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Preface

This book is a descriptive translation study written in the common sense belief that theories should account for observable facts. The theories of translation have, however, failed to do so more often than not, and the issue of translating dialect is a case in point. Almost any theory advanced in that field advocates that translators should simply replace the source language (SL) dialect with a target language (TL) one, while even a cursory examination of ready made translations shows that this solution is hardly ever selected in practice. No wonder, then, that writers on translation distrust theories and ignore them (e.g. Newmark 1981; and numerous followers) if these theories insist on prescribing solutions but do not describe the facts, and predict what translations should be like not knowing what they are like in the first place.

A program intended to remedy this situation was drafted back in Holmes (1970) and recently reiterated by Toury (1995), calling to stop putting the cart before the horse and study what translations really are like before any grander and more general theory can be formulated. This platform argues thus away from any prescription and focuses on investigating the facts without prejudice against any translation. This book will follow that translation studies platform and research the solutions devised by translators to cope with the problem of translating dialect.

The data available for analysis will then be limited to SL texts containing dialect which have already been translated into Polish in whatever way translators found appropriate. The scope of the project requires, however, that only samples be analyzed and the data undergo some preliminary statistical processing before more sophisticated linguistic tools can reasonably be used. The main goal of the project will then be the development of such tools for the analysis of dialect in translation and testing their ability to account for observable facts. Ultimately this book will thus try to bring that building block of translation theory in line with practice.

In order to do so this project work will first examine dialect in functional terms in chapter 1, discuss a textual framework for the study of translation in chapter 2, and proceed to evaluating earlier proposals for the treatment of dialect in translation in the first part of chapter 3. Building on the findings of the first two chapters, the book will then develop a new framework for the study of dialect in translation in the latter part of chapter 3 and test it against a body of
data in chapter 4 to see if the explanatory power of such theoretical proposals is sufficient to account for the observable facts, state the conditions precedent on selecting particular solutions by individual translators, and predict the strategies which are the most likely to be selected in a given case.

In doing so this project will stay away from any prescriptive statements and absolute claims, respecting the fact that whatever the conditions precedent and circumstances, it is a human translator deciding on the course to be followed in the process of translating, and any attempt at restraining his or her creativity will only make the theory lag behind practice again. The best testimony to the resourcefulness of translators is the variety of the solutions to the problem of translating dialect collected in the appendix to this book, and any theoretical investigations will strive to explain that variety and not to constrain it.

1. Dialect

People seem to have been aware of language diversity ever since. The earliest surviving records of such observations are passed down to us in the biblical Book of Judges (XII, 6), and are aptly summarized in the sweeping statement of E. Sapir, who claimed in 1925 that "everyone knows language is variable" (cited after Chambers and Trudgill 1980: 145). Numerous examples of such comments are also handed down in English literary tradition, e.g.: William of Malmsbury's complaints about the harshness of the speech of Yorkshire, which was barely understandable for the Southerners, dating from c. 1125 (Baugh and Cable 1978: 142); or Chaucer's anxiety for the future of his Troilus and Criseyde:

> And for thier is so gret diversite
>   In Englissh, and in writyng of oure tounge.
> So prey I god that non mywsrite the,
> Ne the mys-merre for defaute of tounge.

(Quoted after McCrum et al., 1980: 80)

Beside explicit remarks on language variation (cf. for example Baugh and Cable 1978: 142-143) its existence has also been acknowledged indirectly by writers frequently drawing on dialect awareness for various aesthetic and rhetorical purposes: e.g. Swift's A Dialogue in Hibernian Stile, satirizing the Irish English usages of the early eighteenth century; Lorimer's translation of the New Testament into twelve varieties of Scots with only the devil speaking Standard English (both examples after McCrum et al. 1986: 184), numerous Polish examples provided in Siatkowska (1992), or the texts whose translations this project is intended to research.

1.1. Synchronic perspective

The notion of dialect had not, however, passed beyond the prescientific stage of its development until the emergence of comparative linguistics, when it came specifically to denote a language descended from another one — e.g. English and German are dialects of Germanic (Haugen 1966: 176). Later its meaning was expanded to cover also the geographically restricted variations
on a particular language system, which were judged interrelated closely enough not to be awarded the status of individual languages (Haugen, 1966: 177-179), e.g.: "It is customary to distinguish four principal dialects of Middle English: Northern, East Midland, West Midland and Southern" (Baugh and Cable 1978: 143).

In both meanings dialects were thus viewed as units structurally dependent on higher level systems (i.e. languages), although more often than not the existence of these systems was only hypothesised. If the entire territory presumed to be English speaking was at one time carved up into dialect using areas (O’Donnell and Todd 1992: 34), what actually existed there must have been only local varieties, and the superordinate term has to be treated as a purely theoretical entity resulting much rather from projecting back the present state of affairs than from examining actual data (Haugen 1966: 177-178). Judgements on the status of such local varieties were based, however, solely on structural and language internal evidence, and assumed mutual intelligibility of the varieties or its lack to be the acid test defining dialects and languages respectively (Chambers and Trudgill 1980: 3-4).

The efforts to supplement the structural and primarily written evidence with data drawn on actual usages of the speakers, which gave rise to dialectology as a separate branch of study (Chambers and Trudgill 1980: 18-35), led eventually to the discovery of a wider range of variables conditioning language diversity besides geographical location (e.g. social class, age, style, religion, etc., cf. Weinreich 1974: 89-97 or Trudgill and Chambers 1980: 67-80). This, however, confounded the clear cut neogrammariation division of speech into languages and their dialects (cf. the discussion of this model in Bynon 1977: 165), acknowledging the existence of numerous instances of mutually incomprehensible varieties claimed by their speakers to be dialects of the same language — e.g. Mandarin Chinese and Cantonese (Wardaugh 1986: 26) as well as cases of easily intelligible varieties held by their users to be separate languages: e.g. Serbian and Croatian, border vernaculars of German and Dutch (Wardaugh 1986: 27-28), or the Germanic languages of Scandinavia. “It seems, then, that while the criterion of mutual intelligibility may have some relevance, it is not especially useful in helping us to decide what is and is not a language. In fact, our discussion of the Scandinavian languages and German [preceeding this conclusion — L. B.] suggests that (unless we want to change radically our everyday assumptions about what language is) we have to recognise that, paradoxically enough, a ‘language’ is not a particularly linguistic notion at all. Linguistic features obviously come into it, but it is clear that we consider Norwegian, Swedish, Danish and German to be single languages for reasons that are as much political, geographical, historical, sociological and cultural as linguistic” (Chambers and Trudgill 1980: 3).

Synchoronic perspective

What has emerged from decades of field studies are then large continua of dialects shading off into one another (cf. the map in Trudgill and Chambers 1980: 7) and only rarely separated by sharp divisions, with a patchwork of higher level linguistic units (i.e. standard languages) superimposed on groups of vernaculars on criteria often going beyond the similarity of structure.

Gradual accumulation of data resulted also in the development of a functional approach to the study of dialect (Haugen 1966: 178), foregrounding the exploration of the uses the vernaculars are put to by their speakers, and correlating them with a range of sociological and psychological variables (Chambers and Trudgill 1980: 34-64).

The introduction of extrastructural factors made it thus possible for dialectology to go beyond purely historical investigations which traditionally view dialects as geographically defined subvarieties of a language, which were either exempt from some changes operational in that system, failed to complete them, or initiated alternative developments. The functional approach addresses then not only the question of how dialects differ and where these divergencies come from, but also the questions of when and why these varieties are used (O’Donnell and Todd 1992: 26), which makes it a much better point of departure for a project intending to explore the treatment of dialect usages in the process of translation than a body of knowledge focusing mainly on the description of particular local varieties and tracing their history (e.g. Urbaničzyk 1984, Dejna 1974 or Wakelyn 1977).

Assuming dialect to be a user dependent language variety (Halliday et al. 1964: 11), the functional approach, which will be followed throughout this work, excludes thus any forms of linguistic diversity whose occurrence may be conditioned by the situation of utterance or the relations between the interlocutors. A person whose speech contains some traits of Southern American English may therefore use household, technical or theological vocabulary in a conversation with a speaker using General American, and vary the level of formality depending on the setting and mutual relations between the interlocutors, but only those features which will recur irrespective of the topic, tenor, situation of utterance etc. will be termed dialectal, since only they depend entirely on the user of a specific variety and contribute to his or her personal characteristic. Any other, use dependent, variation will be duly consigned to the categories of style and register (Halliday et al. 1964: 19-20), and consequently left out of the investigation.

1 Whether these notions denote separate bodies of linguistic facts or can be conflated is highly debatable, cf. O’Donnell and Todd (1992), but irrelevant to the discussion of the translation of dialect which is clearly set apart from any of them.
Dialect comprises a wide spectrum of language diversity ranging from idiolects, i.e. speech habits of particular individuals (Halliday et al. 1964: 25-28) to varieties shared by large groups of people and characteristic of a given sex, social class, region or historical epoch (Catford 1965: 85). For the purpose of this project, however, that definition will be further narrowed down, excluding the extreme cases of idiolect and diachronic comparison of dialects, which would require the development of separate methodological approaches for their exploration. It does not mean, however, that only contemporary dialect usages will be considered; the corpus this work is based on includes numerous instances of dialects dating from earlier periods of English (cf. the appendix), in each case however, they will be seen as differing from the then standard, be it local, as in Chaucer, or nationwide, as in later works, and not the one recognized nowadays.

The principal finding of an approach based on these premises is the fact that dialects vary widely not only according to their geographical range, and the age or religion of the speakers, but also in the fields of discourse where they can be used, which will be referred to below as their functions. The varieties delimited along the dimensions quoted above overlap, as the boundaries of socially defined dialects intersect those of geographically established varieties, which in turn, are not coextensive with dialects defined along the dimension of age, etc., and so do the functions these varieties are expected to fulfill, creating an intricate network of interdialectal relations most of which have been found to be heteronomous (Chambers and Trudgill 1980: 10-13). Particular varieties are, therefore, perceived by their speakers not as fully autonomous, all functional systems capable of meeting all the potential linguistic needs of their users, but as units perfectly suitable for performing only some of these functions (which supply thus the rationale for the existence of specific varieties) (Fasold 1992: 1), and depending on a higher level system for other functions (Wardaugh 1986: 37).

A speaker of Cockney may therefore rely on this variety in informal conversation, market bargaining, or public speeches asserting his or her identity, but he or she will look up to Standard English in written language, medicine or law, which can be studied, and consequently, practiced only in the superordinate system, as Cockney has not evolved appropriate fields of discourse (Honey 1989: 70).

The potential of such unequal varieties, their historical developments apart, is assumed, however, to be identical, since the subordinate status of any one of them does not have any inherent linguistic basis (Edwards 1985: 21). Within the functional approach to the study of language diversity, all the linguistic units one can discern in a given speech continuum are, therefore, referred to as dialects or varieties irrespective of their social prestige, number of speakers or the extent of divergence from one another (Chambers and Trudgill 1980: 5).

The heteronomy of actual relations between particular dialects presupposes, however, a hierarchic system of dependencies between varieties (Edwards 1985: 21), with a dominating one all the others ultimately rely on for one function or another. The dialect elevated to such a dominant position is, consequently, termed the standard language, and all the dialects felt by their speakers to be dependent on it, its nonstandard varieties (although there may be more than one standard, e.g. diglossic situations).

The terms dialect and variety may thus be understood as either including the standard (cf. above), or as synonyms of its nonstandard varieties, and both of these usages can be found in literature (e.g. Edwards 1985: 21). For the sake of clarity, this project will assume the latter.

Theoretically, it should be possible to investigate not only the internal relations between the standard and its dialects, but also between the nonstandard varieties themselves. For the purpose of this project, however, it seems sufficient to limit the discussion to a two step model of the standard language and the varieties that depend on it, i.e. its dialects. It may be worthwhile to remark, however, that the frequently used term ‘accent,’ apart from its favourable extralinguistic associations (Honey 1989) refers to varieties depending on the standard only for written language and few highly formalized spoken function (e.g. Queen’s speeches and addresses), which means that in the framework presented above it will rank immediately next to the standard itself.

### 1.2. Diachronic perspective

In historical perspective, however, it is possible to trace the development of the network of dependencies subordinating dialects to a standard we can witness nowadays back to its nascent state, when, any previous standardizing efforts apart (Fisiak 1993: 57-58), the heteronomous relations between varieties had not yet developed, and particular varieties identifiable in that period may be deemed to have been autonomous systems. In England this type of linguistic situation is well documented for the later Middle Ages, when all the formal fields of discourse (e.g. those which required that language develop explicit norms minimizing the possibility of variation in form, e.g. spelling conventions, terminology, etc.) were dominated by French (government, law, literature) and Latin (scholarship, religion) (Milroy 1986: 26-32), while the native language was relegated to the status of vulgar speech (Bolton 1972: 34). E.g. a late fourteenth century comment by Robert of Gloucester:

> For unless a man knows French, men think little of him
> But lov men keep to English, and to their own speech still.

(quoted after Bolton 1984: 34; Chronicle: 7542-7544)
The entire country was carved up into areas speaking individual varieties (Baugh and Cable 1978: 143), called vernaculars in such a prestandard state (Haugen 1966: 179), and once the foreign languages started yielding to the speech of the English in some of the functions mentioned above, each of these varieties began to develop its own norms, commencing the process of standardization (thought to have set in for good by c. 1430 — Wakelyn 1977: 25).

The first major field of formal discourse not to preclude the use of English was literature (Bolton, 1966: 35) and the multiplicity of the fledgling local standards could therefore be best appreciated in early Middle English belles-lettres (Wakelyn 1977: 24).

The works differ widely not only in their grammar and vocabulary, as might be expected from rival dialects, but also in the spelling conventions and the inventories of graphemes they adopt (Milroy and Milroy 1986: 30), testifying to the diversity of the emerging norms. The extent of their independence from one another, may, in turn, be illustrated by the fact that Chaucer’s depiction of the Northern speech in his Reeve’s Tale (cf. the appendix, no. 1) was lost by North Midland scribes copying the work, who levelled the language spoken by the north country students with the one the book was narrated in (Leith 1983: 41). The speech that failed to meet the East Midland standard observed by Chaucer, and consequently presented as dialectal, was clearly not found to be so by scribes following the norms adopted in North Midlands, for whom it seems not to have diverged from their local standard.

The challenge such a variety of dialects and competing standards must have posed for the efforts leading to the introduction of English into the fields of discourse gradually vacated by Latin and French (Fisiak 1993: 145-149), may be best appreciated, however, in the misgivings voiced by Caxton:

In so moche that in my dayes happeneth that cerayn merchauts were in a shippe in tympe, for to have sayled over the sey into zelande, and for lacks of wynne, thei taryed atte pont, and wente to lande for to refreshe them. And one of theyn namen sheffeld, a mercer, cam in to a hows and axed for meye; and specially he axed after eggys. And the good wyn was erweerd, that she come speele no fresse, but wolde have haddle eggys and she understode hym not. And thewne at laste a mother sayde that he hadde wyven. Then the good wyn sayde that she understod hym wel. Loo, what sholde a man in thyse dayes now wyte, eggys or eyren?

(quoted from Caxton’s preface to his paraphrase of Virgil’s Aeneid, after McCorm et al. 1986: 85)

The problems perplexing the first English printer in late fifteenth century were, however, already being taken care of as standardization had already set in by 1430s while this classic text was written c. 1490 (Cable and Baugh 1978: 149). Once more formal fields of discourse were open for the local varieties to expand in, the vernaculars naturally followed the fortunes of their speakers, and developed the functions they needed in order to discharge their duties in their native language (Edwards 1985: 21). The dialect that stood the most to gain was, therefore, the variety spoken by the people who actually held appropriate offices in law and administration, since these two domains of discourse were the next ones to yield to English, and due to the location of the court, as the centre of power and patronage, and of the universities where these clerks and courtiers were educated, both of the functions were quickly monopolized by East Midland (Leith 1983: 39-45).

By the early sixteenth century it is found in wills and charters from various parts of the country, irrespective of the locally spoken dialect (hence it is termed the Chancery Standard) (O’Donnell and Todd 1992: 34), and gradually became the basis of the norm adopted by printers, not only ousting French from the practice of law and government, but also rapidly outpacing other varieties in the standardizing efforts of their speakers. It was therefore East Midland that came to connote high rank, prestige and sophistication, while the development of local norms was halted, and the varieties that once were its equals grew dependent on the emerging standard. (In French linguistic tradition the varieties that did evolve some explicit norms are differentiated from those that did not, and are referred to as dialects and patois, respectively (Haugen 1966: 173). This distinction will, however, have no bearing on this analysis, as both varieties ultimately depend on the standard.)

Within the four stage model of the process of standardization put forward by Haugen (1966), the East Midland variety had thus been selected (1) to that end for the reasons outlined above, and gradually accepted (2) over the span of several generations, so that by the time of Shakespeare the dialect speaking protagonists of his plays were generally assumed to use markedly nonstandard varieties (Leith 1983: 42).

The emergence of a uniform standard made it also the only candidate for further elaboration of function (3), and eventual codification (4), which is theorized to close the process of standardizing a language.

The former (3) was helped along by the Reformation, which spurred English to expand into the sphere of religion (cf. numerous Bible translations and worship in English), and reached its completion in the early eighteenth century (Bolton 1972: 46-48), with the final ousting of Latin from scholarship, and the former (4) was accomplished throughout that century, culminating in Dr. Johnson’s Dictionary of 1755, Bishop Lowth’s grammar of 1762 or L. Murray’s grammar of 1795 (Fisiak 1993: 124-135) as well as in numerous proposals to improve and ultimately fix the language, e.g.: Swift’s Proposal for Correcting, Improving and Ascertaining the English Tongue (1712):

My Lord, I do here, in the name of all the learned and Polite Persons of the Nation, complain to Your Lordship as First Minister, that our Language is extremely imperfect; that its daily improvements are by no means in proportion to its daily
Lamenting over the corruption of one's language or the abuse of its grammar presupposes, however, the existence of an already accepted norm, which some speakers regrettfully failed to live up to. This passionate call for divine action may thus be taken to foreshadow the ensuing era of standard maintenance (Milroy 1986: 27), dominated by strict efforts to enforce the norm that had evolved and stem language change. The extent to which such scrupulous prescription can be effectively achieved depends, however, on the field of discourse. Highly formalized, written domains of language use, such as spelling, law or religion easily undergo very rigid normalization, changing at a barely perceptible rate and preserving linguistic forms generally held to be obsolete (Crystal and Davy 1967). These are, however, the fields of discourse the process of standardization was aimed at. Primarily spoken functions, whose proper fulfillment is much less contingent on the preservation on the same linguistic form, and does not require any schooling, e.g.: conversation, expression of emotions, etc., are for more difficult to constrain (Trudgill and Chambers 1980: 82-100), and, to the bewilderment of language purists (Weinreich 1974: 99-102), enhance continuous change and diversification, which eventually bear on other domains of usage (Chambers and Trudgill 1980: 145-204).

The process of standardization is therefore inherently relative (Milroy 1986: 24). Any efforts to develop a variety which would be substantially immutable in form and fully flexible in function are doomed to yield to language change and diversification wherever the stability of form is not explicitly enforced through education, efficiency of communication (Wells 1982: 97-99), or appropriate deliberative bodies (e.g. the academies established in several Romance language countries, cf. Edwards 1985: 27-30), leaving thus space for nonstandard speech to thrive in. The best testimony to the overwhelming power of language entropy is the fact that the only completely standardized languages are the dead and artificial ones (Milroy 1986). In the case of English, for instance, attempts at prescribing pronunciation were seen as futile even at the outset: it was, after all, in the heyday of standardization that Dr. Johnson testified in the preface to his Dictionary:

Sounds are so volatile and unstable for legal restraints; to enchain syllables, and to lath the wind, are equally the undertakings of pride, unwilling to measure its desires by its strength.

(quoted after Bolton 1984: 49)

Historically, dialects may thus be defined as language varieties which for various reasons failed to expand into the formal fields of discourse, and, consequently, receive the social imprimatur accorded to the standard. Whether their speakers initiated such developments, but were thwarted in their efforts (as was the case with some Middle English dialects mentioned above), or never ventured beyond the stage of a spoken vernacular, all of them are now varieties less versatile than the standard to which they came to be subordinated, and, consequently, are regarded inferior to it in social prestige (cf. the discussion of Cockney in Honey (1989: 70)).

The lack of overt esteem, and the fact that some dialects may place their speakers at a disadvantage, hindering their prospects (Honey 1989: 58-59), are offset, however, by the covert prestige the nonstandard varieties enjoy (Trudgill and Chambers 1980: 98-100). Defying explicit norms, they provide means for asserting one's identity against the background of a uniform standard (Edwards 1985: 4-9), and claiming membership in informal social groups, be they based on status, religion or social background (Trudgill and Chambers 1980: 57-79), as well as for expressing solidarity and intimacy the standard may be felt too impersonal to convey (Honey 1988: 67). In spite of their open stigmatization (Trudgill and Chambers 1980: 86) and waning of traditional rural vernaculars (Wells 1985: 55), dialects are thus endorsed by numerous speakers (cf. Trudgill's estimate putting the number of standard only speakers at 3% of British population, after Honey 1989: 53), and may be considered fairly robust language varieties mirroring the diversity of society.
2. A framework for the study of translation

In order to pursue the treatment dialect undergoes in translation it is not enough to define the former, but it is equally important to develop a framework for the study of the latter. Since translation intrinsically involves language (Catford 1965: 1), any attempt at formulating such a theoretical basis will, however, hinge critically on the perspective adopted on language and its scope.

Depending on the point of departure, translation may then be seen broadly as an object of philosophical investigations (e.g. Quine 1960, and the discussion it sparked available in Stanoz 1993)), and an aspect of semiotics (e.g. Jakobson 1959); or more narrowly as a literary and linguistic fact, studied for its aesthetics (e.g. Benjamin 1925, Levy 1963, Gentzler 1993) or mechanics (e.g. Nida 1964, Catford 1965, Hatin and Mason 1992, etc., or the review of various positions in Kielar (1988)).

The number of possible approaches seems then to be limitless (e.g. deconstructionist (Stawek 1991), historical (Kossowska 1968), theological (cf. the missionary zeal behind the efforts of Nida (Gentzler 1993), etc., just to name a few more) but the variety of insights they provide shows them much rather to be complementary than mutually exclusive. And that, in turn, makes the selection of an appropriate perspective for more contingent on the theoretical persuasion of a particular scholar than on any other reason. This project will then assume a linguistic approach, and explore translation with the aid of the theoretical concepts developed within that field of study.

Since the more specific perspectives on language and translation are bound to rely ultimately on the broader ones, this framework will be grounded on the philosophical investigations of Steiner (1975), the semiotic work of Jakobson (1959), and the methodology adopted by the scholars subscribing to the Translation Studies approach (cf. Bassnett 1980).

2.1. Philosophical foundations

It is only natural to view translation as a phenomenon restricted to communication across barriers separating distinct languages (cf. the anthology by Lefevere 1993; almost any author quoted assumes an interlingual approach to translation); Jakobson (1959), however, transcends this traditional approach, and sees translation in a wider context. Putting natural language on a par with other semiotic systems — e.g. musical notation, the Morse code, symbolic logic, chemical formulae, etc. — he claims that the meaning of any particular sign can be established only through the process of translating it into another. "The meaning of any linguistic sign is its translation into some further, alternative sign" (Jakobson 1959: 232).

The process generally considered to be a marginal linguistic and literary phenomenon (Bassnett 1980: 37-38) is thus elevated to the status of the most fundamental principle underlying all comprehension irrespective of the communication system involved. And as many of these systems tolerate internal variation — e.g. the multiplicity of logical calculi or computer languages, let alone the diversification of speech — translation can be pursued both between particular sign systems, between their varieties, that is languages, and within these subvarieties themselves, if they permit further mutability.

Within this metalinguistic approach the process of translation may then be performed on three distinct levels (Jakobson 1959: 233):

1. Intralingual, between the subvarieties of a language, which in the case of this book will denote particular dialects.
2. Interlingual, between specific languages, which in this project will be assumed to be standard languages (translation proper).
3. Intersemiotic (transmutation), between individual semiotic systems, which due to the linguistic perspective of this book will be left out of the ensuing investigation.

This seminal approach was further elaborated by Steiner (1975); striving to fathom the essence of translation, he extended Jakobson’s reasoning on temporal dialects, idiolects, and particular utterances. The process of translating was thus found to take place in reading literature from earlier periods of a language — e.g. the glosses appended to modern editions of Shakespeare, Chaucer or Kochanowski — as well as in everyday communication, where it seems to be enshrined in numerous phatic expressions, e.g.: ‘What do you mean,’ ‘could you explain,’ ‘what I wanted to say was...’ etc. (Steiner 1975: 1-18). Whether one is turning a passage from English into Polish, reading a text written in obsolete language or trying to understand a contemporary speaker, one is inevitably involved in interpreting somebody else’s intentions, that is translating them into one’s own system of values, beliefs, world knowledge or command of language, e.g.: the perennial problem of ‘what the author wanted to say,’ diverse comments on the same statement and ubiquitous misunderstandings: “Thus a human being performs and act of translation, in the full sense of the word, when receiving a speech message from any other human being. Time, distance, disparities in outlook or assumed reference, make the act more or less difficult. Where the difficulty is great enough, the process passes
from reflex to conscious techniques" (Steiner 1975: 47). Translation in the commonly assumed sense of the word, i.e. between two distinct languages (translation proper), is then only a special case of a phenomenon pervading all communication. It is more conspicuous, since the level of its difficulty may far surpass the threshold of conscious effort, but essentially it is representative of the same process as transmission and intralingual translation.

The imperfection inherent in any attempt at translation, bemoaned by its many practitioners and students (Bassnett 1980: 43-73), is thus not a flaw attributable to a particular method or translator, but an instance of entropy latent in any recourse to semiotic systems in general. The time lag between the formulation of a text and its processing (i.e. language change), idiosyncratic differences in language use, as well as disparities in social background (i.e. social dialects), attitude (i.e. style), etc. hinder communication on any level, and can only be hedged against and evaded — e.g. the redundancy in natural language estimated by Comrie (1981:29) to amount to 50% of the information encoded by speakers — but not avoided.

Crossing the barrier between standard languages only makes these difficulties more apparent. "On the interlingual level translation will pose concentrated, visibly intractable problems, but these same problems abound at a more covert or conventionally neglected level, intralingually. The model 'sender to receiver,' which represents any semiological and semantic process, is ontologically equivalent to the model 'source language to receptor language' used in the theory of translation. [...] In short: inside or between languages, human communication equals translation" (Steiner 1975: 47).

Assuming these insights to be the metalinguistic foundation of any further investigations, this framework, as has already been stated above, will now focus on the linguistic aspects of translation.

### 2.2. Overview of earlier approaches

The milestone separating philological comments on the nature of translation (an exhaustive collection is available in Lefevere (1993)) from its purely linguistic investigation is generally accepted to be the early work on machine translation in 1940s (Bassnett 1980: 40). Although translation has never moved to the forefront of linguistic inquiry (Hatim and Mason 1990: 31), ever since that date it has, however, been debated within that field of study and in terms of the currently advanced theories.

The first approach to be utilized to that end was the European strain of structuralism, which held sway in the study of language at the time linguists turned to translation (Bassnett 1980: 40). The rigorously descriptive methodology of this approach, however, presumed that translation fails only in areas of formal incongruities between the language systems involved (Wojtasiewicz 1957: 27), differing thus significantly from the position adopted in this project. All such exploration of structural discrepancies could lead to was, then, only meticulous taxonomies of potential difficulties, akin, ultimately, to the findings of contrastive linguistics — e.g. Wojtasiewicz (1957) or Darbelnet and Vinay (1959).

A far more dynamic perspective an translation followed from analyzing it within the framework of generative grammar — e.g. Nida (1964). The methodology of this approach shifted the focus of investigation away from the comparison of the language systems involved, and directed it into exploring deeper layers of structure and meaning to be expressed in the target language, while the feasibility of translation was taken for granted due to the existence of language universals: "The translatability of a text is thus guaranteed by the existence of universal categories in syntax, semantics, and the (natural) logic of experience" (Wills 1982: 49). The main thrust of theoretical effort was thus devoted to the development of means for uncovering the deep structure meanings of the original (cf. Nida 1964, Nida and Taber 1969, or Nida 1975), which could then be fed into the generative machinery of any target language grammar (Nida 1964: 68).

Whether this theory was invoked explicitly — e.g. Nida and Taber (1969) — or only presupposed, e.g. Wills (1982), in spite of a per se generative dictum, very little was accomplished of the process of translating itself. The transfer was understood to occur naturally at the level of deep structure universality common to all language; since their existence in that form is, however, questionable (Comrie 1981: 1-26), the claims of the theory seem to do no better.

