the two is rather different and less straightforward than in the case of the English *possible* and *possibly.* Unlike possibly, *możliwie* is typically used before adverbs, as in *możliwie daleko* (roughly: 'as far as possible'). It can also be used to mean 'not too bad', e.g. when used in response to *Jak się czujesz*? ('How are you feeling?'). It seems that Stanisławski was misguided by its morphological likeness to the adjective it derives from.

COLLINS dictionary (1993) does not use *możliwie* to define any of the epistemic adverbs under analysis. The Polish equivalents which it provides are:

allegedly – rzekomo

apparently – najwidoczniej, najwyraźniej

arguably – prawdopodobnie, być może

clearly – wyraźnie, najwyraźniej, najwidoczniej

conceivably – niewykluczone

evidently – najwyraźniej, ewidentnie

obviously – wyraźnie, oczywiście

possibly – być może

presumably – przypuszczalnie

probably – prawdopodobnie

reportedly – podobno

seemingly – pozornie

supposedly – podobno

undoubtedly – niewątpliwie, bez wątpienia

unquestionably – niewątpliwie, bezsprzecznie.

As in Stanisławski's dictionary, the same adverb is given as an equivalent of several English adverbs, which suggests an identity of meanings between such adverbs as *arguably* and *probably*; *arguably* and *possibly*; *supposedly* and *reportedly*; *undoubtedly* and *unquestionably*; *apparently*, *clearly* and *evidently*; *clearly* and *obviously*. A close inspection of all the Polish equivalents suggests that their provision is not very consistent, i.e. if *być może* is given as an equivalent of both *arguably* and *possibly*, there seems to be no specific reason why *prawdopodobnie* is given as another equivalent of *arguably* but not *possibly*. The choice of some equivalents in both Stanisławski and Collins suggests that many epistemic adverbs are too readily treated as synonyms. Their individual semantic and syntactic properties are often ignored.

While defining English epistemic adverbs by providing lists of their rough equivalents in Polish does give dictionary users an idea of what their meanings are, such definitions are in fact imprecise. It is particularly true of those adverbs which have no direct counterparts in Polish, such as *arguably*, *avowedly*, *conceivably* and *reportedly*. In Polish there are no adverbs derived from the adjectives *dyskusyjny* (*arguable*) or *wyobrażalny* (*conceivable*). Likewise, there is no adverb corresponding in its morphological form to *reportedly*. The verb *report* itself has no straightforward equivalent in Polish. It may be translated as *donosić, zgłaszać,* or *relacjonować* (Collins), but none of these equivalents have any adverbial derivatives. Suggesting a semantic and syntactic identity between *reportedly* and *supposedly,* or *arguably* and *possibly* may therefore be rather confusing (and disappointing) for inquisitive readers.

The examples of their use are not very informative, either, e.g. in the entry for *reportedly* (Collins) we read: "he reportedly ordered them to …". The example is so nonspecific that it could also be used in the entries for *probably, clearly* or *obviously*. The sentence illustrating the use of *conceivably* in the Collins dictionary is equally uncharacteristic: "he may conceivably be right". The dictionary leaves it to its readers to wonder if the sentence would mean anything else if *conceivably* was replaced with *possibly* or *supposedly* in this context. The entry for *arguably* (Collins) is even less

precise: the Polish equivalents *prawdopodobnie* and *być może* are followed by the phrase "it is argu- ably …." translated as "jest to, być może…".

The strategy of treating numerous epistemic adverbs as synonyms is well illustrated in the entry for *presumably* provided by bab.la, which gives the word *prawdopodobnie* as its Polish equivalent, while in the Polish translations of the twelve English sentences illustrating its use, it is most often rendered as *przypuszczalnie,* as in the following example:

Eng.: "It produces these strings of light, *presumably* as some form of defense."
Pol.: "Produkuje te strumienie światła, *przypuszczalnie* jako coś na kształt ochrony."

As already mentioned, bab.la is open to contributions from its users, which the founders of the project do not verify. This is why the dictionary is often unreliable, in particular in the case of epistemic adverbs, whose individual semantic properties are even overseen by trained lexi- cographers. For example, the entry for *possibly* gives the words *może* and *możliwie* as its Polish equivalents, and the words *feasibly, perhaps, maybe, perchance,* and *mayhap* as its synonyms in English. With *możliwie*, bab.la falls into the same trap as Stanisławski, but it goes even further and provides an incorrect sentence illustrating its use in Polish. One of its English examples of the use of *possibly* is:

"The British government – any government is potentially the worst client in the world you could ever *possibly* want to have."

It is translated into Polish as:

"Brytyjski rząd – jakikolwiek rząd jest potencjalnie najgorszym klientem na świecie, którego *możliwie* chcielibyście mieć."

The use of *możliwie* in this context makes the sentence awkward. In fact, in Polish there are no modal adverbs which could be used in this sentence with the same function as *possibly*.

Another example of poor translation from the bab.la dictionary is the rendition of a sentence illustrating the meaning of *obviously*. The English sentence is:

"And I'm not very good at this, so I guess I'd better go play video games or get into sports, or something like that, because I *obviously* don't belong here."

Its Polish version is:

"Nie jestem dobry w tym, więc lepiej będzie jak zagram w gry, zaangażuję się w sport, bo *oczywiście* tutaj nie pasuję"

The choice of *oczywiście* as an equivalent of *obviously* is rather unfortunate; *najwyraźniej* would be a better option. Other collocations are also problematic: "zaangażuję się w sport" should be replaced with "zajmę się sportem", "zagram w gry" with "pogram w gry wideo" or "zagram w jakąś grę".

An important advantage of the bab.la dictionary is the provision of a considerable number of examples from English sources, which enables its Polish users to see the contexts in which certain lexical items are used. However, the Polish equivalents and translations it provides should be treated with caution.

The definitions provided by monolingual dictionaries are generally more informative, but they also rely on references to other epistemic adverbs in their definitions. The Free Dictionary defines (after Collins English Dictionary) *allegedly* as: *reportedly, supposedly*; *evidently* as *obviously, clearly; probably* as: *most likely, presumably; undoubtedly* as: *certainly, definitely, unquestionably*, etc.

Longman adopts the same strategy, defining *clearly* as: *undoubtedly, plainly* and using *probably* to explain the meaning of *presumably*: "it may reasonably be supposed that: probably: if you've already eaten, you presumably won't want dinner. Presumably you've read this notice (= I suppose/hope that you have)". Likewise, when defining *probably* Longman contrasts its meaning with that of *certainly*: *probably*: "almost (but not quite) certainly", and equates the meaning of *undoubtedly* (barely mentioned in the entries for *undoubted*, and *doubt*) with that of *certainly*: "There will undoubtedly (= certainly) be trouble with the unions if she is dismissed".

What usually distinguishes monolingual dictionaries from bilingual ones is the inclusion of notes on the usage of the lexical items which they explain. Bilingual dictionaries tend to be rather brief in this respect. However, in the case of the epistemic adverbs under analysis the notes offered by the monolingual dictionaries are also rather sparse. When defining *possibly* Longman refers the reader to its Language Notes on requests and tentativeness, which illustrate the use of *possibly* in polite requests and suggestions. The Free Dictionary has notes on the usage of *arguably*, saying that although the assertion it refers to is open to debate, it can be supported by persuasive argument, and *allegedly* – commenting on a recent tendency to use it in controversial, defamatory and sceptical statements. The entries for the other epistemic adverbs under analysis do not contain any notes on their usage.

References to the entries
of adverbs of a similar type

It is also common practice for dictionaries to invite their readers to compare adverbs of a similar type. Among the adverbs discussed here there is a group of adverbs referred to as evidential, i.e. those which signal that the speaker's claim is based on some evidence (cf. Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer 2007). They include *apparently*, *clearly, obviously, evidently* and *manifestly*. When defining each of them, Longman refers the readers to the entries of the others in the group:

"apparently: it seems (that); according to what I have heard: *I wasn't there, but apparently it was a good party. /Apparently they're intending to put up the price of electricity. /Did she pass her test? Apparently not.* (2) it is clear (that): Apparently she never got my letter after all. – compare EVIDENTLY, OBVIOUSLY"

"evidently: it is proved by clear signs (that); it is plain (that): *He's evidently not well.* – compare APPARENTLY, OBVIOUSLY"

"obviously: it can be easily seen (that); plainly: *This key is obviously the wrong one. /Is she sorry? – obviously not! Look at her.* – compare APPARENTLY, EVIDENTLY"

Such systemic treatment has its advantages because it presents the adverbs in a broader perspective and makes the readers aware of the existence of certain categories within the class of epistemic adverbs. Instead of looking at each of them individually and offering more or less accurate equivalents, it presents them as a system of interrelated elements with their individual properties and differences. However, for such a presentation to work it must follow certain principles. First of all, all the elements of the system should be presented, and, secondly, the differences between them should be stated explicitly, explained clearly, and illustrated with examples.

Most of the Longman definitions of the adverbs which can be classified as evidential state that they rely on some sort of evidence. However, they do not specify whether the evidence is of the same or a different kind for all of them. Thus, based on Longman, *apparently* seems to refer to aural evidence ("according to what I have heard"), while the definition of *obviously* suggests a reliance on visual evidence ("it can be seen"). The reference to *obviously* in the definition of *plainly* suggests that it also refers to visual evidence. The same, by extension, may be postulated for *clearly*, which is defined by a reference to *plainly.* In the case of *evidently* the type of evidence ("clear signs") is not specified. *Manifestly*, as already mentioned, is not listed in the Longman dictionary.

However, an inspection of the quotations included in the British National Corpus shows that the above interpretation is not necessarily correct. Among the 7,582 occurrences of *apparently* in the BNC there are numerous sentences which demonstrate that the conclusion that the adverb relies on aural evidence is wrong, e.g.:

"Later in the letter, considering apparently a different sort of poem written by Williams, Hart Crane confesses."

"For four days the battalion suffered continuous attacks from apparently limitless numbers, during which it made a fighting withdrawal of 10 miles."

"There we discovered the £7.50 hamburger meal, flower-selling girls with Chanel handbags and wealthy exhibitionists who apparently enjoyed being part of a human zoo, preening themselves on their extravagant yachts while the hoi-polloi stared up from the quayside."

It thus appears that interpreting Longman definitions literally, and assuming that they focus on the most distinctive properties of the lexical items which they explain is likely to lead to wrong conclusions. The strategy of comparing the meanings of adverbs of the same kind only makes sense when some differences between them are pointed out. Otherwise, the comparison only blurs their meaning. Longman entries for the other, i.e. non-evidential subcategories of the epistemic adverbs under analysis do not contain any references to the entries of adverbs of a similar type.

Defining adverbs with reference to the corresponding adjectives and verbs

Another tendency in the lexicographic descriptions of epistemic adverbs under analysis is explaining their meanings with reference to the verbs and adjectives they derive from. As noted by Danielewiczowa (2008), this approach is not restricted to dictionaries; it is also commonly used in grammar books and monographs on modality. The most extreme case of such a reduction of adverbial meanings involves putting adverbs at the end of the entries for the related adjectives and verbs, rather than explaining their meanings in separate entries. This is the case with the Longman definitions of *allegedly* – defined briefly in the entry for *allege* as "according to what is alleged", and *unquestionably* – defined in the entry for *unquestionable* as "which cannot be doubted, certain, indisputable". When epistemic adverbs are defined in separate entries their meanings are also often explained with reference to the adjectives or verbs which they derive from, as in the Longman definition of *possibly*: "in accordance with what is possible", the Free Dictionary definitions of *allegedly*: "it is alleged that", *arguably*: "it can be argued that", *clearly*: "in a clear manner", *presumably*: "one presumes or supposes that", and *obviously*: "it is obvious that". The verbal and adjectival meanings are clearly perceived as central while the explanations of adverbial meanings are reduced to the minimum. Such treatment ignores both the specific characteristics of epistemic adverbs as a category and the individual properties of each of the adverbs within the group.

As stressed by both Wierzbicka (2006) and Danielewiczowa (2008, 2012), epistemic verbs, adjectives and adverbs have their distinct meanings and functions. In expressing the speaker's knowledge, verbs are more subjective and speaker-centred than adverbs and adjectives. Phrases such as *I presume*, *I argue,* and *I suppose* emphasize the speaker's stance and his/her point of view. Adverbs, on the other hand, "objectify the speaker's own attitude by extending it, in anticipation, to other people" (Wierzbicka 2006: 289). By using an epistemic adverb the speaker indicates that s/he thinks "that his or her own stand can be shared by other people" (Wierzbicka 2006: 287). Epistemic adjectives, in turn, lack the element of subjectivity in their meaning. Expressions such as *it is possible,* or *it is obvious* make a statement sound more objective. Thus, as Danielewiczowa (2008a: 50-51) puts it, when the meanings of epistemic adverbs are reduced to the meanings of epistemic verbs, the element of objectivity is lost, while, by reducing their meanings to the meanings of adjectives we lose the element of subjectivity which is also inherent in their meanings.

Conclusions

As demonstrated above, dictionaries tend to pay less attention to epistemic adverbs than epistemic verbs and adjectives. Adverbs are more commonly omitted from dictionaries, in particular those whose frequency in English is not very high, such as *manifestly* and *conceivably*. Adverbial meanings are treated as secondary and derivable from adjectives and verbs, much in the same way as adverbs are derived from adjectives and verbs morphologically. This is why adverbs are often included in the entries of adjectives and verbs. The individual properties of each of the epistemic adverbs are not given much attention. Those which express similar meanings tend to be treated as synonyms, which is why monolingual dictionaries use lists of synonyms to define them, and bilingual dictionaries provide a number of Polish equivalents of each English adverb. From the perspective of a dictionary user the dictionaries would be more useful if they presented epistemic adverbs as a system of interrelated elements with their individual properties. However, such a presentation will only be possible when epistemic adverbs receive a more systematic treatment from language scholars.

References:

Danielewiczowa, Magdalena. 2008a. "Opis przysłówków epistemicznych jako wyzwanie teoretyczne", *Prace Filologiczne* t. LIV. *Seria Językoznawcza*, 47-62.

--. 2008b. "Jak nie należy opisywać przysłówków epistemicznych?", *Wiener Slawitischer Almanach*, Sonerband 72, *Lexikalishe Evidenzialitäts-Marker in slavischen Sprachen*, 109-128.

--. 2012. *W głąb specjalizacji znaczeń. Przysłówkowe metapredykaty atestacyjne*. Warszawa: Uniwersytet Warszawski, Bel Studio.

Holmes, Janet. 1983. "Speaking English with the appropriate degree of conviction". In: C. Brumfit (ed.) *Learning and Teaching Languages for Communication: Applied Linguistics Perspectives*. London: Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research, 100-113.

Rozumko, Agata. 2008. "An interdisciplinary approach to teaching grammar to prospective teachers of English". In: K. Bogacki, B. Głowacka and D. Potocka (eds.) *Interdisciplinary Perspectives in Foreign Language Teacher Education*, Białystok: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu w Białymstoku, 309-318.

--. 2012, "Speech-act adverbs in English and Polish: a cross-linguistic and cross-cultural comparison", *Białostockie Archiwum Językowe* 12, 183-196

Simon-Vandenbergen, Anne Marie and Karin Aijmer. 2007. *The Semantic Field of Modal Certainty: a Corpus-Based Study of English Adverbs*, Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

The British National Corpus: http://www.natcorp.ox.ac.uk/

Wierzbicka, Anna. 2006. *English: Meaning and Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dictionaries:

Collins English-Polish Dictionary. 1996. (ed. by J. Fisiak), Warszawa: Polska Oficyna Wydawnicza.

Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English (2nd edition) 1990. Longman: Harlow/Warszawa: PWN.

Stanisławski, Jan (1999), *The Great English-Polish Dictionary*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Philip Wilson.

http://pl.bab.la/slownik/

http://www.thefreedictionary.com

Vitaly V. Tur

Minsk State Linguistic University

Telic features in the semantics of English nominal compounds

Abstract. The paper presents the results of research on the semantic combinability of constituents of English nominal compounds. In the present study we proceed from the assumption that the generation of a compound occurs due to the actualization of some parts of the meaning of its constituents which are not always given explicitly in the surface grammar. In the course of the research conceptual analysis of the compounds has been done for the purpose of finding out the cases of profiling implicit information about the denoted objects that specifies their telic roles (their functions, the ways they may typically act or be affected, the purposes they may have in performing an act, and so on). The study results allow the argument that the system of nominal compounds has a set of principles and regularities in profiling telic features in the semantics of their constituents. The principles that have been determined in the course of the study find their description in the paper we present.

Keywords: compositional semantics, nominal compounds, qualia structure, telic role

Introduction

One of the most striking features of English nominal compounds is the discrepancy between the simplicity of their syntactic structure and the considerable variety of semantic relations they may express. It is surprising that nouns combined in a phrase generate a new compositional unit the meaning of which cannot be deduced from the sum of the lexical meanings of its constituents. It is even more surprising that in most cases speakers hardly seem to have any difficulty in determining the plausible semantic functions of a compound and interpreting its compositional meaning.

So how do the constituents of a compound interact within its semantic structure? Where does an extra part of the meaning of a compound come from? What semantic rules enable speakers to recover this meaning, even though it is not given explicitly in the surface grammar?

Recent research on the semantics of compounds offers a new alternative view on the stated problems. The idea is that the meaning of a compound is not necessarily confined to the lexical meaning of its elements: the semantics of a compound may include various types of encyclopaedic and pragmatic information associated with its denotata; thus, an adequate semantic description of compounds requires consideration of this information.

In the present paper I focus on the semantic structure of English nominal compounds whose compositional meaning requires actualising telic features associated with the denotata of their constituents (their built-in function, effects they may cause, ways they can be affected and so on). The aims of the described research are, firstly, to find out the kinds of telic features of the constituents which contribute to the compositional meaning of compounds; secondly, it is to determine the semantico-syntactic types of the compounds which require actualising this kind of semantic information.

Theoretical issues

Semantics has always been "the greatest area of confusion and disagreement" (Ryder 1994: 16) within the framework of the study of English noun-noun compounds. Although a lot of research has been done on finding ways to describe the meaning of English compounds (Jespersen 1909, Bloomfield 1933, Hatcher 1960, Marchand 1969, Lees 1963, Brekle 1970, Gleitman and Gleitman 1970, Adams 1973, Downing 1975, Bauer 1978, Levi 1978, Warren 1978, Selkirk 1982, Hacken 1992, 1994, 2000, 2004, Ryder 1994, Coulson 2000, Booij 2005, 2010, Benczes 2006, Heinz 2009, Lieber 2009, Jackendoff 2010), the semantic nature of compounding is still far from being fully explained.

The earliest studies on the semantics of compounds were done within the generativist framework (Lees 1963, Bauer 1978, Levi 1978, Warren 1978 and others). It was argued that semantic relations between the elements of nominal compounds were formed on the bases of implicit predicates in their deep structure, which were deleted on the surface but could be reconstituted by transformational procedures (*dust ball = ball **made of** dust* (Warren 1987: 113)).

