CrossRoads

A Journal of English Studies

ISSUE 8

1/2015

CROSSROADS
A Journal of English Studies

ISSUE 8

1/2015

Contents

Nora Bonner
Miami University of Ohio

Elham Shayegh
Miami University of Ohio

Adam Bede Revisited: Social Stigma and the Formation of Deviant Identity

Abstract. In *Adam Bede,* George Eliot explores the way a society divides its members into categories and how these categories contribute to the formation of an individual's identity. In the mid-nineteenth century authors in the naturalist tradition often discussed this dialogical relationship between individual and society, the specific roles for social gaze, the labeling and degrading. Eliot shows an acute of these labels that no one shapes identity without their influence. According to Nancy Anne Marck, *Adam Bede* introduces the theme of "emerging social consciousness" where the characters gain broader awareness of human interdependence through an experience of suffering (447). This is particularly evident when examining Eliot's characters of "lesser fortune." Once we've investigated how Eliot portrays these negative social forces throughout the novel, the labeling and the stigmatization, we will return to how Eliot addresses the larger question permeating her novel of education: how one judges another against the backdrop of community values.

Keywords: stigmatization, social identity, gaze, realism/naturalism, ethics in narrative style

Erving Goffman gives insight to social labeling and the stigmatization in his book, *Stigma Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*. He defines stigma as "the phenomenon whereby an individual with an attribute which is deeply discredited by his/her society is rejected as a result of the attribute" (Goffman 36). In other words, stigma occurs when society recognizes an individual as deviant, thus creating the negative stereotypes that engender prejudiced attitudes. The crimes committed in response to this labeling are "deviations." Stigmas therefore justify discriminatory behavior. Goffman names two types of social identity: actual and virtual. The former refers to a person's social existence—his or her condition in "reality,"—while virtual identity refers to "what is expected of someone based on who, what, or where s/he is" (36). These definitions give insight into how one might understand Eliot's tragic heroine, Hetty Sorrel.

Throughout the novel, Hayslope community[1] refuses to allow Hetty a comfortable position in their society. They elevate her as a most desired object until she believes her higher position, and

---

1 A rural community in Loamshire England, 1799. Loamshire is an imaginary rural county, used as a setting by writers of fiction to avoid identification with actual towns.

until "her dreams were all of luxuries" (Eliot 102). Their praises push her somewhere between her *actual* and *virtual* identities, convincing her that she is qualified for marrying the young squire, captain Arthur Donnithorne: "The baker's daughter [Hetty] goes home and dreams of the handsome young emperor, and perhaps weighs the flour amiss while she is thinking what a heavenly lot it must be to have him for a husband" (105). From this description, it is clear that Hetty's dreams are too lofty to be realistic, mainly because of her ignorance of class difference. Eliot emphasizes this later with Arthur's description of the same encounter: "To flirt with Hetty was a very different affair from flirting with a pretty girl of his own station: that was understood to be an amusement on both sides, or, if it became serious, there was no obstacle to marriage" (144). Hetty never resolves the conflict between her virtual and actual identities because she never finds a way to Arthur's hidden intentions, and finally disappointed by him, she was stigmatized by Hayslope as the undesired *other*. She is now the deviant, the criminal. The fatal sin of murdering her newborn as the narrative implies is a socially constructed crime but the community does not hold itself responsible for it. According to Courtney Berger in "Liability and Individual Consciousness in *Adam Bede*":

> Eliot's early work is indicative of her desire to portray a social world in which individuals both help to constitute and are answerable to the standards of the group. Particularly in her early fiction, we see Eliot endeavoring to develop a theory of the social individual that withstands her concomitant endorsement of what we might call "pluralist" and "universalist" conception of morality-that is, judging individuals according to the standards of the group versus a single comprehensive standard (308).

Eliot acknowledges the individual's inevitable role in identity formations. She addresses a person's capabilities and limitations in 19th-century British society through her other female heroine, Dinah, whose choices defy the imposed stigmas. Dinah's character often directly contrasts Hetty, initially evident in the physical descriptions of the two women. For Dinah, "Her eyes had no peculiar beauty, beyond that of expression; so simple, so candid, so gravely loving, that no accusing scowl, no light sneer could help melting away before their glance" (Eliot 22). Dinah's attractiveness comes from her expressions rather than her features—what she does and does not do with her face. Similar to Dinah, the majority of Hetty's physical description does not focus on specific physical features but on the reactions that those features get from men gazing at her. In Hetty's case, however, these reactions and sensations overwhelm the gazer, cause confusion, and appear out of her control:

> It is a beauty like that of kittens, or very small downy ducks making gentle rippling noises with their soft bills, or babies just beginning to toddle and to engage in conscious mischief--a beauty with which you can never be angry, but that you feel ready to crush for inability to comprehend the state of mind into which it throws you (86).

The contrast between Dinah's authority over the way people react to her and Hetty's lack of it reveals the novel's juxtaposing theme of personal choice as a way to defy social stigma. Dinah is

a devout Methodist, a preacher who persuades the community of her authority and leadership in the way she cares for others. After the town rejects Hetty for her crime of infanticide, it is Dinah who visits her in jail and consoles her. Dinah is determined to never marry, freeing herself from Hayslope's social expectations for women. However, after this set up, and just when the reader might decide that Dinah has defied society's expectations, Dinah changes course and becomes Adam's wife. We could interpret her decision to marry as a failure as she's still unable to survive outside the social norms. Dinah's story reveals that even at our most rebellious state, we submit ourselves to some sort of mold. On the other hand, the marriage might be read as another sort of defiance, a triumph over the constraints she'd imposed on herself.

In the first place, we might read these women's stories together as a juxtaposition—one pitched against the other as a way to verify a lesson for better choices in Dinah's happier ending. "Dinah represents the Second Eve [Mary], Hetty epitomizes the First" (Marr 87). In Hetty, the novel provides a karmic view of life in which she must pay the consequences of her actions: "Our deeds determine us, as much as we determine our deeds" (Eliot 328). On the other hand, we might read the stories to see how they reveal the feminine struggle against Victorian social norms and stigmas. Critics have identified Eliot as a woman writer with awareness of the realities of a male-dominated world (Beer 73). Both Dianah and Hetty, in this sense, fall under the authority of Hayslope patriarchal elements of gender and moral rules.

Hetty represents the working class girl who destroys her life for the love of luxury and comfort. Hetty's dream of luxury is not a simple longing for material possession but a desire for liberation from Hayslope's patriarchal expectations for her. Luxuriousness became that characteristic through which Hetty preserves her individuality. Hetty in her blind passion keeps dreaming about her future wellbeing, the time when Arthur would "marry her and make a lady of her" (157).

> Perhaps some day she should be a grand lady, and ride in her coach, and dress for dinner in a brocaded silk, with feathers in her hair, and her dress sweeping the ground… her hair is done in a great many different ways, and some time in a pink dress, and sometimes in a white one—she doesn't know which one she liked best (158).

In this dreamy "world of brilliant costumes" (262), she desires to "cast all her past [life] behind" (160) and elevate her status to that of a reputable lady. She is dissatisfied with her status and wishes to escape from the society that embodies a "sickening sense of monotonous life" (350). In this way, the desire for luxury is a substitute for her suppressed actual identity. She was denied to work as a "lady's maid" because it would be a humiliation to her uncle, a "laborer" who would like to eat on his "own labor" rather than waiting for people's "charity" (353). As a young girl, she was not permitted to walk in the fields "alone" and come home late, or she would be the object of her aunt's reproachful inquiries. Social restraints become most evident when her dedicated lover, Adam Bede, also questions her behavior. Criticizing her for putting a rose in her hairs, he comments that Hetty's way of dressing was not as modest as Dinah's (238). She then reacts to his critique by wearing a "black gown of her aunt's" in the style of Methodists, thus performing a virtuous identity. As

the novel progress, Hetty's pretense and loss of desired feminine attributes (causing loss of actual identity) become essential for her social survival. According to Marck, throughout the novel,

> Hetty's alienation extends from her own body to her family, to the community of Hayslope, to society at large, and even to nature—the charge of infanticide constructs her as a monstrous female, guilty of a crime against the biological, social, and psychological expectations of motherhood (448).

What is obvious in the novel is the oppressive power of society, which gradually silences the voices of the marginalized citizens, namely the working class and women. The similarity between animals and women, which Eliot emphasizes throughout the novel, suggests a feminine voicelessness. Gyp and Vixen the dogs, and Meg the horse are all female, implying that women are preferred to be silent, obedient and dependent. The society desires "to convert Dinah the preacher… into a convenient household slave" (509). Eliot criticizes this feminine silence through her female characters (the talkative Mrs. Poyser and the eloquent Dinah), and their desires (Hetty seeks refuge in dream of luxurious life and Dinah in religion). Both Hetty and Dinah attempt to express their suffocated self through male figures. Hetty and Dinah are the double faces of the same reality when, at the doorway of their "bed chambers," their "pale faces… looking at each other" (467) suddenly "become indistinct" (468). The fusion of their feminine silence under the voice of a female narrator itself concealed under the male name George Eliot, narrates Hetty's story under the title *Adam Bede*, and presents Victorian marginalized femininity.

The novel's repetitive references to spectacles and eyeglasses intensify the concept of social gaze. The gaze restrains everyone but primarily women, bringing their lives to foreground. Spectating Hetty at the dance party, Lady Irwine declares to her son that as she gets older, her eyes "get better and better for things at the distance" (others) while her near-sightedness worsens (286). Hetty specially becomes aware of social gaze near the murder scene, when "for the first time in her life [she] wished no one would look at her" (391). Her awareness then reaches its climax in the trial scene. We read that the judge is a fellow "with an eye that 'ud pick the needles out of the hay in no time" (447). Gerhard Falk refers to court trials as instances of imposed social stigmatizations:

> Conviction in a court of law… the most important part of the stigmatization process are status-reduction emotions such as a "hearing," a "trial," and the establishment of a public record of such a procedure. Sociologists refer to these transactions as "degradation ceremonies." These place the individual affected outside the legitimate order and outside the world of citizens of good standing (Falk 330).

We might read the trial scene as a degradation ceremony where the Hayslope community judges and convicts Hetty as criminal without considering her maternal trauma. Falk also mentions "secondary deviations" (313) as a way to define the consequences of labeling. These deviations occur when an "individual changes his or her behavior and self-definition to internalize society's stigmatization; the person then begins to behave in 'expected deviant' fashion" (Scheyett). In this light, adultery as Hetty's "secondary deviation" is a response to society's stigmatization of her "naughty"-ness, which leads to her third deviation, infanticide. Sociologists call this last stage the

"dramatization of evil," when the victims start to take on the traits associated with the stigma society imposed on them (Falk 330).

According to Michel Foucault, stigmatization is a "discourse of power" (Foucault). Naming five attributes of *stigma* in their essay "Conceptualizing Stigma," Link & Phelan state that stigmatization is a process, "entirely dependent on the social, economic, and political power necessary to impose discriminatory experiences on the labeled individual or group" (Link & Phelan 372). Labeling Hetty, in this sense, becomes a way in which Hayslope community controls its *second sex* non-aristocratic citizens. Discussing the "power of stigmatizing," Falk likewise asserts that the social labels are so powerful that sometimes they stay with the persons till the end of their lives. Performing its power through stigmatization and punishment, society later "restores" the outcast's piety. "Those who are considered *impure*" according to Falk, "are isolated from ordinary society until their purity is restored by a variety of rituals," for instance, through deportation and exile (311).

Eliot demonstrates Hetty's sudden isolation from society, caused by Hayslope's abandonment, by refraining from narrating these sections. In other words, the author herself, as a member of the Victorian society, leaves Hetty alone. The reader loses track of Hetty after Chapter 37, when the inner voice of the character is no more audible. Hetty, whose "native power of concealment" (338) has already thought her how to conceal herself from society – in the chamber, among the "trees-studded hedgerows," in the hidden "shelter" beside the sheep, and finally in the prison cell, as if she has "no other existence than a hidden one" (388)— succumbs to complete silence as the narrator waits for the witnesses to narrate the rest of the story. Why is the narrator unwilling to follow the criminal woman? Is she afraid? Depriving Hetty of voice and presence, Eliot is making room for society. In its full capacity, society then takes hold of her narrative. Is Eliot the second social outcast, deprived of her storytelling rights?

After hearing about Hetty's imprisonment, Old Mr. Poyser says, "I will not go nigh her, nor ever see her again… she made our bread bitter to us for all of our lives to come" (432). Only Dinah, her feminine equal, recognizes Hetty. It is through religion that Dinah fully embraces Hetty. According to the Methodist beliefs, God, the higher being, cannot act unless the lower beings sin. Jesus, for Dinah, is equal to forgiveness, which cannot operate without sin. Dinah sees herself a person through whom God directly speaks but who needs Hetty, the sinner, to reestablish her position. Dinah who cannot step beyond the limitations of piety likewise fails to restore Hetty at the gallop. This scene may reiterate Eliot's plead against judgment, made earlier in the novel, when she says:

> There are so many of us, and our lots are so different, what wonder that Nature's mood is often in harsh contrast with the great crisis of our lives? We are children of a large family, and must learn, as such children do, not to expect that our hurts will be made much of—to be content with little nurture and caressing, and help each other the more (306).