The development of generative theories of translation was paralleled by the rise of studies drawing on the contextual approach to language, e.g. Catford (1965). In this perspective linguistic inquiry was extended on the context in which the studied system operates and translation came to be discussed in functional terms: "We can distinguish, then, between situational features which are linguistically relevant and those which are functionally relevant in that they are relevant to the communicative function of the text in that situation. For translation equivalence to occur, then, both SL and TL text must be relatable to the functionally relevant features of the situation. A decision, in any particular case, as to what is functionally relevant in that sense must in our present state of knowledge remain, to some extent, a matter of opinion" (Catford 1965: 94).

The essence of translation was then presumed to reside in the preservation of the configuration of the functionally relevant features of the original text, and research naturally centered on identifying their sets and codifying them.
into text types which could then be recreated in the target language (Szymoniuk 1991).

Initiating this approach, Catford (1965) pronounced the sets of functionally relevant features to be fuzzy and indeterminate, but later developments sought to standardize them on various grounds and under different terms. E.g., the dominating language function of Reiss (1971), the author’s Skopos of Reiss and Vermeer (1984), textual prototypes of Neuert (1985), or the dominant contextual focus of Hatim and Mason (1990). These are only a few examples of the solutions put forward so far, but ultimately all these classifications run the risk of falling prey to the ‘empirical fallacy’ (Gentzler, 1993: 65), as instances of pure types are hard to find, and most texts straddle several categories undermining the claims of the theory.

In line with the two approaches discussed above, this perspective also thus gives prominence to the analysis of the source language texts, and takes the process of translating for granted, e.g., “Translation is an operation performed on languages: a process of substituting a text in one language for a text in another” (Catford 1965:1).

Whether a theory concentrates on specifying which modules of a language system are formally untranslatable, or focuses on the analysis of meanings and functions to be transferred into the target language, all these approaches are intrinsically source oriented, exploring translation through the study of the original. This point of departure, however, entails directing further research toward measuring the results of translation against the wealth of meanings uncovered in the source language texts, and away from the process of translating, which is merely assumed to be a simple reproductive activity (cf. above).

In the long run these perspectives are thus biased by value judgments skewing their conclusions, as attempts to determine which layers of meaning or functions are vital for translation to be successful necessarily implies approving of these methods of translating which preserve them and disapproving of those that do not (Gentzler 1992: 76), while more fundamental research (cf. above) clearly shows that any method is inherently imperfect in the first place.

23. **Target oriented approach**

Assuming, after Widdowson (1979), that the key problem in the theory and practice of translation is the process of translating itself, this project will then adopt, in contrast to the frameworks outlined above, a target oriented approach (cf. the discussion in Hatim and Mason 1990: 16-19). Taking for granted the meanings latent in the original, this framework will focus on the ways in which they have been rendered in the target language text and then use these findings as an input for investigations probing into the nature of the process of translating. Translations themselves will thus be viewed not as reproductions of source language texts to be judged for their faithfulness, accuracy, etc., but as final products of a long process whose steps, or at least some of them, can be retraced through careful analysis (Hatim and Mason 1990: 4).

Such reversal of the traditional approach will also respect the natural diversity in translation, and leave prescription beyond the scope of research: “Put five translators onto rendering even a syntactically straightforward, metrically unbound, imaginatively simple poem like Carl Sandberg’s ‘Fog’ into, say, Dutch. The chances that any two of the five translations will be identical are very slight indeed. Then set twenty five other translators into turning the five Dutch versions back into English, five translators to a version. Again, the result will almost certainly be as many renderings as there are translators. To call his equivalence is perverse” (Holms, 1973-74: 68). All translations will thus be treated equally, without any preconceived preferences, and studied for the gains and losses following from the choice of a particular course through the process of translating (i.e. after Holms (1969)).

Treating a complete translation as a premise for inferring earlier stages of its development presupposes, however, viewing the process of translating as a chain of decisions, in line with the model put forward in Levy (1967: passim). This hypothesis seeks to approximate translating as a recursive process of making decisions which are mutually exclusive and predetermine further choices (i.e. a Markov chain); each selection of a particular option is therefore presumed not only to present the translator with a new set of possibilities to choose from (recursiveness), but also to constrain the range of choices made available (predetermination), quite much like a computer window giving access to other windows inside but preventing the use of options made inactive by the previous choices. If a translator decides then to put the *Iliad* into English prose it immediately opens to him a range of prose styles to choose from, but at the same time prevents him or her from selecting any poetic meter. And once a particular prose style has been chosen (say colloquial), it immediately presents the translator with an array of options to handle the figures of speech but only in the selected style, as the other ones have been ruled out on the previous step, and that procedure is thought to recur until the last and most minute problem has been solved.

The initial decisions, made at the outset of translating, clearly bear then on all subsequent work, charting a general course through the process of translation and precluding other courses which technically could have been taken advantage

---

2 Investigating the process, this project does not venture into the domain of psycholinguistics; it is assumed nevertheless that translation proceeds generally along the lines outlined in the textual model in Bell (1991).
of. The primary choices may therefore be theorized to plot an overall policy of overcoming any translation difficulties encountered later on. These general directions predetermined by the options selected in the beginning of the process of translating will then be referred to below as translation strategies as defined in de Beaugrand and Dressler (1980: 57), and researching their properties will be the main goal of this analysis.

Owing to the entropy of communication manifest in interlingual translation primarily as palpable differences between the language systems involved (Steiner 1975: 49), it is not feasible to clone the original in another TL and the translator is bound to focus on some aspects of the source text while blurring others. The question of which layers of the source language text are the most worthwhile to concentrate on has been debated ever since translation was first reflected upon (Bassnett 1980: 39-73), and is at the core of any prescriptive approaches.

For centuries there were two broad perspectives that were championed against each other: adherence to the sense of the text, e.g. the precept laid down by the classics of Roman literature and echoed in St. Jerome’s famous: “non verbum de verbo, sed sensum exprimere de sensu” (quoted after Bassnett 1980: 44); and adherence to the formal properties of the original, e.g. a late twentieth century comment by Nabokov: “Literal rendering, as closely as the associative and syntactical capacities of another language allow, the exact contextual meaning of the original. Only this is true translation... It is when the translator sets out to render the ‘spirit,’ and not the mere sense of the text, that he begins to traduce his author” (Nabokov 1964: VIII-IX; quoted after Hatim and Mason 1990: 14-15). Equivalence was thus presumed to exist either between the form of the original and its translation, or between their meanings (which was conceptualized as literal and free translation, respectively).

The development of linguistics broadened this range of options, opening the pursuit of that relationship on other levels: the response of the readership (Nida 1964), functional (Catford 1965), functional sentence perspective (FSP) (Enquist 1976), semantic and communicative (Newmark 1981) etc. None of these clashing priorities is, however, applicable to all translation. There are both instances of texts requiring diverse focuses — e.g. the translation of legal documents and interpreting informal speeches, to name two extremes — as well as examples of translators choosing different approaches to the same text (Barnačzk 1990: 148-172). The contradictory nature of these criteria has nowhere been set out as clearly as in the list compiled by Savory (1957):

1. A translation must give the words of the original.
2. A translation must give the ideas of the original.
3. A translation should read like an original work.
4. A translation should read like a translation.
5. A translation should reflect the style of the original.

6. A translation should possess the style of the translator.
7. A translation should read as a contemporary of the original.
8. A translation should read as a contemporary of the translator.
9. A translation may add to or omit from the original.
10. A translation may never add to or omit from the original.
11. A translation of verse should be in prose.
12. A translation of verse should be in verse.

(Savory (1957: 80); quoted after Neubert (1985: 159))

These conflicting priorities can, however, be easily accomodated within the model of the process of translating advanced above. Undertaking to turn a text from one language into another, the translator is supposed to weigh the options available and make the initial decisions which determine the policy of solving translation difficulties to be encountered later on. The choice of one of the approaches listed above as vying to regulate all translation may thus be equalled to selecting a particular translation strategy, since both concepts provide the translator with guidelines to follow throughout the text. The model put forward above was, however, based on the assumption that there are more initial options to choose from than only one, and none of the focuses championed by the prescriptive theories may be proven to be the best and only one irrespective of the circumstances. Each of them embodies a different hierarchy of priorities (Enquist 1976: 172), but potentially they all remain on a par. E.g. the confessions of a Polish biblical translator: “considering the ways open for a translator [of Psalms — L. B.]. I concluded that one of these avenues, that of paraphrase, was closed to me, as none can emulate Kochanowski’s timeless masterpiece. Neither did I intend to follow the exegetical translators who incline to dry, linguistic and almost literal translation. I resolved thus to produce a translation imbued with the spirit of the Hebrew speech; short on abstract notions, but long on images, similes and metaphors” (Brandstaetter 1975: 15; my own translation).

This translator awards thus the top priority to preserving the imagery of the original and downgrades both exegetical detail as well as literal accuracy, acknowledging that other translators have thought otherwise. This hierarchy of values defines then the overall strategy selected for his undertaking, and determines the way problems will be solved throughout the text.

The decision as to what hierarchy of values to establish appears, however, to hinge on who translates what for whom why where and when, that is, on factors external to the process of translating itself. The selection may be partially conditioned by objective elements of the context of translation, e.g. the texture of the passage (what), the target readership (for whom), the purpose of the endeavour (why) or the location of the translator in space and time (where and when). The ultimate choice remains, however, at the discretion of the translator (Holms 1974: 78), who acts as a vicarious interpreter of the original, appraises
the conditioning factors, and decides on the degree of latitude appropriate to the situation (cf. the discussion in Levy (1967)).

These subjective factors may thus be held to be responsible for the intrinsic diversity in translation unconstrained by numerous attempts at prescription (Holms 1974: 68). Instead of seeking to restrain this variety by theorizing how translation should be performed, this framework will accept the heterogeneous state of affairs as raw data, trace how these diverse versions are arrived at, and analyze their strengths and weaknesses.

2.4. Text oriented approach

In order to compare the results of resorting to different translation strategies one needs, however, a point of reference against which their properties could be measured. Translation clearly concerns texts so any benchmarks derivable from sentence based grammars will, consequently, be assumed inadequate (Bell 1991: 161), and this framework will draw on wider perspectives. Following Neubert (1985: passim) it will view the drawbacks and advantages arising from the implementation of particular strategies against the background of a set of textual standards posited by Beaugrande and Dressler (1980: 20-31).

These constitutive principles have been argued to hold for all texts (de Beauprande and Dressler 1980: 19), providing a convenient yardstick for every type of translation. It is, however, no less important that none of these standards has been quantified in any way. The theory specifies neither the values to which the standards are expected to adhere, nor the extent to which they should be observed, and claims only that their concurrent manifestation is necessary for a body of language performance to constitute a text (Beauprande and Dressler 1980: 19-20).

When this concept is extended to translation (that is to source and target texts) it is enough to assume, due to the direction of the process of translating, that the textual defaults are complied with in the input (the source text). The output (the target text), referring to the same textworld as the input did, can be discussed in the terms of the textual standards whether it preserves them or not. This approach does not make then any assumptions about the nature of the target text, focuses on the study of the process of translating, and matches the Translation Studies guidelines outlined above, steering clear of prescription and respecting the diversity of translation.

This framework will thus study the properties of particular translation strategies by measuring their performance along some or all of the seven textual dimensions developed by de Beauprande and Dressler (1980):

Coherence: continuity of senses in the configuration of concepts and relations underlying the textworld.

Intentionality: the goals of the author (along with informativity the prime interest of functional views of translation).

Acceptability: the tolerance expected of a reader/hearer (besides informativity the main concern of generative perspectives on translation).

Informativity: the information load of a text measured against the readers' / hearers' expectations.

Situationality: the relationship of a text to the context in which it is produced.

Intertextuality\(^3\); the extent to which the processing of a text depends on prior knowledge of other discourse.

These standards have not been conceived as mutually exclusive and static concepts, but as dynamic and telescoping constitutive principles, varying widely from text to text (Bell 1990: 220). Each of the strategies may thus score differently, focusing on some interrelated standards while being indifferent to others. Ultimately, however, they will be compared for their contribution to the textuality of the translation.

\(^3\) In the sense defined in the quoted work - de Beauprande and Dressler (1980: 239-270) and not in the meaning current in literary studies following Kristeva (1969). For a discussion see Haim and Mason (1990: 120-130).
3. Dialect in translation — theory

3.1. Evaluation of earlier proposals

Following the pattern of translation in general, the problem of dealing with dialectal usages found in source language texts had not come under systematic research, save for insightful but episodic comments (e.g. Schleiermacher quoted in Lefevere (1993: 141-142)), until the heyday of structural linguistics.

Since in that perspective the study of translation was based on the assumption that structural mismatch between the SL and a TL entails untranslatability, most of dialect was duly subsumed under that rubric (Wojtasiwicz 1957: 90), as the linguistic exponents of particular TL and SL varieties clearly do not match. E.g.: the unpalatalized /l/, /g/ characteristic of the speech identifiable with the capital of Poland vs the dropped h’s and shifted diphthongs typically associated with London’s Cockney (Wojtasiwicz 1957: 90). Limited translatability was claimed to occur only within the domain of lexis, where some nonstandard SL items might have precise counterparts in equivalent TL varieties (Wojtasiwicz 1957: 89).

These are not particularly revealing conclusions, but the strengths of Wojtasiwicz’s analysis lie, however, elsewhere. The greatest asset of this approach appears to be the recognition of the fact that untranslatability may stem not only from discrepancies between the linguistic systems involved, but also from differences in the associations activated in SL and TL readers by specific lexical items (Wojtasiwicz 1957: 65). Dialect was therefore claimed to owe its untranslatability primarily to the fact that it alludes to those subvarieties of the SL which are rich in language specific connotations clearly inaccessible to the readership of the TL version.

Any attempt at simple replacement of an SL nonstandard variety with its TL equivalent, e.g.: the speech of Scottish Highlanders with the variety spoken in the mountainous South of Poland, is thus seen as doomed to fail, since the dialectal usages are bound to be associated with Scotland by the SL readers, and with the Podhale region by the TL readership respectively (Wojtasiwicz 1957: 91). Such a mechanical procedure was therefore dismissed on the grounds of distorting an area of meaning which later came to be conceptualized as intertextuality.

Although this approach abstained from exploring the process of translating and focused solely on compiling a taxonomy of instances of untranslatability, it may be said to have foreshadowed the discussion of dialect in terms of intertextuality and hinted, if indirectly, at its contribution to the textuality of a passage (cf. Krzeszowski’s remarks on the relevance of that approach on the sleeve of the new printing). Due to the assumptions underlying the structural paradigm, these seminal concepts were used only to emphasize the theoretical impossibility of fully rendering the SL dialect in any TL, and not to explore how it is actually accomplished in practice, imperfect as the renditions might be. Believing all translation to be inherently imperfect, this project will, however, concentrate wholly on the latter.

Within generative approaches to translation, relying on the assumption that interlingual communication occurs via language universals, the problem of dealing with SL text dialect (referred to as internal dialect differentiation (Nida 1964: 165)) commanded, understandably, much less attention. Since universals were assumed to be shared by all languages, any of their aspects were, by definition, pronounced translatable, which in the case of nonstandard varieties appears to have meant replacing SL dialects with their TL equivalents (Nida 1964: 166). Neither the criteria for selecting such a variety, nor the intertextual consequences of establishing this type of equivalence were, however, considered, although they had already led the structural study of Wojtasiwicz (1957) to dismiss the procedure of simple dialect replacement as failing short of its goals.

The theoretical discussion of translating did not then benefit much from approaching the problem in generative terms, as exploring nonstandard speech requires digging into de Saussure’s parole, i.e. actual language performance, while the generative perspective clung to the ideal speaker/hearer living and communicating in an unvaried, uniform speech community (House 1973: 167). No wonder, then, that the generative theory proved to be far less hospitable to the study of dialect translation than early functional grammar.

Approaching translation through the analysis of the functions performed by particular texts and linguistic devices, that perspective was the first one to base its claims on a clear definition of the extent of the notion of dialect. Previous theories made sweeping statements on the translation of dialect as if it contained all nonstandard speech; in functional terms that vague concept was sharply compartmentalized into style, register and dialect by Halliday et al. (1964) which, in turn, was seen as comprising:

- idiolects,
- social dialects,
- geographical dialects (dialects proper),
- temporal dialects.

(Cutford 1965: 85)
Since each of these subvarieties was singled out on the basis of the functions it performed, and translation was viewed as a function preserving operation, every type of nonstandard speech encountered in SL texts was claimed to require separate and distinct discussion. Having narrowed down the notion of dialect, Catford (1965) proceeded to state that in the case of socially and geographically marked varieties (i.e. those which are investigated in this project), the preservation of the same relationship that held between the SL text and the situation substance in which it arose requires the selection of an equivalent TL nonstandard variety (Catford 1965: 87).

Defining particular types of nonstandard speech in terms of their relation to the original situation substance (i.e. their function in a specific context) made it thus possible for Catford to state the criteria for choosing an appropriate TL variety, which had been tacitly taken for granted by the two hypotheses outlined above. In the case of nonstandard varieties relatable to geographical factors (socially conditioned dialects are not discussed) it meant selecting a TL variety which would refer to the same part of the country as did the one used in the SL text (Catford 1965: 87).

If the original drew thus on the nonstandard speech characteristic of the capital, Catford’s hypothesis called for selecting a dialect typical of the TL capital; the speech of SL coalminers was to be replaced by the language spoken by miners in the TL society, etc. Catford did not, however, postulate seeking equivalence between specific dialectal features, e.g.: dyphthongization, multiple negation, etc. — but between particular varieties, e.g.: Cockney and Parigot, irrespective of the dialect markers employed (Catford 1965: 88).

This approach refuted then the structural claims that the linguistic exponents of nonstandard varieties are untranslatable (Wojtasiewicz 1957: 90), and provided clear criteria for selecting equivalent TL varieties; it ignored, however, the objections against such a replacement of dialects raised in Wojtasiewicz (1957).

Catford states that his solution follows naturally from preserving in the TL text the same relationship that held between the SL dialect and the original situation substance (defined in Catford 1965: 1-4)). Were this the case, the recourse to a TL dialect would not activate in the target reader any significant associations not latent in the SL text, and Wojtasiewicz’s doubts would be dispelled. That presupposes, however, the identity of the SL and TL situation substance, i.e. the fact that both the original and any of its translations refer to the same extralinguistic reality. The key issue appears therefore to be the extent to which that is possible.

Catford admits himself that it is debatable and “linked to the question of the ‘rameness’ or otherwise of the cultures (in the widest and the loosest sense) to which SL and TL belong” (Catford 1965: 52). Defining the criteria for the selection of an equivalent variety, i.e. specifying in what way the SL and TL situation substance is identical, he relies solely on objective factors common to all countries, e.g.: the north, the south, etc. or the location relative to the capital (Catford 1965: 87).

In the opening chapter of this work it has been shown, however, that besides the provenance of its speakers, dialect is relatable to many other characteristics, e.g.: the prestige it is accorded, the social group its users identify with, their education, background, ambitions, religion, etc. Being language and culture specific, these features are far less likely to be shared by the TL and SL situation substance. And if any of them proves to be more relevant for the meaning of a text than the objective factors chosen by Catford, the common ground shared by the TL and SL varieties will shrink to the status of irrelevant paraphernalia.

Should this be the case, the equivalence posited by Catford will, however, collapse by his own criteria: “Translation fails — or untranslatability occurs — when it is impossible to build functionally relevant features of the situation into the contextual meaning of the TL text” (Catford 1965: 94). His analysis is therefore based on the tacit assumption that these are the universal, geographical features of a situation that always achieve functional relevance. But there is nothing inherent to these objective characteristics which would make them predestined to override by default any of the subjective and language specific features relatable to a dialect. Either group of characteristics may outweigh the other, depending on the translator’s subjective appraisal of a particular text. And Catford neither shows that translators actually prefer universal features of a dialect’s situation substance to its culture specific characteristics, nor proves that it should be the case.

The sweeping statement he makes on the translatability of dialect is therefore untenable; the simple replacement of one dialect by another may be one of the strategies decided on by the translator, but by no means can it be pronounced to be the only one. Although this theory thus contributed significantly to the discussion of dialect in translation by clearly defining the notion of nonstandard speech and establishing the principle of translating particular varieties instead of seeking equivalence between their linguistic exponents, it grossly overestimated the potential of those features of dialects which are common to all languages. That, however, appears to stem from a mechanistic approach to translation, focusing on objective factors, and playing down the subjective role of an individual translator (Neubert 1985: 20).

Taking that human factor into consideration led Newmark (1988) to dismiss the universality of the simple replacement of dialects on still other grounds; he pointed out that a necessary prerequisite for resorting to that procedure is a good command of the target language nonstandard variety on the part of the translator himself (Newmark 1988: 195). Only if this is the case can Catford’s solution be seriously considered as an option to follow, which further narrows down the range of its applicability.
That claim notwithstanding, Newmark (1988) followed Catford (1965) in viewing the problem of translating *dialect* in functional terms, and claimed that in majority of instances nonstandard speech is utilized to one of the three ends:

a) to show a slang use of language,
b) to stress social class contrasts,
c) to indicate local cultural features.


Having been identified, these principal functions are then to be recreated in target language texts by drawing on appropriate varieties.

This analysis appears, then, to have based its claims on relating nonstandard varieties to *a fairly wide range of factors* (style, social class, the symbolic use of language), and allows the translator a considerable amount of leeway (three choices dependent on his or her decision). The incidental presentation of these findings, forgetting any theoretical discussion and providing only sketchy exemplification of the claims, let alone investigating their implementation reduce, however, the status of that framework to a set of hints. It is worth mentioning for its insights and apparent refinements of the functional approach, but by no means can it be regarded as a fully fledged hypothesis exploring the problem pursued in this project.

Analyzing translation in general semantic terms, Lebiedziński (1981) argues in favour of rendering SL text dialectal usages only by drawing on equivalent TL regional varieties. This independent return to earlier contentions proceeds, however, from reversing the perspective of viewing the problem; instead of focusing on the original text, Lebiedziński (1981: 90) discusses the question from the viewpoint of the prospective reader of the translation.

Since it is inevitably a foreign reader, rooted in a time, space, culture, society, etc. at least partially distinct from the context of the original, it is not feasible for him or her to appreciate a text in a way which would be commensurate with the potential available to the readers of the source language text. If a text contains any language material sensitive to changes of extralinguistic reality the TL readership clearly cannot then respond to that work in the same way as the readers of the original. Lebiedziński claims, however, that the SL-response can be approximated if the target text draws on context accessible to the prospective readers, *i.e.* on an equivalent regional TL variety (Lebiedziński 1981: 91).

Within that approach any recourse to *nonstandard* speech is assumed to constitute a suprasegmental layer of meaning distributed unevenly over other semantic structures. Translations are therefore expected to diverge from the standard wherever the original does, although it is insisted that only full and equivalent TL regional varieties be used. (No reason for that selection is, however, given. It may only be surmised that appealing to a context familiar
to the TL readers is hoped to activate as many associations as the SL text did, achieving some kind of numerical equivalence.)

Having selected an appropriate variety, the translator may then draw on it in a number of ways, which ultimately fall into four categories of operations:

a) compensation — rendering some SL dialect markers in the TL standard and making up for it by inserting other TL dialect markers elsewhere;
b) shift — using equivalent TL dialect markers, but changing their positions in the text relative to the original;
c) gain/loss — increasing/decreasing the overall number of dialect markers relative to the SL text;
d) amplification/diminution — selecting more/less marked exponents of nonstandard speech than the original.

(Lebiedziński 1981: 95)

All these procedures, it will be recalled, are devised to operate only on full TL regional dialects which are deemed equivalent. Dismissing any other renditions of nonstandard speech, Lebiedziński (1981: 93) does not, however, state the conditions under which a variety becomes equivalent, or show in what way it might be superior to other dialects, had it been used in the translations he objects to.

An interesting analysis of the reader’s perspective on dialect and its contribution to textuality is thus marred by inconsistency of a kind reminiscent of earlier hypotheses, which also insisted on finding an equivalent variety without explaining why or how it should be done. The objections raised against such theories in the preceding discussion may then be taken to hold also in this case, relegating Lebiedziński’s solution of the problem to the rank of a translation strategy whose implementation depends on the translator’s appraisal of a particular text, and does not follow from a fixed rule.

Broadly conceived linguistic perspectives on translating dialect have thus generally remained aloof from translation practice, preferring to argue in purely theoretical and prescriptive terms. Even a cursory examination of a body of TL texts shows how rarely the *injunctions* of the theoreticians are followed by practising translators (cf. the appendix). Such a yawning gap between theory and practice clearly calls for a fact finding approach which would cast new light on the issue and remedy this infelicitous state of affairs; the only attempts to do so, however, have been framed so far in literary perspectives on translation. Although this project has thus abstained from discussing nonlinguistic theories of translation, the studies which drew on them and discussed the pragmatic aspects of translating dialect will be reviewed below.

The first literary approach to dialect in translation to account for the observable data for more accurately than any of the linguistic hypotheses outlined
above was put forward in Levy (1963). Working in formalist terms, Levy argued that translation amounts to casting invariant form and contents in new language material, and claimed that language specific elements (e.g., dialect markers), belonging to neither of the invariants, need not be recreated nor rendered literally (Levy 1963: 80). Either of these procedures would treat select features of the source language as formal devices of the text itself, altering thus its meaning by tinkering with the invariants.

If in a Czech translation of a work by Dante a Provencal poet speaks Polish it is therefore not only misleading for the potential reader by appealing to other extratextual reality, but first of all patently false, as the TL version boasts a formal device not found in the original (after Levy 1963: 84). All the TL readership can be offered is then only an illusion of retaining the original frame of reference; in order not to distort the text the translator is authorized to discard any SL specific element judged to be obscure to the prospective reader of the translation, and compensate for the loss by introducing any unmarked TL elements which would not be immediately recognizable as referring to a specific location, social class, etc.

No matter what dialectal distinctions are drawn in the original, the translator is expected to differentiate only between the TL standard and a general nonstandard variety which draws on linguistic features widespread enough not to be identified with a clearly distinct subgroup of society. Less vague renditions of dialect are pronounced valid only if the nonstandard speech is used for purely comic effects (Levy 1963: 84).

Advocating the use of a diluted and ultimately artificial TL nonstandard variety, this approach outlines an overall strategy steering clear of the extremes of recreating dialect markers and forfeiting them altogether. In contrast to the hypotheses discussed above, it does, however, manage to predict the solutions opted for by majority of translators (cf. chapter 4). The methodology underlying Levy’s analysis did not, however, provide him with any tools for a closer inspection of this wide range of options, and particular solutions decided on by translators in specific circumstances were left uninvestigated. Although this is the most accurate of the models claiming to account for the translation of dialect in a single integral formula, its explanatory power is still relatively low. It correctly points to a body of strategies dominating translation practice (cf. Fig. 18), but it is unable to state anything specific as to their nature, conditions of usage, or the side effects their produce, but alone accounting for the options excluded from Levy’s analysis (e.g., drawing on the TL standard or authentic TL dialects).

In order to pursue these questions one needs to undertake a purely descriptive study, based on an approach abandoning the preconceived idea of discovering a single all explaining principle. The first theoretician to do so was a Polish scholar B. Sienkiewicz, who framed her 1984 article in Bakhtin’s perspective on the novel.4

The point of departure for that investigation, accordingly, was the assumption that what sets this genre apart from other writings is its drawing on a range of speech varieties rather than solely on the idiolect of the author (Bakhtin 1989: passim). The language of the novel was thus posited to be an amalgamation of different styles, dialects, etc., and the study set out to explore how that salient feature, termed heteroglossia (Rice and Waugh 1989: 197-205), is rendered in translation.

Assuming an empirical approach, Sienkiewicz analyzed the imagery conveyed by heteroglossia in selected pairs of SL and TL texts, and claimed that translators rely on four distinct strategies:

a) image for image substitution, i.e. selecting TL varieties capable of fulfilling the function performed by the original dialects — e.g., Yiddish accented Polish substituted for Yiddish accented English — which entails, however, embedding the text in TL extralinguistic reality (Sienkiewicz 1984: 232);

b) approximate variety substitution, i.e. selecting a TL variety which is judged to be equivalent to the SL dialect only in some respects, while diverging from it in others — e.g. colloquial Polish substituted for Polish accented English of Pennsylvania coal miners — which may focus the reader’s attention on other facets of the intended SL image and provide him or her with connotations not latent in the original (Sienkiewicz 1984: 234-235);

c) neutralization, i.e. forfeiting the SL image by resorting to the standard language, e.g. standard Polish substituted for Yiddish accented American English (Sienkiewicz 1984: 234) — which means that the SL text is both translated and explicated, levelling the speech of all characters and forgoing the meanings embedded in heteroglossia (Sienkiewicz 1984: 237);

d) amplification, introducing surplus differentiation where it does not exist in the SL text (Sienkiewicz 1984: 239).