However, in spite of all the advantages of the generativist approach, it suffered from a number of serious drawbacks. Firstly, one and the same compound could imply various predicates (consider Ryder's example of *dirt-machine,* which can imply about ten different predicates: *grind*, *pick up*, *move*, *suck up*, *produce*, *work with* and so on (Ryder 1994: 435). Secondly, the recovered predicates were in most cases too abstract and vague to convey the exact meaning of the compounds. Thus, for example, S. Coulson points out that the compounds *fertility pills* and *headache pills*, which according to Levy's model both entail the predicate FOR (Levi 1978), have significant difference in their meaning: *pills to increase fertility*, *pills to reduce headache* (Coulson 2000).

The problems of the generativist approach have shown that the interpretation of the meaning of a compound cannot be realised only by determining the semantico-syntactic relations between its constituents, but also presupposes some 'world knowledge' associated with them; thus, the explanatory power of any semantic theory would depend on its ability to account for it.

One of the first attempts to formalise this knowledge was taken by L. Bauer. In Bauer's view, the meaning of a compound can be specified by the semantic description of its constituents (for example, the meaning of *wind* contains 'force' which helps us to interpret *windmill* as 'a mill powered by wind' (Bauer 1979: 48)).

E.S. Kubryakova develops the idea of semantic description of the elements of compounds, and argues that it is not the recovering of the implicit predicate that lies in the nature of the interpretation of a compound but rather **the interaction of some parts of the meaning (units of information) of its constituents which are selectively actualised in the process of compounding** (Kubryakova 2002: 22). To illustrate the idea E.S. Kubryakova brings the example of the Russian compounds *lesnaja polyana* 'forest meadow', *lesnye materialy* 'forest product', *lesnoe hozyajstvo* 'forest industry'. She points out that different parts of the meaning of the modifier *forest* are actualised depending on the meaning of the head noun it is combined with. Thus, *forest* in *forest meadow* actualises the information about its territory with no trees on it; in *forest product*, vice versa, the knowledge about trees is relevant while the information about the territory is reduced; comprehension of *forest industry* presupposes actualising implicit information about the role of the forest in human life and so on. The same idea is also expressed by Z.A. Kharitonchik. Consider her examples of the Russian word combinations *vishnevyj sad* 'cherry garden', *vishnevoe platje* 'cherry dress', *vishnevoe varenje* 'cherry jam', where different pieces of semantic information are profiled from the meaning of the modifier (Kharitonchik 2004: 275).

One the most recent attempts to combine the semantic analysis of the compounds with the semantic analysis of their constituents has been made by R. Jackendoff. The author considers the tranformationalist approach misguided. He claims that "compounding is only barely syntactic" (Jackendoff 2009: 115) and the semantic function of the compound is profiled from inside the meanings of its constituents (Jackendoff 2009: 122). R. Jackendoff focuses on different aspects of the compound meaning that come from the semantics of constituents, underlining the role of the principle of co-composition in the process of compounding.

In his study R. Jackendoff dwells on the aspects of the meaning of the constituents that become relevant in the process of generating the complex meaning of a compound. Thus, comparing *helicopter attack* and *attack helicopter,* he points out that in the latter case the modifier serves as an explication of a **proper function** of *helicopter* being the essential part of its lexical meaning. The notion of proper function is very close to J. Pustejovsky's **telic function** in the qualia-structure of the meaning of nouns (Pustejovsky 1991), both used to formalise the process of lexical combinability.

The suggested approach to the nature of compounding, which focuses on how the meaning of two nouns contributes to the meaning of the word combination, offers the challenge for further research within the framework of the semantics of compounds. This approach has been chosen as a theoretical background for the semantic research of the compounds described in the present article. In this paper I will focus on the regularities of actualising **telic features** in the semantic structure of the constituents of English noun-noun compounds.

Pustejovsky's notion of telic features seems appropriate here because, unlike *proper function*, it can be applied not only to the class of artifacts and parts of organisms but to a wider range of objects. Following J. Pustejovsky, by the terms *telic features* or *telic role* I mean any type of semantic information in a lexeme about the denotatum that specifies the ways it can function or typically be affected, the knowledge about its proper function, the purposes it may have in performing an act, and so on. In other words, the telic role is a complex of qualities in the semantic structure of a substantive that in most cases allows it to be used in the role of the performer (causer) or the addressee of the action in the propositional structure of a compound. Thus, as can be seen from the definition, the difference between the notions of telic role and proper function is that the former serves as an umbrella term which includes the latter as an individual case among other possible functions.

The study involved the semantic analysis of 4000 nominal compounds. The methodological basis of the research that helped to formalise the analysis is the introduction of the semantics of nominals in terms of Qualia-structure, suggested by J. Pustejovsky. Qualia-structure is a set of four main classes of properties and qualities (roles) associated with a given lexical item: constitutive role (the relation between an object and its constituents, or proper parts), formal role (distinguishes an object within a larger domain: its orientation, magnitude, shape, etc.), telic role (purpose and function of the object, the ways it can act or be affected, etc.), and agentive role (factors involved in the origin of the object). Thus, for example, the Qualia-structure of the lexemes *novel* and *dictionary* is presented in the following way:

Novel
Const: narrative
Form: book/disk
Telic: read
Agentive: artifact, write
Dictionary
Const: alphabetized-listing
Form: book/disk
Telic: reference
Agentive: artifact, compile (Pustejovsky 1991: 427)

According to Pustejovsky's conception, the realization of any role is possible in the process of the generation of different complex units, including the generation of nominal compounds. As can be seen from the examples below, the semantic variations of a modifier can be analysed according to what qualia is realised in a given compound:

hand palm
hand tattoo

hand lotion

hand control.

Thus, in (1) it is the **constitutive role** of the lexeme *hand* which is relevant; in (2) it is the **formal role** (location). (3) and (4) presuppose actualisation of different **telic functions** of the modifier (to be used for grasping, holding; to be cared for, etc.).

The results of my research show that the telic role is actualized in about 40% of all the nominal compounds examined, either in one of their components or in both of them. Among these are the compounds with various semantico-syntactic relations, each of them described separately further in the article.

3.1. Actor – action/result

The semantic interpretation of the compounds under analysis presents a number of problems which haven't been solved in the framework of the transpositionalist approach. One of the problems can be illustrated by comparing the examples in (1):

a. *teakettle whistling*

b. *wind whistles*

c. *bird whistles*

d. *wheel whistling*

Despite the fact that the head-nouns in all the compounds in (1) name one and the same action, its agents specify its meaning, which can be possible only on condition that the semantic structure of the words *teakettle*, *bird, wind*, *wheel* initially possess mental schemata of the named action. It suggests the idea that a head noun does not denote whatever action can be "mechanically" applied to the agent of the proposition, but rather serves as an **explication of its inherent telic function**.

Note also that the process of whistling presents completely different types of activity for different agents in (1). Thus, for (1a), (1c) it is the realisation of the proper functions of an artifact and a living being. However, in (1d) whistling is not something that the artifact is designed to perform (consider some more examples of this kind: *factory poison, cigar ashes, fridge noise, boot tracks*). In cases like these the head noun expresses **a side action (result)** of the modifier which is performed alongside the realisation of its proper function.

For a more complex case, consider the elliptical constructions in (2):

a. *meteoric risk*

b. *parental advice*

   c. fan letters

   d. frost damage

Semantic interpretation of the compounds in (2) requires recovering not only the deleted predicate but also the rest of the propositional structure with its implicit arguments: *meteoric risk*=risk of hitting **the Earth**, *parental advice*=advice **to children**, *fan letters*=letters **to the object of worship**, *frost damage*=damage to an **object** that can be affected by low temperatures. Thus, not only the information about the possible functions of an actor but also about the objects which can be affected by it becomes relevant in the process of compounding.

Another semantic problem to be considered here can be illustrated by the examples in (3) and (4):

   a. *tree trunk water conducting function*

   b. *tree trunk function was to bridge the chasm and the head of the top*

   a. *presidential directive that could change the world*

   b. *rumors of presidential divorce flood France*

In (3a) and (4a) the compositional principles are clear as the heads *water conducting function* and *directive* express the proper functions of *tree trunk* and *president*. But what about (3b) and (4b)? Obviously, the functions here cannot be considered the proper ones for the named agents. Neither can they be considered their side functions, because divorce and the process of being used as a bridge have nothing to do with performing the proper duties of the president and the functions of the part of a living organism whatsoever.

It seems that to interpret such combinations one must bear in mind that one and the same object may simultaneously belong to several taxonomic groups of different levels of abstraction. As a result it may involve several families of telic functions typical of different taxonomic categories. Thus, for instance, the semantic structure of the lexeme *president* includes the information about the proper functions of the specific post/position (*presidential decision*, *presidential duties*), the proper functions of the president as a kind of employment in general (*presidential retirement*), the functions of a human-being in general (*presidential hobbies*, *presidential divorce*). Consider some more examples of this kind: *elephant games* (animal) – *elephant shade* (physical object), *ambassadorial duties* (position) – *ambassadorial suicide* (human).

Thus, the determination of the relations in the semantic structure of English "actor – action/result" compounds requires the following information about the actor expressed by the modifier: 1) the set of taxonomic categories it belongs to, 2) the set of the proper functions of the actor (as a potential member of different taxonomic categories), 3) the set of its side functions, 4) possible effects it may have on other objects (as potential implicit arguments in the propositional structure of a compound). Here is a list of the semantic models for English "actor – action/result" compounds in which all of the mentioned aspects of meaning of their constituents are taken into account:

artifact performs the proper function/result (*bullet wounds, torch lights, ferry expedition, taxi ride*);

artifact performs a side action/result (*car exhaust, cigarette ash, boot tracks, fridge noise*).

artifact fails to perform its proper function (*boiler explosion, car accident, plane tragedy*);

human occupation – realisation of the proper function (*officer directing operations, detective operations, police investigation*);

human occupation – failure of the proper function (*driver error*);

natural object performs the proper function/has an effect on other objects (*volcanic eruption, volcanic risk, meteoric risk*);

parts of organisms perform the proper function (*hand motions, heart beat*);

living-being performs the proper function (result)/has an effect on other objects (*spider silk, bee pollination, germ disease, locust damage*);

natural phenomenon performs the proper function/has an effect on other objects (*wind whistles, snow damage*).

physical object performs the proper function (*tree trunk barricades, lime shade*).

3.2. Actor – affected object

According to the data of the research, the "actor – affected object" type of compound is much less frequent in the corpus. In all the examples the head-noun names an artifact, so the only type of semantic relations that can be expressed within the pattern can be defined in the following way: "the artifact which is expressed by N2 is designed in such a way that the performance of its proper function presupposes the assistance of the function of N1".

Here are the examples from my corpus: *horse carriages, steam organ, atom lamp, water mill, gasoline engine, gas turbine, turbine engine.*

3.3. Affected object/result – actor

Although the tranformationalist approach enabled the singling out of the "affected object – actor" pattern, it failed to notice significant semantic distinctions between the compounds that comply with it. S. Coulson's example that has been mentioned above (*fertility pills – headache pills*) is just one of many that can be given here to show the diversity of possible semantic relations within the pattern, but before I dwell on the meaning of the compounds as a whole let me focus on the meaning of their constituents.

The head-nouns of most of the "affected object – actor" compounds in my corpus denote either artifacts or human occupations. The semantic structure of these compounds is such that the object denoted by the head-noun realises its proper function upon the object named by the modifier: *heat*

shield (the proper function of *shield* is to provide protection against something), *fly trap* (one of the proper functions of *trap* is to catch somebody or something).

In a fair number of examples, however, the proper function of the head-noun is unclear due to the general meaning of the lexeme. In this case the telic function of the modifier enables us to determine the possible types of the semantic relations between the constituents: *camera man* (the proper function of *camera* is to be used for shooting; thus, *man* performs the role of an actor that utilizes this function). In most such cases, however, the meaning of the compound is ambiguous (or *promiscuous* (Jackendoff 2009: 117)). Consider, for instance, the compound *hen-girl* that, according to E. Ryder, may express about ten different relations: a girl who 1) lives on a farm, 2) tends to hens, 3) takes care of hens, 4) raises hens, 5) works with hens, 6) picks up the hen's eggs each morning and so on (Ryder 1994: 476).

Thus, the number of relations in the semantic structure of the "affected object – actor" compounds will depend on the number of possible effects the head-noun may have upon the modifier performing its proper function. Surprisingly, the variety of these effects does not appear wild, so they can be grouped into a fairly small number of classes. Before I give a list of possible relations consider the following examples in (5) and (6):

   a. *eye glasses*
   b. *sun glasses*
   c. *eye pencil*

(5a) can be traditionally transformed into "glasses for eyes" and thus can be assigned an abstract meaning of purpose. In this case no difference will become evident between (5a), (5b) and (5c) as they all comply with the same "purpose"-pattern. In fact, however, the difference is that in (5a) the proper function of *glasses* is to **assist the proper function** of *eyes*, in (5b) it is to **resist the proper function** of *sun*, while in (5c) the proper function of *pencil* has nothing to do with the proper function of *eyes*: it is to **enhance its formal properties** (here: outer look).

   a. *rocket pilot*
   b. *rocket test*

(6) presents different types of relations in comparison with those in (5). Here N2 does not influence the proper function of N1 but **exploits** (6a) or **obtains information about** its performance (6b).

In Table 1 the full list of the patterns is given that the compounds in my corpus comply with. (Reminder: X stands for the meaning of N_1, Y is for the meaning of N_2)

Thus, in spite of the wide lexical variety of the constituents of the "affected object – actor" compounds, their compositional meanings fall into a relatively narrow range of semantic functions; these functions are determined by the types of effect the actor (denoted by N2) may have on **the properties of the affected object (N1)**.

Properties of N1 affected	Type of effect	Frequency of occurrence	Examples
Effect upon telic functions			
	Y resists a telic function of X	14.7%	*lightning rod, shock gear, heat shield*
	Y assists a telic function of X	13.8%	*eye glasses, liver pills, engine oil*
	Y exploits a telic function of X	12.7%	*camera man, rocket pilots*
	Y obtains information about the performance of a telic function of X	4%	*rocket tests, traffic camera*
	Y controls a telic function of X	1%	*animal charmer*
Effect upon physical properties			
	Y moves X in space	9.8%	*hay truck, barge pole (a pole used to guide a barge)*
	Y changes physical properties of X	8%	*hand lotion, floor varnish, dish towel, food coolers*
	Y obtains information about the physical properties of X	1%	*eclipse observer, distance meter*
Effect upon constitutive properties			
	Y changes structure/ contents of X	1%	*book editor, meat chopper*
Effect upon agentive properties			
	Y creates/causes X	20%	*credit deal, shed wall, song birds, cartoon man*
	Y obtains X	10%	*tourist trap, truth drug*
	Y destroys/annihilates X	4%	*pain pills, fire extinguisher*

Table 1. Types of semantic relations in the "affected object – actor" compounds.

3.4. Place/time-object

According to the survey results, telic role can also be actualized in the meaning of the components of locative compounds. Thus, when analyzing the meaning of the compounds (7) *village street*, (8) *village doctor*, (9) *village boy* it becomes evident that although all of them are traditionally considered locative, only (7) can be transformed into «Y is in X». The objects denoted by the head nouns of the compounds (8) and (9) do not presuppose their immediate location in the place named by the modifier, and are connected to them by means of their proper functions: "doctor **works** in a village", "boy **lives/grew up** in a village".

"Place/time-object" compounds, in which the head noun actualizes its telic role, can be grouped according to the type of actualised telic function (see Table 2).

Semantic relations	Frequency of occurrence	Examples
Y performs its proper function in/on X	66.3%	*town cop, surface robot, bedroom slippers, army knife*
Y performs its proper function during X	18.8%	*afternoon crew, night watchman, summer lightning, night cream, summer clothes*
Y's telic function is to be placed is kept/placed in X	5.7%	*pocket paraphernalia, wall holder, ear ring, fridge magnets*
Y's telic function is to move through/to/from X	9.2%	*air travelers, star pilot, ocean racers, ocean wind*

Table 2. Types of compositional meaning in "place/time-object" nominal compounds.

As can be seen from the table above the most frequent are compounds in which the modifier denotes the place or time of functioning of the object named by the head noun (70.8%); the head nouns in these compounds are expressed in most cases by a noun denoting either an artifact or a human-being by his/her profession or social function (90% of all the cases).

The following semantic models belong to the pattern:

populated area (telic: human habitat) – human (telic: social function/work): *town cop, village priest, farmhouse servants, county sheriff, state police, room steward, planet police,* etc.
organizations/institutions/enterprises/establishments (telic: proper function) – human (telic: social function/work): *hospital director, college boy, school teacher, bank president, prison doctor, army guys, library steward,* etc.
organizations/institutions/enterprises/establishments/parts of buildings (telic: proper function) – human-made object (telic: proper function): *bedroom slippers, hospital bathrobe, bar stool, kitchen*

table, *hospital gown*, *home uniform,* etc.

other areas, regions, places, surfaces – human (telic: perform a social function/work): *riverboat gambler*, *space miner*, *tightrope walker,* etc.

other areas, regions, places, surfaces (telic: placement/container) – human-made object (telic: proper function): *area bell*, *lawn chair*, *street sign*, *space boots*, *air apparatus*, *mattress topper*, *surface robot,* etc.

time – human-made object (telic: proper function): *night cream*, *night clubs*, *summer cottage*, *evening clothes*, *spring dresses,* etc.

time – human (telic: perform a social function/work): *night watchman*, *afternoon milkman*, *afternoon crew*, *morning viewers*, *summer friend*, *childhood friends*, *holiday mates,* etc.

3.5. Object – place

The group of "object-place" compounds expresses the types of complex meaning that are listed below (see Table 3). The table shows that the compounds in which the head noun denotes a container for storing the objects named by the modifier amount to more than a half of all compounds of this type.

Semantic relations	Frequency of occurrence	Examples
Y's proper function is to serve as a container for X	64%	*garbage cans*, *laundry basket*, *oil tanks*, *kitchen utensil drawer*
Y's proper function is to serve as a place where X performs its proper function	24%	*cook unit*, *pilot boards*, *engine rooms*, *computer club*
Y's proper function is to serve as a placement/aperture for X	12%	*coin slot*, *signature line*, *idea notebook*, *bolt holes*

Table 3. Types of compositional meaning in "object-place" nominal compounds.

3.6. Proper function – object

A specific place among the semantic types of compounds under analysis is held by the compounds in which a deverbal modifier names the function for the performance of which the denotatum of the head noun is designed.

holding pins, replacement ferry, fishing vessels, cleaning equipment, warning sign, control button, service personnel, care nurse, research teams, cruise liner, nursing home, operating theater

The meaning of such compounds can be described by the transformation «Y's proper function is to perform X». The compounds under analysis can be divided into subtypes in accordance with the semantics of the head-noun:

proper function – artifact: *development money*, *sewing machine*, *closing shutters*, *heating system*, *test program*, *irrigation canals*, *intake pipe*, *protection stunner,* etc.

proper function – place (buildings, part of buildings, natural and artificial areas used as a place of performing the action): *dance floor*, *swimming pool*, *skating rink*, *service area*, *reading chair*, *examination table*, *launch site*, *killing zone*, *rest area*, *farming settlement*, *amusement hall,* etc.

proper function – human/group of people (proper function of professions/occupations): *ski team*, *survey teams*, *airshow performers*, *rescue party,* etc.

Conclusion

The semantics of a complex lexical unit is the result of the interaction of the meaning of its constituents. In most cases, however, it is not enough to account for the lexical meaning of the constituents as a whole in order to interpret the semantics of a compound. The meaning of a compound results from the interaction of some particular units of information associated with its constitutive elements.