Dinah cannot help Hetty "all the more" until she breaks free from the compulsion to judge. Imagining Hetty as ignorant Dinah constructs basis of her own piety. Eliot, however, has challenged this black and white moral standard. Hetty, we read, has "her peculiar form of worship" (155). Her

"passionate love of life" (404) is her special form of worship. Blaming Dinah her passive trust in God, Mrs. Poyser declares that "if everybody 'ud be running after everybody else to preach to 'em, istead o' bringing up their families, and laying by against a bad harvest. It stands to sense as that can't be the right religion" (80). Sitting with Hetty in the darkness of prisoner's cell, Dinah feels the approach of Hetty's darkness, we read "it got darker and darker… she [Dinah] felt divine presence more and more" (468). In the darkness of Hetty's misery Dinah observes divinity. Dinah "is not the less sinking into the dark gulf" (468). As Dinah's voice eloquently articulates mankind's suffering through the "cross," the reader knows Hetty is the cross-bearer. When later in her song Dinah addresses Jesus to bestow her an easy yoke: "Jesus! the weary wonderer's rest /Give me thy easy yoke to bear" (511). We know whom the "wonderer" and the bearer of the yoke is.

From this, we might attempt to read Eliot's novel as a simple reminder to refrain from judging others. Yet, if this is the code for understanding, Eliot herself breaks it often. For instance, when she gives us two descriptions of Arthur Donnithorne: the way the commoners see him and the way Eliot wants us to see him. Though he's in the militia, not the army, the people of Hayslope saw him as "more intensely [as] a captain than all the young gentlemen of the same rank in his Majesty's regulars--he outshone them as the planet Jupiter outshines the Milky Way" (62). He's a hero to the commoners, but to the author, Arthur is the "well-washed, high-bred, white handed" young Englishman she insists we all know (62). From his description, we must view Arthur as a type of person rather than a person, similar to the way he reduces Hetty to a "pretty butter-maker" (105), despite that she is Hayslope's most desired catch, as shown in the way Adam and the others pine for her throughout most of the novel. In this way, Eliot will not allow her readers to indulge in such simple interpretation, 'do not judge,' and requires us to make several judgments of character thought the narrative. In the end, we learn that Arthur is more than just the simple Englishman Eliot asked us to see at first. The dead infant likewise becomes a "gift" (Dillon 712) through which the narrator challenges the fixed moral standards based on which Hayslope judged and stigmatized Hetty. This is where Eliot, as Douglas Kneale precisely puts it, "points beyond a strictly juridical binarism of guilty/not guilty toward the more complicated ethical question of "how far a man is to be held responsible for the unforeseen consequences of his own deed"" (Kneale 468).

References

Beer, Gillian. 1983. "Darwin's Plots: Evolutionary Narrative in Darwin, George Eliot, and Nineteenth Century Fiction." London, Boston, Melbourne, and Henley: Routledge & Kégan Paul, Web.

Berger, Courtney. 2000. "When Bad Things Happen to Bad People: Liability and Individual Consciousness in *Adam Bede* and *Silas Marner*". *NOVEL: A Forum on Fiction* 33.3: 307–327. Web.

Dillon, Steven. 1992. "George Eliot and the Feminine Gift". *Studies in English Literature, 1500 – 1900* 32.4: 707–721. Web.

Eliot, George. 1980. *Adam Bede*. New York: Penguin Classics, Print.

Falk, Gerhard. 2001. *Stigma: How We Treat Outsiders*. Amherst, N.Y: Prometheus Books, Print.

Foucault, Michel. 1980. "Prison Talk." C. Gordon (Ed.), *Power/knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings*, 1972-1977. New York: Pantheon. pp. 37-54.Web.

Goffman, Erving. 1986. *Stigma Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*. New York: Touchstone, Print.

Heatherton, Todd F., Robert E. Kleck, Michelle R. Hebl, Jay G. Hull. 2003. *The Social Psychology of Stigma*. New York: The Guilford P, Print.

Kneale, Douglas. "Hetty's Hanky." 2015. *ESC: English Studies in Canada* 1.2: 123-150. Project MUSE. Web. 11 Dec. 2015. Web.

Marck, Nancy Anne. 2003 "Narrative Transference and Female Narcissism: The Social Message of *Adam Bede*". *Studies in the Novel* 35.4: 447–470. Web.

Marr, Ryan. 2014. "Dinah Morris as Second Eve: The Fall and Redemption in Adam Bede." *Logos: A Journal of Catholic Thought and Culture* 17.3: 80-102. Project MUSE. Web.

Phelan, J. C. and B. G. Link. 2001. "Conceptualizing Stigma." *Annual Review of Sociology*, 27: 363 – 85. Web.

Scheyett, Anna. 2007. *The Mark of Madness: Stigma, Serious Mental Illnesses, and Social Work*. Retrieved: February 2007. Print.

Łukasz Zarzycki
University of Nizwa

Socio-lingual Phenomenon of the Anti-language of Polish and American Prison Inmates

Abstract. The aim of this paper is to compare Polish and American prison slang terms as well as their inmate codes. This paper is devoted to the phenomenon of prison subculture from the perspective of the Polish prison slang so called the secret *grypserka* language (from gryps – a slang word meaning a letter smuggled into or out of a jail). *Grypserka* is the anti-language of Polish prison inmates. Prisoners are people, too, like doctors, policemen and undertakers but when being in prison they lose their friends or often family and then there is nothing left for them but to learn words (*grypserka* slang) in order to communicate secretly with one another. Perhaps, nobody wants to be sentenced to prison apart from those who are broken-down. A lot of people regard imprisonment as the end of the world. In spite of their dislike or even fear of prisons, they do not close the way to experience power, wealth, sex and addiction. In order to gain so many conveniences, prisoners have to develop their language skills and learn *grypserka* which allow many desires to be met in their "second world" relieving the pains and inconveniences of incarceration.

All in all, it was agreed that "the distinctive argot of inmates gives an insight into the institutions, preoccupations, and style of prison life" (Michaels and Ricks, 1980: 525). Unfortunately, the prison slang has a negative effect on the rehabilitation process because it carries subculture "essence" – rules and norms. It is due to unique expressions, words and phrases that the way of thinking and outlooks of the group members are shaped. When penetrating such a composite phenomenon as the prison slang one should take into consideration its specific attribute – secrecy – and, moreover, the fact that its chief goal is to fight against law.

Keywords: Prison slang, *grypserka*, Polish prison subculture, anti-language, American and Polish prison terminology.

The concept of "prisonization"

First of all, the difference between socialization and prisonization needs to be explained at this point. Socialization refers to the process whereby one adopts the values, behaviours, and norms of the subculture, prisonization may be referred to as the process whereby inmates become so acclimated to prison life that the free world becomes strange and the prison becomes normal (Pollock, 2005: 102).

There are different types of adaptations among inmates. Goffman (1961: 61-63) divided them into situational withdrawal, intransigent line, colonization and conversion. "Situational withdraw-

al" was characterized by a removal and alienation from prison life. Clemmer (1958) first described "situational withdrawal" inmates and labeled them "ungrouped" – those who play a solidary or semisolidary role in the prison environment. Przybylski (2005: 28) calls them "niegrypsujący" or "nieludzie" meaning "non-humans". "Intransigent line" inmates were those who bucked the system and intentionally challenged the institutional regime by flagrantly refusing any and all cooperation with staff members. Schrag (1944) calls them "outlaw" inmates, Giallombardo (1966) "jive bitches". "Colonized" inmates were described by Goffman as those who maximized the perks allowed in prison and created their whole world out of them. Przybyliński's (2005: 28) "grypsujący, ludzie, git-ludzie" meaning "humans" or "cool humans" seem to come close to this role. Schrag (1944) calls them "con-politicians". Colonized inmates may be considered the most prisonized because it appears that they have come to accept prison as home. At last "converted inmates" are those that had completed the institutional role and were described as the "perfect inmate" by staff, jailers and administrators, but not by inmates (Goffman, 1961: 63). The colonized inmates are called by other prisoners a "suck ass" or a "led rider" and are equivalents to Przybyliński's (2005: 28-34) "poszkodowani" or "cwele" meaning "victims" or "faggots". The colonized inmates are called by Giallombardo (1966) "inmate cops" and by Sykes (1958) "centermen". In the Polish prison history, the term "grypserzy" – those who accepted the rules of prison life, has many different names. From 1965 to 1966 the most popular term for "grypserzy" was "urkowie". Urkowie came from Warsaw and used to be treated as those having power over other prisoners. They were considered dangerous and disruptive. In 1965-1966 the word "urkowie" faded and was replaced by "charakterniak" describing a person having a strong character. In 1967 there appeared a new word "ludzie" or "git-ludzie" meaning "humans" or "cool humans" and these terms are still in use (Przybyliński, 2005: 29)

Clemmer (1958: 301) cites the following factors affecting prisonization: "long sentences, unstable personality, few positive relations with outside people, readiness to join prison primary groups, a blind acceptance to the mores of the primary group, chance placement with similar others in prison, and readiness to participate in gambling and "abnormal" sexual behavior".[2] The prison subculture has been described as an underground organization replete with its own codes of rules and terminology and, therefore, one more factor affecting the process of prisonization should be mentioned. That is readiness to learn prison argot or grypserka.

Defining Prison Subculture

The field of subcultural research has been subject to wide number of methodological, theoretical and ideological debate. In reading subcultural research one must be aware not only of biases inherent in the research but also the prejudices the reader brings to the reading. Subcultural research calls on a variety of sociological theory; from early studies of *deviance* to the *post-modern*

---

2 Pollock J.M. (2005) *Prisons Today and Tomorrow,* p.103

to conceptions of a *networked* society. The exploration of subcultures often commences with particular definition of *subculture*. Although the validity of such a task is questionable, it nonetheless provides a means to begin exploration of the topic.

Subculture can be understood as a group of individuals having distinctive attributes that is distinguishable from others within the same society (Fowler, 1964). Such an ambiguous definition provides a reasonable launching point at which to address such a complex subject matter. On reading such a definition one may be provoked to consider a number of counter definitions that essentially negate the properties of the original definition.

The definitional problems of subculture can be recognised in many research projects undertaken in the field of subcultural research. Becker (1963) undertook the study of jazz musicians to understand the conflicts that arose between musicians, employers and the audience. Stallybrass et al. (1986) reconceptualised the festival of canivale from being defined as a popular festival to a subcultural dialectic between the conventional and the unconventional. Jenkins (1992) on television fan culture, Crimp et al. (1990) on AIDS activism and Fonarow (1995) on live music events all demonstrate how broad conceptions of subcultures may be.

Thornton (1997: 1) introduces the *question* of subculture by comparing it to relating concepts such as "the masses", "the public", "society" and "culture". Thornton's (1997: 5) comparison sheds light on the practice of subcultural research as being a process of *construction,* which labels, frames and demarcates, relying heavily on ill-conceived concepts as a definitional base. Early research projects on the nature of subcultural deviance tend to deploy this problematic most seriously (Thornton, 1997: 6).

Early investigations into subcultures tended to engage in a broad descriptive process, often appearing to be lost in the complexities and never-ceasing questions that developed from their observations. Hebdige (1979: 75) traces subcultural research as far back as the nineteenth century to urban ethnographies, written by the likes of Mayhew (1851), Archer (1985) Dickens (1984) and Morrison (1946), which employed descriptive methodologies without *scientific* orientations. The earliest sociological investigation of subcultures can be found in the works of Thrasher (1963), who investigated 1,313 gangs of Chicago to comprehend "gangland" environment, patterns of gang behaviour and problems of delinquency control. Research was undertaken through participant observation which produced a fantastic depth of description. However, Hebdige (1979: 75) has criticized such works as lacking "any analytical or explanatory framework." Although the accuracy of Thrasher's research is certainly debatable Hebdige's criticism may be too harsh for such an early, insightful piece of sociological research.

Chicago University carried out similar work to Thrasher (1963). Notable researchers that engaged in subcultural research at Chicago University included Park (1925), Cohen (1955), Cressey (1932), Becker (1963) and Young (1971). Park (1925) outlined the major theoretical direction that would be undertaken by Chicago University in subcultural research. Such explorations were to include "customs, beliefs, social practices, conceptions of life and the manners of urban life" (Thornton, 1997: 11). An early article produced by Park (1925) called on other sociologists to ex-

plore the urban environment in a similar way to anthropologists like Franz Boas, Robert Lowie and Emile Zola. Park's "The City" draws out the complexities of subculture and sets out over fifty speculative questions and queries for his readers to consider. A less appealing yet more succinct theoretical direction was produced by Albert Cohen (1955). Cohen (1955: 59) suggested that subcultural investigation investigate subcultures as if they were "a series of effort to solve problems." Cohen (1955) argued that subcultures were the product of cultural formations that involved a number of actors interacting in order to solve problems of adjustment. Cohen excluded any empirical undertakings from this postulation and tended to rely on preconceived notions of human nature to form his argument. Most incredible is the significant departure Cohen takes from the imaginative work of Park. Cohen attempts to construct a grand narrative for subcultures that typically eroded the complexities to be investigated and focused on deterministic operators such as subculture as "problem solvers".