Having discussed the options available for translators, Sienkiewicz (1984) ventured also to state the conditions under which these strategies become operational. Amplification (d) was posited to dominate in the translations of SL texts narrated in stylistically neutral language (Sienkiewicz 1984: 239). Neutralization (c) was claimed to gain prominence in (i) texts saturated with

---

4 For a concise introduction in English see Rice and Waugh (1989: 197-205); for further developments see Tabakovska (1990).
heteroglossia, (ii) in cases of SL elements clashing with the translator’s ethics — e.g. ‘Polack’ rendered as ‘kobieta’ by Jęczymik in his version of Slaughterhouse Five (Sienkiewicz 1984: 238) — and (iii) in critical translations purposefully embedding SL texts in TL extralinguistic reality. Substitution by approximate variety (b) was claimed to be used if (i) the TL has not developed an exactly equivalent variety, (ii) when the translator does not feel competent enough in a more appropriate dialect, or (iii) when the stylistic conventions of an epoch force him or her to forgo some layers of meaning (Sienkiewicz 1984: 236). The best choice, however, was postulated to be substitution of one image for another (a), which was asserted to be the default procedure selected in absence of any of the conditioning factors listed above (Sienkiewicz 1984: 239).

All these detailed statements appear, however to be quite unhelpful in the light of the fact that they appear to have been based on the analysis of only two texts.5 Such a meager database cannot, in any way, be considered representative for the large body of translations struggling with the problem of heteroglossia (cf. the appendix), and neither the list of strategies put forward in Sienkiewicz (1984) nor the suggested conditions for their use can be accepted to reflect the practice of translation in general. They are clearly insightful, but not substantiated by enough evidence to withstand the results of wider based investigations.

Most of the claims are supported by only individual examples, which makes them extremely vulnerable to criticism if one considers how large a share of potential data has been left uninvestigated; almost any exploration of that corpus of texts may produce numerous counterexamples refuting the model outlined above. Such low explanatory power of this hypothesis is further weakened by the purely deductive nature of some statements on the conditions determining the use of a strategy — e.g.: (iii) in (d) — which merely account for finished products of translation and do not predict what procedure will be resorted to beforehand, as well as by the fact that heteroglossia is not limited to the genre of the novel alone. (Cf. the corpus in the appendix.)

The flaws pointed to above notwithstanding, Sienkiewicz (1984) is an empirical study, and any of its claims can be debated only against the background of a body of data. In order not to preempt the discussion of the findings of this project, further discussion of this approach will be postponed until chapter four.

3.2. Deictic framework

Within the framework developed for the purpose of this project, the translation of dialect, as has already been stated above, will be viewed in terms of the strategies employed in the process of translating and studied for their contribution to the texuality of the target language versions. In order to assess that contribution it is, however, necessary to explore first how the use of nonstandard speech participates in texuality in general.

Pursuing the synchronic and diachronic aspects of nonstandard speech in chapter one, it was shown that irrespective of the approach one can choose dialects are definable only in contrast to higher level linguistic systems, i.e. that there are, by definition, only dialects of a particular language, which ultimately do not constitute fully independent linguistic units. Whether that subordinating relation was conceptualized as a structural one (in neogrammar, structural or generative terms, cf. Trudgill and Chambers 1980: 37-53), or as functional dependency (the position adopted in this thesis), there has always been a reference point (language or standard language respectively) against which dialects have been debated ever since they were first considered.

Pragmatically, an instance of the use of dialect may thus be argued to parallel some adjuncts and absolute grammatical tenses that it is identifiable only relative to some reference system in the same way that these concepts depend on a point of reference for their meaning; e.g.: the sense of ‘now,’ ‘there,’ ‘tomorrow,’ or the past tense can be established only by relating them to the time and place of the utterance (Allwood 1977: 121).

Drawing on this similarity, it may then be claimed that the set of language elements capable of anchoring a speech event in space and time, that is, establishing the relation of deixis (as defined in Levinson 1983: 53), includes also dialect. Spatial and temporal deixis determines the distance between the here and now and any event referred to in an utterance; in the case of dialect the ultimate point of reference is, however, the standard language. Consequently, the notion of deictic centre conceptualizing the time and place at which a speech event occurs, and relative to which the location of other events is established has to be widened to encompass the standard language besides the moment and place of the utterance. The canonical situation of utterance, hypothesized by Lyons (1977: 589) to be a set of coordinates assumed by default in any use of language and reflecting its primordial design for face to face communication, will thus comprise not only the variables: ‘here,’ ‘now’ and ‘I,’ but also the standardized variety of language, if there is any (otherwise it is the vernacular that fills the slot).

Since dialect was defined in chapter one as a user dependent variety, providing means for asserting one’s identity against the uniform background of the standard and claiming social group membership, an instance of nonstandard usage may then be said to anchor an utterance in a particular language variety and establish the relation of deixis in social space.

"When people use language, they do more than just try to get another person to understand the speaker’s thoughts or feelings. At the same time, both people
Dialect in translation — theory

are using language in subtle ways to define their relationship to each other, to identify themselves, as part of a social group, and to establish the kind of speech event they are in” (Fasold 1990: 1).

Exploring that area of meaning, Levinson (1983: 89) stated that social deixis covers “those aspects of language structure that encode the social identities of participants (properly, incumbents of participant roles), or the social relationship between them, or between one of them and the persons and entities referred to. There are of course many aspects of language usage that depend on these relations [...], but these usages are only relevant to the topic of social deixis in so far as they are grammaticalized.” Under this definition dialect thus clearly meets the description in both of its vital points (encoding social relations and grammaticalization), confirming the claim to the deictic status of nonstandard usages.

Levinson (1983: 89-96) focuses on tracing the meanings inherent in the selection of particular terms of address and honorifics, and claims that appropriate information is carried by conventional implicatures without altering the truth conditions of a statement:

1. Vous êtes Napoléon
2. Tu es Napoléon

Both statements are true under the same conditions, although their meanings clearly differ. The first may be glossed as:

1. You are Napoléon and you are socially superior to (or socially distant from) me, the speaker.

While the second reads:

2. You are Napoleon and you are not socially superior (or socially distant from) me, the speaker.

Both speakers may therefore be said to presume different social relationships to exist between them and the addressee and encode them accordingly in their utterances. The surplus, nontruthconditional meaning is then decoded by the hearer as a conventional implicature attached to specific language structures (Levinson 1983: 96).

Whatever the theoretical status of that stratum of meaning, this analysis can be easily extended on dialect usages:

She nice; glossable as:
She is nice and I, the speaker, am Black
(Trudgill and Chambers 1980: 74)

Ain’t I after telling you? glossable as:
Haven’t I just told you and I, the speaker, am Irish
(Bliss 1985: 144)

Delictic framework

I’ve nae got it; glossable as:
I haven’t got it and I, the speaker, am Scottish
(Hughes and Trudgill 1979: 15)

He went out without no shoes on; glossable as:
He went out without any shoes and I, the speaker, am uneducated, low class etc.
(Hughes and Trudgill 1979: 14)

A fi mi buk dar; glossable as:
It’s my book and I, the speaker, am Jamaican
(Trudgill and Chambers 1980: 10)

The precision of pointing to a specific language community varies, however, as speakers tend to belong to numerous informal groups (Edwards 1985: 6), and one variety may perform the symbolic function for a whole array of them. The basilectal speaker of Jamaican Creole quoted above, may thus be said to claim allegiance not only to his or her native island, but also to the poor, the uneducated, the working class, the countryfolk etc., and disclaim at the same time membership in the powerful, the sophisticated etc., while none of these groups is fully coextensive.6 This wide range of potential identifications seems to be narrower in the case of mesolectal and paralectal varieties e.g. the Scottish example cited above, but ultimately some indeterminacy of social deixis appears to be unavoidable. Only in using the standard does the speaker unequivocably identify with the mainstream of society, eliminating the need for further consideration of details.

The discriminative potential of dialectal usages seems, however, to have been known to man ever since; e.g an event recounted in the biblical Book of Judges:

“Then Jephthah gathered together all the men of Gilead, and fought with Ephraim: and the men of Gilead smote Ephraim because they said, Ye Gileadites are fugitives of Ephraim among the Ephraimites and among the Manassites. And the Gileadites took the passages of Jordan before Ephraimites: and it was so that when those Ephraimites which were escaped said, Let me go over, that the men of Gilead said unto him, Art thou an Ephraimite? If he said, Nay, then said they unto him, say now Shibboleth: and he said Sibboleth: for he could not frame to pronounce it right. Then they took him, and slew him at the passages of Jordan: and there fell at that time of the Ephraimites forty and two thousand.”

(King James Bible, Judges: XII, 4-6)

6 This variety provides thus translators with a wide range of options; they may focus on any subset of these identifications depending on the goals and conditions, preserving at least part of the original deixis. Cf. a similar discussion in functional terms in Hallin and Mason (1990: 45).
Dialect use may thus betray the speech community one claims allegiance to; the details relating that language group to a variety of social, geographical, temporal, religious, etc. factors are, however, accessible to the reader-hearer only through prior exposure to such texts, i.e. through intertextuality. All these associations lie outside the language system itself, but are activated by the selection of particular forms as long as the addressee is familiar with that context (de Beaugrande and Dressler 1980: 258). E.g.:

“Deelye Woman married my son, an’ Henry Clay Binns made ‘er good husband’, if I do have to give it out myself. Yes, ‘n’ deed! An’ sit if you’d ‘a’ heern the rippit them Woman’s kicked up, you’d ‘a’ thought the pore child’d done took ‘n’ run off long a’ whale passel er high pirates from somewhere er nother. I about that time the ole Judge, he got sober fiddleed up, some say in his feet, an’ some say in his head; but his wife that Emily Woman, she taken on useful. I never seen her a-gwine on myself, not that they was any hidin’ out’ amongst the Birnises or the Sardeses. — bless you nor”

(Harris, J. Ch. Mingo and Other Sketches in Black and White, in Schlauch 1959: 275)

The dialectical usages found in the passage clearly anchor the speaker in a subgroup asserting its identity against the background of Standard English. More specific characteristics of that community can be learnt, however, only through earlier acquaintance of the reader with texts containing such usages. Depending on the addressee’s experience, the quoted excerpt may thus evoke associations of nonstandard English, the South East of the USA, white rural speakers, tense relations with the Blacks, rustic way of life, the Civil War, fervent protestant denominations, dry countries etc.

The use of dialect may therefore be said to contribute to the textuality of a passage mainly through providing it with social deixis and rich intertextuality, i.e. through anchoring the speakers in a particular subgroup of society and revealing their background. Consequently, these two areas will constitute the main points of interest in examining the strategies employed in the translation of dialect, which means that the two textual standards involved will be: informativity (since deixis is ultimately a type of information) and intertextuality.

This framework will thus focus on the fact that the process of translation shifts the SL deixic center into TL place, time and social space, and invalidates the relationships dependent on the original point of reference as TL readers speak a different language, and live in another place and/or time. (E.g. the source language markers of the provenance of characters clearly can not be trusted to be accessible to the readers of the TL version.) The translator faces then the task of reestablishing deixis in terms which would be comprehensible to the new readership, i.e. relative to the point of reference rooted in TL language and society. Grounding the deixic relations in the TL context entails, however, having to draw on TL resources and activate target language intertextuality at the expense of the associations latent in the original.

What is more, after the deixic center has been shifted into the TL reality, the original informativity and intertextuality can not be easily conflated and expressed by the same markers, as it is typically the case in SL texts (cf. the examples quoted above). In the new language and setting both textual standards will compete against each other as very precise grounding of a character in a TL speech community is bound to activate rich TL intertextuality alien to the SL textword, and preventing that TL intertextuality from distorting the SL textword by using unmarked language will deprive the SL textword of any grounding in a social group. E.g. translating the speech of Oklahoma farmers into the rural dialect of central Poland will provide the textword with very precise grounding in the TL reality, but will readily invite intertextuality quite alien to the SL textword (e.g. skimpy plots of arable land, fields of rye, tradition of uprisings and resistance, etc.), and stemming that influx of TL intertextuality by using the standard merges the SL group with the mainstream of the population.

Concentrating on one standard of textuality is therefore bound to wreak havoc with the other one, putting any translator in a catch 22 situation. Once a translation strategy has been isolated (the discovery procedures will be dealt with at length in chapter four), it will thus be investigated primarily for the course it plots between these two extremes, as the other textual standards appear to play minor roles in the case of translating dialect.

The investigation will, however, exclude the exploration of the strategies intended to deal solely with the temporal aspects of shifting the deixic center, i.e. with the consequences of the lapse of time between writing the SL text and undertaking its translation into a TL, e.g. archaization as investigating such procedures necessarily involves diachronic comparison of dialects, which is outside the scope of this project. The analysis presented in the next chapter will then concentrate on social deixis and its intertextual implications.
4. Dialect in translation — practice

4.1. Discovery procedures

After the discussion of a textual framework for the study of translation, the deictic nature of dialect and the theoretical issues posed by its use in texts undergoing the process of translation, it will now be attempted to put the analyses advanced above into practice. As has already been explained, this chapter will focus, in line with the Translation Studies approach, not on the deficiencies and inadequacies of the TL renditions of SL texts, but on the measures taken by the translator to accommodate the SL text meanings in the TL version, whatever their nature and origin. Escaping value judgements and using SL/TL text comparison only for reference and clarity, this chapter will pursue the techniques applied in the translation of social deictic meaning and investigate the general strategies underlying the solutions of local translation difficulties.

The second premise underpinning the analysis presented below has been forced upon it by the sheer scope the project. Clearly no corpus can be exhaustive, and nor is feasible to collect, collate and analyze every single specimen of dialect use in the texts found in this body of data, so a sampling procedure has been devised. The excerpts used in the analysis have been selected randomly from different parts of the SL texts, and care has been taken not to privilege any authors, texts or translators, and the size of the samples taken is assumed to be sufficient for them to be representative of particular SL texts and their translations respectively.

As the use of dialect in SL texts and any ways of rendering it in TL texts are manifest in those exponents of linguistic categories which diverge from the standard, such exponents are referred to below as dialect markers, and the initial step of the analysis was their identification on the basis of a relevant description of the dialect or accent in question. In order to gain a deeper insight into their treatment in the process of translation, the markers were then divided into four groups, depending on what levels of language were represented as departing from the standard:

a) phonetics/phonology — comprising all the instances of the use of the spelling conventions of English and Polish to render dialectal pronunciation, i.e. the eye dialect;

b) morphology — referring to any cases of nonstandard selection from paradigms available to dialect speakers, including the use of honorifics;

c) lexis — including dialectal vocabulary and terms of address;

d) syntax — covering any nonstandard relations above the lexical unit level, including the functional sentence perspective (cf. Baker (1993: 119-172) for a discussion of its relevance to translation studies).

Obtaining an objective measure of how much of the dialect used in the SL text is retained in its translation required, in turn, adding up the markers in their respective categories as well as overall for each sample, and dividing the numbers arrived at for a translation by the corresponding figures obtained for the original, yielding in this way a ratio independent of the length of the text under consideration. Such a measure is obviously relative, stating only the rate of change between a translation and the original in a particular category, and not expressing this relationship in absolute numbers, but it is a price worth paying, as the relativity of the data guarantees its comparability. Should the size of any two samples vary, which seems to be inevitable, statements in absolute numbers, e.g. that one translation contains x dialect markers while another one twice as many, would be rendered invalid by the fact that the figures would depend on the lengths of the texts examined.

The ratio provides then information on the number of dialect markers used in a translation relative to the number of markers found in the original, supplying numerical data (i) on the ways in which the dialectal features of the SL texts are rendered in the TL, if the rates in particular categories are compared, and (ii) on the extent to which translations reflect the dialectal usages of the original in general, if the aggregate figures for whole samples are considered.

Being a fraction, with the number of dialect markers in the TL texts in the numerator and the number of dialect markers in SL text in the denominator, the ratio can be interpreted in terms of elementary arithmetics: if it exceeds 1 the former outnumbers the latter, i.e. the translation contains more dialect markers than the original, when it is equal to 1 the numbers match perfectly and when it does not exceed 1 the translation contains less markers than the original.

The ratio is also readily expressible in percentage points, presenting on multiplying the figures by 100, the rate of change in dialect representation in an even more accessible way. E.g.: a ratio of 0.8 means that the translation contains in one form or another 0.8 x 100 = 80% of the dialect markers of the original, a ratio of 1.5 means that the translation contains 1.5 x 100 = 150% of the dialect markers of the original, i.e. 50% more, amplifying the density of dialect markers etc.

The next step of the analysis was the examination of the distribution of the rates in all samples taken, both in the four categories identified, and overall,
for the aggregate scores. In the latter case in can be displayed graphically as a function of the ratio found for each sample, with the arguments rounded up to one decimal point for the sake of clarity of presentation.

The distribution pattern proved to be quite erratic, but after further approximation with a left skewed curve with a tail superimposed on the original graph, it was possible to draw the first albeit still very general conclusions.

The graph, therefore, shows clearly that majority of the translations considered did attempt to render the dialectal usages of the originals, e.g. the mean value of the ratio $X = 0.6322$, signifying that an average TL text retained, in one form or another, as much as over 60% of the dialect markers of the respective SL text. The distribution pattern helps also to identify two groups of translations with significantly low (0.2) and high (2.1) values of the ratio respectively, hinting at the possible translation strategies employed in these TL texts: neutralization of the SL dialect in the former an its amplification in the latter.

Further details could be gleaned, however only from the distribution patterns of the particular categories, displayed below in the form of bar diagrams.

In the case of the group of translations tentatively linked to neutralization, the examination of these diagrams strongly confirmed the initial observation, showing, at least in some of them, a consistent decrease in the number of dialect markers retained in all four categories right down to infinitesimals, ultimately proving neutralization of the SL text dialect markers to be the dominant translation strategy for this group of TL versions.

The extinction of this form of analysis on larger parts of the corpus proved, however, to be inconclusive as TL texts exhibiting very coherent aggregate and partial scores still differed significantly. E.g.: a group of translations with the aggregate ratio fluctuating around 0.4 and the partial scores close to zero except for a considerable increase in the number of lexical markers, averaging on 9 (signifying thus a ninefold increase in the number of lexical markers between the SL and TL texts).

The distribution of the ratio in the four categories pointed to the lexis as the main vehicle employed in those translations to render in TL the dialectal usages

---

9 The number following capital A stands for the aggregate score of a translation, and the number printed in bold type above the translator's last name refers to the appropriate entry in the appendix.
Discovery procedures

The Flower Girl:
— Ow, eez ye — ooa san, is e? Wal, fewd
dan y’deooty bawzm a mother should, eed
now better to spawl a pore gal’s fhaarzn
then ran awy ahulty pyin.
Will ye’oo py me f’them?

Kwiaćarka:
A, to pani synek, co? No proszę. Szkoła, koț
go pani lepiej nie wychowala, bo jak biednej
dziewczynie spieniewiała kwiatki, to by nie
nawiał, ale wybrzucí, co się należy.
Zapłaci pani szanowna za te kwiatki?

H. Melville

Moby Dick
[...] Fleece [...] Kudlacz [...] 

And, by Gor, none of you has de right to dat
whale; dat whale belong to some one else.
I know some o’you has berry big mou, bigger
dan odors; but den de big mouz sometimez
has de small bellies; so dat de bigness ob de
mout is not to swallar wid, but to bite off de
blubber for de small fry ob sharks...

B. Zielińskia

Moby Dick, czyli bialy wieloryb
[...] Kudlacz [...] 

A, na Bogu, właściwie żaden z was nie ma do
diego prawa, bo on należy do gozoș innego.
Wiem, że jeden z was ma bardzo duża gęba,
więszą niż inni, ale przecie — duża gęba
czasem niewyjaśnia mały żołędzeg, więc duża
gęba jest nie po to, żeby nią jeść, ale żeby od-
gryźć trochę tuszu dla małych reżinów...

As it has been hypothesized in the previous chapter, the difference discernable in these translations can be conceptualized in the best way in the terms of the social deixis aimed at by the translator. Introducing lexical items commonly associated in the TL culture with the speech of rural areas (after Markowski 1992, e.g.: niedziela, staruch, ongo, gadać), Stomczyński clearly seeks to identify the nonstandard speaker with uneducated nonmobile peasants. Piotrowski, on the other hand, resorts to colloquial lexis (e.g.: synek, nawiąć, wybucić) using it to anchor the language of the Flower Girl in the speech of low class townsfolk, making her a member of this social group. Colloquial lexis is used also by Zieliński (e.g.: gęba, przecie); he combines it however, with a speech deficit in his nonstandard speaking character identifying him thus with a social group sufficiently acquainted with the TL culture to speak its language fluently, but distinct enough to let its own vernacular interfere with TL phonology (e.g.: regin, gozoș for rekin, kogoș; i.e. voicing of velar consonants). In doing so Zieliński does not refer to any existing language community, while Stomczyński and Piotrowski seem to appeal to the defining features of real social groups.

Since the distinctions consistently eluding statistical analysis could be easily captured by the notion of social deixis, instead of further refining the mathematical means, from this stage of the investigation onwards statistics was duly relegated to the ancillary function of providing the textual explorations with numerical data and partial analyses; objectifying the findings of deictic analysis, but only rarely managing to override them.

Analyzing the corpus in terms of social deixis made it also possible to gain a deeper insight into the factors conditioning the selection of particular
translation strategies, gleaning thus indirectly into the process of translating at the crucial stage of taking strategic decisions determining the tactics of solving local translation difficulties actually encountered in SL texts.

It may be theorized, for instance, that the translators quoted above as resorting to the neutralization of the SL dialect markers decided that they could be dispensed with in the TL texts either because all the characters involved spoke the same dialect (Kydryński, Piotrowski) or there was only one character in the form on the lyrical subject of the poem (Barańczak), in both cases there being no difference in the social group membership of the characters betrayed in their speech, i.e. no difference in the social deixis between the speakers to be retained in TL. On a still higher plane of analysis it can be also argued that the two remaining translators mentioned as practitioners of dialect neutralization (Siwicka, Oleszdka) may have decided on communicating to the TL readership the core ‘messages’ of the respective SL texts at the cost of forgoing their ‘styles,’ striving for dynamic equivalence in the sense of Nida (1964).

The three translators shown above as restricting their renditions of the SL dialect to the lexical substratum of the TL only, may have done so, on the other hand, in order to avoid overt translation imminent in any fuller identification of the speech of their characters with a specific TL culture language group. In doing so they would have run the risk of providing the TL readership with false intertextuality, activating associations and connotations foreign to the SL text. In general, then, these translators can be found to agree with Levin’s approach to dialect treatment in translation.

On the level of translation strategy selection, all three decided, however, to follow diverse paths. Using lexical items associated with the speech of rural areas Słomczyński anchors his character in a vague geographical area instantly identifiable as the country. Piotrowski, in turn, uses vocabulary generally considered colloquial, positioning his nonstandard speaking character in the low working class, i.e. along a social and not geographical dimension.

A similar policy seems to have been taken by Zelinki, who also resorts to colloquial vocabulary; he combines it, however, with a speech defect which is not characteristic of any TL language community, choosing thus to identify the characters with a hypothetical social group considered at home in TL culture, yet distinct due to marked pronunciation.

As is evident from the last two examples, particular strategies can be easily mixed to achieve the effect desired by the translator. For the sake of clarity of presentation, as well as due to the fact that in an overwhelming majority of samples a dominant method can be found, the translation strategies will be discussed below individually, with the discovery procedures outlined above taken for granted.

### 4.2. Neutralization

Some of the linguistic properties of this strategy have already been referred to above in discussing the methodological aspects of the analysis. That preliminary discussion was focused on bringing out the most salient feature of this procedure, i.e. the fact that some translations consistently decrease the number of dialect markers down to infinitesimals on all the levels of language use investigated. The graphs displaying this tendency will be now illustrated with actual samples of TL texts.

W. Shakespeare

**Henry V**

[...]

Jamy:
I say, god day, Captain Fluellen.

**Fluellen:**
God-den to your worship, good Captain James.

**Gower:**
How was, Captain MacMorris,
Have you quit the mines? Have the pioneers given o’er?

**MacMorris:**
By Christ, Ia, tish ill done; the work ish give over; the trumpet sound the retreat. By my hand, I swear: and my father’s soul, the work ish ill done; it ish give over. I would have blew up the town, so Christ shuwe me, Ia, in an hour.

R. Burns

**To a Mouse**

Wec, sikitik, cow’rin, tim’rous beastie.
O, what a panic in thy breastie!
Thou need na start awe sae basty,
Wi’ bickering brattle!
I wad be hae’d to rin an’ chase thee,
Wi murt’d ring pattle;
[...]
But, Mousie, thou art no thy lane
In proving foresight may be vain:
The best laid schemes a mice an’ men
Gang aft a-gley
An’ lae’e us naught but grief an’ pain
For promised joy.

Z. Siwicka

**Krój Henryk Piąty**

[...]

Jamy:
Dziś dobry, kapitan Fluellen.

**Fluellen:**
Dobry dzień waszej miłości, kapitanie James.

**Gower:**
Jakie tam, kapitanie MacMorris?
Czy opuszciliście podkop? Czy sprawcy rzucili robotę?

**MacMorris:**
Na Chrustusa. Wszystko sfrustrowane: rzucili robotę, trąbią na odwrot. Na tę rękę przyjrzemy i na duszę mogącej ojca, że robotę sfrustrowali, rzucili. Wypadziliśmy migotło w powietrze, tak mi Chyste dopomóg, w godzinę.

S. Barańczak

**Do myszy**

Małenki, chicy, bojaźliwy stworze
Lecz popłoch w piersi twojej gorze!
Cóż się tak zrywać, czemu w swojej norze
Dalej nie dzwonić
Myśli, że życie twoje też rozerze
Morderczy lemiesz?
[...]
Leoć Myszko, innych też nadzieja ludzi;
Przewidywaniem może przesądzić się trudzi;
Przemysłowe plany i myszy i ludzi
W gruzy się walu
Nasze zapęły zawód zwykle studzi
Zwątpienia stałą.
G. McCullers  
*The Heart is a Lonely Hunter*  
[...]

“You all the time using that word — Negro,” said Portia. “And that word has a way of hurting people’s feelings. Even old plain neger is better than that word. But polite peoples — no matter what shade they is — always says coloured.” [...]  

“Take Willie and me. Us aren’t all the way coloured.”

All these translations consistently use mainstream TL standard, with only negligible traces of dialect markers below the threshold of statistical relevance. This can be taken to mean that the process of translating has been performed in these samples twice: intralinguially, rendering the vernacular into standard, and interlinguially, transferring the text into the TL. Both stages can obviously overlap, and no claims regarding their temporal organization can be made here; positing an iteration of the process of translating seems, however, to account for the observable facts in the best way, as it stipulates that the products of such a process will not contain any significant number of dialect markers. E.g.: two more text samples whose distribution diagrams have already been presented above.

E. O’Neill  
*Desire under the Elms*  
[...]

_Simeon:_  
We never had no time t’ meddle.

_Peter:_  
Yew was fifteen afore yer Maw died — an’ big fur yer age. Why didn’t you never do nothing?  
_Eben:_  
They was chores t’ do, wa’n’t they? It was on’y arter she died I come to think o’it.

J. Baldwin  
*Tell Me How Long the Train’s Been Gone*  
[...]

“Let them go on,” said our mother, “so they can get back here in time for supper.”  
“It’s the Jew makes them movies, man, in order to mess up our minds. That’s why I don’t never go to see them.”

J. Olędzkaootnote{J. Olędzka}  
*Serce to samotny myśliwy*  
[...]

— Używasz cały czas słowa „Murray” — powiedziała Portia. — A co obejma ludzi. To prawie tak, jakbym po dawnemu mówił „czarnuch”.

Węz Willie’ego i mnie. My nie jesteśmy całkiem czarni.

K. Piotrowskiootnote{K. Piotrowski}  
*Przegadanie w cieniu wiązów*  
[...]

_Symeon:_  
Nigdy nie mieliśmy czasu, żeby się wciągać w nie swoje sprawy.  
_Piotr:_  
Skończyłeś piętnaście lat, gdy odumierać cię matka — wyrobiłs porad swój wiek. Czemu sam nic nie robisz?  
_Eben:_  
Dorem kieś musiał się zając. Dopiero po jej śmierci zrozumiłem, ile miała roboty.

J. Kadyńscyootnote{J. Kadyńscy}  
*Powiedz mi, jak dawno odszedł pociąg*  
[...]

— Niech już sobie idą — powiedziała matka — żeby wrocili na czas na koleję.  
— To Żydzi robią te filmy, człowiek. Po to, żeby nas obrazić. Waśnie dlatego nigdy nie chodzę do kina.