Telic role, which is an integral part of the meaning of nouns, appears to be semantically relevant to almost 40% of all examined compounds, being actualized either in one of its elements or in both of them. It has been shown that *telic role* is a general notion which consists of different kinds of semantic information. Among them is the information about 1) the proper function of a denoted object, 2) its side functions that can be realized alongside the performance of the proper one, 3) a set of objects that may be affected by it, 4) types of the effect it may have on other objects, 5) a set of objects that may have an effect on it 6) the ways it can be affected by other objects.

As has been demonstrated in the article, any piece of this encyclopedic ("world") knowledge about the denoted object may serve as a semantic link that helps the lexeme to combine with other words in a phrase. Thus, compositional semantics must account for this information in order to be able to explain the linguistic nature of compounding.

References

Bauer, Laurie. 1979. In the need for pragmatics in the study of nominal compounding. *Journal of Pragmatics*3. 45 – 50.

Coulson, Seana. 2000. *Semantic Leaps: Frame-shifting and conceptual blending in meaning construction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jackendoff, Ray 2009. Compounding in the parallel architecture and conceptual semantics. In: Rochelle Lieber and Pavol Stekauer (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Compounding*, 105-128. Oxford University Press.

Kharitonchik, Zinaida 2004. O refleksii leksicheskih znachenij componentov v semantike affiksalnyh proizvodnyh. In: *Ocherki o jazyke. Teorija nominacii. Leksicheskaja semantika. Slovoobrazovanije. Izbrannye trudy.* 266 – 281. Minsk.

Kubryakova, Elena 2002 Kognitivnaja lingvistika i problemy kompozicionnoj semantiki v sfere slovoobrazovanija. *Izvestija AN. Seria Literatury Jazyka* 61 (1). 13-24.

Levi, Judith N. 1978. *The Syntax and Semantics of Complex Nominals*. New York: Academic Press.

Pustejovsky, James. 1991. The Generative Lexicon. *Computational Linguistics*17(4). 409-441.

Ryder, Mary Ellen. 1994. *Ordered Chaos: The interpretation of English noun–noun compounds*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Warren, Beatrice. 1987. *Semantic Patterns of Noun-Noun Compounds*. Gothenburg: *Gothenburg Studies in English 41. Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.*

Anna Wing Bo Tso
The Open University of Hong Kong

Transgressing the gender borders

The subversive re-inscription of Eve in Philip Pullman's *His Dark Materials*

Abstract. As a gendered rewriter and a gender boundary transgressor, Philip Pullman uses the *Holy Bible* as a "pre-text" (Stephen and McCallum 1998: 2) when writing *His Dark Materials* (1995 – 2000). He boldly challenges the masculine discourse in the *Bible*, crossing the oppressive and insufficient gender boundary propagated in the *Book of Genesis*. With the objective to examine how Pullman breaks down gender boundaries, in this paper I will first re-read the creation story of *Genesis* of the *Holy Bible* and discuss Eve's sexist portrayal. Then, I will compare the traditional, biased representation of Eve with the portrayal of the new and perfected Eve, namely the female protagonist – Lyra Belacqua in Pullman's *His Dark Materials*. Through examining the re-inscription of Eve (as well as Adam) in Pullman's re-version, the paper will reveal ways in which stereotypical gender implications are played out in the *Holy Bible*.

Keywords: Bible rereading, feminist retelling, gender representation, border transgression, sex-role stereotyping.

Introduction

Philip Pullman's *His Dark Materials* (1995-2000), an award-winning fantasy trilogy, is prominent among recent children's literature in the U.K. and the U.S. One of the most intriguing features of Pullman's series is its brave reinvention of gender representation. In *His Dark Materials* conventional gender roles are denaturalized and overthrown. Eve, the stereotypical female figure, is taken apart from the *Holy Bible*, re-inscribed and reassembled to form a fresh and subversive ideological configuration. Pullman's rewriting of Eve has, in many ways, transgressed traditional gender boundaries, implicating new possibilities in gender representation. With the aim of raising gender awareness, in this article I will compare the parallel yet drastically different biblical pre-text

and re-version, showing how gender borders are transgressed and female stereotypes re-written, reinterpreted and re-invented in Pullman's trilogy. First of all, the source which Pullman based his series on, i.e. the representation of Eve in *Genesis,* will be examined. A discussion of gender stereotypes arising from the Eden myth will also be looked into. From themes such as Adam and Eve in Eden before the Fall of Man, to what happens in the Fall and the consequences of the Fall, I will discuss how Pullman subverts the Myth of the Fall in the *Holy Bible* and introduces a new gender configuration through Lyra Belacqua, the new Eve in *His Dark Materials*.

The Representation of Lyra, or the Subversive Re-inscription of Eve

According to Sakenfeld (1985) one of the emphases of contemporary Christian feminists is to counteract famous Biblical texts used against women, which include:

> …the themes that woman was created second (Genesis 2) and sinned first (Genesis 3 and the reinforcement of this view in 1 Tim. 2:13-14); that women must keep silent in church (1 Cor. 14:1 Tim. 2); and that they should be submissive to their husbands (Ephesians 5) (Sakenfeld 1985: 57).

Having recognized "explicit patriarchal bias" (Sakenfeld 1985: 56), as well as the "more subtle androcentrism in the worldview of the biblical authors" (Sakenfeld 1985: 56), Christian feminists try their best to reinterpret some of these texts and suggest "fresh interpretations that are not so negative toward women" (Sakenfeld 1985: 57).

To a certain extent Pullman's *His Dark Materials* shares a similar focus with the Christian feminists. It acts as a critique of patriarchy, counteracting the Biblical texts used against women. Yet, rather than suggesting "fresh interpretations that are not so negative toward women" (Sakenfeld 1985: 57), Pullman rewrites the Eden story and subverts conventional gender roles propagated in *Genesis*. One of the crucial themes of Pullman's *His Dark materials* is that "Lyra [the female protagonist] is to become the new Eve" (Hodgson 2005: 151) and then "the saviour of the world" (Gray 2009: 181). Indeed, from the beginning to the end of the trilogy the protagonist plays the role of a heroine. She goes on an adventurous journey when she rescues her friend Roger from the Gobblers (the evil child-snatchers), destroys Bolvangar (a human experiment station), saves the kidnapped children, helps Iorek Byrnison, the exiled successor to regain his throne, restores the Dust (life force), and begins to build a 'Republic of Heaven' at the end of the story. However, as Nikolajeva (2003) points out, Pullman's Lyra is not a kind of romantic hero, like Harry Potter, ho is morally pure and innocent. She is morally flawed, and there is ambiguity in her character. Nikolajeva (2003) explains that the "dubious moral qualities" are due to "the postmodern concept of indeterminacy, of the relativity of good and evil" (136 – 137), which makes Lyra more human-like.

The young protagonist may be undetermined and morally flawed, but my main concerns are with the manipulation and transformation of the archetype of Eve. How does Pullman manage to transgress the conventional gender borders and break the negative perception of women as suggested in the *Holy Bible* and many subsequent Christian representations? While the female protagonist does not have to be perfect, how does the retelling of the Myth of the Fall successfully introduce signs of the subversion of the traditional gender roles and stereotypes? In the following section, I will compare the creation story in the Biblical text and Pullman's re-version, with a special focus on gender border transgression and subversion.

Before the Fall: 'Adam and Eve' Becomes 'Eve and Her Helper'

As numerous feminist critics have noticed, the discourse of the *Bible* is almost totally patriarchal (Milne 1997). The Grand Narrative in the *Book of Genesis* introduces a binary opposition of male and female that is overwhelmingly sexist, if not misogynistic. Here, I will present the patriarchal ideology implied in the Eden myth. First, at the beginning of the Garden myth, God, Yahweh, creates the whole world for Adam, the man. Woman is created later. As Trible (1978) notes, first means superior and later means inferior or subordinate. Similar to other gender pairs, such as man and woman, male and female, he and she, husband and wife, boys and girls, sons and daughters, brothers and sisters, etc., the ordering of Adam-Eve reflects a sexist basis. It implies that Adam is primary and normative, whereas Eve is an adjunct, less important, perhaps even deviant. More noticeably, the woman is created for the sake of the man. The male God creates a woman only because Adam cannot find a "suitable helper" (*Genesis* 2:20). She is a helpmate to cure man's loneliness. Such male-centredness becomes more apparent when it is described that Eve, the first woman, is only a derivative made from Adam's rib, whereas Adam is made from the breath of God. Because of the deficiency, women are also said to be initially flawed in their creation. In *Malleus Maleficarum* (1486)[1] it is said that:

> It should be noted that there was a defect in the formation of the first woman, since she was formed from a bent rib, that is, a rib of the breast, which is bent as it were in a contrary direction to a man (Cited in Norris 1998: 327).

Although the book was disowned by the church, and the claim of the bent rib and the initial flaw is now considered a heresy, the notion of woman being taken out of the man still deprives women

---

[1] The *Malleus Maleficarum* (1486), or the "Hammer of the Witches" in English, written by a German Catholic clergyman called Heinrich Kramer, is a medieval text of sheer superstition and misogyny. Yet in the 15th century this infamous witch-hunt manual was taken seriously as "a guide for civil and ecclesiastical authorities to the successful detection and prosecution of witches" (Broedel 2003: 4).

of an autonomous existence (Abraham 2002). This male-biased view is also in line with Aristotle's infamous view on women, which contributes to the notion that women are deformed, incomplete, unfinished men. Seeing Eve as a derivative in his possession, Adam has the power to name her after him, "This is now bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh; she shall be called 'woman'[2], for she was taken out of man" (*Genesis* 2:23). Later on, he also gives her a name – 'Eve', meaning "the mother of all living" (*Genesis* 3:20). With the name, she is assigned the traditional sex-role by Adam.

In *His Dark Materials*, however, such male-centeredness does not occur. As Eve, Lyra Belacqua is never portrayed as inferior or subordinate. Firstly, instead of being the last to be mentioned, Lyra and her daemon are the first to appear in the first book. Then, as the story develops, it becomes increasingly apparent to the readers that the trilogy is not about Adam, but Lyra, the new Eve, and her adventurous journey. The whole plot of *Northern Lights* (1995) revolves around Lyra, with her being the most important and significant protagonist of the series. Through different characters, Pullman highlights the importance of Lyra and her role as the new Eve. In *Northern Lights* (1995), for instance, Serafina the witch foretells how and why Lyra matters so much to them and their worlds:

> There is a curious prophecy about this child: she is destined to bring about the end of destiny. But she must do so without knowing what she is doing, as if it were her nature and not her destiny to do it. If she's told what she must do, it will all fail; death will sweep through all the worlds; it will be the triumph of despair, for ever (1995: 310).

Apparently, the new Eve and the importance of her free will are addressed as primal concerns. Then, in *The Subtle Knife* (1997), Lena Feldt, the witch, emphasizes the notion of Lyra-as-Eve again. It is prophesized that Lyra "will be the mother – she will be life – mother – she will disobey" (328). Lyra is named "Eve! Mother of all! Eve, again! Mother Eve!" (1997: 328). In *The Amber Spyglass* (2000), the final episode, Fra Pavel, the representative and alethiometrist of the Consistorial Court of Discipline, also emphasizes that Lyra is the new Eve:

> The child…is in the position of Eve, the wife of Adam, the mother of us all, and the cause of all sin… if it comes about that the child is tempted, as Eve was, then she is likely to fall (2000: 71).

The new Eve is described as the sole person who makes the decision of going against the evil church, rescuing kidnapped children, and tricking the powerful Ice Bear King. Interestingly, while Eve becomes the centre of attention, Adam, or the idea of Will Parry as the 'Father of all', is hardly mentioned in the books. As the male protagonist Will only joins Lyra in the second book, *The Subtle Knife* (1997), after Lyra has experienced a lot of dangerous adventures on her own. Reversing the

---

[2] The derivation occurs in the most common Bible translations in English, including the King James Version. However, the derivation cannot be shown in other languages such as Chinese.

conventional heroic quest pattern Will plays the secondary role of being an assistant, bodyguard and companion of Lyra, the heroine.

As Lyra's assistant Will plays the atypical role of a domestic helper. He does the cooking, cleans the working surfaces in the kitchen, washes the floor, empties the rubbish into the bin, and teaches Lyra how to do domestic work and take good care of herself. In the second episode Will makes an omelette for Lyra, who has not had a proper meal for days because she thinks only "servants do the cooking" (1997: 24). He also shows Lyra how to open a tin with a can-opener. After supper he asks Lyra to wash the dishes and tidy up. When Lyra refuses to do so, like a mother he nags her about her responsibility of taking care of the place:

> We've got to eat, so we'll eat what's here, but we'll tidy up afterwards and keep the place clean, because we ought to. You wash these dishes. We've got to treat this place right (28).

Yet Lyra does not belong to the domestic sphere. She has no experience in doing the washing up. She does not know that to clean oily cooking utensils washing-up liquid is needed. She only manages to complete the task by trial and error. Besides domestic chores Will also teaches Lyra the need to take care of herself. Lyra, who is boyish and unkempt, is spoiled and indulged. She does not know how to wash her hair properly. Body care and hairstyling are done by her servant, and she never needs to do it herself, she explains. Seeing that Lyra has not washed herself for days, Will plays the part of a nurturer. He patiently reminds Lyra to take care of her personal hygiene, "…the first thing is you better wash yourself. You need to look clean…go and wash your hair for a start. There's some shampoo in the bathroom" (64). Compared to Lyra, who is incompetent in handling domestic chores, Will is definitely a keener housekeeper and carer. The ideological notion of women being 'the angel of the house' is broken, satirized and inverted. Readers are shown that the domestic sphere, a sphere that is often thought to be "more of less defined by the predominance in it of biological reproduction and motherhood, of emotional ties and kin relations" (Lechte 2001: 194) is not necessarily the exclusive province of women. A male, like Will, can be more nurturing than a female. The female has to learn how to take care of the household and hygiene from the male instead. Likewise, a female, like Lyra, can be more powerful, successful and influential than any male in the public sphere. Gender roles are not ordained by nature. The association between women and the private, domestic sphere is only a myth.

In brief, Lyra, the new Eve in Pullman's re-version, turns the gender stereotypes of the Biblical text upside down. In *Genesis* Adam was the first human created by God. He was also the first human character mentioned in the text; on the contrary, in Pullman's trilogy the new Eve is the first and foremost character to be introduced to the readers. In the *Holy Bible* Eve is the derivative, subordinate other who is tied to her natural passions and desires; now, in Pullman's version, she demonstrates that she is a person who strives for reason, justice, autonomy and freedom. Better still, the new Eve is no longer the "suitable helper" (*Genesis* 2:20) of man. In Pullman's rewriting, she transgresses traditional gender borders and becomes the most significant protagonist.

In the next section I will discuss how Pullman's rewriting allows Eve to be transformed from an immoral, faithless ensnarer into a courageous follower of knowledge and truth.

In the Fall: Sin and Shame Glorified

In the story of the Garden of Eden Eve is linked to moral weakness (McKenzie, 1954). Both Adam and Eve are well-informed of God's command, namely "You must not eat fruit from the tree that is in the middle of the garden, and you must not touch it, or you will die" (Genesis 3: 3). The crafty serpent picks the "weaker person" (Foh 1999: 393). Enticed by the serpent, Eve takes the forbidden fruit, eats it and disobeys God. Afterwards, she "usurp[s] her husband's place by leading him into sin". She "entice[s] or seduce[s] Adam into sin" (ibid), causing the wrath of God and finally the Fall of Man. The impact of this negative portrayal of Eve has been so deep and powerful that over the millennia, according to Daly (1973), Eve has been continually considered as the universal woman and as the incarnation of evil. The instructions on worship in 1 *Timothy* 2: 11 – 14 is a good example that illustrates the blaming of Eve and all women:

A woman should learn in quietness and full submission. I do not permit a woman to teach or to have authority over a man; she must be silent. For Adam was formed first, then Eve. And Adam was not the one deceived; it was the woman who was deceived and became a sinner.

Trible (1999) comments that "the Women's Liberation Movement is hostile to the Bible" and feminists "read to reject" (431). From a critical perspective, however, the notions of male supremacy and female subordination legitimated before the Fall, as well as the negative portrayal of the female in the Fall, do need to be re-read and rewritten. Based on the pre-text, Pullman rewrites the Fall and unfixes the gender role demarcation. In *His Dark Materials* God, the creator, is not mentioned. Instead, a false, self-proclaimed deity is introduced. The trilogy makes it clear that the false deity did not create the world and everyone. He is merely the oldest among all conscious beings. In chapter 2 of *The Amber Spyglass* (2000) Balthamos the angel explains:

The Authority, God, the Creator, the Lord, Yahweh, El, Adonai, the King, the Father, the Almighty – those were all names he gave himself. He was never the creator. He was an angel like ourselves… He told those who came after him that he had created them, but it was a lie (33).

Like a dictator the oldest angel demands that all others worship and obey him as the "Authority". The Fall, in this light, is interpreted as a chance to overthrow a false deity.

Also, Eve's personal consciousness, free will, desire for knowledge, truth, and justice, as well as her disobedience to her parents and the church are not punished, but celebrated. Readers are in-

vited to witness Lyra's growth and maturation. She continues to grow into a wiser, stronger, and better person. For instance, at the beginning of the first book, *Northern Lights* (1995), Lyra is simple-minded and she tends to pass judgment on people just by looking at their physical appearances. She regards female scholars with disdain because they look dull and unattractive. She thinks that those women are "poor things" (67) who "could not be taken more seriously than animals dressed up and acting a play" (ibid). She goes so far as to describe the female scholars as "dowdy" (71) and says they "smelt of cabbage and mothballs" (ibid). Contrastively, she looks up to, and thinks highly of, Mrs Coulter, just because the woman looks beautiful and classy. As the trilogy unfolds, however, Lyra learns from her experience, gradually becoming more mature in her reasoning. Shocked by the fact that Mrs Coulter is in charge of the horrible guillotine for children and their daemons (souls), Lyra realizes that Mrs Coulter is a "wicked liar" (285). She reflects on her own superficiality and wonders how she could be so blind as to find "this woman… so fascinating and clever" (286).

Lyra's level of moral reasoning also escalates at a dramatic speed as the story develops. According to Lawrence Kohlberg's theory of moral reasoning development (1981, 1984), a person will normally go through three different levels of moral reasoning before s/he becomes fully mature in his / her cognitive moral development. First of all, a person will enter "the preconventional level" (Jarvis et al 2003: 35). At this level reasoning is based on the consequences of his / her actions. Like a child, a typical preconventional moral reasoner will only stick to rules to avoid punishment. Although s/he may be aware of other people's interests, his / her primary concern is always his / her personal needs and interests. Then, as the person continues to grow in his / her cognitive moral development, s/he will reach "the conventional level" (ibid). At this level, laws, social norms and the expectations of others are taken into account. To a person at this level what is 'good' and 'right' means what pleases and is approved of by others, especially authority figures. Finally, at the highest level, i.e. "the postconventional level" (ibid), reasoning is a matter of individual conscience and personal principles, which are not defined by laws or social norms. People operating at this moral level realize that judgments are based on abstract concepts such as justice, equality, human dignity, etc. It is understood that there are universal ethical principles which all societies should agree to. To postconventional moral reasoners the highest value should be placed on universal ethical principles. Even when they are in conflict with laws or any authority figures worshipped by the majority, one should still stick to one's conscience and ethical principles, stand up for the greater good, and fight for the welfare of all.