Unfortunately, such reductive theoretical frameworks only increase after Cohen (1955) publication. Phil Cohen (1972) was a participant at Birmingham Universities centre for contemporary cultural studies who produced a similar yet more influential work on subcultural theory. The research undertaken at this centre was largely influenced by the earlier work of Chicago University however the centre soon moved well beyond these influences to construct an elaborate re-thinking of subcultural theory that was able to incorporate theories of capitalism into the analysis of subculture (Thorton, 1997: 15; Gelder, 1997: 83). Research at the centre focused on the relationship between ideology and structure found predominantly within working-class youth subcultures (Gelder, 1997: 83). The latter works of the centre, especially those of Dick Hebdige (1979), specifically focused on subcultural structures of style as a means to demonstrate the relationships between youth subcultures and conflict, contradiction and the complexities of working-class.

This relationship between youth subculture and working-class culture is explored by Phil Cohen (1972) in his work "subcultural conflict and working-class community". Cohen begins his exploration by analysing the work of the planning authority of east London in 1955. Cohen (1972: 90) noted that the overall plan for the community was to redevelop slumping real-estate into high density apartments. The desired effect of this change was supposed to elevate the community beyond their current material limits. However, Cohen (1972: 91) argued that this specific change led to the ultimate destablisation of the community. Cohen (1972: 92-93) explored how break-downs in the material structure of the neighborhood left individual families isolated from extended kin-networks, evaluated industrial changes to demonstrate the removal of traditional patterns of socialisation, and argued that the ultimate culmination these changes was the development of a generational battleground between parent and child.

Cohen (1972: 94) described a generational conflict as the movement of interpersonal conflict from a family setting into a collective environment as means to diffuse tension and anxiety that may develop directly between family members. In other words, Cohen (1972: 94) believed that generational conflicts lead directly to the creation of subcultures. For Cohen, youth subcultures can be seen as being involved in a generational conflict as they contain generational specific sym-

bols that functions to "express and resolve the contradictions hidden in a parent culture". Cohen argued that the contradictions found in the East End included a double bind between a protestant work-ethics and consumption values and a similar bind between aspirations for mobility and class identification. In East End youth subcultures, such as "Mods", "Skinheads" and "Crombies", Cohen (1972: 95) argued that symbolic systems and rituatualised activities functioned to either draw out or overcome contradictions found within working-class culture.

Generally, the majority of Cohen's work can be seen as emphasising symbolism, ritualised forms of resistance and how these relate to working-class parent-culture and mass culture (Gelder, 1997: 145). Instead of addressing specific attributes of subculture as his primary source of data Cohen analyses economic infrastructure and concludes that class-conflict must be the major force in constructing subculture. The major problem with this approach is that the research unknowingly imparts ideological biases onto a subculture which may not contain such ideological interests. Cohen often describes particular subcultures as uniform structures that play out an almost scripted narrative of resistance. Through valuing the structural institutions over and above individual agency and interest Cohen defines an individual as being the exclusive product of class while paying little attention to other social and personal attributes. Clarke (1981: 176) argues that Cohen's insight into subcultures often lack a significant comprehension of how subcultures are initially formed, "transformed, appropriated, disfigured and destroyed." Cohen's (1972: 94) analysis often abstracts the agency of an individual to simply bearing and supporting the predefined outcomes of the subculture. And Cohen's work has been widely critiqued for being unable to provide a complete picture of various forms of subculture.

However, Cohen himself has provided alternatives to the narrow framework he constructed earlier in his research. During the 1980s Cohen reworked a large body of his subcultural framework to allow for the incorporation of external entities, such as the media, into the construction of subcultures. Such reconceptualisation allowed for the introduction of (subculture-specific) structural influences into subcultural theory and acted as a catalyst to further the constitution a subculture while allowing for a broader scope of analysis that captured the complexities of subcultures.

Significant alternatives have arisen since Cohen's publication in 1972. The general thrust of many of these theorists has been towards treating subcultures as fluid and mobile entities, although theorists have even returned to early Chicago school models (Gelder, 1997: 148). The work of Maffesoli (1996), for instance, has been largely adopted as a platform to construct a framework for the study of subcultures that is able to overcome the deterministic qualities of Cohen's work. These works typically focus on the consumption patterns, levels of access and mobility and the configuration of individuals in subcultures as related to other entities within society. For example, Ueno (2003: 112) examines "trans-local contexts" found in Rave culture to demonstrate how subcultures relate to locality, foreignness, space and the other. Or Valdivia's (2003: 151) placement of subculture as a "fluidity, hybridity and collaboration located between a 'substream' and 'mainstream' of commercialised culture." And finally, the advent technological environments have focused some subcultural research on the properties of communication and the relationships

formed within technological mediums (Hodkinson, 2003). Essentially, these groups have been able to move beyond the deterministic models of researchers, provided by the like of Cohen (1972), to capture and comprehend the complexity that may be found in within subcultures.

The problem of definition catapults subcultural research towards an ambiguous area. The research boundaries of a subculture become blurred and the notion of a subculture itself is difficult to distinguish from other groups in society. Early subcultural researchers, such as Thrasher (1963) and Park (1925), attempted to devise a research model that was capable of grasping the complexities of urban life. However, this task was soon undermined as researchers began to impart specific ideological interests upon subculture. This is not to wholly negate the value of theorists such as Cohen (1955) and Cohen (1972) but rather just to indicate the problem that ideological approaches bring to research. In Cohen (1972) we can recognize how a top-down theoretical framework removes a number of complexities found within individuals and subcultures. However, these theoretical problems are overcome in more "post-modern" works that focus on networks, relationship and the notion of fluidity. We can recognize that these works are able to capture the nuances of subcultures while also providing a theoretical scope that is slightly ideological but mostly descriptive.

Data collection methods have located within the works of some theorists discussed in this article have orientated my empirical leanings towards a framework that will be able to capture the complexities of a subculture starting from local contexts and examining what wide forces intersect within those contexts. A number of the progressive articles that were briefly mentioned in this article demonstrate the need for a carefully devised research model that will be able to gain access to the very sensibilities of subcultural participants and a firm understanding of the vast number of structural influences that may coincide. The research model must also be aware of what ideological terms, frames and preconceptions are imparted on the subject matter. To this extent, it appears that the comprehension of subcultures will be a difficult undertaking, particularly in devising a thorough research model that will be able to capture a vast variety of subcultural elements. The ultimate solution would be to limit the investigation of subcultures to one specific attribute, such as style, networks, or consumption, yet I am sure even these seemingly simplified topics would be laden with an expansive complexity and an unending source of intrigue.

Apart from the public norms and ways of behaviour issued by a superior there is also another lifestyle in prison opposed to the aims of rehabilitation. These are norms controlling behaviour in prison called "second life". Jedlewski (1971) defines the term "second life" as "some forms of behaviour that are behind regulations determined in the process of interaction between prisoners." "Second life" is a set of uncontrolled norms. These norms specify how to behave in certain situations and live in isolation. Moczydłowski (1988: 163) claims that "the appearance of a subcultural regulator was necessary. We do something in secret so that the new culture must be created"

The prison subculture or also "grypsera" is defined by Morawski (1968: 39-44) as a "special language (prison argot)". Stępniak (1973: 213) analyses the terms "grypsera" (also "grypserka") in the criminal environment in different parts of Poland and defines them as a "prison argot and youth slang". It is very difficult to define the origin of "grypsera" due to the complete lack of any men-

tions of this term in penitentiary literature. Śliwowski (1972: 104) states that "the issue of second life was noticed at the end of the forties and at the beginning of the fifties not only in Poland but also around the world". Grypsera derived from Warsaw and the location of the origin used to be a prison called "Gęsiówka". After a few years grypsera was spread all over Poland, especially in big prisons for young people in Warsaw, Łódź, Wrocław.

Data and Method

The data for comparing Polish and American inmate codes is from *The Inmate Social System* (Sykes and Messinger, 1960), *The mix: The culture of imprisoned women* (Owen and MacKenzie, 2004) and *Life without parole: living in prison today* (Hassine, 1999). Data relating to Polish inmate codes is taken from *Tajemnice grypserki* (Szaszkiewicz, 1997). Samples for analyzing the difference in meaning between Polish and American prison terminology were taken from *The prison community* (Clemmer, 1958), *Texas prisons: the largest hotel chain in Texas* (Glenn, 2001) and *Tajemnice grypserki* (Szaszkiewicz, 1997).

The research is based on a comparative method as a way to compare two forms of prison slangs (American prison slang and Polish "grypserka" slang) and the meaning of inmate codes.

Comparing different inmate codes

The inmate code is a set of rules by which prisoners should run their lives in the prison setting. Not all inmates followed such a code because it is impossible for a group of most dangerous and violent criminals who were unable to follow public rules to follow an inmate code. However, most of them subscribed to these rules. The inmate code as well as special terminology is a part of prison subculture. Giallombardo (1966) conducted research of Alderson, a prison for women to find that such a code did exist. Sykes and Messinger (1960) introduced the following inmate code:

Don't interfere with inmate interests.
Never rat on a con.
Don't be nosy.
Keep off a man's back.
Don't put a guy on the spot.
Be loyal to your class.
Be cool.
Do your own time.
Don't bring heat.
Don't exploit inmates.
Don't cop out.
Be tough.
Be a man.
Never talk to a screw.
Have a connection.
Be sharp. (Sykes and Messinger, 1960)

Some additional features of the female uncovered by Owen and MacKenzie (2004: 159) are: *Mind your own business.*

> *The police are not your friend; stay out of their face.*
> *If asked to do something (by staff), you do not tell.*
> *Do not allow rat-packing–fight one on one only.*
> *Take care of each other.* (Owen and MacKenzie, 2004: 159)

The inmate codes have changed from when early researchers began writing about prisoner subcultures. One result seems to be that inmate solidarity has eroded considerably. Hassine (1999) talks about a code that has changed as a result of younger and more violent offenders entering prisons. Such a code that has changed throughout time is connected with prescriptions such as:

> *Don't gamble.*
> *Don't mess with drugs.*
> *Don't mess with homosexuals.*
> *Don't steal.*
> *Don't borrow or lend, and you might survive.* (Hassine, 1999: 42)

Special norms of behaviour exist also in Polish prison subculture. In some prisons these norms are harder, in the others they become weaker. In Polish literature the inmate codes are described and labeled by a number of authors (see Braun, 1955; Kosewski, 1977; Wawszczyk, Wawrzyniak, Różański, 1994). Szaszkiewicz (1997) divides the inmate codes into three groups, these are:

1. Norms formulated in order to condemn particular groups of people.

   Examples:

   > *Don't make friends with jailers.*
   > *You can't become "human" if your father is a police officer or a jailer.*
   > *Don't shake hands with "victims"*

2. Norms protecting group solidarity.

   Examples:

   > Don't shake hands with anybody who is not in "human" group.
   > "Human" must share any goods such as cigarettes or tea with other humans.
   > "Humans" eat together at the table and "victims" (also "faggots") eat apart.

3. Norms protecting the honour of "humans"

   > *Don't pick up rubbish with hands.*

Don't rob "humans"

Don't clean lavatory with hands. You can use only a brush. (Szaszkiewicz, 1997: 49-60)

To sum up, prisoners are dependent on and in some way determined by all kinds of norms (formal and informal norms). In prison everything is predetermined and a prisoner is not allowed to do anything by himself. If he breaks the rules, there are other rules formulated in order to show how to punish for breaking the rules of "grypserka". According to Einat and Einat (2000: 309) "this code is directly linked to the process of socialization and adaptation to prison life". The inmate code has universal elements that cut across all correctional facilities because the normative society, its attributes, and its delegates are inherent opponents of prisoners (Hensey, Tewksbury, Castle, 2003: 290).

There is a significant connection between the behavioural aspect of the above codes and the linguistic aspects. The exemplified codes help to emphasize unity of prisoners against correctional workers. Such norms are taught using "grypserka" antilanguage and both terms are inseparable since the ability to speak "grypserka" is one of many norms to study in prison.

Prison terminology: Comparing the Polish and American Case

Hargan (1934) stated in his early study that the prison slang had a purpose. It was a secret code against outsiders and prison officials and, therefore acted to reinforce solidarity. However, guards usually know the meaning of prisoner slang as well as the prisoners do, and may use it to a significant degree (Lerner 2002). Garabedian (1964) and Sykes (1958) claim that prisoner argot serves as a symbolic expression of group loyalty, the use of which serves as a measure of integration and allegiance to the inmate subculture. One may define prison slang as a variation of street jargon because a number of the terms can be found in any street slang. Prison slang is a language of prisoners and is regarded as an important part of the prison subculture.

Prison slang terms tend to change over time and they vary between institutions, and across different regions of the countries. According to Dumond (1992: 138), "The terms may have changed somewhat over the decades, prison slang defines sexual habits and inmates' status simultaneously, using homosexuality as a means of placing individuals within the inmate caste system". Prison slang is a dynamic, constantly evolving entity. Some of the earliest examples of prison slang may have very different meanings today, if they are used at all. Prison slang is used in all prison subcultures around the world, with special terms designated for everything from prison food to guards, and especially the different types of inmates and roles in the prison setting (Pollock, 2005: 96). There is evidence that prison argot is still evolving. Clemmers' (1958) contribution to prison argot terminology is one of the earliest. He labeled some prison slang terms and provided their definitions. In 2001 Glenn provided a long list of slang terms in his time when he used to work as a prison warder. Let us compare those two lists of prison slang terms provided by Clemmer (1958) and Glenn (2001) in order to estimate how their meanings have changed over time. Their contributions are listed below.