Neutralization

“You don’t never go to see them,” said our mother, because you too lazy and too old. And can’t nobody tear you away from that rum. Let these children go on—”

— Nie chodziš, bo jesteś za leniwy i za stary. I nikt cię nie może nderwać od tego rumu.

Assuming therefore that the text samples being analyzed have gone through a double loop of the translation process, it is possible to define neutralization as a combination of interlingual and intralingual translations of the same SL text.

The decision to render the SL dialect passages in TL standard obliterates, however, the deictic traits anchoring the SL texts in the speech of a specific language community. Those passages lose thus their social deixis and cease to identify the characters as members of any particular social group. Speaking the standard they merge by default with the mainstream of society and are no longer distinct. The social deixis of the SL text is therefore irretrievably lost, and no attempt is made at restoring it to the TL text.

Forgoing the social deixis of the original, the practitioners of this strategy avoid, however, the peril of introducing into the TL text an intertextuality which would be foreign to its SL version; since the language community pointed to by the SL dialect usages is hardly ever accessible to the TL readers either in the linguistic markers it is recognized by or the associations it arises, the replacement of such a group by any community familiar to the TL readership would be bound to introduce into the text meanings and connotations not to be found in the original. Deciding on neutralization, the translator chooses thus to underranslate in order to protect the integrity of the text and guard it against its distorted comprehension.

The rationale behind the use of this procedure can be therefore twofold:  
a) either the undertranslation effect is judged to be negligible for the integrity of the text, or  
b) the potential distortions entailed by the introduction of a false intertextuality are feared to wreak havoc with the meaning of the original.

The former seems to be operational in texts which do not use their social deixis to bring out the differences in social group membership of particular characters, but to emphasize the author’s stance relative to the standard language, either due to the monologue nature of the text, e.g. poetry in the vernacular (cf. Fig. 4), or because the same dialect is used by all the nonstandard speaking characters, e.g. the texts translated by Kadyńscyootnote{J. Kadyńscy} and Piotrowski. The second reason appears to gain prominence with translators who, guarding the integrity of the original, choose to discard some aspects of its meaning rather
than to distort them, and, like Siwicka and Olędzka, follow the precepts verbalized in Nida and Taber (1969: 14); and render the contents of the SL text with style secondary, that is expendable. The deictic analysis has therefore not confirmed the conditions for the use of that strategy identified by Sienkiewicz (1984), although dynamic translation in the sense of Nida may be taken to parallel the 'critical translation' of Sienkiewicz.

4.3. Lexicalization

In contrast to neutralization, the most salient property of this translation strategy, as it has already been illustrated above, is the fact that its products do contain some traits of the SL text dialect, although the traces are few — the texts representative of this translation strategy average 0.30 in the aggregate ratio compared with 0.6322 for the entire corpus — and restricted to the lexical level of language use only — e.g. the distribution of the ratio in six more texts foregrounding this procedure:
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Since the linguistic facts seem to be explained in the best way by the theoretical claims made above, the strategy of lexicalization may thus be defined as a combination of full interlingual translation and an incomplete intralingual translation excluding the level of lexis.

Restricting the attempts to render the SL text dialect to one stratum of language use results, however, in an inconsistent use of the TL, anchoring the language of the nonstandard speaking characters in the vernacular of a TL speech community on one level, but abstaining from such an identification on others.\(^6\)

\(^6\) Such inconsistencies do, however, occur in language — cf. the discussion of transition zones between dialect areas in Chambers and Trudgill (1980: 125-142).
The choice of standard, i.e. unmarked forms on all the remaining levels, amounting to the lack of commitment of the speaker to any particular TL variety distinct from the standard, contributes then to a considerably vague social deixis of the TL text, which ceases to identify the dialect speaker with any clearly defined group. The specificity of the social deixis of the original is therefore lost.

Imprecise as it may be, the social deixis is, nevertheless, retrievable from the TL texts, locating the provenance of the characters in the broad categories of the town, the country, the uneducated, the underprivileged etc. The vagueness is also highly conducive to minimizing the influx of TL intertextuality unimplicated by the SL text, which, it will be recalled, is inherent in any fuller identification of the characters with a TL language community, and is bound to distort the meaning of the original.

Faced by the dilemma whether to lose meaning or to distort it, the practitioners of lexicalization appear then to search for the golden means, and make concessions on both ends. They sacrifice the sharpness of the social deixis in order to minimize the distortions entailed by its retention, but they also strive not to relinquish any aspect of the meaning of the original. Guarding its integrity they are thus willing to compromise on but not to surrender any of its facets, in which they differ from the followers of neutralization, who incline to the latter. Choosing lexicalization, translators may therefore be said to declare loyalty much rather to the full range of the meanings of the original than to their totality and are prepared to dilute them but not to abandon. They seem to subscribe to the approach verbalized in Levy (1963), who claimed that it was the duty of the translator to retain all the formal features of the original (cf. Gentszler 1993: 78-84).

This tenet stipulates then, that the variety hinted at in the lexis of the TL text will be directly relatable to the respective SL text verbatim, outlining the main features of its social deixis. Such generalizations can follow, however, different dimensions, e.g.: geographical, social, temporal etc., depending on what is perceived to be foregrounded in the social deixis of the original, which, in turn, necessitates a further subdivision of the strategy under consideration into: rural, colloquial, artificial and diminutive lexicalizations.

4.3.1. Rural lexicalization

Utilizing the linguistic apparatus described above, this substrategy seeks to generalize, as it has already been observed, along the geographical dimension of the social deixis of the original, retaining in the translation the lexical items identifying the nonstandard speaking characters as members of a social group typical of a particular region, e.g. the country.

---

W. Shakespeare
King Lear

Oswald: Let go slave, or thou diest.
Edgar: Good gentlewoman, go your gait, and let poor folk pass. An 'ch'nd ha' been zwareg’d out of my life, 'twould not ha' been so long as 't is by a vornigh. Nay, come not near the old man; keep out, che vor'ye or ise try whether your costard or my bellow be the harder. Ch'ill be plain with you.
Oswald: Out, dunghill!
Edgar: Ch'll pick your teeth, zir. Come; no matter for your fains.

H. Przęczkowska
Opowieści kanterberyjskie

[...]
Michał rzuciciel groźny, zapalczawa głowa;
Jeśli się ocknie, gotów pomnikować;
I nam uczynić coś grubijskiego.
[...]
„A ja za mchęa mam osłaka tego!”
[...]
I jogo szepit jak fielg sprysny!
A cóż ja jestem? Ot osiel skończony!
Druh mój za krzywą zacnie nagrodzi,
[...]
Za durnia wzmaz maje i łichą duszę,
Dlibdog, wozan i odważnie ruszę;
Ludziška mowit: „amialkom si powodzi!”

G. Chaucer
The Canterbury Tales

[...]
The miller is a terrible man for slaughter;
If he should wake and find ye with his daughter
He might do injury to ye and me!
"Injury? Him?"
"I count him nat a feal!"
[...]
I shall be made a monkey of for this
My mott has got some comfort for his harms
He has the miller's daughter in his arms
[...]
They'll say I was a softie and a bum!
I'll get up too and take what chance I may
For God helps those that help theirselves, they say!

A. Tretiak
Król Liń

Oswald: Puść, parokto, bo zginięs!
Edgar: Dobry panie, idź swoją drogą, a pozwól biednym ludziom iść przed siebie. A gdybym się miał rozstać z życiem, to mogło to stać i przed tygodniem.
Ninie, nie podchodzi do starszaka; z daleka, mówię, bo spuszczy, czy moja piłka czy też twoja łepetyta jest twardsza; bez ogródka to zrobić.
Oswald: Broń się, śmierdzeliu!
Edgar: Powybijam ci żebę, no, dżej! Twoje pchnięcie mi nie szkodzi.

Pomnikować, osiel, ludziška (Przęczkowska³); ludkom, powybijam ci żebę, łepetyta (Tretiak⁸); ot żywot, dwie niedźwiedzie, godać (Słomczyński¹⁸) are instantly recognizable as belonging to the language of the rural areas (traditional dialect in the terms of Wells (1983) and rural dialect in the terminology of Wakelyn (1977)). No wonder then that they were trusted to convey the rustic origins of the characters in question.
4.3.2. Colloquial lexicalization

Choosing the lexis of the TL texts to be the locus of their social deixis, the practitioner of this subcategory generalizes the deixis of the original along a social dimension, retaining the lexical items which are indicative of the status of the nonstandard speaking characters and identify them with the poor, the underprivileged *etc.* who do not adjust their speech to the higher levels of formality. *E.g.*:

M. Twain
*The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*  
[i...]

She never done it; jis' stood dah, kiner smilin' up at me. It make me mad; en I says ag'in, mighty loud, I says:

"Doan you hear me? Shet de do!"

She jis' stood de same way, kiner smilin' up. I was a-billin'! I says: "I lay I make you mine!" En wid dat I fetch' her a slap side de head dat sent her a-splawlin'!

Ch. Dickens
*The Pickwick Papers*  
[i...]

Night afore he was a going to drive up, comitee on t' other side sends for him quietly, and away he goes with the messenger, who shows him in; — large room — lots of gen'tlem'nt, heaps of papers, pens and ink, and all that 'ere.

K. Tarnowska  
*Przygody Hircza*  
[i...]

"Zamknij drzwi!" Ani się ruszyła. Stoi tobie dalej i tylko się do mnie uśmiecha. Aż tamie zatrzeszło ze złości. Więc powiadam znów, bardzo głośno:


W. Górski
*Klub Pickwicka*  
[i...]

W wilę dnia, gdy miał wyruszyć w drogę, kamień drugiego stronniczta najpokojniej posłał po niego. Idzie tedy z komisjonierem, który go wprowadza do obiernego pokoju. *Kupa genelinmanów, góry papieru, pior r i tak dalej.*

R. O’Connor
*A Good Man is Hard to Find*  
[i...]

"I never was a bad boy that I remember of," the Misfit said in an almost dreamy voice, "but somewheres along the line I done something wrong and got sent to the penitentiary.

4.3.3. Diminutive lexicalization

Deciding on the application of this subcategory the translators seem to generalize the SL text social deixis along a temporal dimension, ascribing the SL nonstandard speakers TL linguistic features typical of very young or quite old lan-
guage users, who are often found to resort to diminutives (Adamczyk-Garbowska 1988: 113-116). Consequently, this procedure emphasizes the identification of the characters with the young and innocent and the old and mellow respectively. E.g.:

H. Beecher Stowe
Uncle Tom’s Cabin
[...]
“Here you, Moses and Pete, get out de way, you niggers! Get away, Polly, honey; mammy’ll give her baby somefin’ bye-and-bye. Now Mas’r George, you jest take off dem books, and set down now” [...]
“La bless you, Mas’r George, ” said Aunt Chloe, with earnestness, catching his arm: ‘you wouldn’t be for cuttin’ it wid dat ar great heavy knife! Smash all down — spile all de pretty rise of it! Here, I’ve got a thin old knife I keeps sharp a purpose.”

M. Twain
The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn
[...]
My folks was living in Pike County, in Missouri, where I was born, and they all died off but me and pa and my brother Ike. Pa, he’lowed he’d break up and go down and live with Uncle Ben, who’s got a little one-horse place on the river forty-four mile below ‘Orleans.

Mrozyniakto, nozyk, nozysko (Tuwim) and tatko, braciszek, wujaszek, maluchna farma (Tarnowska) clearly point to both of the groups mentioned above, although it does not follow from the originals, which anchor the speech of these two characters in the Mid Western language of the frontier and Black Vernacular respectively (cf. the appendix). The selection of this translation strategy and the resultant foregrounding of the temporal dimension in the speech of the protagonists seems to be determined by the target readership of both TL texts, generally assumed to be children (Krzeszowska 1975). In this context, the decision to retain some traits of the SL vernacular led to the introduction of the only type of language markedness accessible to young readers.

4.3.4. Artificial lexicalization

Attempting to convey in the TL lexis the social deixis of the SL text and locate the characters in a fictitious social grouping of the future, the translator chooses to generalize the SL dialect along its cultural difference dimension, devising to that end a vocabulary intended to be as foreign and futuristic for the target readership as the dialect of the original was for its SL readers (Michałowski (1988) and Stiller (1990)). E.g.:

A. Burgess
A Clockwork Orange
[...]
“Oh, you’ve recovered consciousness.” That was like a big root for a malenky pitza like her, and I tried to say so, but the slovenes came out only like er... er... er. She itised off and left me on my oddy knocky, and I could viedy now that I was in a malenky room of my own [...]

C. Michałowski
Mechaniczna pomarańcza
[...]
— O, odzyskałeś przytomność. Powiedzieli to zbyt pełnymi słowami, jak na taką literat do jak ona. Chociaż jej o tym powiedzieć, ale wyszło tylko e... e... e. Odgóręta i zaozwała małe samego i wtedy wyłukałem, że jestem w oddzielnym literalnym pokoju [...]

Wojn, litera laska, odgóręta, wyłukać, literalny pokój, sound unfamiliar enough for a monolingual speaker of Polish to impede the comprehension of the TL text and convey the menace and barbarism of the social group pointed to by the deixis of the original. Since this substrategy was taken advantage of only in the case of an SL text drawing on an artificial variety, its appearance can be therefore claimed to be a sufficient condition for the implementation of artificial lexicalization.

4.4. Partial translation

In the light of numerical data alone, the products of this strategy are scarcely distinct from the results of lexicalization; the difference, however, becomes apparent on closer inspection of the text samples themselves. E.g.:

F. J. Cooper
The Pioneers
[...]
“Welcome, welcome, Thongon,” said the elder of the party, with a strong German accent. “Miss Petya will owe me a kiss.” “And cheerfully will I pay it, my good sir,” cried the soft voice of Elizabeth;

T. Everet
Pionierowie
[...]
— Witamy, witamy, sędio — z wyraźnym niemieckim akcentem odpali starszy z mężczyzn. — Pani Betsy winna mi jest pocałunek. — I chętnie go odda, łaskawy panie — zawołała Elżbieta,

— Der Tenfel Ryszardz — wolał na pół serio, na pół żarem, — masz dziwny sposób wyłudowywania sąs.
used extensively in texts representative of any other types of dialect, save for individual lexical items quoted directly from the SL vernacular, e.g. Ligieth in Tarnowska's whose significance is lost on the TL readership, as the departure from the standard (here an elision of the initial unstressed syllable), and the diotic consequences of that fact (that it is characteristic of Black Vernacular (Labov 1967)) are not retrievable for the TL readers from their linguistic competences.

4.5. Transliteration

Although similar in its numerical characteristic to the products of lexicalization, the sample representative of this procedure shows significant differences. E.g.:

```
S. Bellow
Herzog
[...]
```

```
K. Tarnowska
A = 0.70
Herzog
Fig. 8
```

```
Alojn, alajn, alajn, alajn
Elen dy a ztajn
Mit di tzen finger — alejn
[...]
“Who is it?”
“It’s Moses...”
“I don’t know you. I’m alone. Moses?”
“Tante Tuba — Moses Herzog. Moshe.”
“Ah — Moshe.”
```

The distribution of the ratio meets the description pattern of lexicalization, pointing to the lexis of the TL text as the locus of markers conveying the SL dialect. The vocabulary the ratio represents does not, however, belong to the...
4.6. Speech defect

The nature of this translation strategy has already been referred to in discussing the methodology of this investigation, where it was defined as a procedure foregrounding defects in speakers' phonology as a vehicle of transferring the social deixis of the original, although the distribution of the ratio revealed a tendency to combine this strategy with others: e.g. the distribution patterns of two more text samples.
The discrepancies are therefore not many and none of them is typical of any TL language community (cf. Dejna 1974). The text may be thus said to have undergone full interlingual translation, i.e. from English into Polish, and intralingual translation, i.e. from the dialects into standard, with some defects posited in the TL phonology10 as on all the other levels of language use the translations do not diverge from the target language standard.

Full intralingual translation will nullify, however, the social deixis latent in the original. Although the TL texts do make it clear that the speech of some characters departs from the standard, the lack of dialect markers relating these differences to a specific TL variety renders it impossible for the target readership to validly infer which social group these characters are representative of. What is thus retrievable from these translations is the fact that the protagonists speak different varieties; any meaning inherent in the information as to which particular varieties these are is, however, lost.

The decision to refrain from identifying the nonstandard speaking characters with any TL social groups helps, nevertheless, to marginalize the risk of contaminating the SL text with TL intertextuality, imminent in any attempt at providing the translation with a less vacuous social deixis. Once the TL social groups are not named, the characters may be assumed to speak beyond those presupposed in the original may be assumed to be infitesimal.

The transfer of only the difference itself can be, therefore, claimed to be another try at striking a balance between the loyalty to the formal features of the original and the allegiance to its involuntary integrity, indicative of the approach verbalized in Levy (1963).

Positing few divergencies from the standard, and limiting them to the phonological stratum of language use only, seems also to hint at a language variety very close to the TL and definable much more in terms of an accent than a dialect. Such an interpretation of the meanings implied by the use of this translation strategy cannot, however, be relied on too far, as it appears to be constantly jeopardized by the possibility of understanding the speech defect in terms of idiosyncratic pronunciations of a particular character and not as a general property of the speech of a putative language community, let alone as symptoms of mental infirmity.

The reliance on phonological markers not relatable to any social grouping known to the TL readership may be also hypothesized to account for the range of texts this strategy has been found to be applied to. The speech defects are unquestionably best appreciated when actually heard, no wonder then that drama, i.e. literature designed primarily to be spoken aloud, prevails in fig. 10 and may be deemed to be the main area of implementation of this strategy, although...

---

10 Alternatively, this procedure could be described as a full interlingual translation paralleled by incomplete intralingual translation excluding the level of phonology. It would require, however, postulating a hypothetical variety of Polish, which seems unnecessary.
4.7. Relativization

The most salient feature of this translation strategy is its reduction of the SL dialect into the TL forms of address and honorifics (defined in Levinson 1983: 89-92), if available. E.g.:
grammatical, i.e., honorifics, for example: idzię, nie zaczepeńcie, nie podechodzić, trzymając się z dala in Barańczak. The latter is possible in Polish only in dialectal usages (Urbaniaczyk 1984: 50), adding a rustic tinge to the TL text. Both approaches focus, however, on laying bare the social hierarchy of the text world and explicating the inferiority or superiority of the speaker relative to the social status of the addressee. E.g.:

H. Fielding
The History of Tom Jones

[...]

“I smoke it. I smoke it. Tom is certainly the father of this bastard. Zooks, person, you remember how he recommended the weather o’her to me. D–n un, what a sly b–ch ‘tis. Ay, ay, as sure as twopence. Tom is the weather of the bastard.”

“I should be very sorry for that,” says the person. [...]

“What I suppose does pretend that thee hast never got a bastard? Pox! More good luck’s thine! For I warrant hast a done a therefore many’s the good time and often.”

A. Bidwell
Historia życia Tomka Jonesa, czyli dzieje podróży

[...]

— Czuję swąd! Czuję swąd! Tom jest na pewno ojcem tego dziecka. Do licha, pastorzke! Pamiętacie, jak on mi polecił i rekomendował ojca tej dziewczyny! A cóż to za chyty gągolaki! Jasne jak słońce. Tom jest ojcem tego dziecka!

— Ty chyba za przyko, gdyby to się okazało prawdą — rzekł pastorzke. [...]

— Co, wy pewno chciełbyszewie umówić we mnie, że niczego nie zrobił dziecko dziewczynie? Do licha! Toście mieli szczęścnie! Bo zaśio, że niejeden raz próbował, pastorzce!

Whether the social rank of the addressee is directly referred to by the terms of address — e.g. Ever29 or Marianowicz, — or only implied in a marked choice from the paradigm available to the speaker — e.g. the second person plural used to address an individual instead of the standard third person singular + pan, for instance Barańczak or pamiętacie, wy pewno chcielibyście, że niczego nigdy, toście mieli cited above it is, nevertheless, the only remnant of the SL text dialect, as the translations consistently resort to the TL standard everywhere else.

The strategy under consideration may thus be hypothesized to operate on two levels: inter and intralingual; on the latter, however, the scope of the process of translating seems to be limited pragmatically, excluding the means denoting social relations, no matter if they are lexical or grammatical. The numerical data, accordingly, show significant increases in the number of morphological and lexical dialect markers (Fig. 11).

The retention of the TL standard wherever the text does not denote the social rank of the character, manifest in the low scores in the remaining categories, contributes, however, to the fact that the total ratios only barely exceed the mean value for the entire corpus (x = 0.6322).

Leaving out almost all the dialect markers which do not directly delimit the relations between the text world social groupings, this strategy deprives the translations of social deictic detail hinting at which language community those relations actually pertain to. Such an infringement on the SL social deixis denies thus the target readership the possibility of identifying the nonstandard speaking characters with any particular social group, and limits the retrievable information to an outline of the mutual dependencies of the interlocutors.

The decision to restrict the transfer of the SL social deixis to a grid of the text world social relations minimizes, however, the risk of infusing into the SL text an intertextuality distorting its meaning; since only the hierarchy of the social strata is referred to, and none of them is explicitly identified, it is highly improbable that they will activate any associations not triggered by the original.

This translation strategy is therefore reminiscent of the one discussed above, i.e. speech defect, in adhering to the precepts verbalized in Levy (1963), and striving to strike a balance between fidelity to the full range of the SL text meanings and protecting its integrity. The choice of the means of rendering in the TL the network of the text world social relations, i.e. whether honorifics or terms of address are resorted to, is, however, meaningful in itself, affecting the conditions under which this procedure becomes operational. The discussion of the implementation of this translation strategy requires thus a division of relativization into two sub-strategies:

4.7.1. Honorifics

The selection of honorifics, as has already been mentioned above, amounts to a vague identification of nonstandard speech with the rural varieties of the TL (Urbaniaczyk 1984: 50). E.g.
Dialect in translation — practice

4.7.2. Terms of address

The application of this substrategy appears to be conditioned by the explicitness of its statements on the relationships prevailing between social groups which themselves remain implicit. Such foregrounding of the mutual dependencies at the expense of identificational detail seems to be favoured in translations targeting the young as their putative readership, e.g. all four TL versions of Alice's Adventures in Wonderland examined resorted in the dialect passage to the terms of address:

L. Carroll
Alice's Adventures in Wonderland
[...]

"Now tell me, Patsy, what's that in the window?"

"Sure, it's an arm, yer honour!" (He pronounced it 'arm'). "An arm, you goose! Who ever saw one that size? Why it fills the whole window!"

"Sure, it does, yer honour: but it's an arm for all that!"

M. Morawski39
Ala w krajinie czarów
[...]

— A teraz powiedz mi, co tam tkwi w oku- nie?

— Ramie, proszę jaśnie panu.


— Jak jaśnie pana szanuję, to jest tylko ramie, niech się jaśnie pan kogo zechce spyta.

4.8. Pidginization

The feature that sets this translation strategy apart from all the procedures discussed so far is the use of a full nonstandard TL variety where the latter, to various degrees, drew on the standard itself. E.g.:

H. Melville
Moby Dick
[...]

"Cap'ain, you see him small drop tar on water dere? You see him? Well, spose him one whale eye, well den!" And taking sharp aim at it, he durred the iron right over old Bildad's broad brim. [...]

— Kapitan, ty widzisz to małe płama smoła na wodzie? Widzisz go, to on to być oko wieloryb i proszę! — wycelowawszy dokładnie, cisnął żelazo tuż nad szerokokre- sym kapeluszem Bildada [...]

— No — rzekł Queequeg spojrzał, holując do siebie linie harpunu — gdyby on być oko wieloryb, to to wieloryby być żabia.
D. Defoe
Robinson Crusoe

[...]

"Why you angry mad with Friday, what me don't?" I asked him what he meant; I told him I was not angry with him at all.

"No angry! No angry!" says he repeating the words several times. "Why send Friday home away to my Nation?"

"Why (says I) Friday, did you not say you wish'd you were there?"

"Yes, yes," says he, "wish be both there, no wish Friday there, no Master there." In a word he wouldn't think of going there without me.

Although the exponents of this variety concentrate in the categories of morphology and syntax alone, e.g., the distribution of the ratio in both TL texts given in fig. 12, the confused genders and skipped inflections in: kapitan, ry widzieć, ten mała plana smola, on być oko, ta wieloryba być zabita (Zieliński24), and czemu pan gniewać się, co ja zrobić, czemu odsłać Piętąska do jego narod, chcieć pójść obaj, nie chcieć Piętąska być tam, are instantly recognizable as representative of Pidgin Polish, a fully fledged variety which was epitomized in the speech of Kali in H. Sienkiewicz's W pustyni i w puszczy, and widely used to amuse, e.g., The Zulu Gita routine performed by T. Ross. This variety appears also to have been presumed to be understandable both to the earlier generations of readers, e.g., the anonymous translation published as early as 1844; and to a readership out of touch with the mainstream of TL culture, e.g., a version prepared for the second and third generation of Polish immigrants to Brazil, published by Wydawnictwa Gazety Polskiej w Brazylii in 1940.

![Graph](image-url)

J. Birkkenmaje15
Przypadki Robinsona Crusoe

[...]

—Czemu pan gniewać się na Piętąska? Co ja zrobić? Odpowiedziłem, że nie gniewam się na niego wcale i nie rozumiem, o co mu chodzi.

—Nie gniewać się! Nie gniewać się! — powtarzał kilka razy. — A czemu odsłać Piętąska do jego narod?

—Jak to, mój Piętąska? Czyż nie mówiliś, że pragniesz tam wrócę?

—Tak, tak — rzeczy mi na to — chcieć pójść obaj. Nie chcieć Piętąska być tam, a pan tuż, i nie chciał ani myśleć o tym, by miał jechać tam bez mnie.

Anonymous16
Przypadki Robinsona Crusoe

[...]

J. Zawisza Krusczka17
Robinson Crusoe, przegady na bezludnej wyspie

[...]

J. Zawisza Krusczka17
Robinson Crusoe, przegady na bezludnej wyspie

[...]

Jo: — Lecz dlaczego twój nie wybili cię na wolność?
On: Oni wprowadzili mię pętłą, jeden, dwa, trzy i inne w swoich ćwodzi, a mój naród nie miał wtedy ćwodzi.


J. Zawisza Krusczka17
Robinson Crusoe, przegady na bezludnej wyspie

[...]

Jo: A dlaczego nie odebrali was z rąk wrogów?
Pieć: Gonił nas, jeden, dwa, trzy i ja, mieli kanoy. Moi bracia nie mieć czoln.
Jo: Dobrze, Pięć, a co twoi bracia robią z tymi ludźmi, których biorą do niewoli; czy także ich zdająja?
Pieć: Tak, moi bracia także jeść ludzi.

Kanoy and Pięć in the text published in Brazil bear out the claim that the version was written in a literary tradition undergoing separation from its roots, both translations, however, resort to the same variety, testifying thus to its vitality and universal appeal. E.g.: moi bracia też jeść ludzi, moi bracia nie mieć czolna (Zawisza17); and mój naród zdaje ludzi, my zdajemy wszystkich naszych jeńców, w swoich ćwodzi, a mój naród nie miał wtedy ćwodzi (Anonymous16).

The introduction of a full nonstandard TL variety signifies, however, that the process of translating has been performed only interlinguistically, directly from one dialect into another, with the exclusion of the assistance of intralingual translation to turn some parts or strata of the original into the standard, adhering thus to the theoretical approach verbalized, for instance, in Catford (1965).

Bypassing the intralingual stage of the process of translation, pidginization supplies the target readership with TL dialect markers, which warrants an unabridged transmission of the original social deixis, and, consequently, makes
it possible to identify the speech community the variety has been drawn on and the social group the nonstandard speaking characters are representative of, both sociologically and geographically.

Although it is by far less known and spoken worldwide, Pidgin Polish may be assumed to parallel Pidgin English in its relation to the standard and the risk of distorting the meaning of the SL text by the activation of associations not implied by the original is, therefore, infinitesimal. It is, however, a risk inherent in any total translation of SL dialect, and should the relation holding between the TL and SL nonstandard varieties be less clear cut than here, the introduction of intertextuality foreign to the original, with all its attendant consequences, may be inevitable.

Resorting to the _pidgin_ variety of the TL, the practitioners of this translation strategy draw thus directly on the speech of the people for whom the TL is a second and principally unrelated language, mastered only to a limited extent, and considerably distant culturally. The choice of this way of transferring the SL text social deixis identifies then the nonstandard speaking characters with a social group of non natives, potentially exotic both in their origin and culture, and marginally participating in the TL customs, traditions, heritage and way of life. E.g. speakers whose first languages are claimed to be Amerindian and Maori, respectively.

H. Melville

_Moby Dick_

[...]

"Line! line!" cried Queequeg, looking over the gunwale; "him fast! him fast! — Who line him? Who struck? — Two whale; one big, one little!"

"What all ye, man?" cried Starbuck.

"Look-e here!" said Queequeg pointing down.

J. F. Cooper

_The pathfinder_

[...]