With regard to Kohlberg's ideas of moral reasoning, at the start of the series Lyra, like all children, only shows the most primitive form of morality:

> She is self-centered and egocentric. She does whatever she finds to be fun, and is only obedient so that she can avoid being punished. She is not concerned about how her actions affect others (Dolgin 2005: 75).

For instance, Lyra plays a trick on some dead scholars by switching around the daemon-coins in the dead scholars' skulls. The daemon-coins "shows its owner's lifetime companion" (1995: 50)

and it is improper to disturb the tombs and coffins of the dead just for fun. Pantalaimon, her daemon, is upset by her tricks. He becomes so agitated that he flies up and down, utters shrill cries, and flaps his wings in her face. Still, Lyra takes no notice. She merely restores the daemon-coins to their rightful places and says sorry to the skulls when the angry ghosts of the dead scholars haunt her at night. Simply put, this corresponds to Kohlberg's preconventional level (Dolgin 2005). Interestingly, as Lyra grows older and gets over the primitive stage, she apparently skips the next level, i.e. the conventional moral reasoning level, entirely and leaps into the final, highest level: postconventional moral reasoning. The headstrong protagonist does not care about what others think of her. She remains indifferent to others' expectations. Both she and Pan would feel disgusted if she had to pretend to be a "universal pet" that is always polite, "light-hearted and charming" (1995: 88). She does not desire other people's approval for her actions, either. Nor is she concerned with following conventional rules. The advice and warnings of authority figures such as her parents and the Church have no effect on her. She only follows the truth, i.e. what she reads from the golden compass. She does what she believes is right, even when it contradictory and puts her life at risk. In short, the moral weakness of Eve is replaced by the adolescent maturational change and cognitive moral development of Lyra. Her constant urge for self-reinvention and improvement has gained her glory, victory, friendship, respect and honour.

Pullman's re-version empowers the female protagonist with the strength to resist hierarchical power, but it was considered by some as promoting atheist messages. On 9th October, 2007 a U.S.-based Catholic league criticized Pullman for his attempt to "denigrate Christianity" and promote "atheism for kids" (*Catholic League* 2007). They then called for a boycott campaign of the movie version. Similarly, shortly after the release of the movie, an editorial was published in the Vatican newspaper *L'Osservatore Romano*, in which the movie adaptation was denounced as godless and the "most anti-Christmas film possible" (Owen 16 January 2008, *Times Online*).

Irrespective of whether the books contain elements of anti-Catholicism, most of the critics, although having different positions on the issue, agree that the representation of the new Eve signifies a completely different set of gender ideologies. In the Biblical version Eve is portrayed as weak in mind, unreliable, untrustworthy, faithless, greedy and insatiable. She eats the forbidden fruit because she is tempted and deceived. At the time she picks the fruit she knows very well that she is sinning against God. Still, to obtain knowledge, she "t[akes] some and [eats] it" (*Genesis* 3: 6). Yet, in *His Dark Materials*, the story does not start with greed, temptation or deception. At the beginning Lyra knows nothing about 'the knowledge of good and evil', the forbidden fruit, or the Authority's commandment. She starts her dangerous and toilsome journey to the icy wasteland only because she vows to rescue her missing best friend, Roger, as well as other kidnapped children. To save others Lyra selflessly risks her own life.

In chapter 16 of the *Northern Lights* Lyra almost has her daemon (her soul) removed by a silver guillotine when undergoing the mission of saving children from the Gobblers. Similarly, to find Roger and set the dead free, Lyra risks Pan's life, her dearest daemon's life. In chapter 21 of *The Amber Spyglass* Lyra needs to go into the land of the dead to find Roger. She is warned that to do so she

will have to separate from her soul, "Your daemon vanishes into the air, and you vanish under the ground" (2000: 282). Nonetheless, Lyra sets her mind to do "what's proper" (281):

> …I feel sad and wicked and sorry about my friend Roger…it's a torment and sorrow to me that I never said goodbye to my friend Roger, and I want to say sorry and make it as good as I can…if I have to die to do what's proper, then I will, and be happy while I do. (280 – 281)

To find Roger, Lyra separates from her "heart's companion" (296) and continues her journey to the land of the dead. Pullman describes in detail how Lyra suffers the heart-tearing agony and anguish of leaving Pan:

> Will could hardly watch. Lyra was doing the cruelest thing she had ever done, hating herself, hating the deed, suffering for Pan and with Pan and because of Pan, trying to put him down on the cold path, disengaging his cat-claws from her clothes, weeping, weeping. Will closed his ears: the sound was too unhappy to hear. Time after time she pushed her daemon away, and still he cried and tried to cling (298).

In an interview with *The Sydney Morning Herald* Pullman said that his "books are about killing God" (2003). *I*ntriguingly, in the scene mentioned above, Lyra, the new Eve, becomes a Christ-like figure who beautifully reaffirms Christian virtues such as love, courage and self-sacrifice. In favour of truth and rightness she suffers great pain to bring hope, freedom and happiness to others. Will witnesses the whole ordeal. Unlike Adam in the Biblical text, who hides when trouble comes, Will admires Lyra for her courage, stands by her and feels the pain with her, "he admired her honesty and her courage at the same time as he was wretched with the shock of their [Lyra and Pan's] parting" (298).

Apart from manifesting Christ-like virtues Lyra also subverts the negative perception of Eve as "the first temptress", "a liar in nature" and "responsible for the widespread female tendency to dupe and lie" (Norris 1998: 327).

In chapter 23 of *The Amber Spyglass* Lyra saves the ghosts in the land of the dead and makes friends with the harpies by telling the truth. She nourishes the ghosts and harpies, and brings them hope and joy with true stories of her life and true things about the world. It is the truth, not lies and fantasies that empowers Lyra. When she speaks the truth the audience listens with passion:

As well as the ghosts, silent all around, and her companions, close and living, there was another audience too; because the branches of the tree were clustered with those dark bird-forms, their women's faces gazing down at her, solemn and spellbound (331).

The harpies stop their mocking and attacks on hearing the truth from Lyra. In exchange for Lyra's story they "take the travellers and their knife to a part of the land of the dead where the upper world was close" (334). The bird-forms are also willing to make a treaty with the ghosts – when the ghosts tell them the true stories of the world, the harpies will guide them faithfully "from the

landing-place by the lake all the way through the land of the dead to the new opening out into the world" (334).

Deception, temptation and betrayal do not occur at the critical moment of the Fall either. Firstly, Lyra is neither tempted nor deceived. The so-called encounter with the serpent is just a sharing with Mary Malone, the physicist and former nun who talks about her true feelings of love and how she left the Church. As Mary shares her thoughts she addresses both Lyra and Will. In other words, Mary, who is supposed to be the serpent in the re-version, treats both protagonists as equals. She does not pick and persuade the one with a 'weaker mind'.

Then, at the moment when Lyra and Will 'taste the forbidden fruit', both of them are described as ignorant of their roles as Eve and Adam. They are not torn between the options of obeying God and obtaining the knowledge of good and evil, as Adam and Eve are in *Genesis*. The Eden story in Pullman's text is not about the human misuse of moral freedom and inherited guilt. Instead, it is about coming of age and the awakening of sexuality. As shown in the excerpt below, the protagonists fall in love and enjoy the moment as all lovers do:

> Then Lyra took one of those little red fruits. With a fast-beating heart, she turned to him and said, "Will..."
> And she lifted the fruit gently to his mouth.
> She could see from his eyes that he knew at once what she meant, and that he was too joyful to speak. Her fingers were still at his lips, and he felt them tremble, and he put his own hand up to hold hers there, and then neither of them could look; they were confused; they were brimming with happiness.
> ...their lips touched. Then before they knew how it happened, they were clinging together, blindly pressing their faces towards each other (2000: 491 – 492).

Lyra does not play the role of a deceitful, alluring seductress in Pullman's work. There are no tricks, plans or stratagems set beforehand. It just happens that the two teenagers fall in love and experience love for the first time. The love, passion and attraction between the lovers are real, sincere, natural and mutual.

Critics such as Russell (2005) suggest that Pullman's trilogy may have borrowed the notions of Gnostic Christianity, where the serpent in the *Book of Genesis* is worshipped as the bestower of knowledge, and that Eve's disobedience against God is viewed as an utterly necessary move for gaining wisdom. Indeed, like a rediscovery of the alternative Gnostic Eve, Lyra subverts the binary oppositions in the *Holy Bible* and transgresses the conventional gender role boundaries. She plays the Christ-like role and manifests Christian virtues such as love, self-sacrifice and devotion to the truth. The negative connotations of Eve in the Fall are also inverted. The Fall has become an allegory of the coming of age, and Lyra's Fall is portrayed and celebrated as the key to the awakening of human wisdom. The gender stereotypes in the Biblical text are broken and subverted.

The consequence of the Fall: A Return of Life Spirit

In the *Holy Bible*, immediately after Adam and Eve have eaten the fruit, "the eyes of both of them were opened, and they realized that they were naked" (*Genesis* 3: 7). They feel so afraid and ashamed that they hide and make coverings for themselves. As a punishment for their disobedience God curses Eve and all women, "I will greatly increase your pains in childbearing; with pain you will give birth to children. Your desire will be for your husband, and he will rule over you" (*Genesis* 3:16). For Adam, God gives him a life sentence of hard labour on the ground, "through painful toil will you eat of it all the days of your life" (*Genesis* 3:17).

Regarding the double punishment cast on Eve, a French medieval guidebook known as *The Goodman of Paris* (1393) explains that Eve is twice cursed because she sins twice. Eve's first sin is her pride. She sets herself up to be like God. Accordingly, she is cast down into a position of subjection to her husband. Her second sin is the same as Adam's – she eats the forbidden fruit, and thus her second penalty is the terrible pain of childbearing (Cited in Norris 1998). Though some contemporary scholars explain that in the *Bible* the Eden story is not meant to be an explanation for evil (Phipps 1989), sexist implications remain influential in Christian belief, as well as in our mainstream culture. To this day fundamental Christians still believe that women are the first in the order of sin, women are more sinful, and that they are more susceptible to and responsible for evil, etc.

Picking up this motif, Pullman reconfigures the consequences and implications of the Fall. In *The Amber Spyglass* (2000) sin, guilt and punishment after the Fall are replaced by serenity, universal balance and self-sacrifice. In chapter 35, after Lyra and Will eat the fruit and kiss each other, "around them there was nothing but silence, as if the world were holding its breath" (492). Shortly afterwards, Atal (a peaceful and happy creature created by Pullman) feels the difference in the air. When Mary Malone looks up to the sky with her spyglass she finds that the Dust-flood has stopped and the Dust-stream is returning:

The terrible flood of Dust in the sky had stopped flowing…it was in perpetual movement, but it wasn't flowing away anymore. In fact, if anything, it was falling like snow-flakes…The Dust pouring out of the stars had found a living home again, and these children-no-longer-children, saturated with love, were the cause of it all (496 – 497).

Because of the Fall, Dust, the life spirit returns and nourishes long-starved Nature. For that, Lyra and Will feel no shame or guilt. Instead, they feel like they are "melting with love" (509). Their time together is saturated with love and sweetness. As Pullman (2000) puts it, "they looked dazed, as if some happy accident had robbed them of their wits…They talked, they bathed, they ate, they kissed, they lay in a trance of happiness" (ibid). In the re-version, Lyra, the new Eve, plays the role of the mother of all living not by giving birth, but by re-diverting the flow of life spirit into the universe.

What is remarkable is that Pullman's re-version does not conclude with a blissful ending. Towards the end of *The Amber Spyglass* Kirjava (Will Parry's daemon) and Pan (Lyra Belacqua's daemon) reveal that Dust leaks out into nothingness whenever an opening is made between the worlds. Worse still, every time they open a window with the Subtle Knife a Spectre that feeds on Dust and dae-

mons is made, "It's like a little bit of the abyss that floats out and enters the world" (515). To restore stability and bring ultimate peace to the worlds Lyra and Will must close every single opening and destroy the Subtle Knife. Kirjava suggests that she and Will can leave their world to stay in Lyra's world forever, or that Lyra and Pan can leave theirs and go to Will's world. However, this is not a good idea because no one can leave his / her world for more than ten years. A person will "get sick and ill and fade away and then die" (516) when staying in a different world for ten years, like Will's father. The dilemma gives the protagonists great pain.

> He [Will] thought she [Lyra] would die of her grief there and then. She flung herself into his arms and sobbed, clinging passionately to his shoulders, pressing her nails into his back and her face into his neck, and all he could hear was, "No-no-no..." (513).

For a moment Will is tempted by the selfish notion of secretly opening a window between his world and Lyra's, where "they could go through whenever they chose, and live for a while in each other's worlds" (521). His idea is rejected immediately by Lyra. In spite of her own suffering, Lyra shakes her head and says "No, we can't" to Will. She insists and reminds Will that they have to follow what is genuinely right. In the end Lyra and Will act in favour of ultimate universal balance and the welfare of all. With broken hearts they close all windows and separate forever. They sacrifice their personal happiness and suffer intolerable loss, rage and despair.

Conclusion

To sum up, in this paper I explored the representations of Lyra Belacqua, the female protagonist in Pullman's *His Dark Materials* (1995 – 2000). I argued that through the portrayal of Lyra, the new and perfected Eve, gender stereotypes in the *Holy Bible* are turned upside down. Traditional gender borders are transgressed and unfixed.

In the Myth of the Fall in *Genesis* the narrative is a traditional, patriarchal voice that violently dominates the Biblical text, setting up a series of hierarchical oppositions: 'Man' and 'woman' are distinguished from one another. 'Man' is considered primary, while 'woman' is relegated to a mere derivative, supplementary, and inferior position. In the Bible, Eve, the mother of all humans, has no autonomous existence of her own. She comes into the world only because Adam tells God that he is lonely and needs a partner. Compared to Adam she is also the weaker sex, and is deceived and tempted by the serpent. In brief, the binary differentiation in the Biblical text reduces and pigeon-holes 'woman' as a category that is different from the category of 'man'. In differing and classifying male and female, masculine and feminine, what is originally fluid, free-floating and flexible in 'women' (as well as in 'men') is oppressed, controlled and reduced to something essential and definable in *Genesis*.

Challenging the gender relations as set in *Genesis* Philip Pullman subverts the traditional gender roles and stereotypes before the Fall, in the Fall, and after the Fall of Man. Instead of portraying

Lyra, the new Eve, as the subordinate, inferior other, Pullman makes Lyra the first autonomous being. She is now the most significant protagonist, whereas Will (the new Adam) becomes her caring male helper who is keen on doing domestic chores. More significantly, rather than playing the role of a faithless, untrustworthy seductress, Lyra shows a high level of moral reasoning and self-discipline. For the welfare of all, she restrains Will and herself from the temptation that comes up in Will's mind. Christ-like virtues, such as self-sacrifice, devotion to friendship, and truth become her attributes. In the land of the dead the fearless Lyra nourishes the ghosts and harpies with true stories of her life and true things about the world. In times of danger and need she selflessly risks her life, sacrifices her dearest daemon, and then gives up the chance of staying with Will in order to rescue her friend, liberate the ghosts, and stop Dust (the life force) from leaking out into emptiness. As the mother of all living she re-diverts and restores the flow of life spirit in the worlds, bringing hope and energy back to all. Though controversial, Pullman's *His Dark Materials* crosses conventional gender borders. It can be read as a feminist rewriting of the *Book of Genesis*.

References

Abraham, J. 2002. *Eve: Accused or Acquitted? A Reconsideration of Feminist Readings of the Creation Narrative Texts in Genesis 1-3.* London: Paternoster.

Broedel, Hans Peter. 2003. *The Malleus Maleficarum and the construction of witchcraft*. Manchester, U.K.: Manchester University Press.

Catholic League. 2007. "The Golden Compass" Sparks Protests. http://www.catholicleague.org/release.php?id=1342. (9 October 2013).

Daly, M. 1963. *Beyond God the Father.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Dolgin, Kim. 2005. Coming of age in Svalbard, and beyond. In: Glenn Yeffeth Dallas (ed.)*, Navigating the Golden Compass: Religion, Science and Daemonology in Philip Pullman's His Dark Materials.* 71 – 80. Taxas: Benbella Books, INC.

Foh, Susan T. 1999. The head of the woman is the man. In: Kristen E. Kuam, Linda S. Schearing and Valarie H. Ziegler (eds.), *Eve and Adam: Jewish, Christian, and Muslim Readings on Genesis and Gender.* 391 – 400. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Gray, Williams. 2009. *Fantasy, Myth and the Measure of Truth: Tales of Pullman, Lewis, Tolkien, MacDonald and Hoffman.* New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Hitchens, Peter. 2002. This is the most dangerous author in Britain. *Mail on Sunday*, 63.

Hodgson, Dave. 2005. A new Eve: Evolution of sustainability across many worlds. In: Glenn Yeffeth Dallas (ed.), *Navigating the Golden Compass: Religion, Science and Daemonology in Philip Pullman's His Dark Materials.* 151 – 162. Taxas: Benbella Books.

Holy Bible. 1984. Michigan, U.S.A.: Zondervan Publishing House.

Jarvis, Peter, John Holford & Colin Griffin. 2003. *The Theory & Practice of Learning.* London: Routledge Falmer.

Kohlberg, Lawrence. 1981. *Essays on Moral Development, Vol. I: The Philosophy of Moral Development.* San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row.

--1984. *Essays on Moral Development, Vol. II: The Philosophy of Moral Development*. San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row.

Lechte, John. 2001. *Fifty Key Contemporary Thinkers: From Structuralism to Postmoderism*. New York: Routledge.

Milne, Pamela J. 1997. The patriarchal stamp of scripture: The implications of structural analyses for feminist hermeneutics. In: Athalya Brenner (ed.), *A Feminist Companion to Genesis.* 146 – 172. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press Ltd.

Nikolajeva, Maria. 2003. Harry Potter – A return to the romantic hero. In: Elizabeth Heilman (ed.), *Harry Potter's World: Multidisciplinary Critical Perspectives*. 125 – 140. London: Routledge Falmer.

Norris, P. 1998. *The Story of Eve.* Kent: Picado.

Owen, R. 2008. Harry Potter an 'unreligious' hero says Vatican but finds Christian values in Rowling's books. *Times Online.* http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/comment/faith/article3195733.ece. (26 September 2013).

Phipps, W.E. 1989. *Genesis and Gender: Biblical Myths of Sexuality and Their Cultural Impact.* New York, London: Praeger.

Pullman, Philip. 2000. *The Amber Spyglass.* London: Scholastic Press.

--1995. *Northern Lights.* London: Scholastic Press.

--1997. *The Subtle Knife.* London: Scholastic Press.

Russell, Mary Harris. 2005. "Eve, Again! Mother Eve!": Pullman's Eve variations. In: Millicent Lenz and Carole Scott (eds.), *His Dark Materials Illuminated: Cultural Essays on Philip Pullman's Trilogy.* Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2005. 212 – 222.

Sakenfeld, Katharine Doob. 1985. "Feminist Uses of Biblical Materials". In: Letty M. Russell (ed.), *Feminist Interpretation of the Bible*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press.

Squires, Claire. 2003. *His Dark Materials Trilogy: A Reader's Guide.* New York, London: The Continuum International Publishing Group Inc.