	Clemmer (1940)	Glenn (2001)
policeman	*clown*	*chota*
to masturbate	*hand jig*	*kill*
drug	*junk*	*chiva*
prison warder	*hack (especially a night warden)*	*boss*

It should be noted that prison slang terms vary by place and institution as well. Moreover, there are a number of prison terms for one word such as "crap", "H", "smack" and "brown" for cocaine. Perhaps, argot for marijuana might be the most numerous starting with traditional "grass", "Mary Jane" or "Aunt Mary" and ending with "mutha" and "lubage". Now, I would like to compare some terms of American prison argot and Polish "grypserka" to investigate what are the names of different slang terms in Polish and American argot and to what extent they are different.

	American prison argot[3]	Polish "grypserka"[4]	Literal meaning
a child molester	*tree jumper*	*majciarz*	*the one who wears panties*
one newly arrived to prison	*fish*	*noworodek*	*infant*
a doctor	*croaker*	*piguła*	*pill*
a prison warden	*boss*	*fortepian*	*piano*
tattoo	*ink*	*dziara*	*edging*
prostitute	*canteen punk*	*ćma*	*moth*

---

3 Glenn, Lon B. (2001) "Texas prisons: the largest hotel chain in Texas". Eakin Press.
4 Szaszkiewicz, Maciej (1997) „Tajemnice grypserki". Kraków: Wydawnictwo Instytutu Ekspertyz Sądowych

The special terminology of prison inmates is largely different from that of non-inmates or "non-humans" in Polish "grypserka". The prison slang provides parameters of understandings for constructing a social and cultural environment. Nowhere is this clearer than in correctional institutions, where inmates live, think, and function within the framework defined by the argot (Bondesson 1989). Therefore, Einat and Einat (2000: 310-311) labeled several functions of the prison slang:

- The need to be different and unique
- Alleviation of feelings or rejection and refusal
- Facilitation of social interactions and relationships
- Declaration of belonging to a subculture or social status
- A tool of social identification leading to a sense of belonging to a group
- Secrecy

These argot functions " help to define the treatment which an inmate is likely to receive from other inmates and corrections officers" (Dumond 1992: 138).

Conclusions

The prison argot and the secret Polish "grypserka" as well which characterize prison subcultures are inseparable parts of the concept of prisonization as well as the development of different inmate codes. The earlier research and the present study on argot functions are clear. They reflect and consolidate organization, hierarchy in prison milieu and language of the prison subculture. The research reveals that American and Polish inmate codes are different from each other. American prisoners follow their own codes and prison rules. Polish grypserka assigned different naming for various words. For example, a doctor is called a *croaker* in American prison slang and a *pill* in grypserka.

To coexist in prison, inmates must learn prison argot terms in order to communicate with each other, declare belonging to "humans" or facilitate of social interactions. Slang is developed to make people feel different and distinguish them from community but prison argot may be functioning as an entertaining activity.

References

Archer, Thomas. 1985. *The pauper, the thief, and the convict*. New York: Garland Pub.

Becker, Howard. 1963. *Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance*. New York: The Free Press.

Bondesson, Ulla. 1989. *Prisoners in prison societies*. New Brundswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Braun, Kazimierz. 1975. „Drugie życie wśród skazanych młodocianych", in: *Negatywne zjawiska podkultury więziennej, środki i sposoby przeciwdziałania*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo CZSW.

Clarke, Garry. 1981. "Defending Ski-Jumpers: A Critique of Theories of Youth Subcultures"', in: Thornton, Sarah and Gelder, Ken (eds.), *The Subcultures Reader*. London and New York: Routledge.

Clemmer, Donald. 1958. *The prison community*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Cressey, Donald, R. 1932. *The Taxi-Dance Hall*. New York: Greenwood Press.

Crimp, Douglas and Rolston, Adam. 1980. *AIDS DemoGraphics*. Seattle: Bay Press.

Cohen, Albert K. 1955. *Delinquent boys: the culture of the gang*, Glencoe. Ill: Free Press.

Czapow, Czesław and Jedlewski Stanisław. 1971. *Pedagogika resocjalizacyjna*. Warszawa: PWN.

Dickens, Charles. 1984. *The Adventures of Oliver Twist*. London: Folio Society.

Dumond, Robert W. 1992. "The sexual assault of male inmates in incarcerated settings". *International Journal of the Sociology of Law* 20: 135-157.

Einat, Tomer. 2000. "Inmate Argot as an expression of prison subculture: the Israeli case", *The Prison Journal* 80: 309-325.

Fonarow, Wendy. 1995. *Empire of dirt: The aesthetics and rituals of British indie music*. Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press.

Fowler, Henry Watson. 1964. "Subculture", in: *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English*. London : Clarendon Press.

Garabedian, Peter G. 1964. "Social Roles in a Correctional Community", *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 55 (September): 338-350.

Giallombardo, Rose. 1966. *Society of Women: A Study of a Women's Prison*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Glenn, Lon B. 2001. *Texas prisons: the largest hotel chain in Texas*. Eakin Press.

Goffman, Irving. 1961. *Asylums*. Garden City. N.Y.: Doubleday.

Hebdige, Dick. 1979. *Subculture: the meaning of style*. Methuen, London.

Hargan, James. 1934. "The psychology of prison language". *Journal of abnormal and social psychology* 30 (October-December): 359-361.

Hassine, Victor. 1999. *Life without parole: living in prison today*. Roxbury Pub. Co.

Hensel, Christopher, Tewksbury Richard & Castle, Tammy. 2003. "Characteristics of Prison Sexual Assault Targets in Male Oklahoma Correctional Facilities", *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 18: 595–606.

Hodkinson, Paul. 2003. "Net.Goth: Internet Communication and (sub) Cultural Boundaries'", in: Muggleton, David and Weinzierl, Rupert (eds.) *The post-subcultures reader*. New York: Berg.

Jenkins, Henry. 1992. *Textual Poachers*. London: Routledge.

Kosewski, Marek. 1977. *Agresywni przestępcy*. Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna.

Lerner, Jimmy A. 2002. *You Got Nothing Coming*: *Notes From a Prison Fish. Broadway Books*.

Maffesoli, Michael. 1996. *The Time of the Tribes: The Decline of Individualism in Mass Society*. London: Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.

Mayhew, Augustus. 1851. "*Paved with gold", or, "The romance and reality of the London streets: 'an unfashionable novel'*". London: Chapman and Hall.

Michaels, Leonard & Ricks Christopher. 1980. *The state of the language*. University of California Press.

Moczydłowski, Paweł. 1988. *Drugie życie w instytucji totalnej*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.

Morawski, Jerzy. 1968. „Młodociani grypserzy. (Pragmatyczne i semantyczne aspekty gwary więziennej)", *Przegląd Penitencjarny* VI nr 4/20: 39-44.

Morrison, Arthur. 1946. *A child of the Jago.* Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books.

Owen, Barbara and MacKenzie, Doris. 2004. "The mix: The culture of imprisoned women", in: M. Stohr & C. Hemmens (eds.) *The inmate prison experience.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson, 152-172.

Park, Robert E. 1925. *The City.* University of Chicago Press, London.

Pollock, Joycelyn M. 2005. *Prisons Today and Tomorrow.* Jones & Bartlett Learning.

Przybyliński, Sławomir. 2005. *Podkultura więzienna – wielowymiarowość rzeczywistości penitencjarnej.* Kraków: Impuls.

Schrag, Clarence. 1944. *Social Role Types in a Prison Community.* Unpublished Master's Thesis. University of Washington.

Stallybrass, Peter and White, Allon. 1986. *The politics and poetics of transgression.* London: Methuen.

Stępniak, Klemens. 1973. „Nazwy gwary złodziejskiej", *Poradnik Językowy* 4: 210-222.

Sykes, Gresham M. 1958. *The society of captives: a study of a maximum security prison.* Princeton University Press.

Sykes, Gresham M. & Messinger, Sheldon L. 1960. "The Inmate Social System", in: R. Cloward (ed.), *Theoretical studies in social organization of the prison.* New York: Social Science Research Council.

Szaszkiewicz, Maciej. 1997. *Tajemnice grypserki.* Kraków: Wydawnictwo Instytutu Ekspertyz Sądowych.

Thornton, Sarah. 1997. "General Introduction", in: Thornton, Sarah and Gelder, Ken (eds.), *The Subcultures Reader.* London and New York: Routledge.

Thornton, Sarah and Gelder, Ken. 1997. *The Subcultures Reader.* London and New York: Routledge.

Thrasher, Frederic Milton. 1963. *The gang: A study of 1,313 gangs in Chicago.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ueno, Toshiya. 2003. *"Unlearning to Raver: Techno-Party as the Contact Zone in Trans-local Formations"*, in: Muggleton, David and Weinzierl, Rupert (eds.) *The Post-Subcultures Reader.* New York: Berg.

Valdivia, Angharad. 2003. "Racial Hybridity: Latinias/os as te Paradigmatic transnational Post-subculture", in: Muggleton, David and Weinzierl, Rupert (eds.) *The Post-Subcultures Reader.* New York: Berg.

Wawszczyk W., Wawrzyniak L., Różański Z. 1994. „Charakter i struktura grup nieformalnych w zakładach penitencjarnych i Rejonowym Areszcie Śledczym w Katowicach", in: „Materiały z konferencji". Kalisz: Wydawnictwo CZZK.M.S.

Young, Jock. 1971. "The subterranean world of play", in: Thornton, Sarah and Gelder, Ken (eds.) *The Subcultures Reader*, London and New York: Routledge.

WORK IN PROGRESS

"Work in progress" is a forum for students and university graduates who wish to present the results of their research.

Jacek Kos
University of Bialystok

Anthropolinguistic Analysis of the Semantic Field of the Verb *Cook*

Abstract. Anthropolinguistic analysis of the semantic field of the verb *cook* is an attempt at presenting the evolution of the domain of cooking in English as reflected in the vocabulary pertaining to cooking terms adopted in different historical epochs. The examination of the whole network of related cooking terms (i.e. the semantic field of *to cook*) proves that its development is inextricably linked with the cultural and social changes, new inventions, foreign influences and many other factors.

Keywords: anthropolinguistics, semantic field, *to cook,* semantic relations, evolution of mentality, analysis.

Semantic field is one of the most important notions in the domain of semantics. Crystal (1995: 157) defines semantic field as "a named area of meaning in which lexemes interrelate and define each other in specific ways", while Matthews (2003: 794) refers to it as "a distinct part of the lexicon defined by some general term or concept". It is an important object of study in anthropolinguistics. Anthropolinguistics is a relatively new science concerned with the development of human mentality and reasoning, as reflected in a language. It can be noticed that the way in which humans comprehended the reality varied in different periods in history. Three stages of the development of reasoning reflected in the language are usually distinguished: prescientific, proto-scientific and scientific. While the earliest stage was dominated by naïve type of thinking, the latest (i.e. scientific) period is based on the use of scientific theories and systems of concepts (Griniewicz in Griniewicz et al. 2004). The application of anthropolinguistic tools allows one to establish the changes in the development of English culture as illustrated by the evolution of the semantic field of *to cook*.

As far as the English language is concerned, it is possible to distinguish three main periods of its development whose boundaries are a matter of convention. Each stage however, has its characteristic features. These periods are as follows:

- Old English (450 – 1150)
- Middle English (1150 – 1500)
- Modern English (1500 – present) (Baugh & Cable 1991: 51-52).

More detailed divisions of the history of English into stages can also be found. It is common practice to divide Middle English period into Early Middle English (1100 – 1300) and Late Middle English (1300 – 1500) and Modern English into Early Modern English (1500 – 1800) and Late Modern English (1800 – present) (englishclub.com). Moreover, Late Modern English (1800 – present) is sometimes referred to as Present-Day English (Millward & Hayes in Nordquist 2015). The present study will attempt to outline the evolution of the semantic field of the verb *cook* throughout these periods.

Using *The Longman Synonym Dictionary* (1992) and *The Synonym Finder* (1986) 21 lexemes within the field have been established: *to bake, to roast, to broil, to charbroil, to grill, to barbecue, to sauté, to braise, to fricassee, to fry, to pan, to griddle, to toast, to boil, to simmer, to steam, to stew, to decoct, to brew, to poach, to blanch*. The twenty-one lexemes together with the word *to cook* constitute one semantic field. *The Oxford English Dictionary* (1994) an online source *Dictionary.com*. provide some information regarding the stages in the development of the selected semantic field. The changes within the semantic field of *to cook* can be illustrated in the following way:

- **Old English** (450 – 1150)

    to brew (893) (1)
    to bake (1000) (1)

- **Early Middle English** (1100 – 1300)

    to boil (1225) (1)
    to fry (1290) (1)
    to roast (1297) (1)

- **Late Middle English** (1300 – 1500)

    to cook (1380) (1)
    to broil (1386) (2)
    to poach (1390) (1)
    to blanch (1398) (2)
    to stew (1420) (2)
    to toast (1420) (2)
    to griddle (1430) (1)

- **Early Modern English** (1500 – 1800)

  to decoct (1545) (7)
  to simmer (1653) (1)
  to fricassee (1657) (1)
  to barbecue (1661) (1)
  to grill (1668) (1)
  to braise (1769) (1)
  to steam (1798) (9)

- **Late Modern English** (1800 – present)

  to sauté (1813) (1)
  to pan (1871) (5)
  to charbroil (1959-64) (1)

The dates presented in the list above indicate the year in which a particular lexeme was first attested with reference to food preparation. The number in the brackets denotes the number of meaning referring to cooking. Each of these lexemes appeared or adopted the meaning connected with cooking in different stages of the development of the English language.