J. Sujkowska

_Bestia morska_

[...]

— Lina, lina! — krzyknął Queequeg, przechylając się przez burę. — Złap! złap! Kto jego złapa na lina? Kto uderzy? Dwa wieloryby; jeden duży, drugi mały!


B. Zielinski

_Tropiciel Słów_

[...]

— Za dużo wody — odrzekł Grot Strzały, lekko kijającą głową. — Tuskarrora za chytry, żeby robić ogień z wody. Błada twarz za dużo książek, palić byle co; dużo książek, mało wiedzę!

Kto jego złapa na lina; Kto uderzyć; dwa wieloryby; jeden duży, drugi mały; pociąć tutaj (Sujkowska) and blada twarz za dużo książek, palić byle co; dużo książek, mało wiedzieć (Zielinski) sound foreign enough to transfer the exotic roots of the protagonists; such an identification may be validly sought, however, only if the social deixis of the original does the same. It is, therefore, only natural that the implementation of this translation strategy should be limited to the SL texts employing pidgin varieties of the SL themselves. Cf. fig. 13.

4.9. Artificial variety

Similarly to the translation strategy discussed above, this procedure draws on a full nonstandard TL variety; it is not, however, a dialect actually extant in that language (Stiller 1991). E.g.:

A. Burgess

_A Clockwork Orange_

[...]

"Oh, you're recovered consciousness!" That was like a big rootful for a malenky pilsa like her, and I tried to say so, but the slovsec came out only like er... er... er. She itted off and left me on my oddy knocky, and I could widdly now that I was in a malenky room of my own, not in one of these long wards like I had been in as a very little malchick, full of coughing, dying, starry weeks all around to make you want to get well and fit again. It had been like dipherin I had bad then, O my brothers.

R. Stiller

_Mechaniczna pomarańcza_

[...]

— Ooo! Więc odzyskałeś przytomność. Za wiecki bołach w usto dla maluskiej psiczki, jak ona, to jej próbował powiedzieć, ale wyszło mi tylko yknie jakieś yyl i nic więcej. Wyszła i zostawiła ją sam na sam gwalt i adzinko dopiero zobaczyłem, że leży w osobnym pokoiku, a nie na takiej długiej sali, gdzie trzymali mnie jako drobnego rybiona, pełnej kustii, każdy zbyt chorych wkładając piękniów, żeby ci się prędzej odbiecia chować, tylko aby wyzdrawiać i wlec. Miałem wiedzę coś jakby dżyreczy, o bratrzewkowie.

Neither the lexical items: _bołach, usto, psiczka, rybionok, nor the syntactic pattern found in: zostawisz ją sam na sam gwalt i adzinko, are indicative of any existing TL variety, although the spelling conventions and the phonology they reflect are clearly Polish: e.g. _/w/ _represented by _<l>, _bołach; _/spelt _<s> _and _/l_ _<cz>_ in _psiczka etc._, excluding quotations from a foreign language.
The variety taken advantage of in the TL text appears therefore to be an artificial dialect of Polish coined by the translator, who drew both on Russian, e.g. the items cited above; and colloquial Polish, e.g. the plural concord in: więc odrzuciliśmy przytomność or the lexical items: kastu, kastu, próchniaki and the vocative o brawyczkiwowie (Markowski 1992: 25-50).

The range of the dialect markers, covering morphology, syntax and lexis, as well as occasionally touching on pronunciation, e.g. the long /u/ in dluugiej, and the functional diversity of this purposely used variety, seem to substantiate its claim to the status of a full, albeit futuristic dialect of Polish (the translator’s claim of having anticipated the development of Polish is, however, quite far fetched).

Since the strategy under consideration resorts to the use of a fully fledged nonstandard TL variety, the process of translating may be hypothesized to be performed only interlinguially between the two dialects in question, with the exclusion of the aid of intralingual translation, as it is advocated by almost any student of translation.

Providing the target readership with TL dialect markers, this procedure therefore makes it possible for the readers to recover from the TL text the social deixic information which enables them, in turn, to infer further details pertaining to the roots and character of the social group the dialect is representative of.

The unhindered retrievability of the SL text social deixis is achieved, however, at the cost of jeopardizing the integrity of the text. Although the TL variety is artificial and may be deemed free of any extratextual associations, it is nevertheless, based on a specific natural language which may activate in the TL text readers an intertextuality not presupposed in the original, as the attitudes toward that language may vary between the SL and TL cultures. The damage is only potential and difficult to assess, it seems, however, to be unavoidable.

Developing an artificial TL dialect, the translator reaches, however, beyond the varieties accessible to the readers and forces them to face the unknown. Besides conveying the anxiety inherent in the future and speculating on the evolution of the TL, this procedure strives therefore to identify the nonstandard speaking characters with members of a hypothetical social group whose characteristics reside entirely in the associations triggered by the linguistic material the futuristic variety is based on. The creation of a dialect founded on the colloquial language and heavily influenced by Russian amounts therefore to projecting a social group which is inferior to the readers’ society in sophistication, but surpasses it in violence and barbarism.

The establishment of such a hypothetical identification is legitimate, nevertheless, only if the SL text resorts to the same, which makes the usage of an artificial variety in the original a necessary condition for the implementation of the translation strategy under consideration.

4.10. Colloquialization

Following the pattern set by the two strategies discussed above, this procedure also employs a full nonstandard TL variety; it is not, however, a marginal or futuristic dialect. E.g.:

H. Lee
To Kill a Mockingbird
[...]

"What time was it, Mr. Ewell?" "Just 'fore sundown. Well I was sayin' Mayella was screamin' fit to beat Jesu [...], well, Mayella was raisin' this holy racket so I dropped m'load and run as fas as I could, but I run into the fence, but when I got distangled I run up to th' window and I seen [...]. I seen that black nigger yonder runnin' on my Mayella!"

A. Walker
The Color Purple
[...]

He come home with a girl from round Gray. She be my age but they married. He be on her all the time. She work round like she don't know what hit her. I think she thought she love him. But he got so many of us. All need somethin.

My little sister Nettie is get a boyfriend in the same shape almost as Pa. His wife dide. She was kill by her boyfriend coming home from church. He got only three children though. He seen Nettie in church and now every Sunday evening here come Mr. I tell Nettie to keep at her books. It be more then a notion taking care of children aint even yours. And look what happen to Ma.

W. Faulkner
As I lay dying
[...]

"A fellow's got to guess ahead now and then," I say. "But, come long and short, it won't be no harm done neither way."

Z. Kierszyńska
Zabić dracza
[...]

— Ktoś to był przezadz, panie Ewell? — Przed samym zachodem słońca. No, ja mówię, Mayella wyaczusza, że mógłby ogłuchać Jezus [...]. No, Mayella zrobila ten pietelski rahan, więc upadłem chochla, co go miałem, i pobiłem czym prosię, ale wpadłem na plot, ale kiedy się odprzepędziłem, pobiłem do okna i patrzę, a tu [...] i patrzę, u ten tam smolech, czarny byk, ponieważ mi moja Mayelle!

M. Kłobukowska
Kolor Purpury
[...]


E. Życieński
Kiedy umieram
[...]

— Czasem człowiek musi i naprzód przewidzieć — mówił. — Ale jak tam było, ni w jednym, ni w drugim, skońca się nie stanie.
"She'll want to get started right off," he says.  
"It's fair enough to Jefferson at best."  
"But the roads are good now," I say.  
"It's fixing to rain tonight, too.  His folks buries at New Hope, too, not three miles away.  But it's just like him to marry a woman born a day's hard ride away and have her die on him.  He looks out over the land, rubbing his knees."

"No man so mislikes it," he says.  "They'll get back in plenty of time."

Whether it is the syntax of these samples, e.g.: więc upuśćciliem ten chrust, co go nioślem (Kierszysz[52]; żeści się z kobiętą, co się roządła o doty dzień drogi gdzieś tam (Życińska[58]); i co raz który czegoś chce (Kłobukowski[58]); I przy ładnej pogodzie do Jefferson ładny kawał drogi (Życińska[58]); jak się wraçała z kościoła (Kłobukowski[58]); with the nonstandard relative pronoun co (Kierszysz[52] and (Życińska[58]), iterated paratactic conjunctions (Kłobukowski[58]), or a superfluous reflexivization (Kłobukowski[58]); or the lexis these translations draw on, e.g.: dzieć się, wreszcie, sentence initial no (Kierszysz[52]; ładny kawał drogi, w czas wróć (Życińska[58]); or skąpię, bachory, stanający, pewniaki (Kłobukowski[58]); they are all indicative of colloquial Polish (Markowski 1992), i.e. a variety much more central to the structure of language than a virtually anused pidgin or a hypothetical dialect of the future.

In accordance with the descriptions of this variety (e.g. Markowski 1992), the phonological and morphological markers are relatively infrequent (cf. the distribution of the ratio in these samples given below). If present they are, however, representative of the same dialect, e.g.: mójem, pomys, tere (Kłobukowski[58]) and dzieć (Kłobukowski[58]), in both categories respectively.

---

**Colloquialization**

Lexical and syntactic markers clearly predominate, outnumbering the exponents of the two categories investigated. The variety resorted to is not, however, by any means, a generalization limited to only one stratum of language use as was the case in lexicalization or speech deficit; this translation strategy refers to colloquial TL in all its vital aspects, varying only the extent to which that source is drawn on. E.g.:

G. B. Shaw  
Pigmanon  
[...]

The Flower Girl:  
How much?  
Taxman:  
Can't you read? A shilling,  
The Flower Girl:  
A shilling for two minutes!  
Taxman:  
Two minutes or ten: it's all the same.  
The Flower Girl:  
I don't call it right.  
Taxman:  
Ever been in a taxi before?

M. Twain  
The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn  
[...]

"An look at that — air ladder made out'n rags, sister Hotchkiss," says old Mrs. Damrell, "What in the name o' goodness could he ever want of..."  
"The very words I was a-sayin' no longer ago th'n this minute to Sister Utterback, n' she'll tell you so herself, sh-she, look at that air rag ladder, sh-she."

The range of colloquial features resorted to would certainly be incomplete without the disparaging honorifics encoded in addressing interlocutors in the third person singular without the standard panpani, e.g.: czywać nie umie; jechała kiedy taksówką (Piotrowski[43]), or frequent interjections venting the speakers' emotions, e.g.: Weź pan, w imię Boga, pan Hotchkiss (Tarnowska[34]).

The introduction of such a TL dialect into the process of translating restricts, however, its scope to the interlingual transfer only, in line with the theoretical approaches advocating direct translation from the SL nonstandard variety into an equivalent TL dialect.

Providing the target readership with a full range of dialect markers typical of a well known TL variety, colloquialization facilitates inferring the social
deictic information latent in the text and implies identifying the nonstandard speaking protagonists with the lower strata of TL society unable to vary their speech to match the formality of the situation. The ease of the retrieval of the SL social deixis is accomplished, however, at the cost of infringing on its specificity and precision; since it is the social aspect of the deixis of the original text that is focused on, the information pertaining to the geographical location of the speaker seems to have been judged less vital and, consequently, forfeited. E.g.:

W. Faulkner
The Sound and the Fury

"I works to suit de man what pays me Sat'dy night," he says. "When I does that, it don't leave me a whole lot of time to please other folks." He screwed up a nut.

"Aint nobody works much in dis counry cep de boll-weevil, noways," he says.

The syntax of żeby dogodzić temu, co mi płaci rygodniówkę w sobótę wieczór or dżisz a to w tym kraju nikt duży nie pracuje, tylko stonka bawelniana clearly identifies the speaker with a low status social group (Markowski 1992). It is, however, impossible, to locate him geographically, as his language does not betray any regional features and the colloquial variety he uses is spoken throughout the TL territory.

Foregrounding the social dimension of the SL text deixis at the expense of its geographical reality, this procedure strives also to curb the contamination of the meaning of the original with an intertextuality specific only to the TL. Since the nonstandard varieties generally command much lower prestige than the standard itself, the risk that the connotations activated by the use of the most widely spoken TL nonstandard variety will go beyond the associations implied by the SL text may be deemed negligible.

Drawing on colloquial language, this strategy does not, however, seek to identify the SL text nonstandard speaking characters with that part of TL society which is proficient in this variety, as it would render the TL text deixis virtually meaningless, but only with those speakers who do not feel competent in any other one, i.e. with the people who are unable to adjust their speech to the level of formality assumed by the interlocutor or required by the setting. E.g.:

H. Lee
To Kill a Mockingbird

"Is there any other way to go?"
"No suh, none's I know of"
"Tom, did she ever speak to you?"
"Why, yes suh, I'd tip m' hat when I'd go by, and one day she asked me to come inside"

Z. Kierszys
Zabić drogła

"Czy nie mogę chodzić inną drogą? — Nie.
psz... anu, nie wiem, żeby tam była inna droga.
— Tom, czy panna Ewell się kiedy zagadywała?
— No i owszem, psz... anu. Jak przechodziło, to się kłaniałem kapeluszem i jednego

Rusticalization

the fence and bust up a chiffrobe for her"

[...] She said: "I reckon I'll hafta give you a nickel, won't I?" and I said "No, ma'am, there ain't no charge."

dnia mnie poprosiła, żebym wszedł na podwórkó i porządził na niej szafę. [...] Powiedzieli: "To chyba muszę ci dać piątka, prawda?" A ja powiedziałem: „Nie, psz... panny Ewell, to bez placenia".

The inability to vary one’s language, visible in the contrast between the standard questions and colloquial responses, e.g.: nie wiem, żeby tam była inna droga, kłaniałem się kapeluszem, psz... anu, psz... panny, piątka etc. vs czy nie mogłeś... czy panna... etc., further amplified by situating the exchange in a court of law, is thus explicitly indicative of an uneducated speaker, implying, at the same time a person identified with the poor, the powerless, the underprivileged and the vulnerable.

The presupposition of such group membership seems also to account for the range of SL texts this translation strategy has been found to apply to. As is evident from fig. 15 colloquialization correlates well with SL text dialects whose speakers are either perceived in the TL culture to be powerless and struggling for their rights (as well as not identifiable nowadays with any specific region), e.g. Black Vernacular; or known in the TL culture to differ from the mainstream of society due to their lack of education and poverty, e.g. Southern AE or Cockney. The use of such a dialect in the original could therefore be the reason for the implementation of this procedure.

The use of this translation strategy has then been found to be conditioned by a factor entirely different from the set of criteria posited in Sienkiewicz (1984) for approximate variety substitution, which appears to parallel colloquialization in most of its properties.

4.11. Rusticalization

The property that stands out the most in the translations representative of this strategy, making it instantly recognizable, is the use of a full nonstandard TL regional variety. E.g.:

W. Shakespeare
King Lear

— Why, yes suh, I'd tip m' hat when I'd go by, and one day she asked me to come inside

J. Paszkowski
Krod Lind

Oswald:
Let go slave, or thou diest.

Oswald:
Odstąp, szubrawce, albo zginiesz.
process of translating will therefore be limited to the interlingual transfer only, from one nonstandard variety into another, in line with the theories advocating the usage of a TL dialect to render the nonstandard passages of the SL text. Adhering to this tenet, the strategy under consideration provides thus the target readership with numerous (cf. fig. 16), and instantly accessible TL dialect markers, facilitating the retrieval of the social deixis latent in the text both in its sociological and geographical aspects. Since it is a specific TL regional variety that is referred to, it is therefore possible to infer not only the social status of its speakers, but also their provenance (cf. the two samples discussed above), and due to considerable marker density (cf. fig. 16) both identifications seem to be quite palpable.

The aggregate ratios in the samples cited above (1.47 and 1.90 respectively) significantly surpass the average value for the entire corpus (\( x = 0.6322 \)) locating these TL texts in the tail of the marker sequence curve displayed in fig. 1, which may be assumed to be representative of all the samples found to be dominated by this strategy, as the mean value of the ratio in those texts is equal to 1.53.

The multitude of dialect markers reflected by these data can therefore be claimed to guarantee a full and in depth retrieval of the social deictic information encoded in the translation. To a considerable extent, however, the information conveyed by these markers will be specific to the TL texts only, and not implied by the original. The associations evoked by the use a particular language variety may differ between the SL and TL readerships in the case of any dialect, the gap appears, however, to be especially relevant if the variety resorted to is as
Dialect in translation — practice

Choice, as even limiting the number of the dialect features resorted to may be meaningful in itself.

W. Shakespeare
King Lear
[...]

Oswald:
Let go slave, or thou diest.
Edgar:
Good gentleman, go your gait, and let poor Volk pass. An ch'ad ha' been zagger'd out of my life, 't would not ha' been so long as 't is by a vornight.
Nay, come not near the old man; keep out, che vor' ye or ise try whether your costard or my hulow be the harder. Ch'll be plain with you.

The dialect of Małopska, manifest in (i) the replacement of palato-alveolar fricatives and affricates by their dental counterparts; [ʃ]/[ʃ], [ʃ]/[ʃ], [ʃ]/[ʃ], [ʃ]/[ʃ] /ɔ/wa, ɔ/wa, ɔ/wa; /ɔ/→/ɔ/; (ii) the distribution of /ɔ/ and /ɔ/ alternative to the standard and relatable to divergent developments of the Old Polish long open and front half close vowels respectively (Dejna 1974) wom, iy; (iii) the denasalization of the standard /ɔ/ and /ɔ/; /ɔ/→/ɔ/; /ɔ/; prawie, swojom, drogom; (iv) dialectal honorifics; ɔ/djece, dajsc, prawyrajcje; and (v) the lexical items: ɔdrom, panocku, ɔpeta; clearly indicates a rustic speaker, but additionally activates also the associations of hilly countryside typical of Southern Poland, steep roofed loghouses and poor but stalwart sustenance farmers holding small patches of barely arable land, none of which can be claimed to be latent in the original.

As has already been mentioned above, should the translation employ a highly language specific TL variety, laden with connotations particular solely to the readers' culture, the influx of intertextuality foreign to the original and skewing the comprehension of the text will be greatly enhanced. The practitioners of the translation procedures discussed so far have been found to try to minimize these distortions either disregarding the dialectal features of the original (neutralization), or drawing only on some facets of the TL variety in question (lexicalization, speech defect, relativization) or referring to a TL dialect closely paralleled in the SL (pidginization, colloquialization). The translators deciding on the implementation of this strategy, appear, however, to have little

11 Cf. the remarks in Reed (1967: 59), and Chambers and Trudgill (1980: 106-112); retating the degree of variation in speech to the length of the period of time an area has been settled.
The use of such a variety, furnishing the TL readership with numerous dialect markers on various levels of language use (cf. fig. 16) appears, however, to go much further than merely facilitating the retrieval of social deixis information. As has already been exemplified above, the abundance of dialectal detail, tantamount to an unrestricted influx of TL culture intertextuality, significantly increases the probability of a full identification of the nonstandard speaking characters with members of a TL rural speech community, shifting the setting of the plot into that region and naturalizing the protagonists.

In the light of this analysis it seems only natural that majority of the texts found to have been dominated by this procedure are representative of drama (cf. fig. 17), since the acceptance of stage conventions is an essential part of the concept of theatre itself, and the putative changes of setting and identity claimed above, will only add on to an artificiality already agreed upon.

The theatrical conventionality implicit in the use of this strategy is even more apparent when two dialects are drawn on. E.g.:

**G. B. Shaw**

*Pygmalion*

[...]

*Liza*: But I'm sayin' it Ahyee, Byee, Ceye.

*Higgins*: Stop. Say a cup of tea.

*Liza*: A cappete-ee.

*Higgins*: Put your tongue forward [...] Now say cup.

*Liza*: C-c-c. I can't. C-cup.

[...]

*The Bystander*: You be careful: give him a flower for it.

*The Bystander*: Theres a bloke here behind taking down every blessed word you're saying.

[...]

*The Bystander*: That aint a police whistle: thats a sporting whistle.

**F. Sobieniowski**

*Pigmalion*

[...]

*Eliza*: Przecie mówię... A, by, cy...

*Higgins*: Doć. Powiedź herbata.

*Eliza*: Chierbata.

*Higgins*: Nie ściśkaj gardła — otwórz usta szerzej... i powiedź „herbata”.

*Liza*: Nie magie... ch...ch... herbata.

[...]

*Pierwszy z gawędzi*: dej pozór... Cisniej ta w niego jakim kwia... Pod ściną jakość skiel stoi i kuże twoje słówko do książki wpisuje...

[...]

*Pierwszy z gawędzi*: Ni, to nie polska język, to sportowy.
Concluding remarks and summary

Inquiring into the treatment of dialect in translation, this project has proceeded on the assumptions that:
— dialect subsumes language variation relatable only to a particular speaker and independent of the setting, register, discourse function, etc.;
— whether it is pursued synchronically or diachronically, dialect is an essentially relative concept, definable only against the background of the standard language;
— translation underlies all communication and is intrinsically imperfect; below the level of language (between idiolects, styles, registers, dialects, etc.) it is rarely reflected on and its difficulty goes mainly unnoticed, but while crossing a standard language barrier it poses problems conspicuous enough to give rise to conscious rules and investigations;
— translation may thus be explored interlingually (between individual languages), intralingually (between their varieties) and intersemiotically (between particular sign systems);
— the prime interest of the theory of translation is the pursuit of the process of translating itself;
— the process may be modelled as a chain of decisions with the initial choices determining a general strategy of solving subsequent translation difficulties;
— translators behave consistently, so that the process can be retraced through the study of the products of translating, ultimately pointing to an overall strategy followed in a particular text;
— given their disparate means and objectives, as well as the fact that translations are texts, individual strategies can be compared only against a system of reference able to account for textuality in general, i.e. a text linguistic model of discourse.

Being a relative notion, dialect has thus been claimed to be intrinsically deictic, pointing to a specific community of speakers referred to in a text and providing, at the same time, ample information on the external characteristics of such a group through drawing on the readership’s associations. In technical terms, dialectal usages have therefore been hypothesized to contribute to the textuality of a passage principally by supplying it with social deixis and rich intertextuality. Consequently, these two dimensions become convenient yardsticks against which it is possible to compare the performance of individual strategies tackling dialect in translation, and assess their strengths and weaknesses.

The validity of this theoretical statement has been confirmed by the fact that its application to an extensive corpus of translations from English into Polish made it possible to account coherently for all the observable facts, which clearly was not feasible in terms of earlier approaches to the problem.

Supplementing the deictic and intertextual investigations with statistical analysis of the distribution of dialect markers in individual translations has thus led to the isolation of ten distinct strategies:

1. Neutralization — full intralingual and interlingual translations of the SL text.

2. Lexicalization — full interlingual translation accompanied by an intralingual translation excluding the level of lexis, forming four distinct sub-strategies:
   a) rural lexicalization,
   b) colloquial lexicalization,
   c) diminutive lexicalization,
   d) artificial lexicalization.

3. Partial translation — incomplete intralingual and interlingual translations of the SL text excluding select excerpts.

4. Transliteration — incomplete intralingual and interlingual translations of the SL text supplemented by the transliteration of select excerpts.

5. Speech defect — full interlingual and intralingual translations with a defect posed in the TL phonology.

6. Relativization — full interlingual translation accompanied by an intralingual translation excluding the domain of:
   a) honorifics,
   b) terms of address.

7. Pidginization — full interlingual translation into the pidgin variety of the TL.

8. Artificial variety — full interlingual translation into a hypothetical TL dialect.

9. Colloquialization — full interlingual translation into the colloquial variety of the TL.

10. Rusticization — full interlingual translation into a rural TL dialect.

When listed in that order, these procedures range continuously between the extremes of forfeiting the original social deixis for the sake of protecting the text from contaminating it with TL intertextuality, and recreating the SL text social deixis in TL terms at the risk of replacing the original intertextuality with associations specific solely to the language of the translation. The most radical procedure is neutralization (1), which strives to guard the integrity of
the text undergoing translation against any distortions at the cost of forgoing its social deixis altogether. More moderate approaches seek to strike a balance between the two, and recreate an outline of the SL text social deixis while placing various constraints on the imminent influx of the TL intertextuality. Lexicalization (2), partial translation (3) and transliteration (4) limit the transfer of social deixic meaning to the level of lexis alone, speech defect restricts that operation to the level of phonology, and relativization (6) draws only on honorifics and terms of address, conveying the social hierarchy referred to without even naming the groups involved. The four remaining strategies rely on full nonstandard TL varieties, running thus the risk of replacing the original intertextuality with associations not latent in the SL text. Whether the advantage of precise recreation of the original social deixis actually outweighs the risk of distorting the text, depends, however, on the characteristics of the variety resorted to. Drawing on a little used pidgin and a hypothetical dialect, pidginization (7) and artificial variety (8) seem to be relatively unlikely to activate associations significantly altering the meaning of the SL text. In the case of colloquialization (9) and rusticization (10), which depend on a much more widely used TL varieties (colloquial language and rural dialects respectively), the probability of ousting the original intertextuality and losing the translation with items triggering purely TL specific associations is, nevertheless, considerably higher.

The assumption that translating may be approximated as a decision making process entails, however, that the conditions under which individual strategies become operational cannot be stated in absolute terms — e.g. a procedure X is resorted to if and only if the text meets certain requirements — but only as tendencies, e.g.: given a strategy X its use is the most likely to be triggered by factor Y. These are human translators who make each decision involved in the process and they have to be allowed some leeway to appraise a text, select a translation strategy or even to err. Were they required to follow a fixed rule, they would be reduced to the status of automata executing a default procedure; this might lead to more elegant generalization, but instead of accounting for the observable facts it would only dictate what the translators ought to do.

Some procedures were thus linked to the genre of the text undergoing translation: neutralization (1) was found to be highly probable in poetry, while speech defect (5) and rusticization (10) dominate in drama. Other strategies were shown to be triggered by the dialect resorted to in the original: pidginization (7), artificial variety (8), honorifics (6a), as well as rural and artificial lexicalization (2a and 2d) tend to be operational if the SL text draws on a pidgin, an artificial variety or a rural dialect respectively. Still other factors include: (i) low social status of the characters referred to — e.g. colloquialization (9) and colloquial lexicalization (2b); (ii) young age of the prospective readers — e.g. terms of address (6b) and diminutive lexicalization (2c); (iii) drawing
Appendix

The Appendix contains the corpus of data underlying the analysis presented in chapter four. All the samples are preceded by the identification of their source, the dialect resorted to in the source language text, and the basis of its description, if available.

Source: G. Chaucer, The Canterbury Tales, The Reeve’s Tale
Identification: Northern Middle English
Description: Schlauch (1959)

[...]
Alan the clerk in all this melody
Gave John a poke and said, "Are ye awake?
Did ye ever hear ye take for guidance sake?"
There's family prayers for ye among they nodlies!
Wild fire come doon and burn them up, the bodlies!
Who ever heard a canny thing like that?
The devil take their souls for what they're at!
All this lang neet I shall na get nie rest!
'But never ye mind, all shall be for the best;
I tell ye, John, as sure as I'm a man
I'm going to have that wench there, if I can!
The law grants easement when things gan amiss,
For John there is a law that gans like this:
"If in one point a person be aggrieved,
Then in another he shall be reviewed."
"Wor corn, iz Stolen, nivver doubt of that;
I'll — luck has followed us in all we're at,
And since no compensation has been offered
Against wot loss, I'll take the easement propered
God's soul, it shall be so indeed, none other!"
John whispered back to him "Be careful, brother."
The miller is a terible man for slaughter;
If he should wake and find ye with his daughter
'He might do injury to you and me!
"Injury? Him! I count him not a flea!"
Alan rose up [...]
John lay there still for quite a little while
Complaining and lamenting in this style:
'A bloody joke ... Lord, What a chance to miss!"
A ja tu leży jać wór z otrąbami...
Gdy rzecz rozęjdzie się między druhami,
Za durnia weznan mnie i lichą duszą,
Daliób, wstanę i odważnie ruszę!
Ludziska mówią: „śmiertkom się powodzi!”

Source: Sir Patrick Spence

Identification: Scots
Description: Aitken (1984)

The king sits in Dunfermline town
Drinking the blue-red wine,
‘O where will I get good sailor,
To sail this ship of mine?’

Up and spake an elder knight,
Sat at the king’s right knee:
‘Sir Patrick Spence is the best sailor
That sails upon the sea.’

The king has written a broad letter
And sign’d it with his hand;
And sent it to Sir Patrick Spence,
Was walking on the sand.

The first line that Sir Patrick read,
A loud laugh laughed he;
The next line that Sir Patrick read,
The tear blinded his eye.

Lute, late yestreen! I saw the new moon
With the old moon in her arm;
And I fear, I fear, my deare master
That we will come to harm!

O our Scotch nobles were right loath
To wet their cork-heel’d shoon;
But long ere all the play were played,
Their hats swam aboon!

O long, long may their ladies sit
With their fans in their hand,
O’er they see Sir Patrick Spence
Come sailing to the land.