Stephens, John & McCallum, Robyn. 1998. *Retelling Stories, Framing Culture: Traditional Story and Metanarratives in Children's Literature*. New York: Garland Publishers.

Trible, P. 1978. *God and the Rhetoric of Sexuality*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

--1999. Eve and Adam: Genesis 2 – 3 reread. In: Kristen E. Kuam, Linda S. Schearing and Valarie H. Ziegler (eds.) *Eve and Adam: Jewish, Christian, and Muslim Readings on Genesis and Gender.* 431 – 442. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Monika Roszkowska
The University of Warsaw

The evolution of translation standards as illustrated by the history of Polish translations of *Jane Eyre* by Charlotte Brontë

Abstract. The aim of this article is to outline the most characteristic changes in translation standards which have occurred since the late 19th century. It examines the strategies used by three Polish translators of *Jane Eyre* by Charlotte Brontë: Emilia Dobrzańska (1880-1881), Teresa Świderska (1930) and Gabriela Jaworska (2007). The earliest translation is more of an adaptation than a faithful rendering; it also makes frequent use of domestication (e.g. most proper names are translated into Polish). The other two translations apply foreignization more often, in particular the most recent one, and are closer to the original both in form and meaning.
Key words: translation, Polish, English, Jane Eyre, foreignization, domestication

Introduction

Translation standards, techniques and trends change with time, as they do in any discipline. Books considered as "classics" become subject to numerous re-translations, which, when viewed

from a historical perspective, illustrate how the standards of translation practice have evolved. The present article examines three Polish translations of *Jane Eyre* by Charlotte Brontë: the earliest one, by Emilia Dobrzańska (1880-1881), the classic one, by Teresa Świderska (1930) and the most recent one, by Gabriela Jaworska (2007). It looks at the strategies employed by the three translators, taking into consideration the historical contexts in which they appeared, their purpose, and the changes in translation theory over time.

Jane Eyre and its Polish translators

Most readers today encounter the classics through the medium of translation" (Haynes, 2010:13), so a good deal of responsibility for the reception of literary classics rests with their translators. *Jane Eyre*, written by Charlotte Brontë in 1847, is a canonical book which has been rendered into numerous languages, including Esperanto, and has sold millions of copies worldwide (McCauley 1997). It is a classic love story containing some elements of Gothic fiction and *bildungsroman*, and takes place in nineteenth century northern England. Although the book was first published quite a long time ago, it has been popular ever since as it tells the story of a relatively modern character with whom many present-day women can identify – it is a passionate depiction of a woman's search for equality and freedom. A novel of this calibre could not be disregarded by Polish translators. So far, three Polish renderings have been published – they were done by Emilia Dobrzańska, Teresa Świderska and Gabriela Jaworska.

Dobrzańska's translation, originally entitled *Janina,* is the earliest one. It was first printed in installments as a supplement to the periodical *Tydzień* in the years 1880-1881. In 2006 it was published in the form of a book by Hachette Livre Polska. The publishing house made some changes while preparing it for publication. The title was changed to *Dziwne losy Jane Eyre;* the punctuation and spelling were also modified, but the text itself was not altered in any significant way. Examples discussed in the present study have been excerpted from the 2006 edition.

Emilia Dobrzańska, née Karczewska, was born in Rożenek, Poland, in 1853 (Estreicher 1872–1882) and brought up in an affluent family. She attended a school for girls in Piotrków Trybunalski. Later she was a teacher of Botany and French there. After the school was closed down in the 1870s she opened another school for girls in the same place in 1881. Unfortunately, two years later it was also closed down. However, Dobrzańska did not give up. Ostensibly to create a boarding house for girls, she opened a successful underground four-grade educational institution for girls in 1883. In the meantime she married the lawyer, journalist and poet Mirosław Dobrzański, the chief editor of the periodical *Tydzień*, where her translation of *Jane Eyre* was published (web 1). Apart from being a notable educational activist Dobrzańska was also a prolific translator from French and English into Polish, though the majority of her works are now inaccessible and, as a consequence, not much is known about her translation style. Her English-Polish translations include, in addition to *Jane*

Eyre, Venus and Adonis by William Shakespeare; she also translated the works of such French writers as Henry Gréville, Réné de Pont-Jest, and André Valdés. As was the case with *Janina*, many of them were published as supplements to periodicals, such as *Tydzień* and *Dziennik Łódzki*. Emilia Dobrzańska died in 1925 at 72 years of age (Estreicher 1872–1882).

Teresa Świderska was the second Polish translator of *Jane Eyre. Dziwne losy Jane Eyre* was published in 1930 and has become the classic Polish translation of *Jane Eyre*. Not much is known about Świderska's life and writing style. What we do know, however, is that she also translated *The Bride of Lammermoor, Waverley* and *Rob Roy* by Walter Scott, *A Tale of Two Cities* and *David Copperfield* by Charles Dickens, as well as some works of Thomas Woodrow Wilson.

Gabriela Jaworska is the latest Polish translator of *Jane Eyre* – her version was first published in 2007. She was the first Polish translator to reject a Polonized title in favour of the original name *Jane Eyre*. Her rendition is relatively new, and, as "one translation does not cancel out another" (Haynes 2010:14), for the time being it cannot compete with the well-established version by Świderska. When it comes to Jaworska's translation experience, her renderings include the works of contemporary writers of detective stories and children's literature, e.g. *"C" is for corpse* by Sue Grafton, the series *Children of the Red King* by Jenny Nimmo, and *Nim's Island* by Wendy Orr. Apart from being a translator Jaworska writes poetry – she has published three books of poems: *Listy* (1997), *Czas budowania* (2006), and *Pójdę na Roztocze...* (2010).

A contrastive analysis of the Polish renderings of *Jane Eyre* by Charlotte Brontë

The temporal distance which separates the three Polish renditions of the novel as well as the individual linguistic choices of the translators result in numerous differences between the three versions of the book. The contrastive analysis which follows concentrates on the most characteristic differences between the translation strategies employed by the three translators with the aim of demonstrating how translation standards have evolved over time.

Reduction and omission

The most significant difference between Dobrzańska's translation and the other two is her frequent use of reduction and omission. This characteristic has already been noted by Hadyna (2013) in her recent study of Dobrzańska's translation of *Jane Eyre*. Omission, or as Hadyna calls it, abridgement, is also found in other early translations of literary works, e.g. the first Polish translation of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* by Lewis Carroll, which appeared in 1910[1]. It seems that some of

---

[1] See A. Smoleńska's article in the current issue.

the 19th and early 20th century translators simply wanted the Polish audience to know what the famous books they decided to translate were about. The frequent use of omission by Dobrzańska may have also resulted from the fact that her translation was published in installments in a periodical. She may have been limited by the space available there.

In many cases Dobrzańska merely summarizes what happens in the story. For instance, a 4-page-long passage in the original describing a conversation between Mr. Rochester's guests about governesses is summarized in one sentence: *Tu nastąpił opis kilku nauczycielek u panien Ingram i nauczycieli apatycznego lorda, wzajemnych ich stosunków, etc.* ('Here followed a description of several governesses working for the Ingrams, the apathetic lord's teachers, the relationships between them, etc.' (chapter XIV, p. 96). The time spent by Jane at Lowood, described in about 60 pages in the book, takes 10 pages in her rendition. She omits the description of Lowood with its buildings, its vicinity, teachers, students and school rigour, Jane's best friend, Helen Burns, her attitude towards life and God, as well as her premature death. Likewise, the part of the book which describes the main heroine's stay at the house of the Rivers family and her experiences as a country teacher is reduced from about 120 pages in the original to a mere 25 pages in Dobrzańska's rendering. As a result, whole chapters of the source text are omitted.

Dobrzańska begins reducing the text from its first page. The original introduction:

There was no possibility of taking a walk that day. We had been wandering, indeed in the leafless shrubbery an hour in the morning; but since dinner (Mrs. Reed, when there was no company, dined early) the cold winter wind brought with it clouds so sombre, and a rain so penetrating, that further out-door exercise, was now out of the question (chapter I, p. 5)

is rendered as one short sentence:

Dzień był słotny i mroźny, nie sposób też było myśleć o przechadzce ('The day was rainy and frosty, a walk was unthinkable'). (chapter I, p. 5)

In many cases Dobrzańska says what happened but fails to give any details, as in her translation of the following fragment:

(…) only soon after breakfast, I heard some bustle in the neighbourhood of Mr. Rochester's chamber, Mrs. Fairfax's voice, and Leah's, and the cook's – that is, John's wife – and even John's own gruff tones. There were exclamations of 'What a mercy master was not burnt in his bed!' 'It is always dangerous to keep a candle lit at night.' 'How providential that he had presence of mind to think of the water-jug!' 'I wonder he waked nobody!' 'It is to be hoped he will not take cold with sleeping on the library sofa…', (chapter XVI, p.108)

which she renders as:

Dopiero około południa posłyszałam gwar od strony pokoju pana Rochestera. Służące, pani Fairfax i domownicy, każdy dodawał swoje słówko a wszyscy dziwili się wypadkowi zaszłemu w nocy, dziękowali Bogu, że ich pan prawie cudem uszedł niebezpieczeństwa. (chapter XII, p.80)

Sometimes, she not only makes the text shorter, but also modifies its content, as in her rendering of the fragment:

That forest-dell, where Lowood lay, was the cradle of fog and fog-bred pestilence; which, quickening with the quickening spring, crept into the Orphan Asylum, breathed typhus through its crowded schoolroom and dormitory (…). Semi-starvation and neglected colds had predisposed most of the pupils to receive infection. (chapter IX, p.55)

as:

Głód, zimno, brak powietrza i zdrowej wody w ciągu zimy sprawiły, że większa część wychowanek Lowoodu padła ofiarą panującej w okolicy zarazy tyfusu. (chapter VI, p. 26)

Here, she changes the causes of the epidemic. In her version these are: starvation, cold, the lack of good air and healthy water.

Dobrzańska frequently omits the titles of literary works. For example, she renders *[Adelé] began [declaiming], 'La Ligue des Rats: fable de La Fontaine* (chapter XI, p.73) as: *[Adela] deklamowała jakiś wiersz La Fontaine'a,* (chapter VIII, p. 39) ('some poem by La Fontaine'). Also, when the source text contains a song or a piece of another literary work, Dobrzańska omits them in her rendition.

Modern translators avoid reduction, in particular the reduction of long fragments of the source text (Hejwowski, 2004:83). Neither of the more recent renderings of *Jane Eyre* contains omissions comparable to those used by Dobrzańska.

Addition

Another technique found almost exclusively in Dobrzańska's rendering is addition, i.e. augmentation of the source language text by the translator (Berman, in: Venuti 2000:290). Dobrzańska adds adjectives to the descriptions of various objects in the novel and gives additional information about the characters. For instance, in her rendering of the sentence *She was occupied in knitting; a large cat sat demurely at her feet,* (chapter XI, p. 68) the cat is black and the woman is knitting a stocking: *Robiła pończochę, a u nóg jej leżał olbrzymi czarny kot.*(chapter VIII, p. 33) When she translates the word *snowflakes* she adds the adjective *gęste* ('thick'); the word *Christian* is translated with the additional modifier *prawy* ('righteous'), and the age of the character is added in her rendering of the sentence: *They went, shutting the door, and locking it behind them* (chapter II, p. 10)

into *Wyszły i zamknęły za sobą drzwi. Zostałam sama, a miałam wtedy 10 lat* (chapter II, p. 8) ('I was left alone, and I was 10 years old then'). Possibly, the translator wanted to make the situation more dramatic. Dobrzańska changed the expression *God must have led me on* (chapter XXVII, p. 222) into *Prowadził mnie tylko Bóg i duch mojej matki* (chapter XXIV, p. 203), thus adding the ghost of her deceased mother who, in her version, led the character together with God. What is interesting about this addition is the fact that the reader of the book knows next to nothing about Jane's mother – she is rather unimportant to the plot – therefore it is curious why Dobrzańska decided on mentioning this figure in her translation. Another example of addition can be seen in her translation of the sentence *The ground was hard, the air was still, my road was lonely* (chapter XII, p. 78) into *Ziemia była zmarznięta, powietrze bardzo chłodne, ale słońce jasne i dzień pogodny* (chapter IX, p. 44) ('although the ground was frozen and the air was cold, the sun shone brightly and the weather was fine'). Her version changes the mood of the situation by making it more optimistic.

Sometimes the sentences she puts into the mouths of the characters are her own inventions. In her version, Mr. Rochester says: *Chorą i cierpiącą chciałbym cię stokroć więcej niż zdrową i szczęśliwą* (chapter XXIV, p. 189) ('I would rather you were ill and in anguish than healthy and happy'), which he never says in the original. Such additions suggest that Dobrzańska did not try to be neutral and objective while translating the novel. She offered the readers her own interpretation of the events and the characters' motives.

Substitution

Another technique characteristic of Dobrzańska's rendering of *Jane Eyre* is substitution. The term refers to a situation when a translator decides on substituting the original expression with one that has "little or no morpho-syntactic or semantic relation" (Malone, in: Taylor 2009:52) to it in the rendition.

Dobrzańska substitutes individual words with more or less related lexical items of her own choice. She translates *garters* as *sznurek* ('twine'), *a cameo head* as *lalka porcelanowa* ('a porcelain doll'), *wild strawberries* as *jagody* ('blueberries'), *a moth* as *żuk* ('a beetle') *porridge* as *kasza* (roughly 'semolina'), *twilight* as *mgła* ('fog'), *a bedfoot* as *wezgłowie łóżka* ('a bedhead'), *a cold* as *kaszel* ('a cough'), *a penknife* as *szpileczka* ('a pin'), *a lark* as *jaskółka* ('a swallow'), *doors* as *dziury* ('holes'), *shrubs* as *drzewa* ('trees'), *a great cabinet* as *starożytna szafa* ('the ancient cabinet'), *warm hand* as *chłodna ręka* ('cold hand'), *fastidious* as *despotyczny* ('despotic'), *stained* as *poczerniałe* ('blackened'), *a snuff-box* as *szczypta tabaki* ('a pinch of snuff'), *a chair* as *stołek* ('a stool'), *a coach-house* as *stajnia* ('a stable'), *knives* as *naczynia kuchenne* ('kitchen utensils'), *a basin* as *szklanka* ('a glass'), *a seed-cake* as *pierniki* ('gingerbread biscuits'), *pudding* as *konfitura* ('jam'), *a phial* as *słoik* ('a jar'), *lips* as *powieki* ('eyelids'), *a shoulder* as *szyja* ('a neck'), both *Jamaica* and *Spanish Town* as *Madera,* etc.

She also substitutes longer fragments of the source text. For instance, she renders *she boxed both my ears* (chapter IV, p. 20) as *uderzyła [mnie] w twarz* (chapter IV, p. 15) ('she hit me in the face'),

she [Adelé] touched my knee (chapter XVII, p. 119) as *Adela pociągnęła mnie za suknię* (chapter XIV, p. 91) ('Adelé pulled my dress') and *At last both slept: the fire and candle went out* (chapter III, p. 15) into *Usnęły – a ja całą noc przeleżałam (…) przy świetle płonącego ogniska* (chapter III, p .11) ('they both slept – and I stayed up all night lying by the fire'), *Bessie, you must promise not to scold me any more till I go* (chapter IV, p. 28) with *Bessie, przyrzeknij mi, że nie będziesz się gniewać z powodu mojego wyjazdu* (chapter IV, p. 19) 'Bessie, you must promise me not to be angry because of my departure'. Similarly, Dobrzańska replaces *neither of us had dropt a tear* (chapter XXI, p. 168) with *ja jedna wylałam łzę rzewną* (chapter XVIII, p. 140) 'it was only me who shed a tear', which is another example of her intervention in the plot and interpretation of the events. Another example is her rendering of the sentence *Some natural tears she shed on being told this; but as I began to look very grave, she consented at last to wipe them* (chapter XVII, p. 116) as *Pocieszyłam ją jak mogłam, pieściłam i dziecko wkrótce zapomniało o doznanej przykrości* (chapter XIV, p. 89) ('I consoled her as much as I could, I caressed her and the child quickly forgot about the unpleasant experience'). Here, Dobrzańska completely changes the original scenario, for she suggests that Jane pandered to little Adelé's whim, while in the original it was Adelé who had to suppress her craving to go and see Mr. Rochester's newly arrived guests, and translating *Did you ever hear that my father was an avaricious grasping man?* (chapter XXVII, p. 213) as *Słyszałaś, że brat ten był skąpcem?* (chapter XXIV, p. 192), which indicates that it was Mr. Rochester's brother, not father, who was a stingy man.

Another area in Dobrzańska's translation where substitution is common is in references of time and number. First of all, Dobrzańska frequently substitutes simple units of time. Examples of this kind include translating: *an hour* as *parę godzin* ('a few hours'), *about an hour ago* as *przed chwilą* ('a moment ago'), *perhaps two or three weeks* as *tydzień, góra dwa* ('a week or two'), *for nearly a fortnight past* as *parę ostatnich dni* ('over the past few days'), *it was yet but six [o'clock]* as *było już wprawdzie po siódmej* ('it was already past seven [o'clock]'), *June* as *lipiec* ('July'), *the 20th of October* as *20 listopad* ('the 20th of November'), *autumn* as *wiosna* ('spring'), and *for two generations* as *przez parę wieków* ('several centuries').

Also, changes in the grammatical aspect of the verb are often observable, for instance, when Dobrzańska renders *[she] began to remove my shawl* (chapter XI, p. 68) as *zdjęła ze mnie szal* (chapter VIII, p. 34). Here, in the source phrase the action of removing has only just begun, while in the translation it has been completed. Similarly, it happens from time to time that Dobrzańska changes grammatical tenses. For example, she changes the present tense in the 28th chapter of the original into the past tense in her translation (chapter XXV, p. 204).

Dobrzańska also often changes numbers which occur in the original. For example, she translates *Not three in three thousand raw school-girl-governesses would have answered me as you have just done* (chapter XIV, p. 96) as *Na sto nauczycielek, ani jedna nie zdołała by się na to, co mi pani powiedziała* (chapter XI, p. 66) ('Not one in a hundred …') or she renders *All the night I heard but three sounds at three long intervals, – a step creak, a momentary renewal of the snarling, canine noise, and a deep human groan* (chapter XX, p. 147) into *W ciągu całej nocy tylko raz słyszałam szmer kroków, mruknięcie podobne do warczenia psa i jakiś przeciągły jęk,* (chapter XVII, p. 124), which

suggests that Jane heard three voices at the same time, or one after another. Similar cases of number substitution include rendering *a third of* as *połowa* ('a half of'), *once or twice* into *dwa albo trzy razy* ('two or three times'), *at the age of one-and-twenty* as *w dwudziestym roku życia* ('being twenty years of age'), *two miles* as *trzy angielskie mile* ('three English miles'), *an egg at the least* as *co najmniej parę jaj* ('a couple of eggs at the least'), etc.

Overtranslation and undertranslation

The techniques of overtranslation and undertranslation involve using expressions that are respectively too strong or too weak for the context (Duff, in: Chan and Pollard 2001:716,1108). Both of them result in non-equivalent translations (Wang 2012).