What is noticeable in the analysis of the semantic field of *to cook* is the fact that in the case of certain verbs, e.g. *to roast*, their secondary meanings seem to precede their primary denotations. As far as the Old English period (450-1150) is concerned, it is clear that the domain of cooking was not particularly advanced as merely two verbs, i.e. *to brew* and *to bake*, referring to cooking techniques existed in English at that time. The verb *to brew* in the meaning 'to make (ale, beer and the like) by infusion, boiling and fermentation' (*The Oxford English Dictionary* 1994) was the one which initialized the semantic field of terms denoting cooking methods. Although, as it is implied by its meaning, the verb refers to preparing drinks, it can be included in the semantic field *to cook* as it involves processing items of food by heating them to make them ready for consumption.

The mentioned verb was the only one which referred to an action of preparing a drink. It might be expected that there should have existed a lexeme which indicated food preparation in a specific way. The verb *to bake* whose first usage was recorded in 1000 conveyed the following meaning: 'to cook by dry heat acting by conduction, and not by radiation, hence either in a closed place (oven, ashes, etc.), or on a heated surface, primarily used of preparing bread, then of potatoes, apples, the flesh of animals' (*The Oxford English Dictionary* 1994). Since the origins of the verb can be traced back to the Old High German form *bachan*, it may be assumed that the introduction of this lexeme is associated with Anglo-Saxon influence after their invasion on the British Isles in the 5th century AD.

Without doubt, the appearance of *to brew* and *to bake* must be regarded as a part of the initial stage of the domain of cooking and at the same time the semantic field *to cook*. The mentioned lexemes indicate rather different processes but both of them refer to preparing foodstuff by the use of

heat. They might be qualified as co-hyponyms of another more general superordinate term which did not exist in the Old English period though.

The Middle English period (1150-1500), on the other hand, brought a significant broadening of the semantic field of the verbs denoting food preparation techniques by the use of heat. Thus, it is reasonable to expect numerous divisions in the field. The lexemes which already existed might have acquired new meanings. The overwhelming majority of cooking terms which appeared at that stage are of French origin. It can be treated as an outcome of the Norman conquest in 1066 which had an enormous impact on the British culture. As it turns out, the French influence is also visible in the domain of cooking.

In 1250, the verb *to brew* acquired another meaning which was 'to concoct, contrive, prepare, bring about, cause' (*The Oxford English Dictionary* 1994). As it can be inferred, the meaning was established on the basis of the resemblance to the primary meaning of the verb. In this way the lexeme became polysemous. Nevertheless, this change did not have any influence on the semantic field of cooking terms.

To fry is another verb which came into the lexical field under analysis in 1290. It conveyed the following meaning 'to cook food with fat in a shallow pan over the fire' (*The Oxford English Dictionary* 1994). This method of preparing meals without doubt differed significantly from the ones already known. The term indicating it might be perceived as a hyponym of a more general notion together with other already existing lexemes.

The verb *to roast* which appeared in the meaning 'to make (flesh or other food) ready for eating by prolonged exposure to heat at or before a fire' in 1297 (*The Oxford English Dictionary* 1994) contributed to the further division of the semantic field of cooking terms. Taking into consideration the definition of the mentioned lexeme, it might be pointed out that roasting was the first and most primitive method of preparing food as it did not involve any special skills or knowledge. Nevertheless, the lexeme did not appear as the first one but was preceded by *to brew*, *to bake* and *to fry*. Supposedly, there might have existed an earlier Old English counterpart of the verb *to roast* which was used even before the words *to brew* and *to bake* were coined. It might have been caused by the influence of French culture and language that the Old English lexeme has been ousted from the lexicon and replaced by the Norman equivalent *to roast*. It is worth mentioning that it existed some years earlier and its meaning was 'to torture by exposure to flame or heat' (1290). The new meaning must have developed on the basis of the similarity between the process of exposing food to fire and heating a person in a flame as a form of punishment. This association was possible due to the existence of cruel penal practices in the societies of medieval Europe.

The verb *boil* was first attested in 1325 and meant 'to cook solid articles by continued immersion in boiling liquid' (*The Oxford English Dictionary* 1994). It was the second lexeme after *to brew* which indicated cooking in water. It should be mentioned that the lexeme existed before in the following meanings 'to reach the boiling point, to turn from the liquid into the gaseous state' (1225) and 'to move with agitation like that of boiling water' (1300) (*The Oxford English Dictionary* 1994). Originally, the verb referred merely to water. Presumably, some similarity between a person mov-

ing with agitation and the water undergoing the process of boiling based on their physical characteristics was noticed. Subsequently, with the development of reasoning, people figured out that it was possible to submerge food in the boiling water and make it ready for consumption in this way. Therefore, the process of boiling became more practical as it started to be utilized in preparation of many different items of food.

Not many years later, the verb *to brew* started to be used in the meaning 'to convert (barley, malt or other substance) into a fermented liquor' (1362) (*The Oxford English Dictionary* 1994). Clearly, the part of a larger process of brewing started to be referred by the same name as the whole process. The development of brewing industry might have been one of the reasons for such a transformation.

The verb *to cook* had not existed until the year 1380. It appeared then in the meaning 'to act as cook, to prepare food by the action of heat (for a household, etc.) (*The Oxford English Dictionary* 1994). Nevertheless, taking into consideration the literal meaning of the verb *to cook*, it can be inferred that the lexeme was not a general notion comprising all the existing lexemes denoting cooking techniques known at that time. The verb probably referred to preparing food as a professional activity performed by one person in a particular community. It might be assumed that there did not exist a cook as a job before the 14th century and food preparation was performed by any person.

The verb *to fry* used to mean 'to torture (a person) by fire; to burn or scorch' (*The Oxford English Dictionary* 1994) can be traced back to the year 1382. In this way the word became polysemous as the secondary meaning is related to the primary one. Nevertheless, the derived meaning refers to a different action not connected with food preparation. The appearance of the latter meaning did not have any impact on the semantic field *to cook* .There can be noticed a similarity between the verbs *to roast* and *to fry* whose secondary meanings are the same, i.e. 'to torture by exposure to flame or heat' and 'to torture (a person) by fire' respectively (*The Oxford English Dictionary* 1994). Comparing the primary definitions of the two mentioned verbs, it can be concluded that they refer to slightly different processes, i.e. frying involves cooking with extra fat while roasting does not. However, since they acquired identical metaphorical meaning, it might be assumed they were often used synonymously.

The 14th century brought further broadening of the lexical field *to cook*. There appeared the verb *to broil* in the meaning 'to cook (meat) by placing it on the fire, or on a gridiron over it' (*The Oxford English Dictionary* 1994), first attested in 1386. Comparing the meanings of the two verbs, i.e. *to roast* and *to broil*, it can be concluded that most probably they were synonymous and used interchangeably in the Middle English period.

Roughly in the same period, the verb *to bake* acquired another meaning, i.e. 'to harden by heat' (1388) (*The Oxford English Dictionary* 1994). In this way the verb became polysemous. The word which was earlier used with reference to a cooking process acquired a related but rather different

meaning. Later, in the Middle English period as well as in the following stage the verb became even more polysemous.

Another lexeme which appeared in the semantic field of *to cook* was the verb *to poach*. It was a completely new word which did not exist in English in any meaning earlier. As it has French roots in the form *pochier* and was without doubt incorporated into English as a result of Norman influences on British culture. Moreover, it referred to a very specific and sophisticated way of cooking. The meaning in which the verb appeared in 1390 was the following: 'to cook an egg by dropping it, without the shell, into boiling water simmering gently; to cook (fish, fruit, etc.) by simmering in water or another liquid' (*The Oxford English Dictionary* 1994). The lexeme with its meaning without doubt contributed to further divisions within the whole semantic field of *to cook*. It may have also limited the range of meanings of another already existing verb denoting cooking food in water, i.e. *to boil*.

The verb *to blanch* tracing its French roots in the form *blanchir* appeared in 1398. Its meaning which was 'to whiten almonds, or the like, by taking off the skin; to scald by a short rapid boil in order to remove the skin' (*The Oxford English Dictionary* 1994) was the first in which the word came into the lexicon. It became polysemous almost at the same time acquiring a more general but related meaning, i.e. 'to make white; whiten; to bleach' (1400) (*The Oxford English Dictionary* 1994). The mentioned case is a good illustration of a general tendency according to which more abstract notions gain their names from the domain of concrete terms evincing similar features.

To stew is another verb that broadened the semantic field *to cook*. Its meaning recorded in 1420 was the following: 'to boil slowly in a close vessel' (*The Oxford English Dictionary* 1994). It has its roots in the Old French form *estui*, which means 'case', 'sheath', etc. It already existed in the year 1400 in the meaning 'to bathe in a hot bath or a vapour bath' (*The Oxford English Dictionary* 1994).

The Middle English period is also the time when such verbs as *to toast* in its meaning 'to brown (bread, cheese, etc.) by exposure to the heat of a fire, etc.' (1420), *to decoct* in the meaning 'to prepare as food by the agency of fire' (1420) and *to griddle* in its meaning 'to cook on a griddle' (1430) entered the English lexicon (*The Oxford English Dictionary* 1994). It is difficult to explain the need for incorporating the verb *to decoct* in English, as there already existed lexemes referring to food preparation with the use of fire. It might have been treated as a hypernym of the terms such as *to bake* or *to roast*. The verb *to griddle* might have appeared as a result of the introduction of a new kitchen utensil, i.e. a griddle. Preparing food in it started to be referred to as griddling. The verb *to bake*, on the other hand, acquired two meanings, i.e. 'to prepare, make ready' (1460) and 'to form into a cake or mass' (1460) which are both obsolete now.

In the Modern English period (1500-1800), the verbs *to brew*, *to bake*, *to poach*, *to blanch* or *to roast* acquired new secondary meanings. The lexeme *to bake* started to refer to a more general process than preparing food. Its meaning recorded in 1527 was the following: 'to harden as frost does' (*The Oxford English Dictionary* 1994). The verb extended its polysemous character. Moreover, the word *to blanch* also acquired a new meaning related to its primary sense, i.e. 'to make pale with

fear, cold, hunger, etc.' (1605) (*The Oxford English Dictionary* 1994). There is an evident visual similarity between making almonds white and a person becoming pale. It is clearly visible that the terms originating in the domain of cooking (e.g. *to broil, to boil, to blanch*) are frequently used in a metaphorical sense with reference to human emotions.

Although the term *to decoct* already existed in the Middle English, it appeared again in the subsequent stage in a more specialized meaning, i.e. 'to boil so as to extract the soluble parts or principles' (1545) (*The Oxford English Dictionary* 1994). It is difficult to judge whether its previous definition, i.e. 'to prepare food by the agency of fire' (1420) (*The Oxford English Dictionary* 1994) referred to a similar process or not due to its more general character.

The lexeme *fricassee* which appeared in the English lexicon in 1568 first operated as a noun denoting 'meat sliced and fried or stewed and served with sauce' (*The Oxford English Dictionary* 1994). The noun of an obvious French origin found its place in English as a result of an ongoing French influence on British culture. Later, it started to operate as a verb meaning 'to make a fricassee of; to dress as a fricassee' (1657) (*The Oxford English Dictionary* 1994). The process of conversion which is frequently encountered in the Modern English period is without doubt a very productive way of coining new words, as illustrated by the lexeme *fricassee*.

The appearance of the verb *to cook* (around 1611) meaning 'to prepare food; to make fit for eating by due application of heat' (*The Oxford English Dictionary* 1994) is an interesting fact. The term which is now regarded as the most general from the whole set of cooking terms did not initialize the mentioned semantic field. Presumably, due to the emergence of more and more cooking techniques together with the names referring to them, it was necessary to encompass them all under one notion.

The verb *to grill* which can be traced back to 1668 conveyed the meaning 'to broil on a gridiron or similar apparatus over or before a fire' (*The Oxford English Dictionary* 1994). Taking into consideration the verbs *to broil*, *to roast* and even *to bake*, it might be claimed that all of them could have been treated as synonyms at that time. They all refer to the process of exposing food to fire. Nevertheless, the definition of the verb indicates a specific device which is involved in the process of grilling. Presumably, with the introduction of more and more kitchen appliances and tools, the meaning of the verb *to grill* became specialized and the lexeme was no longer perceived as synonymous to other verbs indicating the process of heating food in a fire.