O long, long may the ladies stand
With their gold combs in their hair,
Waiting for their own dear lords
For they’ll see them na mair.

Half o’er hold o’er to Aberdour,
It’s fifty fathom deep;
And there lies good Sir Patrick Spence,
With the Scotch lords at his feet.
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Władysław Dulęba: Sir Patrick Spens, [w:] Król Orfej i inne ballady szkockie i angielskie, Polskie Wydawnictwo Muzyczne 1975, str. 13-15

Siedzi król w mieście Dunfermline,
czerwone pije wino.
Nowy, powiada, okręt mam,
lecź kto by nim popłynął.

A pewien rycerz stary wstał
niedbago słowo waży
i mówi tak: Sir Patrick Spens
najpierw bazm z tych żeglarzy.

Napisał król szeroki list
i pieczę doń przypożył,
gdy przyszłeś list, Sir Patrick Spens
przechadzał się nad morzem.

W Norwegów kraj popółnież nam,
po falach mór popłyniesz,
królewska córka czeka tam,
przywieziesz nam ją ninie.

O świecie rusza zacna łódź,
egużuje się ludziska!
Nieszczyśliwa kapitulacja los,
ielektrzna burza błyska!

Widziałem wczoraj wieczór nów,
jak tulil książę stary;
jesli ruszymy w taki czas
możemy przebadać miary.

O, długo mogły punie tak
siedzieć z wachlarzem w ręce,
patrząc, czy wraca okręt nasz
pod Sir Patrickem Spensem!

Dziecięcza długo mogły też
cześćć z grzebianiem w dłoni,
ale kochanki żaden już
nie wrócił z tamtej strony.

W połowie szlaku do Aberdour,
na dwóch szep głęboko,
tam leży nasz Sir Patrick Spens
ze szkocką swą zabóją.

Source: W. Shakespeare, King Lear, Act 4, Scene 6
Identification: Schlauch (1959)
Description: Kentish

Oswald: Wherefore, bold peasant
            Darst thou support a publish'd traitor? Hence;
            Lest that the infection of this fortune take
            Like hold on thee. Let go his arm.

Edgar: Ch'ill not let go, zir, without further 'caision.

Oswald: Let go slave, or thou diest.

Edgar: Good gentleman, go your gai, and let poor
volk pass. An ch'nd h'z been zagger'd out of my
life, 't would not ha' been zo long as 't is by a
vornightly.

Nay, come not near the old man; keep out, che
vor' ye or iie try whether your costard or my
bable be the harder. Ch'ill be plain with you.

Oswald: Out, dunghill!

Edgar: Ch'ill pick your teeth, zir. Come; we matter
vor your foons.

- 3 -

Stanisław Barańczak: Król Lear, „W drodze” 1991, str. 154

Oswald: Jak śmiesz, chanie
            Stawaj w obronie napiętnowanego
            Zdrajcy! Uważaj, żeby cię nie skęla
            Zaraza jego haniebnego losu
            Pecz! Puść i zaraz jego ramię!

Edgar: Nie puszęc, wielmoży panie, chyba że do bijatyki dojdzie.

Oswald: Puść, niedźwiedzu, bo zginięs!

Edgar: Idziesz swoją drogą, dobry panie, i biednych ludziśków nie zaczeprzyjacie. Jakbym ja
tak przez byle co miał się wzywać z życia, to bym byl nieboszczykiem już że dwa
tygodnie. Nie pochodziście do starego, powiadam! Trzymając się z dala, mówić po
dobremu, bo jak nie, to spróbuję, co twardze — wasza makówka czy moja pałka!
Mówię, jak jest!
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Witold Chwałecki: Król Lear, PIW 1964, str. 177

Oswald: Jak śmiesz chłopie,
            Za zdrajęcą, wrogiem państwa się ujmować?
            Odsąd na stronę albo zły los jego
            I sam podźielisz. Puść i zaraz jego ramię!

Edgar: Wielmoży panie, czy koniecznie trzeba, żebym puścił?

Oswald: Odsąd albo zginiesz, chanie.

Edgar: Idźcie, dobodzieju panie, swojom drogom i dajcie chudobie przejść, że król z pyśkiem na
matie wsiadże, to zaraz się nie wykoprytaną, boybom już dobrze dwie niedziele temu
któ odwalił. Radze, panie, do starucha nie podchodzie, a nie, to obeczym, co twardze,
moja pałka czy wasza makówka. Bez ogródków to wam powiadam.

Oswald: Zmiataj, groju!

Edgar: Ano to po żebach zdejście pana, paradom pańską się nie przejmam.
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Jan Kasprowicz: Król Lir, IW „Biblioteka Polska” 1922, str. 117-118

Oswald: Bezczynny chłopie, myślisz dopomagać
            Jawieniu zdrajcy? Pecz stąd, bo inaczej
            Zaraza jego losu tenże i ciebie!

Edgar: Niechże dobre panizko idem swojom drogom i nie przeszkadzam biednym naro-
dow. Kiedy ja tak bez hytle co miel tracić życie, obybym goj iże miel od jakich dwu
niedzieli. Nie, wicie. Nie zbliżajc Doyle do starego cłowiewka, idźcie, mówie wam, bo jak
nie, to popróbujcie, co twardze: mój kosturek, cy waso lepetiu! Mówie wam bez
ogrdki!

Oswald: Pecz, groju!

Edgar: Wybije wam zęby, panocku; was spiknie to dzło maże jest nie, panocku.
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Władysław Tarnowski: Król Lear, ZNIo 1957, str. 194-195

Oswald: Czemu, zuchwali gurbie, śmiesz osłaniać
            Człeka, którego ogłoszono zdrajcą?
            Pecz, aby jego zarządza dola
            Z nim nie dosięgła cie! Puść jego ręki!

Edgar: Nie pőde, panocku, przez bitki.

Oswald: Puść, chanie, bo zginięs!
Edgar: Dobry panuocku, idźcie se swojom drogom i dajcie przejść biednym ludkom. Żeby to mnie można było przechwykać do deznawiać życi, jest tym tym się żył od dwóch tydni. Nie, nie przybyszcie się do staruszki; trymając się z daleka, pedom wam, bo popróbujcie, co jest niewrse, cy moja pałka, cy wasa lepeta — pedom wam otwarcie.

Oswald: Proszę, kępo gojtu!

Edgar: Ej, panuocku, bo wam wykhuje zemby. Co tam wase wyćwjańce!
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Zofia Siwicka: Król Li, PIW 1956, str. 166-167

Oswald: Jak śmiać, zuchwały chłopie, bronić tego jawnego zdrążę? Proszę, aby ciebie Zaraza jego losu nie dotknęła.

Edgar: Puść jego ramię!

Oswald: Jęże, panuocku, bo zginiłeś!

Edgar: Proszę, panuocku, bo zginiłeś!

Oswald: Puść, ty nożduitku, bo zginiłeś!

Edgar: idźcie, dobry panie, lepiej swojemu drogome i dzieje spokój bidnemu narodowi. Kieby jo mił nie tak bez biłe ko wyzuwać ze życia, tobym go juzni ni miół od jalich dwoch niedziel. Nie, nie podchoćże do jego staraże, trymoczcie się z daleka, bo jak nie, to spodbuję, co możnajecie, was leb, cy moja pałka. Do rozumum wam mówicie3.

Edgar: Proszę, gojtu!

Oswald: Wybiej wam zemby. Co mi ta wos śpikułec.
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Andrzej Tretiak: Król Li, Biblioteka Narodowa 1929, str. 126-127

Oswald: Chłopie zuchwały, czemu się odważesz bronić wywołanego zdrążę? Proszę, bo ciebie zaraza jego losu też pochwycy.

Edgar: Puść jego ramię!

Oswald: Nie puszczy, bo przyjdzie do okazii3.

Edgar: Puść parobiku, bo zginięsz!

Oswald: Dobry panie, idź swój droga, a pozwól biednym ludkom iść przed siebie. A gdybym się miał rozstać z życiem, to mogło się to stać i przed tygodnem. Nie, nie podchoćże do staruszki z daleka, mówicie, bo spodbuję, czy moja pałka czy też twoją lepety jas twardsza; bez ogrodke to zrobić.

Oswald: Broń się, śmierdzielcu.

Edgar: Puśmywaeram ci zęby; no, dalej! Tvoje pchnięcia mi nie szkodzię.

2 W oryginale Edgar postępuje się tutaj konwencjonalnym na scenach dialektom Somersetshire.

3 Nie puszcę... id. Podczas całego spotkania z Oswaldem Edgar przemawia dialektu południowym. Nie zachowała go w tłumaczeniu, gdyż u nas nie ma tak wybitnych różnic w dialektach jak w języku angielskim, a przy tym w całej tej scenie ukrywanie się Edgara jest niepotrzebne...
Maciej Stomecyński: Dzieje żywota króla Henryka Piętego, WL 1984, Akt 3; 2

Wchodzę Kapitan MacMorris i Kapitan Jamy.

**Gower:** Oto nachodzi, a z nim szołcki dowódca, kapitan Jamy.

**Fluellen:** Kapitan Jamy to nad podziw waleczny szlachcic, mający wielką wiedzę o starożytnych wojnach, z tego so wiem o jego rozkazach. Na Jeżusa umie on podziwiać św rzące w przedmiocie dawnych wojen rzymskich lepiej niż każdy inny sztukowiec na tym świecie.

**Jamy:** Dzen dobry, kapitan Fluellen.

**Fluellen:** Dopiero dzisiaj żyjesz waszej szhgodności, kapitanie Jamy.

**Gower:** Coż tam, kapitanie MacMorris? Czy porzuciłeś podkop? Czy superzy zaprzestały pracy?

**MacMorris:** Na Chrysztusza, hej! To żła sprawa. Praczę poszukował, trąbka gra odwór. Na mą rękę złamał się i na duszę mego ojca, tu praczę żle jest przeprowadzona, poszukałem ją. A wszędobylsko miasz, tak mi jeszę dopomógzę, w godzinę. O, to żła szpawra, żła szpawra, na mą rękę żła szpawra!
Jamy: Na mądą świetą, zanim te moje oczy do snu się zamknią, odbędą niezgoszłą służbę — albo legną, tak, podg trupem. A dam im odprowadzniejca, na jaką mnie stoczą, zobaczycie, i na tym koniec. Ale jako żywo, chętnie bym posłuchał, jak się dalej spekuluje.
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Leon Ulrich: Henryk V, Gebethner i Wolff, 1885, str. 47-48

Gower zbiła się właśnie, a z nim szkocki kapitan Jamy.

Fluellen: Kapitan Jamy jest to słuchacz fielkiego aniemonzu, ani siępliczności, żołnierz obrotny i oczywisty w starożytnych fojach, jak to jest z osoùw, z jego zdziczeń, tego rozpoczynają; na Jesuza, on potrafi przynależyć szefu argumentu o dyscyplinie starożytnych fojien szymackich jak najlepszy żołnierz pod stofołem. Jamy: Dzień dobry, kapitan Fluellen.


Macmorris: Na Chrystusa, wszystko sze zrobiono: opuszczena robota; trąbka daje znak odwrotu. Na tę rękę przysięgła i na duszę mojego ojca, robota sze zrobiona; opuszczone ją, bytym wysadził miasto, tak zbaw mnie Chrystus; nie później, niż w godzinę. O, robota sze zrobiona, na tę rękę, sze zrobiona.

Fluellen: Kapitan Macmorris, czy chciałby przyjąć ze mną krótką dyszę, czy fideisz, częścią o fijoninie dyscyplinie, szymackich fojien, drogą argumentą, czy fideisz, i przyjaścielskiego porozumienia, częścią żeby zespokój moje podspiewanie, a częścią, na koniec, dla satysfakcji, jak fideisz, mojego zdania o praktyce fijonie dyscypliny, i to całkowity.

Jamy: Byłyby to rzecz bardzo piękna, na uczciwość, dwojko kapietow, a i tu, z waszem pozwoleńiem, wściebić moje słowko, jeśli, jeśli się zdary okazać, wściebić na uczciwość.

Macmorris: Nie pora teraz na dyskury, tak zbaw mnie Chrystus; dzień jest gorący, i czas i wojny, i król i książęta, nie pora teraz na dyskury. Miano jest obłożone i trąbna wyważy nas do wywodu, a my tu budujemy, i, na Chrystusa, pozwólmy, na swój wsiedza wszystkich, tak zbaw mnie Boże, to wszyscy stali z założonymi rękami, to wszyscy, na tę rękę, gdy się nadzimia pora rzecze gardzeli i pełniej rycerskie czyny, a my tu próżnujemy, tak zbaw mnie Chrystus, la.

Jamy: Na mądą świetną, nim to moje oczy do snu się zamknię, dokonam uciuchowej służby, albo mnie zakopam, tak jest, albo umrę. Sprawię się, jak będę mógł najwaleczniejszym, sprawię się, mocznie mi wizycz, i na tym kwita. Ale nimo tego radnym psysłuchać się waszej dyscypliny.
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Jan Kasprowicz: Henryk V, Gebethner i Wolff, str. 245-246

Gower: Idzcie ku niemu, a z nim razem szkoczi kapitan, kapitan Dżemy.

Fluellen: Kapitan Dżemy jest zadziwiające waleczny słuchacz, to z pewnościąm obrotny jest i obesznany z starożeńczy ubójcy, a zwłaszcza według mojego szczególnego, w ich deryszczyz, na Jesuza, potrafi on, jak żaden inny żołnierz na świecie, bronić swoich argumentów nabyte co do starożeńczy sztuki wojenny w Rzymian.

Source: D. Defoe, Robinson Crusoe
Identification: Pidgin English
Description: Romaine (1994)
"Why, you angry mad with Friday, what me done?" I asked him what he meant; I told him I was not angry with him at all. No angry! No angry! says he, repeating the words several times. Why send Friday home away to my Nation? Why (says I) Friday, did you not say you wish'd you were here? Yes, yes, says he, wish be both there, no wish Friday there, no Master there. In a word, he would not think of going there without me. [...]

[...]

Molly odpowiedziała "tywo [...]. Mówiąc to wyciągnęła kilka gwinei i jedną dała maść.

Gdy tylko kobietka poczuła w swej dłoni złotą monetę [...]

Ale niech tam! Jasno panienka Western lepiej by zrobiła pilnując własnego domu; pamiętając, kim był jej dziadek. Może ktoś z mojej rodziny, co całkiem prawdopodobnie, jeżeli powożo, a czyli dziek chodził piechotą. Ona sobie wyobraża, że wielką łaskę zrobiła przyspieszając nam tę starą sitkę; [...]

Szalecic.składł go stirzycie, po czym, zwracając się do pastora, wykrzyknął:

"Czuje swą! Czuje swą! Tom jest na pewno ojcem tego dziecka. Do licha, pastorze! Pamiętacie, jak on mi polecał i rekomendował ojca tej dziewczyny? A co to za chytry gąsien? Jasne jak słońce. Tom jest ojcem tego dziecka!

"Będę mu bardzo przykro, gdyby to się okazało prawda — rzekł pastor.

"Ależ dłuższe przykro! — zakrzyczał szczalenic. — O co tyle hałasu, Co, wy pewno chcieliobyście wymówić we mnie, żeścige nigdy nie zrobił szczęśliwych dzieci? Do licha! To niech mieli ścieżki! Bo założę się, że niejeden raz próbowałeś, pastorze!

— Pan raczy żarować — odzierał pastor. — Jestem innego zdania o przeszczości takiego postępu i sądzą, że tego woliowo nie docenia, a poza tym obwąchaj, że taka nieprawość dotknę mocno pana Allworthy.

[...]

Zofia Kierszys: *Do myszy*, [w:] *Z wierszy szkołnych*, PIW 1956, str. 65-66

O biedne, ścięte w brudzie małe
Stworzono z języka dźwięce ałe!
Czyś musiszą w pole spacerzałeś
Gdzie ni spod nóg?
Ja pługiem zabić cię nie chciałem —
Jakżebym mógł!

To wstyd, że człowiek praw swych strzeże
Natury depcząc Wszęszczypmierzenie.
Dlatego przed nim drżysz, nie wierysz
Chociaż on jak ty,
Wędrując ścieżką ziemska przecjęć
Przed smutnictą dżi.

Czasami krzemiesz — cóż nieboże,
Powietrzem samym żyć nie możesz.
To, że gdzieś w stercie uszkóeniesz zboże,
Kłos, dwa, czy sześć,
Nie zmniejszy plonów, które zwoję —
Chleb będę jeść.

Twój dom kłuc w szczątkach. Wiatr spiądrów wó
Głupiutkie ścianki, a od nowa
Za późno inne już budować
Z zielonych żidżel
Już zamieć czas się grudniowa
W szarości anget.

Gdy zimę się zsunąła nisko
Chmurną szarości na ściejmanisko,
Załóżą sobie tu schronisko
I wtem jak grom

Stanisław Barańczak: *Do myszy*, [w:] *Ocalone w tłumaczeniu*, Wydawnictwo A5 1992, str. 397

Małeński, cichy, bojaźniowy stworze
Ileż popochu w pierś twojej gorze!
Cóż się tak zrywasz, czemu w swojej norze
Dalej nie drzemiesz
Myślisz, że życie twoje też rozorze
Morderczy lemiszą?

Przykro, iż na tej człowieczej przewadze
Cierpią Natury jednocześnie władze
I, kiedy pługiem o nerkę zawadzę
Nie zauważysz,
Żem też śmiertelny i twój w każdym płude
Ziemska towarzysz!

Ja sam nie wątpię, że żyjesz z krzędzie;
I cóż. Chudznie też się coś należy:
Porwać ze słogu kłosek? Będziesz szczery —
Żadna to zbrodnia
Zostanie dość, bym miał bochenek świeży
Na stole co dnia.

Lecz z domku twojego została ruina!
Licha ziemianka, nawet bez komina,
Wszakże osłona przed zimnem jedyna:
Z jakich mełów sklecię
Nową? Za późno: zły Grudzień zaczyna
Mrozem dać przecież!
Source: Walter Scott, Rob Roy
Identification: Scots
Description: Aitken (1984)

"God even, my friend."
"Gude c’ev — gude e’en t’ye’ answered the man, without looking up, and in a tone which at once indicated his northern extraction.
"Fine weather for your work, my friend."
"It’s no that muckle to be compleened o, answered the man [...] he touched his Scotch bonnet with an air of respect, as he observed “Eh, gude safe u! it’s a sight for sair een, to see a gold laced jeistedor in the Ha’ harden swe late at e’en.”
"A gold laced what, my good friend?"
"Ou, a jeistedor — that’s a jacket like your ain there. They ha’ othe things to do wi’ them up yerder — unbuttoning them to make room for the beef and bag puddings, and the claret wine, nae doubt — that’s the ordinary for evening lecture on this side of the Border."
"There is a such plenty of good cheer in your country, my good friend.” I replied “as to tempt you to sit so late at it.”
"Hoot, sir, ye ken little about Scotland: H’is no for want of gude vives — the best of fish, flesh and for I ha’ we by sybos ingams tuncapes, and other garden fruit. But we ha’e masse and discretion, and are moderate of our mouth; but here frae the kitchen to the ha’, it’s fill and feit mair frae the tae end of the fair and twainty till the tother. Even their, fast days — they ca’ it fating when they ha’ the best o’sea fish frae Hartlepool and Sunderland by land passage, forbye trouts, gilives, salmon, and a’ the love o’t, and so make their very fating a kind of luxury and abomination; and then the awfu’ masses and matis o the pair deceived souls — But I shou’dna speak about them, for your honour will be a Roman, I’se warrant, like the lave.”
"Not I, my friend; I was bred an English presbyterian and dissentier.”

Source: Emily Brontë, Wuthering Heights
Identification: Yorkshire
Description: Wells (1982)

"[...] Vinegar faced Joseph projected his head from a round window of the barn.
"Whet are ye for?” he shouted. “T’ maisters dah i’ fowld. Goa rahned by th’ end ut thalith, if yah went tu speak i’lil him.”
"Is there nobody inside to open the door?” I hallowed responsively."
"They’s noobtur t’missis; and sho’ll not open ‘t an ye mak yer flaysome dins till neeght.”
"Why? Cannot you toll her who I am, oh, Joseph?”
"Nor — ne me! Aw’ll hae hoe nos hendi wi’t,” muttered the head, vanishing."
"[...] Aw woonder nagh yah can faishion tuh stand, theur idlenes un war, when all on’em’s goan aghit. Bad yah’re a nowit, and it’s no use talking — yah, niver mend uh yer ill ways; bud goa right tuh t’ divil, like yer mother afore ye!"

---
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Teresa Świderska (uzupełnił Stefan Garczyński): Rob Roy, IW Nasza Księgarnia 1973, str. 46, 296

— Dobry wieczór, przyjacielu!
— Dobry wieczór, dobry wieczór panu! — odpowiedział nie oglądając się, akcentem, który od razu zdradzał jego szkockie pochodzenie.
— Piękna macie pogode przy waszej robocie, przyjacielu.
— Ha, nie ma się czego uskarzać, odpowiedział [...] dotknął z uszanowaniem swej szkockiej czapczek i zauważył:
— Ej, Boże mocny! To ci rzadki widok taka złotem naszywana kamiczka tu w ogrodzie wieczorem! Bo oni tam co innego mają do roboty... Rozpinają wszystkie guziki, by zrobić miejsce na mięso, puddling i czerwone wino.

Tak, tak... taki to porządek i taki pacierz wieczorni po tej stronie granicy.
— Nie ma tu u was tyle dobrego jedzenia, przyjacielu — odpowiedziałem — więc też nie macie pokusy do późna nad nim wysiadywać.
— Ej, panie, mało pan wie o Szkoci. Nie brak tam co najlepszej żywności. Albo to mało mamy najwybórniejszych ryb, mięsa, gadziny wszelkiej, a goruch, fiszki, rzepy i innej ogrodowizny? Ale my ludzie skromni i niewiele nam potrzeba, a jażda to zwykły umieszkowanie. Zaś futat je od kuchni do jadalni jeno noś a nalewaj, noś a nalewaj, od rana do nocy i od nocy do rana. Nawet ich posy... Oni to nazywają posiekiem, kiedy najlepsze morskie ryby z Hartlepool a Sunderland kotami zwóżone mają, już nie mówią o pstragach, lososiach, jesiorach, które tu łowią. Nawet post u nich to obżarstwo i zgorszenie. Biedne ich dusze, biedne ich dusze! Ale nie powinieneń tak mówić, bo szanowny pan też z pewnością jest katolikiem, takim samym jak oni.
— Nie, mój przyjacielu. Należy do Kościoła Prezbiteriańskiego, jestem dysydentem.

[...]
Janina Sujkowska: Wickrowe wzgórza, ZN im. Ossolińskich 1990, str. 9, 42

[...] Z okragłego okienka stodoły wyrażała kwaśna geba Józefa.
— Czego tam? — wziął — Pan poszedł do owczarni. Trzeba obejrzeć naokoło, jeżeli chcesz z nim gadać.
— Czy nikogo w domu nie ma, że nie otwierają?
— Jest panu, ale ona nie otwory, choćbyś się rządził do późnej nocy.
— Może być, powiedzieć jej, Józefie, kto przyszedł?
— Proszęć czego? Nie moja rzecz — mruknął stary chowający głowę.
[...]
— Ze też będzie w sieni i przechwali, kiedy tamoń poszli do roboty. Szkoda gadać! I tak nic z lenin nie będzie! Diabli wzięli, jak matkę wzięli!
[...]

Source: H. Melville, Moby Dick
Identification: Black English
Description: Dillard (1973)

“Who dat? Den preach to him yourself,” said sullenly turning to go.
“No cook, go oz, go on.”
“Well, den, Belched fellow critters:”
“Right!” exclaimed Stubb, approvingly, “coax ‘em to it; try that; and Fleece continued.”
“Dough you is all sharks, and by nature very worous, jest I say to you, fellow critters, dat
dat worousness — ‘top dat dam slapping’ ob de tail! How you tink, to bear, spose you keep
up, such a dam slappin’ and bitin’ dare?”
“Cook” cried Stubb, collarin’ him, “I want have that swearing. Talk to ‘em gentlemanly.”
Once more the sermon proceeded.
“Your worousness, fellow critters. I don’t blame ye so much for; dat is natur, and can’t be
helped; but to gobern dat’ wicked natur, dat is de pint. You is sharks, sardin; but if you gobern
dat shark in you, why den you be angel; for all angel is not in’ge more dan de shark well gobern.
Now, look here, brethen, just try want to be chiel, a helping yourselves from dat whale. Don’t
be tearin’ de blubber out your neighbour’s mount, I say, Is not one shark dead right as toder to
dat whale? And, by Gosh, none of you has the right to dat whale; dat whale belong to one
es. I know some o’you has bery big mout, bigger dan oders; but den de big mouts sometimes
has de small bettlers; so dat de bigness ob de mount is not to swaller wid, but to bite off de blubber
for de small fry ob sharks; dat can’t get into de streoge to help demselfes!”
“Well done, Old Fleece!” cried Stubb. “That’s Christianity, go on.”
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— Jak? No to gadał ban do nich sam — odpowi Mrozyn poniżając się do odesłania.
— Nie, kucharz; mów, mów dalej.
— No więc ugochani moli...
Janina Sujkowska: *Bestia morska*, Wydawnictwo Eugeniusza Kuthana, 1948, str. 48, 92

- Kapitan, widzieć tam ta smola na wodzie? Malty czarny kropka? Widzieć? To oko od wieloryby! Ha! Śmieję żelazo przeleciło nad szerokim kapeluszem starego Biłda i nad pokładami okrętu, i uderzyło w błyśczącą plamę smoly.
- Uf — rzekł dziński, śrąpając linę. — Jakby to być oko od wieloryby, już on gotowa.
- Lina, lina! — krzyknął Queeqeg, przecińając się przez burzę. — Złapać, złapać! Wto jego złapać na lina? Wto uderzyć? Dwa wieloryby: jeden duża, drugi mała!
- Zwiariowali, człowieku? — zawołał Starbuck.
- Patrzeć tutaj! — odpalił Queeqeg wskazując w dół.

Source: Harriet Beecher Stowe, *Uncle Tom’s Cabin*
Identification: Black Facetious
Description: Dillard (1973)

“Here you, Mose and Pete, get out de way, you niggers! Get away, Polly, honey; mummy’ll give her baby somefin bye-and-bye. Now Mas’r George, you jest take off dem books, and set down now with my old man, and I’ll take up de sausages, and de first griddle full of cakes on your plates in less den no time.”

“They wanted me to come to supper in the house,” said George, “but I knew what was what too well for that, Aunt Chloe.”

“So you did — so you did, honey,” said aunt Chloe, heaping the smoking butter-cakes on his plate; “you know’d your old aunty’d keep the best for you. Oh, let you alone for dat — go way.”

And with that Auntie gave George a nudge with her finger, designed to be immensely facetious, and turned again too her griddle with great briskness.

“Now for the cake,” said Mas’r George, when the activity of the griddle department had somewhat subsided; and with that the younger furnished a large knife over the article in question.

“La bless you, Mas’r George,” said Aunt Chloe, with earnestness, catching his arm: “you wouldn’t be for cuttin’ it wid dat ar great heavy knife! Smash all down — spile all de pretty rise of it! Here, I’ve got a thin old knife I keeps sharp a purpose. Dar how, see — comes apart light as a feather! Now eat away — you won’t get anything to beat that!”

“Tom Lincon says,” said George speaking with his mouth full, “that their Jiny is a better cook than you.”

Source: J. F. Cooper, *The Pathfinder*
Identification: Pidgin English
Description: Romaine (1994)

“May I take the liberty of asking Arrowhead, why you fancy that smoke, now a paleface’s smoke and not a redskin’s?”

“Wet wood,” returned the warrior, with the calmness with which the pedagogue might point out an arithmetical demonstration to his puzzled pupil. “Much wet — much smoke; much water — black smoke.”

“Too much water,” returned Arrowhead with a slight nod of the head.

“Tascora too cuttin’ to make fire with water! Paleface too much book, and bun anything; much book, little know.”

“But in an unknown region like this, I think it is unsafe to trust the pilot alone too far from the ship; so, with your leave, we will part company.”

“What my brother want?” asked the Indian gravely, though without taking offense at a distrust that was sufficiently plain.