Dobrzańska uses overtranslation more often than the other two translators. She writes about love when the original talks about fondness, e.g. when she renders: *I don't dislike you, Miss; I believe I am fonder of you than of all the others* (chapter IV, p. 28) as *Nie, dziecko, ja cię kocham więcej, niż ktokolwiek w tym domu* (chapter IV, p. 20) ('No, my dear, I love you more than anybody else in this house'). She also translates *Do you like him?* (chapter XXXVII, p. 304) as *Czy go kochasz?* (chapter XXVIII, p.233) ('Do you love him?').

Another case when overtranslation applies is translating *'She's done for me, I fear,' was the faint reply* (chapter XX, p. 148) as *Zabiła mnie, zabiła!* (chapter XVII, p. 125) by Dobrzańska and *Zamordowała mnie, lękam się – brzmiała słaba odpowiedź* (chapter XX, p. 323) by Świderska. The sense of killing is conveyed by both translators. However, the connotative meaning of the original phrase is strengthened or even exaggerated – especially when it comes to Dobrzańska's version, which one can literally translate as 'She killed me! Killed me!'. The next example of employing the technique is apparent in her rendering of Mr. Rochester's words *'I wish you all good-night, now,' said he, making a movement of the hand towards the door, in token that he was tired of our company, and wished to dismiss us* (chapter XIII, p. 90) as *Nudzicie mnie, męczycie swoim towarzystwem, idźcie więc wszyscy precz!* (chapter X, p. 59) ('You bore me, you torture me with your company, go away from me!').

Similarly, Dobrzańska translates the phrase *Nor do I particularly affect simple-minded old ladies* (chapter XIV, p. 92) as *Nie cierpię ich równie mocno jak starych bab o ograniczonym umyśle* (chapter XI, p. 61) ('I hate them as much as [I hate] narrow-minded old hags'). Here, the translator changes the rather neutral words of Mr. Rochester into offensive language, thus making him a rude man.

There are also a few cases of undertranslation in the Polish renditions, for example Dobrzańska's rendering of the negative *the wicked* in the sentence *Do you know where the wicked go after death?* (chapter IV, p. 23) as completely neutral *dusze* ('souls') (chapter IV, p. 16). Another such case is translating *clouds so sombre* (chapter I, p. 5) as *ciemne chmury* (chapter I, p. 3) ('dark clouds') by Świderska. The word *ciemne* only conveys the colour-component of the source expression and disregards the other connotations connected with clouds being 'melancholic'. Here, a closer equivalent is *posępne chmury* (chapter I, p. 9) – as it is translated by Jaworska.

Explicitation

Explicitation involves "making explicit in the target language what remains implicit in the source language because it is apparent from either the context or the situation" (Vinay and Darbelnet, in: Kwieciński 2001:127).

In the Polish translations of *Jane Eyre* explicitation often involves the category of gender. English specifies the gender of living beings less often than Polish. It is then the translator's task to decide whether a certain noun should be rendered as masculine or feminine in Polish. Thus, for instance, *cat* is masculine *kot* in Dobrzańska's translation, and feminine *kotka* in Świderska's rendering. Similarly, the word *servant* is translated by Dobrzańska as masculine *sługa*, and as feminine *służąca* by both Świderska and Jaworska. Another example of this kind is the rendition of *a cook* as masculine *kucharz* by Dobrzańska, and feminine *kucharka* by the other two translators. Dobrzańska seems to prefer the masculine gender when the original does not make it explicit.

In addition to the words with no gender marking there are also other English expressions which require specification in Polish. For instance, when Mr. Rochester wants Jane *to take tea with him* (chapter XIII, p. 84) the Polish translator faces the choice between translating this expression as *napicie się herbaty* ('drinking tea') or *zjedzenie podwieczorku* 'eating a light afternoon meal'. Unfortunately for the Polish translators the context does not indicate if it is a meal or just a cup of tea. Dobrzańska and Świderska choose 'drinking tea', while Jaworska's choice is 'eating an afternoon meal'.

Another choice which the translators had to make involves finding the Polish equivalent of *dinner*. Świderska translated it as *obiad* (chapter I, p. 3) because it is the name of the main meal in Polish, while Jaworska chose the word *kolacja* (chapter I, p. 9) because it is eaten at a similar time as English dinner. In the context in which it appears in the novel, however, *obiad* seems more appropriate: *We had been wandering, indeed, in the leafless shrubbery an hour in the morning; but since dinner (Mrs Reed, when there was no company, dined early) the cold winter wind had brought with it clouds so sombre, and a rain so penetrating, that further out-door exercise was now out of the question.* (chapter I, p. 5) Jaworska's translation – *kolacja*, which is a meal eaten in the evening, does not really fit in the situation described by the author.

Another example of explicitation is apparent in rendering *the match* in the phrase *the match was broken off* (chapter XXII, p. 172) as *małżeństwo* by both Dobrzańska and Świderska, and *narzeczeństwo* by Jaworska. Though *the match* can be interpreted in two ways – as 'marriage' and 'engagement' – only Jaworska's version, i.e. 'engagement', is appropriate in the context as Mr. Rochester and Mrs. Ingram do not get married in the book – they just plan to do so.

Foreignization vs. domestication

The choice between foreignization and domestication is one of the most basic decisions a translator has to make. Domestication is "adopted [by the translator] in order to minimize the strange-

ness of the foreign text for target language readers" (Venuti, in: Shuttleworth and Cowie 1997:44), whereas by means of foreignization the target text retains something of the foreignness of the source text, thus deliberately breaking target conventions (Venuti, 1995:20). Nowadays, foreignization is preferred by most translators and translation theorists (Venuti 1995:309-310), because a translator's disregard of the reader's knowledge and language skills equals treating the reader as inferior. Moreover, the strategy of domestication has the negative connotations of the unreceptiveness to the foreign as shown by "aggressively monolingual" (Venuti, in: Shuttleworth and Cowie 1997:44) superior cultures.

Translation of proper names

The choice between foreignization and domestication is visible in the translation of proper names. In accordance with the current trends in translation proper names should not be translated unless they carry a meaning which is contextually relevant or they have their recognized equivalent in the target language (Newmark 1988:214, 2001:71). Only minor changes in the spelling of proper names are acceptable, for they often facilitate the process of translation as well as reading in the target language (Hejwowski 2004:98).

Probably the most numerous group of proper nouns in *Jane Eyre* is the category of first names. Dobrzańska's rendition abounds in Polonized names. Examples include the following renderings: *Jane* as *Janina*, *Georgiana* as *Georgina*, *Helen* as *Helena*, *Leah* as *Liwia*, *Sophie* as *Zofia*, *Grace* as *Gracja*, *Celiné* as *Celina*, *Adelé* as *Adela*, *Blanche* as *Blanka*, *Mary* as *Maria*, *Henry* as *Henryk*, *Frederick* as *Fryderyk*, *Louisa* as *Luiza*, *Richard* as *Ryszard*, *Alice* as *Alicja*, *Bertha Antoinetta* as *Berta Antonina*, *Giacinta* as *Hiacynta*, *Clara* as *Klara*, and *Rosamond* as *Rozamunda*. In the book there are two men named John – *John Reed,* and *John* who is a servant. Interestingly, Dobrzańska translates the name of *John Reed* into *Jan Reed*, but leaves the name of *John* the servant intact. She also modifies a few names, substituting *Hannah* with *Anna*, a dog's name, *Pilot* with *Pilote* and the surname *Leaven* with *Lieven*.

When it comes to Świderska, she is not consistent with any particular strategy of dealing with proper names. Some names are translated in her rendition, while others are left unchanged. For instance, she translates names such as *Celiné*, *Adelé* or *Alice*, but she does not change, for example, *Sophie*, *Mary* or *John*.

Jaworska, as a rule, does not translate any first names in her rendition – with two minor exceptions of the dropping the final 'h': she changes *Hannah* into *Hanna* and *Leah* into *Lea*.

There is another interesting example of a proper name in the novel: *Welsh rabbit,* which is the name of a traditional British dish having, in fact, nothing to do with rabbit meat, as it consists only of pieces of toast accompanied by hot melted Cheddar cheese. Dobrzańska falls victim to this tricky term and translates the phrase *I could fancy a Welsh rabbit for supper* (chapter III, p.19) as *Mam ochotę na kawałek królika* (chapter III, p. 14) ('I feel like eating a piece of rabbit'). When it comes to

Świderska, she provides the reader with a descriptive equivalent of the foreign concept: *Zjadłabym grzanki z serem na kolację* (chapter III, p. 34) ('I feel like eating some toast with cheese for supper'). Jaworska, in turn, decides to leave this specific term intact: *Mam apetyt na welsh rabbit na kolację* (chapter III, p. 27) ('I have an appetite for Welsh rabbit for supper').

Translation of foreign expressions

Jane Eyre contains a lot of French inclusions, for the British aristocracy of those times was fascinated with the French language and culture. That is why Mr. Rochester, together with the members of his social circle, as well as little Adelé, a French girl whose knowledge of English is rather poor, all produce French utterances prolifically.

Each of the three translators has chosen a different way of dealing with foreign expressions. Dobrzańska tends to translate all of them into Polish. Świderska leaves them in the original and explains their meanings in brackets, while Jaworska leaves them in the original or explains their meanings in footnotes.

A perfect example contrasting the strategies used by the three translators is rendering *'C'est le ma gouverante!' said she, pointing to me, and addressing her nurse; who answered – 'Maisoui, certainement'* (chapter XI, p. 72) into:

– *Czy to moja nauczycielka? – spytała piastunki po francusku. – Tak, to ona* (chapter VIII, p. 38) by Dobrzańska,

– *C'est l ma gouvernante? (Czy to moja guwernantka? – fr.) – rzekła wskazując mnie palcem i zwracając się do bony; ta odpowiedziała: – Maisoui, certainement. (Ależ tak, naturalnie. – fr.)* (chapter XI, p. 151) by Świderska, and

– *C'estlá ma gouverante?[2] – zapytała bonę, wskazując mnie paluszkiem. – Maisoui, certainement.[3];* (chapter XI, p.97) by Jaworska.

Another instance of a similar kind is translating *"Jeune encore"*, *as the French say* (chapter XXXVII, p. 304) as:

– *A zatem można go jeszcze nazwać młodym* (chapter XXVIII, p. 233) by Dobrzańska,

– *Jeune encore (Jeszcze młody – Fr.), jak mówią Francuzi* (chapter XXXVII, p. 685) by Świderska, and

– *Jeune encore[4], jak mawiają Francuzi* (vol. III chapter XI, p.422) by Jaworska.

---

[2] *Czy to moja guwernantka?*

[3] *Ależ tak, na pewno*

[4] *Jeszcze młody*

Archaisms

The translations by Emilia Dobrzańska and Teresa Świderska date back to the pre-war years, which is why they contain numerous expressions which have become archaic. For instance, both translators render the expression *without grimace* as *bez minoderii, a portmanteau* as *wieszadło*, or *a sleek gander* as *gładki gąsior*, while nowadays the adjective *gładki* will be substituted with *tłusty*, as it is in Jaworska's rendition. Moreover, Świderska translates *a toilet table* as *toaleta*, which denotes 'a toilet' nowadays, *a chaise* as *ekwipaż*, or *a sprite* as *wodnica*.

Dobrzańska renders *the driver of the post-chaise* as archaic *pocztylion*, *a trunk* as *tłumoczek, cuirass* as *puklerz, ornaments* as *graciki,* and *play with shuttlecock* as *bawić się w wolanta*. In addition, she uses such archaisms as *krasa* 'beauty', *wychowanie* 'wygląd', *kibić* 'waist' and *ludny* 'populous'. Some phraseologisms which she uses are also archaic, e.g. *Opatrzność stanęła w poprzek moim zamiarom* (chapter XXIII, p. 180), which is her translation of *Providence has checked me.* (chapter XXVI, p. 204) The other two translators use a more modern version: *Opatrzność mnie powstrzymała* (Świderska: chapter XXIII, p. 450; Jaworska: vol. II, chapter XI, p. 278).

Errors

Some of Dobrzańska's unconventional renderings cannot be explained by the use of any specific translation strategies, but they have to be classified as errors, such as the already mentioned *Welsh rabbit* (cf. section 3.6.1), or simply oversights. For example, her rendering of: *Diana's husband is a captain in the navy (…). Mary's is a clergyman* (chapter XXXVIII, p. 313) as *Diana [wyszła za] za pastora (…), Maria za kapitana marynarki* (chapter XXIX, p. 244) in which she reverses the men's professions ('Diana is a clergyman's wife while Maria married a captain in the navy') suggests that the translation was not edited properly.

Dobrzańska also has problems translating the word *lecture* in the sentence: *You can go down [Bessie]; I will give Miss Jane a lecture till you come back* (chapter III, p. 17). She translates it as: *Idź Bessie, (…), ja przez ten czas poczytam trochę panience* (chapter III, p. 12) ('I will read to Miss Jane'). Świderska's version is: *Proszę spokojnie iść na dół, ja tu tymczasem dam burę panience Jane* (chapter III, p. 29) ('I will scold Miss Jane'), while Jaworska's: *Możesz odejść [Bessie]. Pogawędzę z panną Jane do twojego powrotu* (chapter III, p. 24) ('I will have a talk with Miss Jane'). Świderska's translation seems to be the most accurate; Jaworska's is acceptable as well, but Dobrzańska's rendering is clearly wrong.

Conclusion

The Polish renderings of *Jane Eyre* differ from each other significantly in both their style and the translation strategies employed by the translators. Undoubtedly, the most striking contrast is visible

when comparing the oldest Polish translation done by Dobrzańska in 1880-1881 and the latest one done by Gabriela Jaworska in 2007.

As is to be expected, Dobrzańska's translation contains many words which have become archaic, and so does Świderska's translation published in 1930. However, the most important difference lies in the whole philosophy of translation adopted by Dobrzańska and the two later translators. Dobrzańska omits large fragments of the original text, adds information which is not included in the original, and substitutes original expressions with language items of her own choice. Omission, addition and substitution are not found in the other two translations.

As far as the renderings by Świderska and Jaworska are concerned, except for minor differences they are comparable with each other. Świderska's *Dziwne Losy Jane Eyre* stands in between Dobrzańska's *Janina* and Jaworska's *Jane Eyre*. This median position is apparent when looking at the way in which Świderska translates, for instance, proper names – she chooses to render some into Polish, while others she leaves in the original. Jaworska, as a rule, does not translate proper names. French inclusions in *Jane Eyre* are also treated differently by the three translators: Dobrzańska translates them into Polish, Świderska explains them in brackets, Jaworska translates them only when it is inevitable, and when she does so she uses footnotes.

Dobrzańska's rendering seems the least faithful to the original, while Teresa Świderska and Gabriela Jaworska stay close to the form and meaning of the original. Dobrzańska has created her own, autonomous story based upon the original novel *Jane Eyre*.

The most characteristic patterns in the evolution of translation standards seem to involve a shift from a free subjective adaptation to faithful translation, and from domestication to foreignization.

References:

Primary sources:

Brontë, Charlotte. 1953. *Jane Eyre*. Beccles and London: Harper Collins Publishers.

--. 2003. *Dziwne Losy Jane Eyre*. Tr. Teresa Świderska. Warszawa: Prószyński i S-ka.

--. 2006. *Dziwne Losy Jane Eyre*. Tr. Emilia Dobrzańska. Poessneck: Hachette Livre Polska.

--. 2009. *Jane Eyre*. Tr. Gabriela Jaworska. Kraków: Zielona Sowa.

electronic version of the original at: http://www.classicly.com/download-jane-eyre-pdf – ManyBooks.net

electronic version of Świderska's translation at: http://chomikuj.pl/betty.one/zachomikowane/Bronte+Charlotte++Dziwne+losy+Jane+Eyre,2807152851.pdf – Prószyński i S-ka

Secondary sources:

Duff, Alan McConnell. 2001. "Overtranslation"; "Undertranslation". In: Chan, Sin Wai and David Edward Pollard (eds.). *An Encyclopaedia of Translation: Chinese-English, English-Chinese.* Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press. 716-730; 1108-1118.

Estreicher, Karol. 1872–1882. *Bibliografia polska. Stulecie XIX* (volume 1). Kraków: Spółka Księgarzy Polskich. Online: http://www.estreicher.uj.edu.pl/ – 29.05.13

Fawcett, Peter. 1997. *Translation and Language. Linguistic Theories Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Hadyna, Dagmara. 2013. "A controversial translation justified by the context: *Janin*a, the first Polish version of Charlotte Brontë's *Jane Eyre*", MA dissertation, Kraków, Jagiellonian University, URL:

http://www.academia.edu/4019388/A_controversial_translation_justified_by_the_context_Janina_the_first_Polish_version_of_Charlotte_Brontes_Jane_Eyre_

Haynes, Kenneth (ed.). 2010. *Classics and Translation: Essays by D. S. Carne-Ross*. Cranbury: Rosemont Publishing & Printing Corp.

Hejwowski, Krzysztof. 2004. *Kognitywno-komunikacyjna teoria przekładu*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Kwieciński, Michał. 2001. *Disturbing Strangeness. Foreignisation and domestication in translation procedures in the context of cultural asymmetry*. Toruń: EDYTOR.

McCauley, Mary C. 1997. "Exploring the many faces of '*Jane Eyre*'. Critical Eye."

Online:http://articles.baltimoresun.com/2007-08-19/news/0708180048_1_jane-eyre-version-of-jane-novel – 05.06.13.

Molina, Lucía and Amparo Hurtado Albir. 2002. "Translation Techniques Revisited: A Dynamic and Functionalist Approach".

Online: http://www.erudit.org/revue/meta/2002/v47/n4/008033ar.pdf – 04.01.13.

Munday, Jeremy. 2001. *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and applications*. London and New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

Newmark, Peter. 1988. *A Textbook of Translation*. New York: Prentice-Hall International and Pearson Education Ltd.

--. 2001. *Approaches to Translation*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.

Nida, Eugene A. 2000. "Principles of Correspondence", in: Venuti, Lawrence (ed.). *The Translation Studies Reader*. London and New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group. 126-140..

Shuttleworth, Mark and Moira Cowie. 1997. *Dictionary of Translation Studies*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Taylor, Christopher. 2007. *Language to Language. A practical and theoretical guide for Italian/English translators* (7th edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Venuti, Lawrence. 1995. *The Translator's Invisibility. A History of Translation*. London and New York: Routledge.

Vinay, Jean-Paul and Jean L. Darbelnet. 1995(1958). *Comparative Stylistics of French and English*. English translation. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co..

Wang, Mian. 2012. "An Analysis of Over-translation and Under-translation in Perspective of Cultural Connotation".

Online: http://www.translationdirectory.com/articles/article1704.php – 15.05.13

dictionary 1 *The Free Dictionary*. Online: http://www.thefreedictionary.com/
dictionary 2 *Oxford Advanced Learners' Dictionary* (8th edition) – electronic version.