The acquisition of another meaning by the verb *to stew* seems to be an interesting phenomenon. The verb which previously indicated the process of cooking in a closed vessel appeared in the meaning 'to stay excessively long in bed' (1671) (*The Oxford English Dictionary* 1994). The change is likely to have been caused by the similarity between the duration of stewing as a cooking process and staying long in bed. This change in the meaning contributed to the polysemous character of the verb *to stew*. The lexeme turned out to be another term from the domain of cooking incorporated in a vocabulary segment representing another sphere of life.

The lexeme *barbecue* was another word which entered the semantic field *to cook*. In Present-Day English it operates both as a verb and a noun. Nevertheless, it entered the language as a verb in

the meaning 'to broil or roast (an animal) whole' (1690) (*The Oxford English Dictionary* 1994) and then as a noun in the meaning 'a rude wooden framework used in America for supporting above a fire meat that is to be smoked or dried (1697) (*The Oxford English Dictionary* 1994). Taking into consideration the meaning of the verb, it might be assumed that before its emergence there already existed two words which referred to similar cooking processes, e.g. *to broil* or *to roast*. It is difficult to find a logical explanation for the emergence of another verb with a similar meaning. It might be partially explained by the fact that the word *barbecue* traces its roots in a Spanish form *barbacoa*. Presumably, it found its place in English thanks to the contacts between British and Spanish colonists in the North America. The verb *to barbecue* is more frequently encountered in American English which can be treated as a confirmation of the mentioned hypothesis. Moreover, the word appeared first as a verb and then as a noun which is quite unusual. Supposedly, as a loanword, it entered the English lexicon both as a verb and a noun since the first recorded usages (i.e. 1690, 1697) are not remote in time.

The Modern English period is characterized by the fact that many already existing words acquired new related meanings then. In the case of verbs, their new meanings usually referred to completely different processes. Nevertheless, there could be found certain physical similarities between the primary and secondary meanings. On the other hand, the verb *to roast* which is one of the lexemes which initialized the semantic field *to cook* acquired another meaning in 1724, i.e. 'to expose (coffee beans) to heat in order to prepare for grinding' (*The Oxford English Dictionary* 1994). The appearance of this new meaning had a direct influence on the semantic field *to cook* as the already existing term started to be used in reference to a new action. It might have been triggered by the popularization of coffee as a beverage among British people at that time.

Another term denoting a cooking method, i.e. *to braise*, found its place in the set of English vocabulary in the 18ᵗʰ century (1797) with the meaning 'to stew in a tightly closed pan' (*The Oxford English Dictionary* 1994). The term referred to a complicated and sophisticated process which involved the meat being surrounded with slices of bacon, herbs, etc. The method and the term denoting it has been borrowed from French and therefore can be regarded as another indication of the cultural influence of France on the British Isles. Just like many other verbs indicating different ways of preparing food, the lexeme *braise* was known earlier as a noun. Its first usage was recorded in 1769 with the meaning 'braised meat' (*The Oxford English Dictionary* 1994).

Although the lexeme *steam* can be found in English as early as in the year 1000, it did not operate as a verb until the 18ᵗʰ century (first recorded in 1798). It started to be used in the meaning 'to treat with steam for the purpose of cooking' (*The Oxford English Dictionary* 1994). As can be noticed, the previous meanings of the verb *to steam* (e.g. 'to be emitted or exhaled'), did not refer to any kind of cooking but rather to a physical process of emitting vapour or fume. Although steaming is quite an old way of preparing food, it may not have been referred to by this term at the earliest stages after its discovery. Similar to the lexemes *griddle* and *grill*, the verb *to steam* was first used as a noun and then started to operate as a verb too. Moreover, the year 1798, in which the verb *to steam* was first used in reference to food preparation, may have been an initial stage of

healthy lifestyle involving popularization of cooking methods associated with retaining nutrients and departure from traditional cooking techniques based on fat and direct exposure to fire.

The modern English period is also characterized by further acquisition of new related meanings by the already existing verbs. The lexemes such as *to bake*, *to toast* and *to roast* which denoted cooking terms acquired the new meanings, i.e. 'to ripen with heat' (1697), 'to redden (by drinking)' (1701) and 'to criticize, to denounce' (1710) respectively (*The Oxford English Dictionary* 1994). However, the mentioned changes did not have a significant influence on the shape of the semantic field of *to cook*.

The appearance of new verbs denoting various cooking procedures which used to operate as nouns indicating certain kitchen utensils and appliances is one of the striking features of both the Modern and Present-Day English period. Food preparation with the use of griddles, pans and grills started to be referred as griddling, panning and grilling respectively.

The verb *to simmer* broadened the semantic field of *to cook* in 1823 with the meaning 'to keep in a heated condition just below boiling point' (*The Oxford English Dictionary* 1994). Obviously, the verb existed before but its meaning did not refer to the process of food preparation. Simmering was without doubt a cooking method unknown before and referred to preparation of new items of food such as different kinds of vegetables brought from the New World. The cooking technique which previously might have been encompassed by another term indicating cooking in water, i.e. *to boil*, started to be referred by a new separate term. The emergence of the verb *to simmer* divided the lexical field of *to cook* further and contributed to semantic shifts within it.

The verb *to sauté* appeared in English even earlier, i.e. in 1813. It refers to a specific way of cooking in which meat, vegetables, etc. are fried in a pan with a little butter over a high heat, while being tossed from time to time (*The Oxford English Dictionary* 1994). The lexeme is based on the French form *sauter* which means 'to jump'. Before the introduction of the verb into English, there already existed a verb with a very similar meaning, i.e. *to fry*. The verb *to sauté* might be perceived as partially synonymous to the verb *to fry*. On the other hand, it can also be claimed that frying is a more general term than sautéing and the relation existing between the two forms is one of hyponymy. Nevertheless, the introduction of the verb into the English lexicon broadened the semantic field of *to cook* and contributed to the emergence of the relations of hyponymy or synonymy while the terms indicating cooking in fat are concerned.

In Present-Day English, other lexemes previously denoting cooking terms acquired new meanings and therefore became polysemous. It might have been triggered by the evolution of human mentality or growing literacy in British society as the newly coined meanings of the already existing terms might seem to be poetic, e.g. *to cook* – 'to ruin, spoil, do for' (1851) or *to grill* – 'to subject to severe questioning' (1894) (*The Oxford English Dictionary* 1994). On the other hand, these verbs used in their secondary senses might belong to colloquial language which often incorporates words and phrases from the domains familiar for an average person (e.g. cooking).

The lexeme *pan* existed in English as early as in the 9th century and denoted 'a vessel of metal or earthenware for domestic uses' (897) (*The Oxford English Dictionary* 1994). Nevertheless, it is

not possible to find the usage of the mentioned lexeme as a verb until the year 1871 in which it was first recorded in the meaning 'to cook or dress in a pan' (*The Oxford English Dictionary* 1994). Apparently, the word is far more frequently encountered as a noun than a verb. Nevertheless, the increasing popularity of metal kitchen utensils, e.g. pans, triggered the introduction of the verb *to pan*.

It can be concluded that the most polysemous verbs in the semantic field of *to cook,* i.e. *to bake*, *to roast* or *to boil* were the ones which were used the most frequently. Paying attention to this tendency may provide an answer to the question which cooking techniques were the most popular in different epochs. Even in the 20th century, the primary verbs in the mentioned lexical field, *to bake* and *to cook,* acquired new meanings, i.e. 'to be made uncomfortably hot (by the sun, a fire, etc.)' and 'to play music with excitement' respectively (*The Oxford English Dictionary* 1994).

Finally, the latest lexeme included in the semantic field of *to cook* is the verb *to charbroil* in the meaning 'to grill or broil over a charcoal fire' (Dictionary.com). It was coined in the years 1959-64 as a result of blending the two lexemes, i.e. *charcoal* and *grill*. Similar to panning, charbroiling must have been known earlier as a method of cooking although it was not referred to by the mentioned term then.

As already mentioned, the state of human mentality and reasoning in a certain period of time is reflected in the language (or vocabulary) used by the people at that time. As far as the domain of cooking is concerned, it is easy to notice that the ways of food preparation varied in different stages of human evolution. The development of the semantic field of *to cook* depended on many factors, such as the state of human reasoning, availability of particular items of food, cultural influences, changes in the lifestyle, etc. Taking into consideration the diachronic analysis conducted in the present thesis, it is possible to distinguish changes in the English mentality concerning the ways of cooking and define their possible reasons. It can be assumed that the advent of cooking, i.e. preparing food with the use of heat, is linked with the discovery of fire. Cooking should be without doubt regarded as one of the earliest human activities. Most anthropologists assume that fire was already controlled by the mankind 250,000 years ago (Wikipedia.org). On the other hand, the scientist Richard Wrangham supposes that the fire was known to humans as early as 1.8 million years ago and cooking began at nearly the same time (Wrangham 2009: 45). Due to the fact that archeological evidence is insufficient to establish the exact moment in which cooking started to be applied by the mankind, it is possible to search for clues in biological features of early humans (Wrangham 2009: 42). In the evolution of *Homo erectus* from habilines, it is possible to observe such transformations as the reduction in tooth and gut size, the increase in body size and a significant decline of climbing ability. They all may support the claim that cooking as a method of food preparation was already known to *Homo erectus* who appeared approximately 1.8 million years ago (Wrangham 2009: 46). Therefore, it seems legitimate to maintain that the emergence of cooking had an enormous impact on the further physical and mental development of human beings which facilitated the rise of modern civilization.

Just like cooking prompted the progress of human mentality and reasoning, it should also be admitted that the emergent abilities of the mankind contributed to the introduction of more and more advanced cooking techniques. As it is assumed, roasting, inseparably combined with the use of fire, was the only method of preparing meals known to the earliest human beings. It turns out that steaming is also one of the earliest cooking methods as the Aurignacian people of southern France prepared their food in this way wrapping it in wet leaves. The introduction of pottery in the Neolithic period gave rise to the entirely new methods of preparing meals such as boiling, stewing or braising which diversified the domain of cooking. Additionally, the appearance of metal cookware gave an opportunity for a more frequent usage of cooking methods based on water. Social changes such as the development of settled communities, domestication of livestock and the beginning of cultivation of edible plants also contributed to the emergence of new cooking techniques (allthatcooking.com).

Taking into consideration the linguistic analysis of the semantic field of *to cook*, it is possible to conclude that it developed unevenly in different historical periods. As the data available in *The Oxford English Dictionary* (1994) suggest, the first lexeme which initialized the semantic field of cooking terms is the verb *to brew*. It appeared as early as the 9th century AD which is the Old English period. It is unsurprising as brewing is one of the earliest cooking methods applied by people. It was already known to the inhabitants of ancient Egypt and Mesopotamia (Wikipedia. org). The method referred to by the term brewing was originally applied to making beer which suggests that beer was one of the first beverages consumed by ancient people. A small number of cooking terms existing in the Old English period, i.e. early Middle Ages, indicates that very few manners of preparing food were known to people living at that time. It might have stemmed from a rather low level of education of the majority of the population. Moreover, the early Middle Ages was a specific period in which spiritual values were propounded over material ones. In other words, there was no particular importance attached to the preparation of food, its taste or nutritious values.

Another lexeme referring to food preparation existing in the Old English period, i.e. *to bake*, has its roots in an Old High German form *bachan*. The time of the appearance of the form to bake in English is consistent with Germanic invasions on the British Isles which took place in the 5th century. As the given evidence is concerned, Germanic (or Anglo-Saxon) culture did not contribute to the development of cooking habits applied by the population inhabiting the British Isles. It can be concluded that Anglo-Saxons were not particularly inventive in reference to cooking techniques.

The Middle English period, on the other hand, is characterized by the appearance of numerous verbs denoting different ways of preparing food with the use of heat. The introduction of many previously unknown cooking techniques might have been linked to the development of human reasoning or the emergence of new human needs concerning tastes of meals and nutritious values. However, the most probable reason for such a significant broadening of the semantic field of cooking terms in the Middle English period was the influence of another culture. After the Norman

conquest in 1066, England was regarded mainly as a cultural colony of France. Such a stance is perfectly understandable if the influences in the fields of music, literature or architecture are taken into consideration (Morgan 1997: 107). It turns out that an overwhelming majority of cooking terms which were incorporated into English after the Norman conquest in 1066 such as *to roast*, *to boil* or *to stew*, which are of a French origin. It is also worth mentioning that a considerable number of terms denoting kinds of fish and meat, fruit, seasoning and condiments have French roots. However the impact of the invaders on the Anglo-Saxon culture might be perceived, it should be admitted that the Normans enriched the culture of the locals in the domain of cuisine in a significant way although all those new methods were adopted exclusively by the aristocracy who were willing to use the French language and cultivate Norman customs (Baugh & Cable 1991: 171).

The Modern English period, which began approximately in 1500, can also be regarded as a phase of a dynamic development of the semantic field of cooking terms. A significant number of verbs denoting various cooking processes appeared in English at that time. Generally, the year 1500 is regarded as the beginning of the Renaissance. The most important inventions of this particular period in history such as the appearance of the printing press, the spread of popular education, new means of communication and the growth of social consciousness exerted an enormous influence on the evolution of English (Baugh & Cable 1991: 199).