“Your company, Master Arrowhead, and no more. I will go with you and speak these strangers.”
Bronisław Zieleński: Tropiciel śladów, Iskry 1955, str. 9, 152

[...]
Czy wolno mi spytać, Grocie, dlaczego sądzisz, że to dym błądnych twarzy, a nie czerwonooskórych?
— Mokre dwowo — oparł wojewódzac stokolcem naszych cielnic, który wyjaśnił zdziwionemu uczniowi matematyczne zadanie. — Duże wilogi — duże dymy; duże wody — czarny dym.
[...]
— Za dużo wody — odrzekł Grot Szały, lekko kiwając głową. — Tuskarora ze słodycz, żeby robić ogień z wody. Błada twarz za dużo książek i paści byleć czy dużo książek, mało wiedzieć.
[...]
— natomiast uważam, że w takich nieznanych stronach jest rzeczna niebezpieczną pozwałą pilota, aby sam jeden nazbyt się oddalał od statku. Przeto, za twoim pozwoleniem, nie rozszołaczmy się z tobą.
— Czego chcieć mój brat? — zapytał Indianin z powąsem, choć bez wraży za ową dosyć wyraźną nieufność.
— Towyego towarzystwa, mości Grocie, niczego więcej. Pójdę z tobą i pogadam z tymi nieznajomymi.

Source: J. F. Cooper, The Pioneers
Identification: German accented English
Description: —
"Welcome, welcome, Tchooge," said the elder of the party, with a strong German accent. "Miss Petsy will owe me a kiss."
"And cheerfully will I pay it, my good sir," cried the soft voice of Elizabeth;
[...]
Major Hartman, whose self-possession had been admirably preserved during the whole evolution, was the first of the party that gained his foot and voice.
"Ter deyvel, Richard!" he exclaimed, in a voice half serious, half comical, "put you unloot your sleigh very hantily."
[...]
"Upon my word, doctor," observed Major Hartman with a roguish roll of his little black eyes, but with every other feature of his face in a state of perfect rest, "put you have a very pretty packet-pick of tools tere, and your doctor-stuff glitters as if it was pretter for ter eyes as for ter pelly."
[...]

Tadeusz Evert: Pionierowie, Iskry 1990, str. 27, 292

— Witamy, witamy, spędzi — z wyraźnym niemieckim akcentem oparł starszy z mężczyzn.
— Pan Betsy winna mi jest pocztunek.
— I chybiło go odda, tuskawy panie — zawołała Elżbieta.
[...]
Major Hartman, który przez cały czas doskonale panował nad sobą, zerwał się pierwszy i pierwszy też odszukał mowę.

Source: J. F. Cooper, The Pioneers
Identification: French accented English
Description: —
"Ah! oui; es sait," returned Monsieur Le Quei, with a slight shrug of his shoulder, and a trifling grimace, "dree is more, I feel ver happy dat you love eet. I hope dat Madam Doleet' is in good health."
[...]
I ask the Mounsineer to his face, if it is not a clever little thing, taking it by and large?
Tadeusz Ewert: Pionierowie, Iskry 1990, str. 73-74

[...]

Ajax, oui, tak drogi panie — wrazzazając lekką ramionami i wykrzywiając twarz w nieokreślonym grymasie odpalił Francuz. — Jesteśmy jest. Cieszę się, że panu smakował. Jak się ma pan Doolittle?

[...]

Pytam go więc prosto z mostu, czy to nie dobrze obmywany budynek?
— Bardzo odpowiednia przeznaczenie — odpalił Francuz — bardzo pomysłowa budowa... ale w katolickich krajach buduje się... jak się nazywa, eee... la grande cathédrale — aha! Katedra. Katedra Świętego Pawła w Londynie jest bardzo ładna... obrazka, piękna, ale za przeproszeniem, panie Ben, nie chętnie się do naszej Notre Dame.

[...]

Ale gdzie pan Le Quoi?
— O! Mój drogi sędzia! moj przyjacielu — rozległ się słodkość głos. — Dzięki Bogu żyje. Panie Agamemnonie, proszę, niech pan tu przyjdzie i pomoże mi wstać. Pastor i Marzyn schwycił uwięzionego Francusza za nogi i wyciągnął go z trzystopowego zasypi, skąd głos jego dobywał się jak z gruba. Po wydostaniu się na wolność pan Le Quoi przez chwilę nie bardzo wiedział, co się z nim dzieje. Widząc jednak, że jest zupełnie bezpieczny, odzyskał dawny humor.

Source: Charles Dickens, The Pickwick Papers
Identification: Cockney
Description: Schlauch (1959)

[...]

"Wot are you a roarin' at?" said Sam impetuously, when the old gentleman had discharged himself of another shout, "makin' yourself so precious hot that you looks like an aggwared glass-blower. Wol's the matter?"

"Aha!", replied the old gentleman, "I began to be afraid that you'ld gone for a walk round the Regency Park Samny."

"Come," said Sam, "none o'them taunts agin the Wickstum o' avarice, and come off that 'ere step, Wot are you a settin' down there for? I don't live there."

"I've got such a game for you, Sammy," said the elder Mr. Weller, rising.

"Stop a minit," said Sam, "you're all vitt behind."

Appendix

"That's right, Sammy, rub it off," said Mr. Weller, at his son dusted him, "it might look personal here, if a man walked about with whitenwash on his clothes, eh, Sammy?"

As Mr. Weller exhibited in this place unequivocal symptoms of an approaching fit of chuckling, Sam interposed to stop it.

"Keep quiet, do," said Sam, "there never vos, such a old picture's born. Wat are you bustin' wiff, now?"

"Sammy," said Mr. Weller, wiping his forehead, "I'm afraid that vun o' these days I shall laugh myself into appoplexy, my boy. Who do you think's come here with me, Samivel?" said Mr. Weller, drawing back a pace or two, pursing up his mouth, and extending his eyebrows.

"Pell?" said Sam.

Włodzimierz Górski: Klub Pickwicka, Czytelnik 1958, str. 370

[...]

— Czego tak ryzykujesz? — zapytał Sam, gdy stary zawołał raz jeszcze. — Poczerwieniałe jak szklarz wydmuchujący butelki. Co się stało?


— Czy cieś ale opowiadziesz wybony kawal! — zawołał Weller wstając.

— Czekaj — rzekł Sam. — Ubiegnę się na plecach.

— No to oczyść panie — rzekł pan Weller, gdy syn szerrywał już kurz z jego pleców. — Byłyby to niezły wypadek, gdyby tu ktoś miał na sobie coś biblijnego. Prawda Sammy? — Pomniaż, mówiąc to był bliski nowego napeku śmiechu, Sam pośpieszył powściągając go i rzekł:

— Uspokój się, takiego starego warianta jeszcze świat nie widział. Czego tak ryzykujesz?

— Sammy — rzekł Weller, cofając się o dwa kroki, otwierając usta i podnosząc brwi. — Zgadnij, kto tu przybył ze mną, Samivelu?

— Pan Pell — rzekł Sam.

Source: Charles Dickens, The Pickwick Papers
Identification: Cockney
Description: Schlauch (1959)

“What was that?” inquired Mr. Pickwick.

“Why he drove a coach down here once,” said Sam; “lection time came on, and he was engaged by vun party to bring down woters from London. Night afore he was a going to drive up, comittee on’ other side sends for him quietly, and away he goes with the messanger, who shows him in; — large room — lots of gen’l’m’n, heaps of papers, pons and ink, and all that ’ere. “Ah, Mr. Weller,” says the gen’l’m’n in the chair, “glad to see you sir; how are you?” — “Werry well, thank’e’e, sir,” says my father; “I hope you’re perty middlin’,” says he — “Pretty well, thank’e’e, sir,” says the gen’l’m’n; “sit down, Mr. Weller, pray sit down, sir.” So my father sits down, and he and the gen’l’m’n looks verry hard, at each other. “You don’t remember me?” Says the gen’l’m’n — “Can’t say I do,” says my father — “Oh, I know you” — says gen’l’m’n; “know’d you when you was a boy,” says he — “Well, I don’t remember you,” says my father — “That’s very odd,” says the gen’l’m’n —
"Worry" says my father — "You must have a bad mon’ry, Mr. Weller," says the gen’l m’n — "Well, it is a very bad un," says my father — "I thought so," says the gen’l m’n. So then they pours him out a glass of wine, and gammons him about his driving, and gets him into reg’lar good humour, and at last shoves a twenty pound note in his hand.
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Włodzimierz Górski: Klub Pickwicka, Czytelnik 1958, str. 175

A co takiego? zapytał pan Pickwick.

— Tak to było, panie. Onego czasu jedżdż on tu dyliżansem z Londynu. Nadszedł wybory i jedno stronnictwo zamawia go do transportowania wyborców ze stolicy. W wilię dnia, gdy miał wyruszyć w drogę, komitet drugiego stronnictwa najpierw przemówił go po ręce, i z tego z komisjonarem, który go wyprowadza do obłokowego pokoję. Kupa geniusem, góry papieru, piór i tak dalej.


— Bardzo dobrze, dziękuję panu — powiada mój ojciec. — Spodziewam się, że i pan nie chudnie — powiada. — Dziękuję, nieźle idzie — powiada genialnie i obaj wytrzymać na siebie ślepia.


To wszystko jedno — mówi mój ojciec — wcale sobie panie nie przypomina. — To dziwne — mówi tamten. — Bardzo dziwne — mówi ojciec. — Pan musi mieć bardzo słabą pamięć, panie Weller — mówi tamten. — Nieświadoma, to prawda, mówi ojciec. Tak się domyślałem — mówi tamten, potem nalewa mu szklankę wina i zaczyna rozwodzić się nad sposobem, w jaki powróci i wprawdzie mego ojca w doskoną humor, a w końcu pokazuje mu banknot na dwudziestu funtów szterlingów.

---

Source: M. Twain, The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn Identification: Missouri Negro dialect (Black Vernacular)

Description: Dillard (1973)

[... and by and by he says:
What makes me feel so bad dis time ’uz because I heard sumpn over younder on de bank like a whack, er a slam, while ago, en it mine me de time I treat my little ’Lizabeth so ornery. She warn’t on’y ’bout fo’ year old, en she tuck de sk’yarth fever, en had a powful rough spells; but she got well, en one day she was a-stammerin’ eroux, en I says to her, I says:
"shet de do."
She never done it; jis’ stood dah, kiner smilin’ up at me. Ti make me mad; en I says ag’in, mighty loud, I says:
"Doin’ you hear me? Shet de do’"
She jis stood de same way, kiner smilin’ up. I was a-bit! I says:
"I lay I make you mind!"
En wid dat I fech’ her a slap side de head dat sotr her a-sprawlin’! Den I went into de yuther room, en ’uz gone ’bout ten minutes; en when I come back dah was dat do’ a-stamin’ open yit, en dat chile stamin’ most right in it, a-lookin’ down, and murrin’, en de tears ranin’ downe. My, but I wiz mad! I was a-gwine for de chile, but jis’ den — it was a do’ dat open inners — jis’ den, ’lang come de wind en slam it to, behin’ de chile, ker-blam! emny jun’, de child never move’! My breff ma’st hop outer me; en feel so-so; I doin kno, how I feel. I crope out.

---

Source: M. Twain, The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn Identification: Backwoods Southwestern

Description: Wells (1982)

[...] "An’ look at that — air ladder made out’n rags, Sister Hotchkiiss" says old Mrs. Dannrell.

"What in the name o’goodness could he ever want of —"

"The very words I was a-sayin’ no longer ago in this minne to Sister Utterback, ’n’ she’ll tell you so herself. Sh-sh, look at that air ladder, sh-sh; ’n’ s’il, yes, look at it, s’il — what could he ’a’ wanted of it? s’il. Sh-sh, Sister Hotchkiiss, sh-sh...

"But how in the nation’d they ever git that grindstone in there anyway? ’n’ who dug that-air hole? "n’ who —?"

"My very words, Breer Penrod! I was a-sayin’ — past that — air sasser o’ m’lasses, won’t ye? — I was a-sayin’ to Sister Dunlap, jist this minute, how did they git that grindstone in there? s’il. Without help, mind you — thou help! Ther’s where ’tis. Don’t tell me, s’il; there wuz help,
s'f; 'n ther' wuz a plenty help, too s'f; ther's ben a dozen a-helpin' that nigger, 'n' I lay i'd skin every last nigger on this place but i'd find who done it, s'f; 'n' moreover s'f—

"A dozen says youf forty couldn't 'a done everything that's been, done. Look at them case-knife saws and things, how tedious they've been made; look at that bed-leg sawed off with 'm, a week's work for six men; look at that nigger made out'n saw on the bed; and look at —

"You may well say it, Berr Heightower! It's jist as I was a-sayin' to Berr Phelps, his own self. S'f, what do you think of it, Sister Hotchkiss? s'f. Think o' what Berr Phelps? s'f. Think o' that bed-leg sawed off that a way? s'f. Think o' it s'f. I lay it never sawed itself off, s'f—someone sawed it, s'f; that's my opinion, take it or leave it, it maybe be no coun't, s'f, but sith as 's, it is, it's my opinion, s'f, 'n' if anybody k'n start a better one, s'f, let him do it, s'f, that's all. I says to Sister Dunlap, s'f—"

Kryśtyna Tarnowska: Przygody Hucka, Iskry 1988, str. 302-303

---

Albo wez pani, pani Hotchkiss, taką drabinę sznurową — wręczli pani Dannell. — Do czego, w imię Boga, potrzebna mu była...

— Słowo w słowo to samo mówili do pani Utterback nie dalej jak przed minutą, na pewno pamięta. Ona to samo mówiła. „Weź pani taką drabinę sznurową” — mówiła. „To prawda” — powiadam — „Do czego mogła mu być potrzebna drabinę sznurową?” — powiadam. A na to pani Utterback powiadam...

— Ale w jaki sposób, u licha, udało mi się wziąć ten kameń szlifierski do szalasu? I kto wykopał tę dziurę? Albo kto...

— Słowo w słowo to samo mówili, panienko Penrod — przerwała znowu pani Hotchkiss. — Wszystko przed chwilą... mogę prosić o tę fazkę syropu? — mówiłam do pani Dunlap. Jakim cudem mogłaby wziąć ten kameń szlifierski? Bez pomocy, uwadze, bez żadnej pomocy. Akurat — powiadam. Nie mówię mi, powiadam, że nie było żadnej pomocy. Była pomoc! Ten czarnuch, powiadam, miał najmniej kilkunastu pomocników. I jakże to o mnie choroszyło... wyprzestali kolejno wszystkich Murzynów na tej plani, ale dowiedział się, czyja to sprawka. A co więcej...

— Kilkunastu pomocników! Czyżbyś nie zamrażał, żeś wszystkiego, co ci ludzie tu zrobił. Weźcie choćby te płyty ze wsparcia i różne takie narzędzia — jaki to żmudna praca. Albo to noga od łóżka, odpowiadana szczyrkiem — sześć ludzi musiało się nad nim moźmie najmniej przez tydzień. Albo ten Murzyn zrobiłby ze słomy, albo...

— Słusznie mówisz, panie Hightower. Słowo w słowo to samo mówili panu Phelps, „Co pani o tym myśli, pani Hotchkiss?” — spytał mnie pan Phelps, „Co o tym myśleć?” — spytałam. „O tej nadziei odpominanej w taki sposób” — powiadam panu Phelps, „Co o tym myśleć? Główę daj, że sama nie mogła się odpomiń — powiadam. — Ktoś ja musiał odpominąć — powiadam. — Także jest moje zdanie — powiadam. — Wszysko mi jedno, czy się pan ze mną zgadza, ale także jest moje zdanie, a jak ktoś inny poryszy wymyślić coś najdroższej — powiadam — niech sobie wymyślił”. Powiadam do pani Dunlap...

Source: M. Twain, The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn

Identification: Dorset

Description: Pike Country Dialect (Mid-West)

[...]

Mieszkałiśmy z całą rodziną w okolicy Pike w stanie Missouri, ale wszyscy kolejno porumierali i zostali tylko tatu, ja i mój braciak, Ike. Tańko postanowił rzucić wszystko i pojechać do wioski Beno, który ma malutką farmę nad samą rzeką, czternaście mil poniżej Orlenu. Tańko był budy, jak mysz kośćelna i miał trochę długów, więc jak poplasty długi, zostało mu w całym majątku, szesnaście dolarów i nas Murzyn Jim. Za te szesnaście dolarów nie przejęłbyśmy stygania czternaści ani pod pokładem, ani w inny sposób. Ale jak rzeka wezbrała, tańko poszło się i którego dni złapał na wodzie trawę, więc pomyślał sobie, że popłynie tam do Orlenu. Cóż, tańko na szczęście się skończyło, bo któreś nocy parowiec stuknął w przód trawą i wszyscy wypadli do wody i dalszy norę, żeby nas śruba nie porządł. Jim i ja wypłynęliśmy do wierzb, ale tańko był pijany, a Ike miał tylko cztery lata, więc jak wypadli, tak już zostali. No a potem przez kilku dni milistym strasznie dawno zewnątrz głowy, bo co rusz podjeżdżali do nas ludzie i chcieli mi zabrac Jima, i mówił, że to na pewno z/MPLyt Murzyn. Ten wcale nie płyniemy dniem, tylko nocą, bo w nocy nikt się nas nie czepia.

Source: T. Hardy, Tess of the D'Urbervilles

Identification: Dorset

Description: Walekyn (1984)

[...] "Sir John d'Urberville — that's who I am," continued the prostrate man. "That’s is if knights were baronets — which they be. "I is recorded in history all about me. Don't know of such a place, lad, as Kingsbere-sub-Greenhill?"

"Yes. I've been there to Greenhill Fair!"

"Well, under the church of that city there lie —"

"Tisn't a city, the place I mean; leastwise 'twedden' when I was there — was a little one — eyed, blinking son o'place!"

"Never you mind the place boy, that's not the question before us. Under the church of that there parish lie my ancestors — hundreds of 'em — in coats of mail and jewels, in grt' head coffins weighing tons and tons. There's not a man in the county O'South Wessex that's got gander and nobbler skillentin in his family than I!"

[...]
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Identification: Dorset
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Identification: Dorset

Description: Walekyn (1984)

[...] "Sir John d'Urberville — that's who I am," continued the prostrate man. "That’s is if knights were baronets — which they be. "I is recorded in history all about me. Don't know of such a place, lad, as Kingsbere-sub-Greenhill?"

"Yes. I've been there to Greenhill Fair!"
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[...]
Róża Czećkańska-Heymanowa: Tessa d'Urberville, PIW 1960, str. 10, 17

[...]
Sir John d'Urberville, oto jak się nazywam! — mówił dalej rozciągnięty na trawie mężczyzna.
To jest, gdyby rycerze byli baronetami — którymi właśnie są, Wszystko, co mnie dotyczy, zapisane jest w historii. Choćby, czy nie znasz miejscowości, która nazywa się Kingsbere-sub-Greenhill?
Tak, byłbym tam na jarmarku.
A więc pod kościołem tego miasta spoczywają...
To nie jest, co, o czym mówię. W każdym razie nie było nim wtedy, kiedy tam pojechał. Taka sobie nęcąca miła dziura.
Mniejż o to. Maj chłopcy, tu nie o to chodzi. Odchód pod kościołem w tej tam parafii spoczywają moi przodkowie — jest ich całe setki — leży w wielkich ołowianych trumnach, ważących Bóg wie ile ton. Leżą ubraną w zbroje i klejnoty. W całym krabstwie południowego Wessexu nie znajdziesz nikogo, kto by miał w rodzinie równie wspaniałe i pańskie szklaste jak ja.
[...]
Dobrze, sir Johnie. Dźwiękuję. Czy to już wszystko, sir Johnie?
Powiedz tam u mnie w domu, że chciałbym mieć na kolację...
[...]
Ale nie poniższy tęski fundów — zawsze była Lady Durbeifield.
Powiedz mu, że zgodzę się na tęsyfundów. A nawet, skoro już o tym pomyślałem, weźme mniej. On będzie go godniej nosił niż taki biedny niedolganą jak ja. Powiedz, że oddam tytuł za sto fundów. A zresztą, ja tam nie upieram się przy drobiazgach, więc powiedz, że może go mieć za pięść, bo wreszcie za dwadzieścia fundów. Tak, tak, dwadzieścia fundów to już najniższa cena. Cóż u diabła, tu rozchođzi się o honor całej familii i nie wiesz ani peusa mniej...
[...]
Muszę już iść do zbierania śmieci — mówiła usiłując wysunąć się z jego objęć — a dziś mamy tylko starą Debi do pomocy. Pani Crick pojechała na targ, Reeta częściowo niedobra, a inni porozchoǳieli się gdzieś i powrócą dopiero przed wieczornym udojem. Gdy weszli do mleczarni, na schodach ukazała się Deborah Ponyard.
[...]
Zaożyłbym się nic wiem o co, że przyszedli do Terezy.
O nie! Jej czuł się ostatnio jakiś pastor od metodystów, nie taki elegant jak ten.
Ale to tam człowiek?
Więc to miałby być tamem kaznodzieja? Przecież wygląda zupełnie inaczej.
Bo nie ma już za sobą czarnego surduta i białego fartucha i zgoła sobie barczki, ale to tam sam.
Czy być może? W takim razie uprzedzę ją — rzekła Marianna.
— Daj spokój, i tak sama zaraz go zobaczy.

Source: L. Carroll, Alice's Adventures in Wonderland
Identification: Cockney
Description: Schlauch (1959)

[...]
Next came an angry voice — the Rabbit's — "Pat! Pat! Where are you?" And then a voice she had never heard before, "Sure then I'm here! Digging for apples, yer honour!"
"Digging for apples, indeed," said the Rabbit angrily. "Here, come and help me out of this!"
"Now, tell me Pat, what's that in the window?"
"Sure, it's an arm, yer honour!" (He pronounced it 'arrunt').
"An arm, you goose! Who ever saw one that size? Why, it fills the whole window!"
"Sure, it does, yer honour: but it's an arm for all that!
"Well, it's got no business there, at any rate; go and take it away!"
[...]
Last came a little feeble, squeaking voice ('that's Bill' thought Alice), "Well hardly know — No more, thank ye'; I'm better now — but I'm a deal too flustered to tell you — all I know is, something comes at me like a Jack-in-the-box, and up I goes like a sky-rocket!"
"So you did, old fellow!" said the others.

Robert Stiller: Alicja w Krainie Czarów i Po drugiej stronie lustra, Wydawnictwa Alfa, 1986, str. 57

[...]
Następnie rozległ się gniewny głos — Królika: "Pat! Pat! Gdzie jesteś?" A potem głos, którego nigdy jeszcze nie słyszała: "Pewniaki tu żem jest, a niby gdzie! Jabłka wykopuję, jaśnie panie!" "Znam ja to twoje wykupianie jabłek!" Odpowiadzili z wściekłością Króliki. "Chodź tutaj! Pomoż mi się z tego wydostać!"
"A teraz powiedz mi, Patryko, co tam jest w oknie?"
"Pewniaki ręka, jaśnie panie!" (Wymawiał to: rynka). "Ręka, ty cholerze! Kto wdziała rękę tej wielkości? Przecież ona zającuje całe okno!"
„Pewnikiem zajmuje, jaśnie panie! ale zawsze to ręka”.
„W każdym razie nie powinno tam być. Weź i zabierz ją stamtąd”.

[...]
Wreszcie rozległ się słaby, piskliwy głosik. („To Zbych!”) pomyślała Alicja.) „Po prawdzie to sam nie wiem... nie drżę się, wystarczy: już mi lepiej... ale mnie załazano rozpręgło, żeby opowiadali... wiem tylko, że coś mnie rząży, jak ten diabeł z pudełka, i polecałem jak rakieta!” „A fakt, żeś poleciał, stary!” przywołali mu.

- 38 -
Antoni Marianowicz: Alicja w krainie czarów, Nasza Księgarnia 1969, str. 56, 60

[...]
Następnie usłyszała gniewny głosik:
— Buzzy. Bazyli, gdzie jesteś? — na co jakiś nieznany głos odpowiedział:
— Tutaj jestem, jaśnie panie! Kopie jabłka, proszę jaśnie pana.
— Kopie jabłka, dajmy na to, że kopie — rzekł Królk z wściekłością. — Na razie jednak chodź tutaj i pomóż mi się stąd wyciągnąć!
— Powiedz mi, Bazyli, co tam jest w oknie?
— Ani chyba rąka, proszę jaśnie pana.
— Rąka, ty osłup! Czyś kiedy widział rąkę takiej wielkości?
Przecież ona węzelną całe oko!
— Tak jest, proszę jaśnie pana, ale to jednak rączka.
— Tak czy inaczej, ona nie ma tu nic do roboty. Idź i usuń ją.
[...]
Na koniec rozległ się słaby piskliwy głosik.
„(To musi być Bizz! — pomyślała Alicja).
— Naprawdę, ja nic nie wiem tak samo jak i wy; teraz mi lepiej — jestem nazwiskiem wroniastym, by opowiazać, wiemy tylko, że coś wyskoczyło na mnie i poruszyłem w głąb jak rakietka.
— Tak było, właśnie tak — zgodzili się słuchacze.

- 39 -
Maria Morawska: Ala w krainie czarów, Gebethner i Wolff, 1927, str. 48, 52

[...]
Za chwilę słychać było gniewny głos królika.
— Pacie! Pacie! Gdzie się chowałeś?
— Tu jestem, proszę jaśnie pana — odezwał się jakiś obcy głos — zbieram jabłka.
— Rzuć to wszystko, chodź tu zaraz, pomóż mi się stąd wyciągnąć!... Uf... tak... dobrze... a teraz powiedz mi, co tam tkwi w oknie.
— Ramię, proszę jaśnie pana.
— Ramie?! Darmo jeden, głupstwa pleciesz, widział króle może ramię? Całe okno zapchanie.
— Jak jaśnie pana szanuję, to jest tylko ramiona, niech sie jaśnie pan kogo zechce spija.
— Wreszcie małe mię chodzi, co to jest, Idź i zabierz to prez.
[...]
Następnie odezwał się słaby, piszący głos.
Nie wiem nic. Nie nie rozumiem. Uderzyło mi coś, wypchnęło. Lepiej mi teraz trochę... w głowie mi się jeszcze które... to wódka tak mała. Coż ja tam mogę powiedzieć... Jak pająk wyłaczyłem z pudełka, drucik do przytłuczania nie było.
— Wyskoczylem... ktoś ma wystrelity... Bo ja wiem wreszcie...
— Wylecieł jak z procy... Wdzięcznicy — odezwały się liczne głosy.

Source: George Bernard Shaw, Pygmalion
Identification: Cockney
Description: Schlauch (1959)

Higgins: Say your alphabet [...]
Liza: Oh well, if you put it like that — Ahyoe, beyee, cyeeye, deeyee.
Higgins: Stop. Listen to this Pickering. This is what we pay for as elementary education. This unfortunate animal has been locked up for nine years in shock at our expense to teach her to speak and read the language of Shakespeare and Milton. And the result is Ahyoe, Be-e-e, Ce-e-e, De-e-e.
Say A, B, C, D
Liza: 'But I'm saying it. Ahyoe, Beeyee, Ce-eye-
Higgins: Stop. Say a cup of tea.
Liza: A cappete-e.
Higgins: Put your tongue forward [... ] Now say cup.
Liza: C-e-e. I can't. C-cup.
Pickering: Good. Splendid, Miss Doolittle.
Higgins: By Jupiter, she's done it at the first shot [...] Now do you think you could possibly say tea? Not co-e-e, mind: if you ever say be-e-e, ce-e-e, de-e-e again you shall be dragged round the room three times by the hair of your head. T.T.T.T.
Liza: I can't hear no difference c-e-e' that it sounds more genteel — like when you say it.
Kazimierz Piotrowski: *Pigmalion*, PIW 1981, str. 89-90

Higgins: Powiedz: trzy, trzba, drzwi [...]
Liza: Trudno, jeśli pan prosi. Czyssza, czesba, dźwi [...]


Higgins: Dosyć. Powiedz: „załamran nie przetrze, mężczyzny nie przeprze”.
Higgins: Jakaś czesna nie pszcze, mężczyzny nie p-szepsze.
Higgins: Nie mdw przez zęby [...]. Teraz powiedz: przetrze.
Liza: Nie mogę. Przejrzeć.

Pickering: Dobrze. Świętemie, panu Doolittle.
Higgins: Jak mi Bóg mily, szczerzliwu w dziesiątkę. A teraz, jak myślisz, moglibyś powiedzieć: „ciu młodsze co młodsze, to twardsze, co stawsze”. Ale spróbuj tylko powiedzieć: „młodsze”, a złąpie za kolun i trzy razy objędziesz pokój dookoła. Młodsze!

Liza: Nie słyszę różnice, tylko u pana brzmii to elegancie.

Florian Sobieniowski: *Pigmalion*, PIW 1972, str. 59-76

Higgins: Powtórz alfabet [...]
Eliza: Jak tak, to mówię: A, bi, cy, dy [...]
Higgins: Dosść!!! Słyszko, Pickering? Oto za co wyciągają z nos pieniędzy na poważne nauczenie! Ten nieszczęsny stwar spędził dzieść lań w szkole na nasz koszt, aby się nauczyć mówić językiem Szekspira i Miltona. A rezultat... A, by, cy, dy. Powiedz A, be, ce, de [...]