Internet sources:
web 1 http://lo2piotrkow.eu/data/_uploaded/image/150_lat_biuletyn.pdf – 29.05.13
web 2 http://www.ling.helsinki.fi/monako/atk/glossary_np.shtml – 05.06.13
web 3 http://pl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Obiad – 05.06.13

Agnieszka Smoleńska
The University of Rzeszow

Wordplay in selected Polish translations of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* by Lewis Carroll

Abstract. This article presents the results of a comparative analysis of the translations of wordplay in selected Polish renderings of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* by Lewis Carroll. So far, there have been 10 attempts to translate this book into Polish. The present paper looks at the techniques employed by three translators: Antoni Marianowicz (1955), Maciej Słomczyński (1965), and Bogumiła Kaniewska (2010), though occasionally reference is also made to other renditions of the book. *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* is particularly rich in wordplay, which is why rendering it into a foreign language is a real challenge. Słomczyński and Marianowicz tried to preserve most of the puns used by Carroll or replace them with new ones, while Kaniewska's translation is much more literal and, in consequence, it fails to convey the ambiguity and comic effect of the original.
Key words: wordplay, Lewis Carroll, translation, Polish, humour, pun.

Introduction

    Alice's Adventures in Wonderland, a novel written by Charles Lutwidge Dodgson under the pseudonym Lewis Carroll, is commonly considered to be one of the finest books ever written. This timeless story has provided inspiration for numerous influential artists – writers, painters, directors, rock stars, singers and composers, and video game designers. Salvador Dali, for instance, created 12 illustrations – one for each chapter of Carroll's story, and Walt Disney released the animated film *Alice in Wonderland* in 1951. Roland Topor, a French illustrator, painter and writer, wrote *Alice au Pays des Lettres,* and Andrzej Sapkowski, a Polish writer of fantasy books, presented the story from the point of view of the Cheshire Cat in *Złote popołudnie*. Also, in a popular science fiction film *The Matrix* Neo is sent a message to "follow the white rabbit". These are just a few examples of works inspired by this extraordinary tale.

Not all books require great artistry to be translated. However, some publications are very difficult to render into another language, and constitute a real challenge for translators. Carroll's novel indisputably belongs to this category. This literary masterpiece is so complex and full of riddles and wordplay that every reader (and translator) may construe it in his/her individual way. The book has been translated into more than 125 languages, including Esperanto, Hindi, Hebrew, Gaelic, Pashto and Swahili. There are also versions in Braille (Thomas 2007). The first Polish version appeared 45 years after the publication of the original. At the moment, 10 Polish translations are available. In this paper I put under scrutiny the ways in which Polish translators have dealt with the wordplay used by L. Carroll in *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*. I focus on the renderings by Antoni Marianowicz (1955), Macviej Słomczyński and Maria Kaniewska, though occasionally reference is also made to the works of other translators.

The Origins of Carroll's Masterpiece

Lewis Carroll was born on January 27, 1832 in Daresbury, Cheshire, England as Charles Lutwidge Dodgson. His biggest problem was a stutter, which resulted in better relations with children than with adults. It was his father who had a great influence on his life. To continue the family traditions, Dodgson become a pastor (but never undertook pastoral duties). He also inherited an outstanding passion for mathematics, and, as a consequence, published approximately 250 papers on logic, mathematics and cryptography (*Nowy słownik literarury dla dzieci i młodzieży* 1979: 95). He was also a photographer. One of his favourite models was Alice Liddell – the archetype of the protagonist in *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*. This occupation has provoked a lot of suspicion, since Dodgson mainly took pictures of little girls, who sometimes posed nude. It was speculated that he may have suffered from some kind of sexual deviation. However, all of the photos were taken at the children's parents' request, and women, who, as children, were photographed by Dodgson remembered him as a dear friend who gave them high self-esteem (Thomas 2007: 27).

Dodgson became famous for another reason. In addition to taking photographs of his little friends he also used to tell children incredible stories about imaginary creatures to entertain them during those sessions. His dominant inspiration was again Alice Liddell. It became something of a tradition for him to take Alice and her two sisters out for picnics, during which he told them tales. On one of his expeditions Dodgson invented a story about a girl named Alice, who falls down a rabbit hole into a strange place called Wonderland, where she experiences numerous adventures (Thomas 2007: 186-187).

The title of Dodgson's novel was originally different from the one we all know today. "*Alice's Adventures Underground* was the first name of the story; later on it became *Alice's Hour in Elfland*. It was not until June 18, 1864 that he finally decided upon *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*" (Collingwood 1967: 96). The book was published in 1865. Dodgson's pen name originated from an Anglicized form of his name - "Lewis" stands for Lutwidge and "Carroll" is an Anglicized form of Charles.

Most probably, his mathematical fondness had an impact on his masterpiece, as it contains numerous plays on words riddles and tongue twisters. *Alice* turned out to be a real sensation, since it was not a book conventionally familiar to Victorians. People either loved it or hated it. For instance, *Antheneum* wrote that "a normal child would be rather puzzled than enchanted by this strange and twisted story"(Thomas 2007:197). Among its first readers were people such as Queen Victoria and Oscar Wilde. The success of the book led Carroll to write a sequel – *Through the Looking Glass and What Alice Found There,* which became equally popular.

Polish Translations of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*

Carroll's masterpiece is a challenge for translators because of its linguistic intricacies – complex syntax, numerous puns and allusions – which may remain unnoticed without a sufficient knowledge of the book's origins and the details of the Victorian era. At the moment, 10 Polish renderings of this book are available. The first one, by Adela S. (her full name is unknown), appeared in 1910 – 45 years after the publication of the original. Its fate after World War I remains a mystery. All that is known about her version is that Adela S. named her translation *Przygody Alinki w Krainie Cudów*, and that it was an adaptation of the original story addressed at young readers rather than a faithful rendering.

In 1927 the Warsaw publishing house Gebethner i Wolff ordered a new version. The author of this rendering was Maria Morawska. She named it *Ala w krainie czarów*, and on its first page she gave an inscription saying "free translation from English", which turned out to be true, as many excerpts were omitted and others were added. Morawska tried to simplify the text and set the story in a Polish context. The strongest point of this version is the inclusion of nursery rhymes translated by the Polish poet Antoni Lange.

In 1955 the next rendering of *Alice*, by Antoni Marianowicz, appeared on the Polish publishing market. His translation is the most polonized one and is clearly directed at the youngest readers. The Victorian nursery rhymes that in the original book are parodied by Carroll were changed by Marianowicz into parodies of famous Polish nursery rhymes.

Maciej Słomczyński, the translator of all of Shakespeare's works and *Ulysses* by James Joyce, wrote the next rendering of *Alice* in 1965; he was also the first to translate *Through the Looking Glass and What Alice Found There* into Polish. It was the first text that was consistent with the original tale and revealed its oniric character. In the preface to his work Słomczyński wrote: "I wanted this book to contain the same things that the original one contains: two overlapping books – for children and for adults. Furthermore, I wanted this book to be written in the language of a dream and in the grammar of a dream dreamt in Victorian England" (Słomczyński 2000: 6, translation mine: A.S).

The fifth Polish translation of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* came into being in 1986. Robert Stiller, a translator of *A Clockwork Orange* by Anthony Burgess and *Lolita* by Vladimir Nabokov, was

deeply convinced that Słomczyński's version did not equal the original one and decided to write his own translation. He supplied his text with nearly 100 annotations, explaining the facts concerning the reality of Victorian England, and information about the author and the archetype of the protagonist. Moreover, these footnotes also explain the wordplays which have lost their meanings in translation. Stiller relied greatly on the renderings of his predecessors, whom he had previously criticized. Eventually, his translation never became more popular than Słomczyński's version.

Jolanta Kozak's and Iwona Libucha's versions were published at almost the same time. Kozak's rendering is very anachronistic. There are numerous colloquial expressions and teenage sayings. She also changed some characters' names that were deeply rooted in the minds of Polish readers. For instance, "kot z Cheshire" has been changed into "Szczery Kot" (lit. 'an honest cat'). However, such a modernized version was not well-received. Libucha's book is a short adaptation of *Alice* without wordplays and nursery rhymes. Even the characters' names are so simplified that it is no longer clear whether this is still a translation of *Alice* or not.

In the centenary of the first Polish edition of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, in 2010, two new versions of it appeared on the Polish publishing market. One of them was written by Bogumiła Kaniewska. She stuck to the original and used very simple language without losing the finesse of the text. She neither modernized nor imitated the style of the original. Her renderings of Carroll's wordplays are very novel and accurate. Consequently, her book is widely considered as one of the best Polish translations.

Another version from 2010 was published by Krzysztof Dworak. The most considerable merit of this edition are the illustrations and the graphic design created by Robert Ingpen. His innovative pictures differ significantly from Tenniel's grotesque vision of the Wonderland which was presented in the first edition of the original. Nevertheless, many readers maintain that this is the most beautiful edition of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* in Poland.

The most recent translation of Carroll's work was written by Elżbieta Tabakowska – the Director of the UNESCO Chair in Translation Studies and Intercultural Communication at Jagiellonian University. She is also a translator of Norman Davies's works and an author of books on the theory and practice of translation. In 2012 Bona publishing house edited the result of her long-term work. Her book is decorated with the illustrations of Tove Jansson, the author of the Moomin books. In her rendering Tabakowska changed Victorian nursery rhymes into well-known Polish songs and poems. This time "Alice speaks normal present-day language, which would be used by a girl from Jansson's pictures if she were a Pole" (Tabakowska 2012: 116, translation mine: A.S). Because of that, many Polish readers claim that Alice in Tabakowska's translation is closer to them.

Ten translations of one book may seem too many. However, when Tabakowska was asked why she wrote another rendering of Alice, she said: "When asked this question, a translator may answer in the same way as did a great climber who was asked why he was climbing mountains and said: 'because they exist' " (Tabakowska 2012:115, translation mine: A.S). It is also the case with Carroll's masterpiece – it exists, and because of its greatness it sill seduces translators to try and create their own versions of Alice.

An Analysis of Polish Translations of Wordplay in *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*

The following analysis focuses on three Polish renderings of Carroll's masterpiece: one by Antoni Marianowicz, the second written by Maciej Słomczyński, and the last one by Bogumiła Kaniewska. Occasionally, reference will also be made to other translations. It is beyond the scope of the present paper to discuss all the cases of wordplay included in the book, so the foregoing will only look at the most well-known ones or those which differ significantly across the translations.

One of the first and probably the most famous examples of wordplay in *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* can be found in chapter 3 – *A Caucus-race and a long tale.* This fragment focuses on the Mouse's misery and Alice's curiosity about why this animal hates cats and dogs. Eventually, the rodent offers to tell its tale. The title of this passage itself is a pun, since the word *tale* is homophonous with *tail*. Polish versions of this title differ enormously. Morawska (1997), for instance, rendered it as *Wyścigi* (Eng. 'race'), Marianowicz's (1988) version is *Wyścigi ptasie i opowieść Myszy* (Eng. 'a bird race and the Mouse's tale'), Słomczyński (2000) translated it as *Wyścigi Kumotrów i ogonopowieść* (Eng. 'a log-rollers' race and a tail-tale'), while Stiller (1986) titled it *Kumoterski wyścig i ogoniasta opowieść.* (Eng. 'a log-rolling race and a tale with a tail'). The most recent renderings are found in Dworak (2009): *Gonitwa za stanowiskami oraz rzecz długa o smutnym zakończeniu* (Eng. 'a jobs race and a long thing with a sad ending'), Kaniewska (2010), whose version is *Wyścigi elit i długaśna opowieść* (Eng. 'the elite's race and a long-long tale'), and Tabakowska (2012), who named it *Maraton przedwyborczy i długa opowieść* (Eng. 'a pre-election marathon and a long tale'). As can easily be observed, most of the translations failed to convey the ambiguity of the original. Słomczyński and Stiller showed their creativity and attempted to include the Polish equivalents of *tail* (Pol. *ogon*) and *tale* (Pol. *opowieść*), but the most felicitous translation is probably the one created by Dworak. He changed the word *tale* into *rzecz długa o smutnym zakończeniu* (*a long thing with a sad ending*), which, in fact, may refer both to *ogon* (*tail*) and *opowieść* (*tale).*

The situation becomes even more complicated when it comes to the translation of a longer passage. The original reads as follows:

'You promised to tell me your history, you know,' said Alice,' and why it is you hate – C and D,' she added in a whisper, half afraid that it would be offended again.
'Mine is a long and a sad tale!' said the Mouse, turning to Alice, and sighing.
'It *is* a long tail, certainly,' said Alice, looking down with wonder at the Mouse's tail; 'but why do you call it sad?' (Carroll 1992: 37)

Marianowicz rendered it as:

- Obiecałaś, że opowiesz mi swoją historię – rzekła Alicja. – Dlaczego nie znosisz „k" i „p" – dodała półszeptem, nie chcąc raz jeszcze obrazić Myszy.

- Dobrze, obiecałam. Zobaczysz sama, jak bardzo ten problem jest *zaogniony*...

- *Za o*... – powtórzyła bezmyślnie Alicja, nie bardzo rozumiejąc, o co chodzi. – *Za o*..., ale za co?...

za ogony! – przypomniała sobie, gdy popatrzyła na długi i kręty ogon Myszy (1988: 48)

Słomczyński's version is:

- Obiecałaś, że opowiesz mi o swoim losie – powiedziała Alicja – i o tym, dlaczego nienawidzisz...

K i P – dodała szeptem, obawiając się, że urazi ją ponownie.

- *O, goni smutny i długi* mnie los, smutny i długi jak ta opowieść! – powiedziała Myszka, zwracając

się ku Alicji i wzdychając.

- *Ogon i smutny, i długi*? – powiedziała Alicja spoglądając ze zdumieniem na jej ogon. – Długi tak,

ale dlaczego mówisz, że smutny? (2000: 27)

Whereas Kaniewska dealt with this fragment in the following way:

- Obiecałaś, że opowiesz mi swoją historię – nalegała Alicja. – Wiesz, tę, która mówi, dlaczego nie

lubisz tych na Ka ani tych na Pe – dodała szeptem, w obawie, że Mysz znów poczuje się obrażona.

- To będzie długi i smutny agon! – powiedziała Mysz, spoglądając na Alicję i wzdychając.

- Tak, rzeczywiście DŁUGI – powiedziała Alicja, zerkając w dół na ogon Myszy. – Ale dlaczego

uważasz, że jest smutny? (2000: 43)

In the original the play on words is obvious. The Mouse says that its story is very long and miserable. As the animal uses the word *tale*, which sounds identical to the word *tail,* Alice confuses these words. Consequently, she can perfectly understand that the mouse's tail is long, but she cannot see it as being sad.

Marianowicz changed the original text. He replaced one pun with another. It is still the conversation about why the Mouse hates cats and dogs, but Alice is not surprised by the fact that the animal says that it has a long tale. Here, Alice simply did not understand what the Mouse had said and she tries to guess what it could be. This translator substitutes the word *tale* with the word *problem* (*a problem*) and describes it as being *zaogniony* (*very complicated*). Then, when Alice looks at the rodent's tail, she immediately starts to think that what the Mouse said is *za ogony* (*for tails*). As can easily be noticed, Marianowicz sought to make a connection between the adjective *zaogniony* and the phrase *za ogony*. From the semantic point of view these words have very little in common, since *zaogniony* comes from the word *ogień* (*fire*) and not from the word *ogon* (*tail*), but they sound similar.

The next quoted fragment comes from Słomczyński's translation. He modified the original text to create a new wordplay. He came up with the phrase *O, goni smutny i długi mnie los* (*O, a sad and a long fate is chasing me*), which in fast speech might be understood as *ogon i smutny i długi* (*a sad and a long tail*). This is also the case in this passage. Alice mishears this phrase and cannot

understand why the Mouse calls its tail sad. All in all, even though the text is slightly different, Słomczyński's wordplay is very close to the original pun.

Kaniewska, in turn, made an attempt to translate Carroll's pun as literally as possible. The form of this fragment is almost identical to the original. The only visible difference is in the change of the word *tale* into *agon,* which comes from the word *agonia* (*agony*). The word has nothing to do with tales but it is semantically close to a mournful story and it differs from the word *ogon* in only one vowel.

Another example of wordplay involving homophones occurs in chapter 9 – *The Mock Turtle's Story.* In this section, the Mock Turtle, despite his constant sobbing, tries to tell his story about how he used to be a real turtle in school times. The original version is:

'When we were little,' the Mock Turtle went on at last, more calmly, though still sobbing a little now and then, 'we went to school in the sea. The master was an old Turtle – we used to call him Tortoise -'
'Why did you call him Tortoise, if he wasn't one?' Alice asked.
'We called him Tortoise because he taught us,' said the Mock Turtle angrily: ' really you are very dull!'
(Carroll 1992: 114-116)

Marianowicz rendered it as:

– Kiedy byliśmy mali – odezwał się na koniec Niby Żółw spokojnym już głosem, przerywanym tylko od czasu do czasu cichym łkaniem – kiedy byliśmy mali, chodziłem do morskiej szkoły. Nauczycielem naszym był pewien stary, bezzębny Rekin, którego nazywaliśmy Piłą.
– Dlaczego nazywaliście go Piłą, skoro był Rekinem, a w dodatku nie miał zębów? – zapytała Alicja.
– Ponieważ piłował nas wciąż w czasie lekcji – odparł ze zniecierpliwieniem Niby Żółw. – Twoje pytanie nie świadczy doprawdy o zbyt wielkim rozsądku (1988: 166).

Słomczyński's translation reads as follows:

– Gdy byliśmy dziećmi – powiedział wreszcie Żółwiciel głosem spokojniejszym, choć przerywanym od czasu do czasu łkaniem – uczęszczaliśmy do szkoły znajdującej się w morzu. Nauczycielem naszym był stary Żółw... nazywaliśmy go Ostrygą...
– Dlaczego nazywaliście go Ostrygą, jeżeli nią nie był? – zapytała Alicja.
– Nazywaliśmy go Ostrygą, bo był ostry – powiedział gniewnie Żółwiciel. – Jesteś naprawdę bardzo tępa! (2000: 79)

Kaniewska's rendition is:

– Kiedy jeszcze byliśmy mali – Niby-Żółw w końcu podjął opowieść i mówił trochę spokojniej, choć od czasu do czasu pochlipywał – chodziliśmy do szkoły w morzu. Naszym nauczycielem był pewien stary żółw, nazywaliśmy go Uczeń...

– Dlaczego nazywaliście go uczniem, jeżeli nim nie był? – spytała Alicja.

– Nazywaliśmy go Uczniem, bo nas uczył – rozzłościł się Niby-Żółw. – Naprawdę, strasznie tępa jesteś! (2010: 130)

While Dworak's version is:

– Kiedy byliśmy mali – Nibyżółw podjął opowieść spokojniej, choć nadal od czasu do czasu pochlipywał – chodziliśmy do szkoły w morzu. Nauczycielem był stary Żółw Morski – nazywaliśmy go Żółwiem Lądowym...

– Dlaczego nazywaliście go Żółwiem Lądowym, skoro nim nie był? – zapytała Alicja.

– Bo często lądowaliśmy u niego na dywaniku – odparł ze złością Nibyżółw. – Naprawdę jesteś tępa! (2009: 134)

In Carroll's novel the Mock Turtle says that he used to go to the sea school every single day and his master was an old turtle named Tortoise. Alice wants to know why they called him this, and the creature explains that they named him Tortoise "because he taught us". Here the pun plays on the phonetic similarity of "taught us" and "tortoise", the name of a similar type of creature. In Polish *turtle* and *tortoise* are *żółw morski* and *żółw lądowy* respectively, but Polish speakers rarely distinguish between these species and call both *żółw*.