As far as the domain of cuisine is concerned, the introduction of new vegetables such as potato (1586), broccoli (before 1724) or tomato (1750s) after the discovery of the New World may have facilitated the rise of new methods of cooking so that these obscure items of food were fit for consumption (Wikipedia.org). The appearance of many new kitchen utensils may also have played a significant role in the evolution of cookery at that time. Although the metal cookware was present in earlier epochs, it was the 17th century that brought popularization of brass, copper and iron cooking vessels. A typical Western kitchen of that time was equipped with skillets, baking pans, a kettle and several pots (Wikipedia.org). Moreover, due to the social changes in France in the 1790s, many chefs had to emigrate in order to find a job in various places in Europe. In this way, as the French are perceived as the first who created and wrote down the systems and rules for cooking, they instilled professional approach to cooking in various societies including the British (Clarke 2013). Thus, the verb *to fricassee* was created on the basis of a French noun *fricassee* denoting stewed meat served with sauce. Similarly, frying food quickly in hot fat started to be referred to as *sautéing*. The appearance of other cooking terms in English in the modern period can also be justified by social changes and discoveries in the fields of culture, science, etc.

In the case *to steam*, it is legitimate to assume that the fact of acquiring the meaning 'to treat with steam for the purpose of cooking' (*The Oxford English Dictionary* 1994) by it and the invention of the steam engine at nearly the same time were not coincidental. Presumably, it was observed that the produced steam can also be used in the process of cooking thanks to its heating properties. It might be useful to mention that steaming as a method of cooking can be regarded as one of the earliest (allthatcooking.com). Nevertheless, the process applied by prehistoric people

involved exposing food wrapped in wet leaves to the steam from hot embers and thus it cannot be compared to the method of steaming employed in the present-day art of cooking.

The verb *to brew* appeared as early as the 9th century and was used in reference to making beer. Nevertheless, in the Modern English period it acquired another meaning, i.e. 'to make by infusion, as tea' (1626) (*The Oxford English Dictionary* 1994). The period in which the mentioned verb started to be used with reference to the preparation of tea can be associated with the introduction of this beverage in England by a Portuguese woman Catherine of Braganza, wife of King Charles II. The tea did not gain a widespread popularity until the end of 18th century though (Wikipedia.org).

Finally, *to charbroil* is the only lexeme included in the present analysis which came into existence in the meaning referring to food preparation in the Present-Day English period. It was coined as the result of blending two lexemes, i.e. *charcoal* and *broil* (Dictionary.com). Although the method of cooking does not seem to be one of the latest, it has been referred to by the mentioned term for only about fifty years so far. It might be explained by the general tendency of inventing new names for the already existing phenomena. Presumably, it is triggered by the rapid development of many scientific and cultural domains which results in the appearance of a significant number of new terms. The entities once referred to by more general notions acquire new more specific names.

To sum up, the evolution of human mentality and reasoning is reflected in particular stages of the development of a language. Taking into consideration the examples presented above, it should be concluded that cooking as one of the primary human activities has always been dependent on human mentality and reasoning. However, the advent of cooking facilitated physical and mental development of mankind and provided the foundations for the rise of modern civilization too. As the new methods of preparing food by the use of heat emerged, there were coined the lexemes denoting those cooking techniques. In this way, the semantic field 'to cook' had a chance to broaden its range and incorporate more and more terms. It would be reasonable to expect further development of the mentioned semantic field in the future as thanks to numerous technological improvements, there appear more and more kitchen utensils. Moreover, some verbs may disappear if certain cooking techniques come out of use due to various reasons. Nevertheless, the ongoing process of globalization will favour the introduction of different ingredients unknown in Anglo-American culture and thus the further broadening of the semantic field of *to cook* might be expected.

References

All that cooking. History of cooking.
  http://allthatcooking.com/history-of-cooking/. Retrieved: 08.05.2015
Baugh, Albert C.; Cable, Thomas. 1991. *A History of the English Language*. London: Routledge.
Brewing – Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia
  en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Brewing. Retrieved: 10.05.2015
British cuisine – Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia
  en.wikipedia.org/wiki/British_cuisine. Retrieved: 08.05.2015

Clarke, Lydia. 2013. *Haute Cuisine: Why Is French the Lingua Franca of Cooking?* http://www.acclaro.com/translation-resources/translation-localization-blog/haute-cuisine-355. Retrieved: 08.05.2015

Cooking – Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia
en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cooking. Retrieved: 10.05.2015

Crystal, David. 1995. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dictionary.com. http://dictionary.reference.com/.

Grinev-Griniewicz, Siergiej, Particia Thomas and Sławomir Raube (eds). 2004. *Language and Culture: establishing foundations for anthropological linguistics*. Białystok: Wyższa Szkoła Finansów i Zarządzania.

Matthews, Peter H. 2003. *The Concise Dictionary of Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Morgan, Kenneth O. (ed.). 1997. *The Oxford Illustrated History of Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nordquist, Richard. 2015. *Present-Day English (PDE)*. http://grammar.about.com/od/pq/g/Present-day-English-pde.htm. Retrieved: 02.02.2015.

Rodale, Jerome I. 1986. *The Synonym Finder*. New York: Warner Books.

Simpson, John A. and Weiner, Edmund. 1994. *The Oxford English Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Tea – Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia
en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tea. Retrieved: 08.05.2015

The Longman Synonym Dictionary. 1992. Urdang, Laurence (ed.). Harlow: Longman.

Wrangham, Richard. 2009. *Catching Fire: How Cooking Made Us Human*. New York: Basic Books.

DISCUSSION FORUM

In this issue, we present an email discussion between two translators, Małgorzata Semil and Krzysztof Puławski on the translation of anthroponyms in theatrical plays. Both participants are experienced translators of Anglophone literature into Polish. Małgorzata Semil is one of the editors of *Dialog,* a Polish monthly devoted to contemporary theatre, cinema, radio and TV plays, and a co-author of *Słownik współczesnego teatru* [A dictionary of modern theatre]. Krzysztof Puławski is a frequent contributor to *Dialog.* He also teaches translation courses at the University of Bialystok, Poland. The discussion was conducted in Polish. We present it in its original language version.

ANTROPONIMY W TEATRZE

W 2012 roku przygotowywałem referat, który początkowo miał dotyczyć wyłącznie sztuk teatralnych, a konkretnie tłumaczenia (lub nie) występujących w nim imion, nazwisk, pseudonimów etc, czyli ogólnie antroponimów. W ramach przygotowań skontaktowałem się z Małgorzatą Semil, nie tylko znaną tłumaczką i redaktorką *Dialogu,* ale też współautorką *Słownika współczesnego teatru.* Owocem tego kontaktu była prawdziwa burza mózgów, dotycząca wykorzystania antroponimów w teatrze. I chociaż wielokrotnie przy różnych okazjach wykorzystywałem wątki tej korespondencji, to kusiło mnie, żeby zaprezentować ją w całości, w takiej roboczej formie, w jakiej się odbywała. Myślę, że po trzech latach nie straciła ona nic ze swojej aktualności.

Krzysztof Puławski

Szanowna Pani,

dostałem Pani adres od Joanny Krakowskiej z *Dialogu*. Chciałbym przygotować referat na temat sposobów traktowania przez tłumaczy imion, nazwisk i przydomków bohaterów w tłumaczeniach sztuk teatralnych (na konferencję Imago Mundi na UW) i skierowano mnie do Pani jako osoby najbardziej kompetentnej w tej kwestii (i w ogóle sprawach tłumaczeniowych).

Robiłem jakiś czas temu dla *Dialogu* redakcję dawnych tłumaczeń sztuk Yeatsa i Synge'a i zauważyłem tam parę dziwnych rzeczy. Na przykład imię Patrik (takie skrzyżowanie Patryka i Patricka) czy używanie w tym samym tekście imion polskich i obcych, co zresztą zdarza się i współcześnie. Zastanawiam się:

1. Czy *Dialog* miał od początku lub jakiegoś momentu zalecenia dotyczące imion, nazwisk i pseudonimów?
2. W jakim stopniu była to jednak kwestia indywidualnego wyboru?
3. Co się działo ze znaczącymi przydomkami?
4. Czy były (a jeśli tak, to kiedy) jakieś zmiany w ogólnym podejściu do imion i nazwisk?
5. Skąd pochodzi zasada, by Shakespeare'a pisać tak jak w oryginale (co w zapisie może dziwić, kiedy na przykład rozmawiają dwaj chłopcy albo jacyś prości ludzie)?

Będę wdzięczny za wszelkie informacje i wskazówki, a sam czekam na ferie, żeby dać nura w stare numery *Dialogu*.

Łączę pozdrowienia,
Krzysztof Puławski

P.S. Może pamięta też Pani jakieś gafy związane z imionami, etc. Niezbyt to przyjemne dla tłumacza, ale jakie ciekawe.

Szanowny Panie,

dziękuję za miły list i spróbuję odpowiedzieć na Pana pytania, choć nie jest dla mnie do końca jasne, czy pyta Pan o politykę *Dialogu*, czy o moją własną praktykę.

1. Czy *Dialog* miał od początku lub jakiegoś momentu zalecenia dotyczące imion, nazwisk i pseudonimów?

Żadna zasada nie była nigdy i nigdzie zapisana, ale było zawsze ogólnie przyjęte, że imion się nie tłumaczy. Czasem opór (albo upór) tłumacza był niemożliwy do pokonania i podejrzewam, że w przypadku Synge'a czy Yeatsa tak właśnie było. Adam Tarn był bardzo światowy i tej światowości pilnował, do tego stopnia, że obstawał przy pisaniu NEW YORK. Również to on pilnował SHAKESPEARE'A i MOLIERE'A. Dopiero w latach siedemdziesiątych – już po osiero-

ceniu nas – odstąpiliśmy od NEW YORKU ale pozostaliśmy przy oryginalnej pisowni nazwisk – tyle że SHAKESPEARE w wersji przymiotnikowej piszemy SZEKSPIROWSKI. Nazwijmy to naszą specyfiką (obok kilku innych)

2. W jakim stopniu była to jednak kwestia indywidualna?
3. Co się działo ze znaczącymi przydomkami?

Nie potrafię tego prześledzić i myślę, że pytanie nr 2 zawiera odpowiedź: rzecz zawsze zależała (i w moim przekonaniu zależy) od konkretnego tekstu, od roli, jaką znaczenie imienia czy nazwiska gra w tekście, a ostatecznie od inwencji i talentu tłumacza. Z reguły drukowaliśmy zawsze przekłady, a nie adaptacje. Tylko, jak wiadomo, granica między jednym a drugim bywa cienka. Na przykład, czy dzieło Ireny Tuwim KUBUŚ PUCHATEK kwalifikuje się jako przekład czy jako adaptacja? Myślę, że gdyby tej jakości przekład dramatu do nas trafił, nie mielibyśmy wątpliwości, że należy drukować. W końcu drukowaliśmy jakieś „spolszczenia", bodajże Rymkiewicza.

Myślę, że gdyby w sztuce pojawił się Tom, Dick i Harry na bezludnej wyspie, to coś by z tym należało zrobić. Ale co konkretnie, zależałoby od kontekstów.

Pamiętam sytuację, w której tłumaczka była dość bezradna wobec postaci o imionach BEE, DEE, VEE, JAY i KAY. Skończyło się na MOLLY, POLLY, BELLA, STELLA i DELLA.

4. Czy były (a jeśli tak, to kiedy) jakieś zmiany w ogólnym podejściu do imion i nazwisk?

Dyrektyw żadnych nie było. Główną zasadą jest zdrowy rozsądek i konsekwencja.
Kundle w rodzaju PATRIKA by dzisiaj nie przeszły.

5. Skąd pochodzi zasada, by Shakespeare'a pisać tak jak w oryginale (co w zapisie może dziwić, kiedy na przykład rozmawiają dwaj chłopcy albo jacyś prości ludzie)?

Ja sama staram się pozostać A) przy imionach oryginalnych, chyba że powodują zbyt wielkie problemy fonetyczne. Jeśli to możliwe, staram się to skonsultować z autorem. Tak było w przypadku jakiegoś bohatera u LaBute'a. Imię zastępcze było też angielskie i starałam się, żeby miało podobne usytuowanie kulturowo-społeczne, ale po polsku brzmiało lepiej. Nie pamiętam, co to było za imię. Wiem, że gdyby postać miała na imię GUY, to bym szukała zamiennika. Przed ślubem stulecia zastanawiałabym się nad użyciem imienia PIPPA.

Ze studentami pracowałam nad sztuką, w której występował chłopak, który się nazywał TROUT STANLEY i była mowa o tym, że rodzice „dali mu rybie imię". Po długich deliberacjach zdecydowaliśmy się go nazwać CARP/KARP STANLEY. Rozumowanie było następujące: PSTRĄG stanowił zbyt dużą przeszkodę w kwestiach; szukaliśmy ryby, która istnieje po angielsku i po polsku, (odrzucając m.in. Halibuta i Turbota), a Karp nam się w tekście sprawdzał.

Pozostał tylko problem, jak go odmieniać: CARPIE, czy CARPIU. Przez semestr problem pozostał nierozstrzygnięty.

Łączę wyrazy szacunku,
Małgorzata Semil

Szanowna Pani,

dziękuję za błyskawiczną i bardzo obszerną odpowiedź. Oczywiście głównie chodziło mi o tendencje „ogólnodialogowe" i takie będę starał się wyśledzić, chociaż z tego, co Pani pisała, wynika, że często decydowało wyczucie Naczelnego. Zresztą „wyczucie" to pewnie złe słowo, bo chyba chodziło o odcięcie się w ten sposób od siermiężnego komunizmu. Jak Pani pisała: światowość.

Natomiast doświadczenia osobiste są zawsze bardzo ciekawe, zwłaszcza że sam podchodzę do tekstu bardziej wzrokowo. Dlatego raziłyby mnie imiona takie jak Jeb, albo Bo (od Beauregard) – w tym drugim wypadku trudno do tego imienia dostosować składnię zdania i w ogóle trzeba je chyba zmieniać w większości tłumaczeń. Dopiero ostatnio zacząłem przy okazji tłumaczenia dramatów czytać tekst polski na głos, żeby sprawdzić, jak będzie brzmiał ze sceny. Stąd na przykład (co prawda w prozie) zamiana imienia Beccah na Rebeka – bo bohaterka wcale nie była „beką".

Ze spolszczeń sztuk pamiętam to, co robił Sito, ale nie wydaje mi się, żeby te teksty były drukowane w *Dialogu*. Grywano je chyba co jakiś czas, bodaj w Dramatycznym, ale głowy nie dam. To oczywiście kolejny wątek, bo z całą pewnością pojawiali się w *Dialogu* tacy tłumacze, którzy robili to, co chcieli, o czym zresztą również Pani wspomina.

Wydaje mi się, że byłoby bardzo interesujące wyłowienie tych osób.

Bardzo ciekawy jest też problem Trout/Carp. Można by się zastanowić, czy nie dać tu wyjątkowo Polikarpa (odpadłby problem z odmianą). Sam się czasami zastanawiam, czy u Wilde'a nie powinno być np. Szczęsnego zamiast Ernesta. No i chciałoby się coś zrobić z Krappem z „Ostatniej taśmy", chociaż zamiana na Kaua byłaby zbyt gruba. Znalazłoby się jeszcze więcej przykładów...

I ostatnia rzecz: mam wrażenie, że jednak w teatrze jest tendencja do spolszczania imion i mieszania ich z obcymi. Przypominam sobie na przykład „Opowieści o zwyczajnym szaleństwie" Zelenki w Dramatycznym, gdzie główny bohater był Piotrem, ale inni nosili już bardziej czeskie imiona czy „Marata/Sade'a" z Supraśla (gdzie nb. mieszkam) z Karoliną (sic!) Corday. Nie wiem, czy ten tekst Weissa nie był drukowany w *Dialogu*...

Raz jeszcze bardzo dziękuję za pomoc. Mam nadzieję, że mogę wykorzystać Pani uwagi, oczywiście z podaniem źródła.

Łączę pozdrowienia,
Krzysztof Puławski

Szanowny Panie,
odpowiadam na czerwono.

Z ukłonami,
Malgorzata Semil

Szanowna Pani,
dziękuję za błyskawiczną i bardzo obszerną odpowiedź. Oczywiście głównie chodziło mi o tendencje „ogólnodialogowe" i takie będę starał się wyśledzić, chociaż z tego, co Pani pisała wynika, że często decydowało wyczucie Naczelnego. Zresztą „wyczucie" to pewnie złe słowo, bo chyba chodziło o odcięcie się w ten sposób od siermiężnego komunizmu. Jak Pani pisała: światowość.

W dużym stopniu ma Pan rację.

Natomiast doświadczenia osobiste są zawsze bardzo ciekawe, zwłaszcza że sam podchodzę do tekstu bardziej wzrokowo. Dlatego raziłyby mnie imiona takie jak Jeb, albo Bo (od Beauregard) – w tym drugim wypadku trudno do tego imienia dostosować składnię zdania i w ogóle trzeba je chyba zmieniać w większości tłumaczeń. Dopiero ostatnio zacząłem przy okazji tłumaczenia dramatów czytać tekst polski na głos, żeby sprawdzić, jak będzie brzmiał ze sceny. Stąd na przykład (co prawda w prozie) zamiana imienia Beccah na Rebeka.

Ze spolszczeń sztuk pamiętam to, co robił Sito, ale nie wydaje mi się, żeby te teksty były drukowane w *Dialogu*. Grywano je chyba co jakiś czas, bodaj w Dramatycznym, ale głowy nie dam. To oczywiście kolejny wątek, bo z całą pewnością pojawiali się w Dialogu tacy tłumacze, którzy robili to, co chcieli, o czym zresztą również Pani wspomina. Wydaje mi się, że byłoby bardzo interesujące wyłowienie tych osób.

Może i tak, ale wiele z tych osób nie ma już wśród żywych – np. Cecylii Wojewody. Nie ma już także Jerzego S.

Notabene – z pewnością w rozlicznych dziełach nt teorii tłumaczenia z pewnością są jakieś reguły opisane i uzasadnione. Niestety, albo stety, ja ich nie znam. Jak już powiedziałam, kieruję się wyłącznie pragmatyką (doskonały przykład z Jeb i Beccah) oraz zdrowym rozsądkiem.

Bardzo interesujący jest też problem Trout/Carp. Można by się zastanowić, czy nie dać tu wyjątkowo Polikarpa (odpadłby problem z odmianą). Sam się czasami zastanawiam, czy u Wilde'a nie powinno być np. Szczęsnego zamiast Ernesta. No i chciałoby się coś zrobić z Krappem z „Ostatniej taśmy" chociaż zamiana na Kaua byłaby zbyt gruba. Znalazłoby sie jeszcze więcej przykładów...

Obawiam się, że na Kaua – zamiast Krappa – nie pozwoliłby polski wice Beckett, ale pomysł mi się podoba.

Co do Polikarpa, chyba byłoby to za mało „rybne" a przez to za mało absurdalne. Chociaż wtedy zniknłby problem z odmianą.

Marat/Sade był drukowany w *Dialogu* (nr 1/1965), ale w owym czasie tłumaczy z niemieckiego było niewielu i byli bardzo różnej jakości. Niestety, jest tam właśnie Karolina Corday. I tu pojawia się dodatkowy problem: jak nazywać postaci dramatu, które są zarazem postaciami historycznymi, np. Król Karol czy Król Charles (zupełnie hipotetyczny przykład)

I ostatnia rzecz, mam wrażenie, że jednak w teatrze jest tendencja do spolszczania imion i mieszania ich z obcymi.

I tu się z Panem zgadzam, tylko dodam, że w teatrze panuje totalny bałagan i każdy reżyser, a już nie daj Boże „dramaturg" wszystko wie najlepiej, zwłaszcza, jeśli odbył kurs angielskiego dla początkujących. Wie przecież, że Blue to znaczy niebieski, a Sweet znaczy słodki – na przykład. Kłopoty zaś mają ze słuchem językowym i ze znajomością kultury czy realiów. Nie dziwią mnie te kontaminacje – bo wszystkowiedztwo plus ogólne niechlujstwo. Miałam ostatnio takie oto frustrujące doświadczenie. Przetłumaczyłam dawno, dawno temu sztukę, która nosiła tytuł SWEET PHOEBE i opowiadała historię małżeństwa japiszonów, które szuka zagubionego psa imieniem Phoebe, a przy tej okazji traci kontakt emocjonalny i ich związek ulega erozji. Pies w sztuce nie występuje; jest tylko katalizatorem. Zatytułowałam utwór po polsku FEBE, WRÓĆ. I pod takim tytułem ukazał się on drukiem i w teatrze TV. Teraz jednak, młodzi aktorzy, obyci z angielszczyzną, wzięli się do realizacji i nazwali sztukę SŁODKA FIBI. Bo przecież PHOEBE się czyta FIBI (jaka głupia ta tłumaczka!) a Sweet – no, wiadomo. Argumenty, że ludzie, którzy psa nazywają imieniem mitycznym, imieniem szekspirowskim, to nie ci sami, którzy nazywają psa na przykład Fifi, Mimi, Pipi etc. – a do tego sprowadza się nazwanie go Fibi – nie docierały. Podobnie nie docierały argumenty, że „słodki" to wyraz z repertuaru jakiejś cioci-kloci, a nie ostrych japiszonów i że słowo może znaczy to samo w jednym i drugim języku, ale w sensie niedosłownym funkcjonuje inaczej. Skończyło się niezbyt przyjemnie dla obu stron, ale my, tłumacze, wobec tendencji w dzisiejszym teatrze stoimy na przegranej pozycji, niestety.

Szanowna Pani,

dziękuję za przykład z Febe. Znakomity! A jednocześnie pomyślałem, że to też jest problem, jak ze sceny się słyszy imiona i nazwiska obce w obcej wymowie. To jest trochę tak, jakby się miało do czynienia z kolejnymi wersjami Mariusza Maksa Kolonko. Sam się do tego kiedyś przyczyniłem, bo jak zadzwonił do mnie reżyser z pytaniem o prawidłową wymowę imion, to

podałem mu angielską, zamiast powiedzieć normalnie albo odesłać do słownika Bartmińskich. Potem dzwoniłem i to odkręcałem, ale bez większych rezultatów. Zdaje się, że aktorzy przywiązali się do takiej wymowy.

Odnośnie do książek z translatologii (bo tak się to teraz nazywa), które muszę ostatnio czytać, to oczywiście bywa różnie. Po pierwsze samych teorii jest bez liku i czasami sobie przeczą. A poza tym jakość tych prac zależy od doświadczeń autora. Bardzo dobre rzeczy napisali praktycy (Tabakowska, Hejwowski, Jarniewicz), ale teoretycy mają czasami zupełnie pokręcone pomysły, których często gotowi są bronić jak niepodległości.

Raz jeszcze dziękuję za pomoc i przepraszam za mało składny mail, ale mam za sobą dwadzieścia godzin zajęć (weekend i poniedziałek).

Łączę pozdrowienia,
Krzysztof Puławski

Tak właśnie prezentuje się ta wymiana mailowa. Wydaje mi się, że warto ją jeszcze podsumować i napisać o paru zupełnie podstawowych sprawach, które z niej wynikają:

1. Antroponimy w sztukach teatralnych (i szerzej, w literaturze) są ważne i rzadko bywają przypadkowe.

2. Tłumacze zwykle zdają sobie z tego sprawę i nawet jeśli ich nie zmieniają, to nie znaczy, że o nich nie myślą. Wszelkie tłumaczenia i zmiany wynikają więc z naprawdę poważnych przemyśleń (Małgorzata Semil pisała, że przy zamianie imienia brała pod uwagę jego społeczne umocowanie.)

3. Antroponimy stanowią integralną część tekstu i tak właśnie trzeba je traktować. Nie można ich od niego oddzielić, ani uważać za jedynie „doczepione" do całości. Małgorzata Semil podała tu doskonały przykład z psem Febe, który jest Febusem, słońcem swoich właścicieli (a wiec mogą być na jego punkcie zaślepieni i tak dalej). Mój przykład z Krappem-Kauem jest chyba mniej fortunny, bo angielskie „crap" w tym wypadku znaczy „bzdury" czy „głupoty" – czyli od razu stanowi podsumowanie tego, co ma do powiedzenia bohater sztuki. Może więc jakiś Bzdett?

4. Tłumacz powinien mieć istotny wpływ na ostateczne formy antroponimów w sztukach teatralnych. Nikt nie odmawia reżyserowi prawa do adaptacji tekstu, nawet w formach skrajnych (co swoją drogą nie znaczy, że my jako widzowie nie możemy tego rodzaju przeróbek ocenić), ale przy okazji warto, by skonsultował się w tej sprawie z tłumaczem.

Krzysztof Puławski

NOTE ON CONTRIBUTORS

Nora Bonner is a fiction writer and a writing instructor. She also moonlights as a singer/songwriter. She grew up in Detroit and lived in Bangkok, Thailand, where she worked at a research center and sang in a cover band on Khao San Road. In order to pursue a writing career, Nora went back to the States to get her MA in Creative Writing from Miami University of Ohio. She now has an MFA from Florida State University in Tallahassee. E-mail address: norabonner@gmail.com

Jacek Kos is a graduate of the University of Bialystok. His research interests include: semantic relations, intercultural pragmatics, cross-linguistic equivalence of proverbs and idioms. E-mail address: jkos@onet.eu

Elham Shayegh is a Ph.D. student in English Language and Literature at Miami University. She is interested in finding the meeting points of literature and psychology and in presenting the possibility of dialogue via literature. E-mail address: shayege@miamioh.edu

Łukasz Zarzycki holds a PhD in Linguistics from the University of Wroclaw, Poland. He holds Qualified Teacher Status for England. He is also a translator. He specializes in anthropolinguistics, dialectology and sociolinguistics. He published 13 papers and is the author of one monograph. He has been an editorial board member for *Journal for the Study of English Linguistics*, Las Vegas, Nevada, United States, *The Linguistics Journal*, United States, *Journal of ELT and Applied Linguistics* (JELTAL) and *Arab World English Journal* (AWEJ). He is also a member of Arab Society of English Language Studies (ASELS) and TERTIUM Cracow Linguistic Society. E-mail address: lukasz@unizwa.edu.om