Marianowicz decided to use different animal names than Carroll did. He changed *an old turtle* into *stary rekin* ('an old shark') whom the students named *Piła* ('sawfish'). To make the pun even more humorous he added the adjective *bezzębny* ('toothless') to describe this creature. The wordplay consists in the use of the word *piła* and the turtle's explanation, where he says that they used to call the teacher this way since he *piłował* ('pestered/was very strict towards') his students. Actually, the verb *piłować,* which in colloquial language is used to indicate that someone, especially a teacher, is very strict, comes from the word *piła* (*a saw*). Nevertheless, in Polish this word is a homonym, which may refer either to *a saw* or to *a sawfish*. What is also interesting is the fact that over 30 years later Robert Stiller (1986) made use of Marianowicz's idea and included the same pun in his own translation of this book.

Słomczyński coped with this fragment in a different way. He translated *an old Turtle* as *stary Żółw*, who was called *Ostryga* (*an oyster*). The reason for naming this teacher *Ostryga* is that he was *ostry* (*severe*). Even though these words do not derive from the same term and they have little in common on the semantic level, they include the same element – *ostry.* Accordingly, they might be quite easily associated with each other. As in Marianowicz's version, the teacher is portrayed as demanding and strict, whereas in the original there is no reference to this fact.

Kaniewska found yet another solution to translate this pun. In her version the old Turtle was called *Uczeń* (*a learner*). When Alice interrupts The Mock Turtle to find out why they called him *uczeń* if he was not one, the creature responds: *Nazywaliśmy go Uczniem, bo nas uczył.* Its literal translation into English – 'We called him a Learner because he taught us' sounds completely illogical, but in Polish *uczyć* refers to both learning and teaching, though when it is used to mean 'learn'

it is a reflexive verb accompanied by *się* (oneself). *Uczeń* is not a person who teaches (it is *nauczyciel* in Polish), but a Polish reader will understand the connection.

The last quoted passage is written by Dworak. This translation is the closest to the original while looking at the animals chosen. Here, *a Turtle* was rendered as *żółw morski* and *a Tortoise* was translated as *żółw lądowy*. To justify his decisions he came up with the Mock Turtle's explanation that they used to call their teacher this way, *bo często lądowaliśmy u niego na dywaniku* ('because we were often called on the carpet'). The words *lądowy* ('living on land') and *lądować* ('to land') are semantically related, so it is easy for Polish speakers to associate one with the other. All in all, Dworak's attempt is quite successful, as he managed to preserve the comic effect of the original.

There is another instance of wordplay in the same chapter. The Mock Turtle continues to talk about his education, which he considers to be the best available. Alice is curious about what subjects he studied. The original reads as follows:

'What was that?' inquired Alice.

'Reeling and Writhing, of course, to begin with,' the Mock Turtle replied; 'and then the different branches of Arithmetic – Ambition, Distraction, Uglification, and Derision.'

'I never heard of "Uglification,"' Alice ventured to say. 'What is it?'

The Gryphon lifted up both its paws in surprise. 'What! Never heard of uglifying!' it exclaimed. 'You know what to beautify is, I suppose?'

'Yes,' said Alice doubtfully: 'it means – to – make – anything – prettier.'

'Well, then,' the Gryphon went on, if you don't know what to uglify is, you *are* a simpleton.' (Carroll 1992: 117)

Marianowicz translated it as:

– A jakie mieliście przedmioty? – zapytała Alicja.

– No, oczywiście przede wszystkim: *zgrzytanie* i *zwisanie*. („czytanie i pisanie" – pomyślała Alicja). Ponadto cztery działania arytmetyczne: *podawanie, obejmowanie, mrożenie* i *gdzielenie*.

– Nigdy nie słyszałam o *gdzieleniu* – odezwała się nieśmiało Alicja. – Co to za przedmiot?

Smok podniósł przednie łapy i przybrał pozę wyrażającą bezgraniczne zdumienie.

– Nigdy nie słyszałaś o *gdzieleniu*? A co mówi nauczyciel, gdy część uczniów nie zdążyła zrobić na czas klasówki?

– Nie wiem.

– Nauczyciel pyta wówczas:„*A gdzie lenie*, którzy nie oddali jeszcze zeszytów?" – i to jest właśnie ten przedmiot. Jeśli tego nie rozumiesz, no to wybacz... (1988: 170-171)

Słomczyński's version is:

– Jakich? – spytała Alicja.

– Na początku była oczywiście nauka Chlapecadła i Portografia – odpowiedział Żółwiciel – a później różne odgałęzienia Arytmetyki – Wodowanie, Obejmowanie, Dnożenie i Brzydzielenie.

– Nigdy nie słyszałam o „Brzydzieleniu" – odważyła się wtrącić Alicja. – Cóż to jest takiego?

Zdumiony Gryf aż uniósł obie łapy. – Nigdy nie słyszała o „Brzydzieleniu"! – wykrzyknął. – Mam nadzieję, że wiesz, co oznacza słowo upięknianie?

– Tak – powiedziała niepewnie Alicja – oznacza to... że... chce się... chce się coś upięknić.

– W takim razie – ciągnął Gryf – *musisz być* wielkim głuptasem, jeżeli nie wiesz, co to jest „Brzydzielenie" (2000: 80).

While Kaniewska's rendition of this fragment is:

– Czyli co?- zaciekawiła się Alicja.

– Nawijanie i Wykręcanie, oczywiście, żeby od czegoś zacząć – odpowiedział Niby-Żółw – no i do tego różne dziedziny arytmetyczne: Ambicjonowanie, Różniczkowanie, Szkaradzenie i Ironizowanie.

– Nigdy nie słyszałam o takim przedmiocie, jak Szkaradzenie – odważyła się wtrącić Alicja. – Czego na nim uczą?

Gryfon podniósł obie łapy ze zdziwienia:

– Co takiego? Nie słyszała o Szkaradzeniu! – wykrzyknął. – Ale wiesz chyba, o co chodzi w upiększaniu?

– No tak – przyznała niepewnie Alicja – to znaczy... żeby robić coś... żeby było ładniej...

– Ano właśnie – mówił Gryfon – więc jeśli nie wiesz, o co chodzi w szkaradzeniu, to OSIOŁ z ciebie! (p. 132)

In the original text the play on words involves the names of extraordinary courses that the Mock Turtle attended at school. He studied Reeling and Writing, Ambition, Distraction, Uglification, and Derision. *Reeling* is naturally more meaningful to sea creatures than *reading*, and *writhing* is more useful than *writing,* which are the elementary skills taught in school. So is the case with the different branches of Arithmetic that the Mock Turtle was taught – *ambition, distraction, uglification, and derision* (addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division). Alice asks him to explain *uglification*, which the Mock Turtle explains as the reverse of beautification. Each of the Polish translators dealt with the puns in a different way.

Marianowicz translated *reeling* and *writhing* as *zgrzytanie* ('grinding') and *zwisanie* ('hanging down'), which are not connected in any way with sea creatures. In fact, these words are also difficult to associate with the Polish equivalents of *reading* and *writing* which are *czytanie* and *pisanie*. Marianowicz was aware of the shortcomings of his rendition and added an explanation in parenthesis: *"czytanie i pisanie" – pomyślała Alicja* ("reading and writing" – Alice thought). As far as the names of the branches of arithmetic are concerned, Marianowicz's choices are: *podawanie* ('passing'), *obejmowanie* ('embracing'), *mrożenie* ('freezing'), and *gdzielenie* (a neologism based on *dzielenie* 'division'). *Gdzielenie* is the one Alice asks about. To explain this riddle the Mock Turtle asks Alice

what the teacher says to students who do not manage to finish their tests on time. Alice does not know the answer, which turns out to be: *A gdzie lenie, którzy nie oddali jeszcze zeszytów?* ('Where are the lazybones who have not yet returned their notebooks?').

Słomczyński found another way to render this passage. In this version *chlapecadło* and *portografia* stand for *reeling* and *writhing*. The former is based on the verb *chlapać* ('to splash') and the word *abecadło* ('the alphabet'). The second one is a combination of the words *port* ('a harbour') and *ortografia* ('orthography'). These names do not resemble *reading* and *writing* but they are easily associated with things taught in school – the alphabet and orthography. The connection with the sea has been retained as well, as in the case of some of the names of the four mathematical calculations, which Słomczyński rendered as *wodowanie, obejmowanie, dnożenie,* and *brzydzielenie. Wodowanie* ('to launch a ship') is a combination of the words *woda* ('water') and *dodawanie* ('addition'), while *dnożenie* is a mixture of the terms *dno* ('sea bed') and *mnożenie* ('multiplication'). The word that is explained by the Mock Turtle is *brzydzielenie*. It is composed of the words *brzydki* ('ugly') and *dzielenie* ('division'), which makes it close to the original pun. The turtle's clarification is also very similar (if not identical) to the one present in Carroll's work, since *brzydzielić* is to make something uglier. Consequently, Słomczyński's version is very close to the original one and preserves the comic effect of the original puns.

Kaniewska tried to render Carroll's puns as literally as possible, which is why most of the ambiguities and allusions have been lost. *Reeling* and *writhing* are translated as *nawijanie* ('reeling') and *wykręcanie* ('twisting'). *Ambition* becomes *ambicjowanie, differentiation* is rendered as *różniczkowanie, uglification* becomes *szkaradzenie, derision – ironizowanie.* Linguistically, the translation is correct, but it fails to preserve any connection with the names of school subjects and sea terms.

As chapter 9 abounds in puns one more example is worth mentioning. In the passage quoted below Alice asks about the length of the lessons, and the Mock Turtle responds that they became shorter day by day. Alice finds this confusing, but the Mock Turtle explains that they were called lessons because they "lessen." The original version is:

> 'And how many hours a day did you do lessons?' said Alice, in a hurry to change the subject.
>
> 'Ten hours the first day,' said the Mock Turtle: 'nine the next, and so on.'
>
> 'What a curious plan!' exclaimed Alice.
>
> 'That's the reason they're called lessons,' the Gryphon remarked: 'because they lessen from day to day.'
>
> This was quite a new idea to Alice, and she thought it over a little before she made her next remark.
>
> 'Then the eleventh day must have been a holiday?'
>
> 'Of course it was,' said the Mock Turtle.
>
> 'And how did you manage on the twelfth?' Alice went on eagerly (Carroll 1992: 118).

> Morawska's rendering reads as follows:
>
> – Ile godzin dziennie mieliście lekcje? – spytała Alicja, aby oderwać strapionych od rozmyślań.
>
> – Dziesięć godzin pierwszego dnia – powiedział Fałszywy Żółw – dziewięć następnego itd.

– Nadzwyczajny program – zdumiała się Alicja.

– I dlatego nazywali to lekcjami, rozumiesz, z każdym dniem l e k c e j i l e k c e j.

Taki rozkład zajęć był tak bardzo nowy dla Alicji, że przez jakiś czas milczała pogrążona w rozmyślaniu i dopiero po niejakim czasie zapytała:

– A więc jedenasty dzień był dniem świątecznym?

– Oczywiście, że był – potwierdził Żółw.

– A coście robili z dwunastym? – zapytała pospiesznie Alicja (p. 104-105).

Marianowicz's translation is:

– A czy mieliście często wypracowania? zapytała Alicja, pragnąc jak najszybciej zmienić temat rozmowy, nasuwający obu zwierzakom tak bolesne wspomnienia.

– I owszem. Mieliśmy *wyprasowania domowe* mniej więcej raz na tydzień – odrzekł Smok.

– A czasem nawet dwa – dodał Niby Żółw.

– A jak było u was z *ćwiczeniami*?

– O, świetnie, znakomicie. Zapewniam cię, że ćwiczeń nam nie brakło. Byliśmy *ćwiczeni* przy każdej okazji – odparł dumnie Niby Żółw (p. 172).

Słomczyński's version reads as follows:

– A miewaliście piątki? – zapytała pospiesznie Alicja, chcąc szybko zmienić temat.

– Tak, ponad pięćdziesiąt rocznie, cztery miesięcznie i raz w tygodniu.

– Zawsze raz w tygodniu? – zawołała zdumiona Alicja.

– Oczywiście, że tak – powiedział Gryf – przecież jest tylko jeden piątek w tygodniu.

Odpowiedź ta tak zdziwiła Alicję, że musiała się zastanowić trochę, zanim zadała następne pytanie.

– A czwórek nie mieliście w takim razie wcale?

– Oczywiście, że nie – odparł Żółwiciel (2000: 81).

While Kaniewska rendered it as:

– A ile godzin zabierały wam lekcje? – spytała Alicja, żeby jak najprędzej zmienić temat.

– Pierwszego dnia zabierały dziesięć godzin – powiedział Niby-Żółw – a następnego zabierały dziewięć godzin i tak dalej.

– Dziwny plan! – wykrzyknęła Alicja.

– Właśnie dlatego się mówi, że godziny zabierały nam lekcje – zauważył Gryfon – bo każdego dnia zabierały sobie jedną.

Była to dla Alicji absolutna nowość, więc musiała przez chwilę nad nią pomyśleć, nim wygłosiła kolejną uwagę:

– A więc jedenastego dnia musieliście mieć wolne?

– No oczywiście – powiedział Niby-Żółw.
– A jak sobie radziliście dwunastego dnia? – Alicja była niezwykle ciekawa odpowiedzi (2010: 133-134).

In the original the play on words again relies on the use of homophones which are very hard to translate into Polish: *lesson* and *lessen*.

In Morawska's version there are no homophones, nevertheless she managed to preserve the content of the source text, and stayed close to its form. Here, when Alice is puzzled by the turtle's lesson plan, he responds that lessons are named *lekcje* because it is *lekcej i lekcej* with each passing day. *Lekcej* ('easier'/lighter') is a nonstandard form, a comparative of *lekko* ('easy/light'). The standard version is *lżej* but the pun is only possible with the nonstandard variant. Some years later Stiller (1986) decided to include this rendering in his own translation.

Marianowicz's choice was entirely different. He replaced the original exchange with two completely different puns. In his version, Alice wants to know how often the sea creature had to write *wypracowania* ('essays'). The Mock Turtle replies that they had *wyprasowania* once a week. *Wyprasowanie* is a neologism based on the verb *prasować* ('to iron'). In the second pun, Alice inquires whether they did any *ćwiczenia* ('exercises'). The creature confuses this word with the phrase *być ćwiczonym*, which has a close meaning but in colloquial language is much stronger and refers to drilling with a degree of physical force. Marianowicz's play on words relies on the misunderstandings between the two characters, but it is very distant from both the content and the effect of the original.

Słomczyński also decided to substitute the original pun with a new one. In his translation Alice asks whether students in the Mock Turtle's school ever got *piątki* ('fives' – the highest grade in the Polish educational system at the time). This word is a homonym in Polish: *piątki* also means 'Fridays', which is how the turtle understands it.

Kaniewska found another way to translate this pun. She made use of the homonym *zabierać*, which may mean either *to take something away* or *to last* ('take time'). According to the Mock Turtle, during the first day the lessons *zabierały* ('took') ten hours, but on the next day they lasted nine hours and so on. When Alice is surprised by this extraordinary lesson plan the Mock Turtle says that each day *zabierał* ('took away') one lesson.

Concluding remarks

The overview of translations presented in this paper demonstrates why there are so many Polish renderings of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland:* the book is so rich in language-specific puns that there are countless possibilities of rendering it into foreign languages. As Barańczak (2004) observes, when someone decides to publish a new translation of a literary work, they usually believe that they can do a better job than their predecessors. The translations discussed here differ in many significant ways. Marianowicz's rendition is domesticated and rather infantile because he translated

the book as a story for children. Nevertheless, he tried to preserve some of the puns used by Carroll or replace them with new ones. Słomczyński focused on the humorous effect of the puns more than on the original structure and content of the text. He often modified the source text to have the possibility to play on words. Kaniewska's translation is the most literal of the ones discussed here, which is why it fails to reflect most of the ambiguity and comic quality of the original.

References

Primary sources:

Carroll, Lewis. 1992. *Alice's Adventures In Wonderland and Through the Looking Glass*, London: David Campbell Publishers Ltd.

--. 1997. *Alicja w Krainie Czarów* (tr. Maria Morawska), Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Siedmioróg.

--. 1988. *Alicja w Krainie Czarów* (tr. Antoni Marianowicz), Warszawa: Nasza Księgarnia.

--. 2000. *Przygody Alicji w Krainie Czarów* (tr. Maciej Słomczyński), Kraków: Wydawnictwo Zielona Sowa.

--. 1986. *Alicja w Krainie Czarów i Po Drugiej Stronie Lustra* (tr. Robert Stiller), Warszawa: Wydawnictwo „Alfa".

--. 2010. *Alicja w Krainie Czarów* (tr. Krzysztof Dworak), Warszawa: Buchmann Sp. z o.o.

--. 2010. *Alicja w Krainie Czarów. Po Drugiej Stronie Lustra* (tr. Bogumiła Kaniewska), Poznań: Vesper.

--. 2012. *Alicja w Krainie Czarów* (tr. Elżbieta Tabakowska), Kraków: Wydawnictwo Bona.

Secondary sources:

Bałutowa, Bronisława. 1971. *Mały słownik pisarzy angielskich i amerykańskich*, Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo "Wiedza Powszechna".

Barańczak, Stanisław. 2004. *Ocalone w tłumaczeniu* (3rd ed.) Kraków: Wydawnictwo a5.

Collingwood, Steward Dodgson. 1967. *The Life and Letters of Lewis Carroll*, Detroit: Gale Research Company, Book Tower.

Kuliczkowska, Krystyna, B. Tylicka,. (eds.) 1979. *Nowy słownik literatury dla dzieci i młodzieży*, Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo "Wiedza Powszechna".

Słomczyński, Maciej. 2000. "Od tłumacza". In: Lewis Carroll 2000. *Przygody Alicji w Krainie Czarów*, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Zielona Sowa.

Tabakowska, Elżbieta. 2012. "Słowo-po-słowie od tłumacza". In: Lewis Carroll 2012. Alicja w Krainie Czarów, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Bona.

Thomas, Donald. 2007. *Lewis Carroll po obu stronach lustra*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Książkowe Twój Styl.

A NOTE ON CONTRIBUTORS

Monika Roszkowska is a graduate of the University of Bialystok, currently an MA student at the University of Warsaw. Her interests include translation and TEFL methodology (learner anxiety/learner perfectionism). E-mail address: monika.roszkowska91@gmail.com

Agata Rozumko holds a PhD in English historical linguistics. She works at the Department of English at the University of Bialystok. Her current research interests include English-Polish contrastive grammar, modality and cross-cultural pragmatics. E-mail address: a.rozumko@uwb.edu.pl

Agnieszka Smoleńska is a graduate of the University of Bialystok, currently an MA student at the University of Rzeszow. Her interests include translation. E-mail address: smolenska_agnieszka@wp.pl

Vitaly V. Tur is a PhD student at Minsk State Linguistic University. His research interests include compositional semantics and the meanings of English noun-noun compounds. E-mail address: vitaly.tur@gmail.com

Anna Wing Bo Tso, PhD, is a lecturer in English and Applied Linguistics who teaches postgraduate and undergraduate courses at the Open University of Hong Kong. Her research interests include language arts, children's fantasy, gender studies and translation studies. She has published articles in various refereed journals, including The International Journal of Early Childhood, Libri & Liberi: Journal of Research on Children's Literature and Culture, and SPECTRUM: NCUE Studies in Language, Literature, Translation and Interpretation. E-mail address: atso@ouhk.edu.hk