Eliza: Przele mowie... A, by, cy...
Higgins: Dosyć. Powiedz herbata.
Eliza: Cierbate.
Higgins: Nie ściszą gardła — otwór ust szerzej... i powiedz „herbata”.
Eliza: Nie mogę... ch... ch... herbata.
Pickering: Doskonale, doskonale, panno Doolittle.
Higgins: Do Ludka! Powiedziała za pierwszym razem. [...] A razem pamiętaj: „herbata”. Nie chierbata, rozumiesz? Jak jeszcze raz wydawasz te słowa to zwierzęta dźwięk, to cię złąpie za włosy i zamiast toby pokój trzy razy! h, h, h.

Eliza: Nie widzę żadnej różnicy, chyba że to u pana wychodzi delikatniej. [...]

Source: George Bernard Shaw, *Pigmalion*
Identification: Cockney
Description: Schlauch (1959)

The Bystander: You be carefull: give him a flower for it. There's a bloke here behind taking down every blessed word you're saying.

The Flower Girl: I ain't done nothing by speaking to the gentlemen. I've a right to sell flowers if I keep of the herb. I'm a respectable girl. I never spoke to him except to ask him to buy a flower off me.

The Bystander: It's a rawr. es a gentleman: look at his be-oats. She thought you was a copper's mark, sir.

The Flower Girl: You just show me what you're written about me. What's that. That ain't proper writing. I cant read that.

The Note Taker: Cheer ap Keptin. u' bow ya flair off a pure gel.

The Flower Girl: It's because I called him Captain. I meant no harm. Oh, sir don't let him lay a charge a'me for a word like that. You —

The Sarcastic one: There. I knowed he was a plain clothes copper.

The Bystander: That aint a police whistle: thus a sporting whistle [...]

The Sarcastic one: I can tell where you come from. You come from Anwell. Go back there.

The Note Taker: Hanwell.

The Taxisman: Give it here. Tippence extra.

The Flower Girl: No. I don't want nobody to see it [...]

The Taxisman: Were so?

The Flower Girl: Bucknam Pellis [Buckingham Palace].

The Taxisman: What d'you mean? — Bucknam Pellis?

The Flower Girl: Don't you know? where it is — in the Green Park, where the King lives.

Goodyerb, Freedy. Don't let me keep you standing there. Goodyerb.

Freddy: Goodyerb.

The Taxisman: Here? What's this about Bucknam Pellis? What business have you at Bucknam Pellis?

The Flower Girl: Of course, I havent none. But I wasn't going to let him know that. You drive me home.

The Taxisman: How much?

The Flower Girl: Can't you read? A shilling.

The Flower Girl: A shilling for two minutes!!

The Taxisman: Two minutes or ten: it's all the same.

The Flower Girl: I don't call it right.

The Taxisman: Ever been in a taxi before?

Kazimierz Piotrowski: *Pigmalion*, PIW 1981, str. 31-45

Obywatel I: Uważaj, daj mu kwiatku. Tam z tyłu stoi jakiś typ i zapisuje każde słowo z tej nowożytniej bużki.


Obywatel I: Szkoda każdego słowa: ten pan jest dźwięczelem. Wystarczy spojrzeć na jego budy. Ona myśli, że pani jest kapus, panie szanowny. [...]


Pan II: To ja przeczytam. „Wiene uszy do góry, panie majowie. Niech pan kuźni kwiatka to bidnej dziewczyny”.

Kwiatłka: I wszysko za to, że tego pana nauczaliśmy. Nie chciałam go obrazić. Och, taktowy panie, niech pan nie pozwoli, żeby on za jedno słówko złożył na mnie skargę. Pan...

[...]

Obywatel II: No proszę! Wiedziałem, że tu tajniak.

Obywatel I: To nie jest policyjny gwizdek, tylko sportowy.

[...]


Pan II: Hanwell.

[...]

Taksówkarz: Proszę go dać tutaj. Dwa pensy dopłaty.

Kwiatłka: Nie. Chociaż, żeby go ludzie widzieli [...]

Taksówkarz: Dokąd?

Lisa: Baskam Pelis.

Taksówkarz: A cóż to znowu. Baskam Pelis?


Freddy: Do widzenia.

Taksówkarz: No i jak, Co jest z tym Baskam Pelis. Czego panna tam szuka.


[...]

Lisa: Ile?

Taksówkarz: Czytać nie umie? Szyling.

Lisa: Szyling za dwie krótkie minuty jazdy?

Taksówkarz: Dwie minuty albo dziesięć — nie ma różnicy.

Lisa: Nie powiem, żeby to było w porządku.

Taksówkarz: Jechała już kiedy taksówką?
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Florian Sobienieowski: Pigmalion, PIW 1972, str. 25-39

[...]

Pierwszy z gawędzi: Dej pozór... ciśniej tu w niego jakimś kwiatkiem... pod ścianą jakieśści skleś stoi i każde swoje słówko do książki wpisuje...

Kwiatłka: Rany boskie, a co tam, do choler, takiego zrobiła, źem się odezwała do tego pana? Mojego prawo sprzedać kwiaty... legularne prawo mam. Jak Boga kocham, jesiem przyzwisła dziewczyna... przecież nie innego, do choler, nie mówiłam, ale żeby co kupić.

[...]

Kwiatłka: A to po mnie pan zapał? Czy mnie pan rychły odnowił? Pukać pan, co tam stoi... Cóż to za zakrzeszy? To nie legularne pismo, nie z tego nie mogłem wyczytać...

Jedność z notatką: A ja mogę, posłuchać... „Ten do koloru kapciecie. Pan kupi kwiatka od bidnej dziewczyny...”

---

Source: D. H. Lawrence, The First Lady Chatterley, the first version of Lady Chatterley’s Lover

Identification: Yorkshire

Description: Wakesley (1984)

[...]

"Not when I touch you," she said. "When I touch you, you are only lovely to me. — But one never knows what a man will think afterwards!"

"Do you like to touch me, though?" he asked, in a soft, doubtful voice.

"You’re lovely to touch! You’re lovely to touch!" she moaned.

"Are you sure it is? Like thee ter me?" he said in the full slow tones of the dialect, with such a soft, warm flooding of truth.

[...]

The keeper thought about it, but his mind resolved nothing.

"So you can go on like you have been doing?" he asked.

"I don’t ever want anybody to know about us — about you and me," she said.

"You don’t, do you?"

---

4 Dzielnica, w której znajdował się zakład psychiatryczny.
"I shan’t tell anybody," he said, laconic.

There was a long pause.

"What makes yer come to a feller like me?" He asked at length, getting a question off his mind.

"Cause yer think yer can take it or leave it as you like?"

She too pondered. Why had she come to this man?

"I don’t know!" she said slowly. "But once I saw you washing at the back of your cottage, and I thought you were beautiful."

[...]

"You come when you like, an’ you go when you like!" he said, "an’ you take no count of me. But what about me, when I wait and watch across th’ park, an’ you never come? An’ I say to myself: she wants none o’thee tonight, hah! Go whoam an’ hang thy gun up! — Ay, I’ll wait! Yi, an’ I’ll go home, an’ wait again th’ next day. But I know right enough. You think nothing of me. You look down on me. Only you enjoy a bit o’cunt wi’ me. But you look down on me, caw, an’ all."
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Zofia Sroczyńska: Kochanek Lady Chatterley, Almanpress 1987, str. 47, 89-90

[...]

— Nie wiedzy, kiedy ciebie dotykam — powiedziała. — Jestem wtedy dla mnie tylko piękna. Ale nigdy nie wzięłom, co mężczyznę sobie połom pomyśli.

— Wicie lubisz mnie dotykać? — zapytał cichym, niepewnym głosem.

— Tak, bardzo lubię. To cudownie, jęknęła.

— Naprawdę lubisz? Tak jak ja? — rzekł powoli, gwarowo rozciągając słowa, w których zabrzmiało szczere uczucie.

[...] Park zastanawiał się nad tym, ale nie znalazł żadnego rozwiązania.

— Wicie bęǳiesz to mogli robić, jak dotąd? — zapytał.

— Nie chce, żebyś się kórko o nas dowiedział... o mnie i o sobie... odparł. — Ty też tego nie chcesz, prawda?

— Nikomu nie powiem — rzekł lakonicznie.

Młodzi przez słuszna chwile.

— Co się gna do takiego chłopa, jak ja? — zapytał w końcu, uwalniając się od dręczącego pytania.

— Bo sobie mylisz, że możesz przychoǳić i nie przychoǳić, jak chcesz? Z kolei ona długo się zastanawiała. Dlaczego przyszła do tego człowieka?

— Nie wiem — powiedziała powoli. — Ale kiedyś zobaczyłam, jak się stymił na podwórku za domem, i pomyślałam, że jesteś piękny.


Source: E. O’Neill, Desire under the Elms, scene 2
Identification: Midwestern
Description: —

Source: John Steinbeck, The Grapes of Wrath
Identification: Midwestern
Description: —

By the tent a little embarrassment had set in and social intercourse had paused before it started. Pa said, “You ain’t Oklahoma folks?”

And Al, who stood near the car, looked at the license plates. “Kansass,” he said.

The lean man said, “Galsena, or right about there. Wilson. Ivy Wilson.”

“We’re Jocks,” said Pa. “We come from right near Sullivan.”

“Well, we’re proud to meet you folks,” said Ivy Wilson.
“Saira, these is Joads.”
“I knowed you wasn’t Oklahoma folks. You talk queer, kinda — that ain’t no blame, you understand.”
“Ever’ body says words different,” said Ivy. “Arkansas folks says ‘em different, and Oklahoma folks says ‘em different. And we seen a lady from Massachusetts an’ said ‘em different of all. Couldn’t hardly make out what she was sayin.”

[...]

Wilson said, “We had to leave my brother Will.” The heads turned toward him. “He an’ me had a fight side by side. He’s older’n me. Neither one ever drove a car. Well, we went in an’ we sol’ everything. Will, he bought a car, an’ they give him a kid to show him how to use it. So the afternoon ‘fore we’re gonna start, Will an’ Aunt Minnie go a-practizin’. Will, he comes to a bend in the road an’ he yells ‘Whoo!’ an’ yanks back, an’ he goes, through a fence. An’ he yells ‘Whoo, you bastard!’ An’ tramps down on the gas, an’ goes over into a gulch. An’ there he was. Didn’t have nothing more to sell, an’ didn’t have no car. But it was his own damn fault, praise God. He’s so damn mad, he won’t come along with us, jist’ set there a-cussin’ an’ a-cussin’.”

“What’s he gonna do?”
“I dunno. He’s too mad to figure. An’ we couldn’t wait. On’y had eighty-five dollars to go on [...] I dunno when we’ll ever get to California. ‘F, I could only fix a car, but I don’t know nothin’, about cars.”

[...]

Alfred Liebfeld: Grona gnieźna, PIW 1956, str. 195, 218

[...]

Przed namiotem zapanowało lekce zaułkotanie i towarzysząca rozmowa urwała się, zanim się naprawdę rozpoczął. Ojciec wypłynął:

— Nie jesteście czosem z Ohio?
Al, który stał w pobliżu samochodu turystycznego, rzucał okiem na tablicę rejestracyjną i wspiął się na kanapę.

Chudy człowiek uzupełnił:


— Ano, bardzo nam miło — oświadczył Wilson. — Saira, oto nasza gość: Joadowie, zaprezentować.
— Od razu poznalem, że nie są z Ohio. Bez obrawy, ale mówią macie dzikim.

— Każdy mówi inaczej — stwierdził Wilson. — Inaczej mówią ludzie z Arkansas, inaczej z Ohio. Ale spotkaliśmy je w Massachusetts, w Massachusetts, w Massachusetts, w Massachusetts, w Massachusetts.

— Trudno było w ogóle wyróżnić, o co je chodzi.

[...]

Młodzień przerwał Wilson.

— A my musielibyśmy zostawić w domu mego brata Willa.

Wszystkie głowy zwróciły się w jego stronę.

“Now, now,” Dilsey says, “I ain’t gwine let him tech you.” She put her hand on Quentin. She knocked it down.

“You damn old nigger,” she says. She ran toward the door.

[...]

I went on to the back, where old Job was uncrating them, at the rate of about three bolts to the hour.

Appendix

136

Source: William Faulkner, *The Sound and the Fury*

Identification: Black English

Description: Dillard (1973)

[...]

She came babbling between us trying to hold me again. “Hit me, den,” she says, “’Ef nothin else but hittin somebody wont do you.”

“Hit me,” she says.

“You think I want?” I says.

“I dont put up no devilmont beyond you,” she says. Then I heard Mother on the stairs. I might have known she wasnt going to keep out of it. I let up. She stumbled back against the wall, holding her kimono shut.

“All right,” I says, “Wll just put this off a while. But dont think you can run it over me. I’m not an old woman, nor an old half dead nigger, either. You dont little slut,” I says.

“Dilsey,” she says, “Dilsey, I want my mother.”

Dilsey went to her. “Now, now,” she says. “He aint gwine so much as lay his hand on you while Ise here.” Mother come on down the stairs.

“Jason,” she says, “Dilsey.”

“Now, now,” Dilsey says, “I aint gwine let him tech you.” She put her hand on Quentin. She knocked it down.

“You damn old nigger,” she says. She ran toward the door.

[...]


[...]

Udałem się na tyły magazynu, gdzie stary Job wyciągnął je ze skrzyni, z szybkością mniej więcej trzech śrub na godzinę.

Powinieneś u mnie pracować – powiadam. – Wszystkie inne czarne lepiej w tym miesiącu jadają w mojej kuchni.

Pracuję, żeby dogodzić temu, co mi płaci tygodniówkę w srebrze wiciór – on na to – nie mam już czasu, żeby jeszcze innym dogadać. – Wykręcił zławkę. – Dzisiaj to w tym kraju nikt dużo nie pracuje tylko stonka bawelniana.

To się ciesz, że nie jesteś stonka, która ustawia te kulisywary. Zapracowałby się na śmierć, zanimby ci kto zdążył w tym przeszkodzić.

Source: William Faulkner, *As I Lay Dying*

Identification: Southern American English

Description: Wells (1992)

[...]

“IT wants to get started right off,” he says. “It’s far enough to Jefferson at best.”

“But the roads is good now,” I say. “It’s fixing to rain tonight, too. His folks buries at New Hope, too, not three miles away. But it’s just like him to marry a woman born a day’s hard ride away and have her die on him.”
He looks out over the land, rubbing his knees. "No man so mislikes it," he says. "They'll get back in plenty of time," I say. "I wouldn't worry none."

"It means three dollars," he says.

"Might be it won't be no need for them to rush back, noways," I say. "I hope it."

"She's a-going," he says. "Her mind is set on it."
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Ewa Życieńska: Kiedy umieram, Czytelnik 1968, str. 33

[...]

— Czasem człowiek musi i naprawdę przewidzieć — mówi. — Ale jak tam było, ni w jednym, ni w drugim, szkoda się nie stanie.

— Ona by chciała, żeby zaraz wyruszyć — powiada. — I przy najlepszej pogodzie do Jefferson ładny kawał drogi.

— Ale droga teraz dobra — mówi. I zbiera się na deszcz dziś wieczór. Do tego jego rodzina grzebie swoich w New Hope, niecałe trzy mile stąd. Ale to właśnie do niego podobne żenić się z kobietą, co się rozdzielili o dobry dzień drogi gdzieś tam, żeby potem mieć klępek jak umrze. Purzy był przez pół i trze kolana.

— Już mnie się to najpierw widzi z was wszystkich — powiada.

— W czas wróć — mówi. — No, ja bym się nie marwił.

— To dla nas trzy dolary — powiada.

— Może być, że wcale nie będą musieli się spieszyć — mówi. — Taką mam nadzieję.

— Już ona się zbiera — powiada. — Już się na to namawia.

Source: F. O'Connor, A Good Man is Hard to Find
Identification: Southern American English
Description: Wells (1982)

[...]

The Misfit squatted down on the ground. "Watch them children, Bobby Lee," he said. "You know they make me nervous." He looked at the six of them huddled together in front of him and he seemed to be embarrassed as if he couldn't think of anything to say. "Ain't a cloud in the sky," he remarked, looking up at it. "Don't see no sun but don't see no cloud neither."

"You shouldn't call yourself the Misfit because I know you're a good man at heart! I can just look at you and tell."

[...]

"I was a gospel singer for a while," the Misfit said. "I been most everything. Been in the arm service, both land and sea, at home and abroad, been twice married, been an undertaker, been with the railroads, plowed Mother Earth, been in a tornado, seen a man burn alive once," and he looked up at the children's mother and the little girl who were sitting close together, their faces white and their eyes glassy; "I even seen a woman flogged," he said.

"Pray, pray," the grandmother began, "pry, pray..."

"I never was a bad boy that I remember of," the Misfit said in an almost dreamy voice, "but somewheres along the line I done something wrong and got sent to the penitentiary. I was buried alive," and he looked up and held her attention to him by a steady stare.

"That's when you should have started to pray," she said. "What did you do to get sent to the penitentiary that first time?"
"Are you the father of Mayella Ewell?" was the next question.

"Well! If I ain't I can't do nothing about it now, her ma's dead!" was the answer.

[...]

"Would you tell us what happened on the evening of November twenty-first, please?" [...]

"Well, the night of November twenty-one I was comin' in from the woods with a load o' kindlin' and just as I got to the fence I heard Mayella screamin' like a stuck hog inside the house" [...]

"What time was it, Mr. Ewell?"

"Just 'fore sundown, Well I was sayin' Mayella was screamin' fit to beat Jesus [...] Well, Mayella was raisin' this holy racket so I dropped m'load and run as fas as I could, but I run into the fence, but when I got distangled, I run up to th' window and I seen [...] I seen that black nigger yonder nutin' on my Mayella!"

[...]

"You say you were at the window?" asked Mr. Gilmer.

"Yes sir." [...]
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Zofia Kierszys: Zabić drogą, Książka i Wiedza 1973, str. 241-251

[...]

Pan Robert Ewell? — zapytał pan Gilmer.

-Tasieżywam, szerzyce — odrzekł świadek [...]

-Pan jest ojcem Mayelli Ewell? — zadał pan Gilmer następné pytanie.

-No, jeżeli nie jestem, płaczę już i tak o to nie zrobię. Jej mamitka nie żyje — padł odpowiedź [...]

-Pan Ewell, zechce pan nam opowiedzieć swoimi słowy, co stało się w tamten wieczór dwudziestego pierwszego listopada?

-No, w tamten wieczór dwudziestego pierwszego listopada nikt z lasu chrust na podpalke i doszlem wstecz do polec, a tu słyszę, jak Mayella drze się w domu niczym chyba zarysowana swińka [...]

-Która to była godzina, panie Ewell? [...]

Przed samym zachodem słońca. No, jak mówię, Mayella tak wrzeszczała, że mógłby ochłuchać Jezusa [...] No, Mayella robila ten piekliwy ruch, więc upuściłem chrust, co go niszczył, i pobiłem czym prędzej, ale wypadłem na płot, ale kiedy się odczepiem, pobiłem do okna i patrzę, a w [...]. Jaki to chlas, a ten tam smolek, czarny byk, poniewiera mi moją Mayelle! [...]

-Mówi pan, że stał pan pod oknem? — zapytał pan Gilmer.

-A jakże.

Source: Harper Lee, To Kill a Mockingbird
Identification: Black Vernacular
Description: Dillard (1982)

"I was goin' home as usual that evenin', an' when I passed the Ewell place Miss Mayella were on the porch, like she said, she were. It seemed real quiet like, an' I didn't quite know why. I was studyin' why, just passin' by, when she says for me to come there and help her a minute [...]. And she says 'Now I got somethin' for you to do in the house. Th' old door's off its hinges an' fall's comin on pretty fast. I said 'you got a screwdriver, Miss Mayella?' She said she sho' had. Well I went up the steps an' she motioned me to come inside, and I went into the front room an' looked at the door. I said Miss Mayella, this door look all right. I pulled it back'n forth and those hinges was all right. Then she shut the door in my face. Mr. Finch, I was wonderin' why it was so quiet like, an' it come to me that there weren't a chile on the place, not one of 'em, and I said Miss Mayella, 'where the chillun?' [...] I say, 'where the chillun?' he continued 'an' she says — she was laughin', sort of — she says they all gone to town to get ice cream. She says 'took me a slap year to save seeb'n nickels,' but I done it. They all gone to town. [...] What did you say them, Tom?' asked Atticus.

"I said somethin' like, 'why Miss Mayella, that's right smart o' you to treat 'em.' An' she said 'You think so?' I don't think she understood what I was thinkin' — I meant it was smart of her to save like that, an' nice of her to treat 'em' [...] Well, I said 'I best be goin', I couldn't do nothin' for her, an' she says 'oh yes, I could,' an' I ask her what, and she says to just step on that chair yonder an' git that box down from on top of the chiffarobe' [...]

'Not the same chiffarobe you bussed up?' asked Atticus.

The witness smiled. "Now suh, another one. Most as tall as the room, so I done what she told me, an' I was just reachin' when the next thing I knows she — she'd grabbed me round the legs, grabbed me round th' legs, Mr. Finch. She scared me so bad I hopped down an' turned the chair over — that was the only thing, only furniture, 'sturbed in that room, Mr. Finch, when I left it. I swear 'fere God.' [...]"
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Zofia Kierszys: Zabić drogą, Książka i Wiedza 1973, str. 267-277

-Psz...ana, panie Finch — powiedział — wracałem wtedy wieczór jak zawsze i panna Mayella, jak siedział koło obejścia Ewolów, była na gunku, tak jak mówiła, że była. Była tam jakby cicho i nie wiedziałem, dlaczego. Myślałem sobie, dlaczego tam tak cicho i siedziałem, a tu ona mówi, żebym wszedł na chwilę i jej pomógł. [...] I ona mówi: "Nie, coś mum dla ciebie do roboty w domu. Te drzwi takie stare i lecą z zawiasów, a już jeść tylko patrzenie". Zapytałem się: "Jesu uważ śrubokręć, panno Mayello?" A ona powiedziała: "Pewnie, że jest. No więc wszedłem na schodki, a ona kiwnęła rękę, żeby wejść do środka. Więc wszedłem do pokoju od frontu i oglądam te drzwi. Powiedziałem: "Panno Mayello, te drzwi wyglądać w porządku". Pociągnąłem je tam i razad i zawiasy były dobre. A ona zaszyfrowała te drzwi mi prosto w nos. Dałem się, co tak cicho i mi zauważyło, że nie ma dzieci niesłusza, ani jednego z nich, więc się zapytałem panu Mayelli, gdzie dzieci. [...] ja się zapytałem, gdzie dzieci, a ona mówi... śmieje się jakby... mówi, że poszli wszyscy na lody. Mówi: "Chyba z rok odkładali tam siedem piąteków dla nich, ale odlżyłam. Wszyscy poszli do muścia na lody" [...]

-Co wtedy powiedziałem, Tom? — zapytał Atticus.

-Powiedziałem coś tak: "Zmyślenie panna Mayella zrobiła, że im zafundowała". A ona na to: "Tak uważasz? Chyba mnie jakieś nie zrozumiała... Ja chciałbym powiedzieć, że zmyślenie te ceny odkładają i ładnie, że im zafundowała te lody. [...] Now, powiedziałem, że już sobie pójdu, jak nie mam co dla niej zrobić, a ona mówi, że ma, a ja się piętam co, a ona mówi, żeby wejść na to krześe tam i siedzieć na starcie, a tu ona znienacka lepie mnie za nogi... za nogi mnie złapała, psz... pana. Tak okropnie się złamał, że skoczyłem, i to krzesło się wywróciło... to chyba jedyna rzecz psz...ana, jedyny mebel wywrócił w tym pokoju, jak samotną odszedł. Przysięgam przed Bogiem. [...]"
Source: J. Baldwin, *Tell me how long the train's been gone*
Identification: Black English
Description: Dillard (1973)

[...]
“What movie,” asked our father, “you fixin’ to take him to see?”
“I don’t know,” said Caleb. “We’ll see what’s playing at the Lincoln.”
“I don’t want his mind all messed up — you know that.”
“He ain’t going to get his mind messed up — not by going to the movies.”
“You don’t know the Jew like I know him.”
“You don’t never go to see them.”
“You don’t never go to see them,” said our mother, “because you too lazy and too old. And can’t nobody tear you away from that rum. Let these children go on —
“You’ll see,” he said, grimly, “you’re going to see one of these days, just what I’m talking about. And you ain’t going to like what you see at all.”
“Hush,” he said, “I ain’t afraid of what I’m going to see. I know what I’ve seen already.”
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Juliusz Kydryński: *Powiedz mi, jak dawnio odszedł pociąg*, Książka i Wiedza 1974, str. 31

[...]
— Na jaki film chcesz go zaprowadzić? — spytał ojciec.
— Nie wiem — odpowiedział Kaleb. — Zobaczymy co grają w „Lincolnie”.
— Nie chęć, żebyś go balansował — wiesz o tym.
— On nie da za balansować — nie jest klun.
— Ty nie zrozum tych Żydów, tak jak ja ich znam.
— Niech już sobie idą — powiedziała matka — żeby wrócili na czas na kolację.
— To Żydzi robią te filmy, człowieku. Po to, żeby nas obalansować. Właśnie dlatego nigdy nie chodzę do kina.
— Nie chodzię, bo ja jestem za leniwy i za stary. I nikt cię nie może odcierć od tego rumu. Niech dzieci już idą...
— Zobaczysz — mówił z przejęciem — zobaczysz kiedyś, że to prawda. I wcale ci się to nie będzie podobało.

Source: S. Bellow, *Herzog*
Identification: Yiddish accented English
Description: —

[...]
He said loudly and sternly, “Yah?”
“Mr. Dienstag on the phone.”
“Who? That Schmuck? I’m waiting for that affidavit. Tell him plaintiff will kick his ass if he can’t produce it. He better get it this afternoon, that ludicrous shmegeggery!” Amplified, his tones were ecstatic. Then he switched off, and said with resumed meekness to Moses, “Veil, veil I get so tired of these divorces.” [...]

Source: Anthony Burgess, *A Clockwork Orange*
Identification: Artificial dialect
Description: Stiller (1991)

[...]
“...Alein, alein, alein
Elend wie u shein
Mit die teen finger — alein”

[...]
He nodded and mused
“...Alone, alone, alone, alone
Solitary as a stone
With my ten fingers — alone”

[...]
“Who is it?”
“It’s Moses...”
“I don’t know you. I’m alone. Moses?”
“Tante Taube — Moses Herzog, Moshe.”
“Ah — Moshe.”

- 55 -

Krystyna Tarnowska: *Herzog*, Czytelnik 1971, str. 56-214

[...]
Simkin rzucił głośno i surowo: „Tak?”
„Pan Dienstag przy telefonię.”
Gdy Simkin miała obsadzić, w pokój rozległ się huk oceanu. Odkleił słuchawkę i zwrócił się do Herzoga z poprzednią powściągliwą — Och, ach! Mam tych rozważań powyżej uszu. [...]

[...]
Alajn, alajn, alajn, alajn
Elend wi a shtajn
Mid di cen finger — alajn

[...]
Kiwnał głową w zadumie.
Samotny, samotny, samotny
Nby w połu głaz —
Tylko moich dziesięć paków
Jest tu że maą wraz

[...]
— Kto to?
— Moses.
— Nie znam pana. Jestem sama w domu.
— Chito Tafo... to ja, Moses Herzog, Moshe.
— Ach, Mosze.

Source: Anthony Burgess, *A Clockwork Orange*
Identification: Artificial dialect
Description: Stiller (1991)

[...]
“...Oh, you’ve recovered consciousness.”
Dobry z ciebie chłopiec — powiedział ten Wielki Członkowie. — Grzeczny i dobry chłopczyk, A teraz, no proszę, mały przesicz. I cóż wieszli, o braciszku, jak nie wielkie błąskacze pudło, i od razu wiedziałem co to. A to było stereo. Postawił mi je przy wyrzku i otworzyli i jakiś faga wskazał jego przewód do gniazdkap w ścianie. — Co ma być? — zapytał jakiś pinglark w ochoczach na kluflie i w rękach trzymały monsieu ślicznych błyskaczących koszulek pełnych muzyków.

— Mozart! Beechoven! Schönberg! A może Carlo Orfit? —

— Dziewiąta — rzekłem. — Nieznana Dziewiąta.
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— O, odzyskałeś przytomność.

Powiedziała to zbyt pełnym wojsem, jak na taką nieliczną słasę jak ona. Chciałem jej o tym powiedzieć, ale wyszło tylko e... e... e. Odgórna i zostawiła mnie samego i wtedy wytulam, że jestem w oddzielnym ciała polokoję, a nie na jednym z tych długich oddziałów, na jakim byłem jako mały boj, pełnym kaszelujących ojcowych domu dookoła, że aż chciało się wyzorować, i znów być w dobrej formie. Miałem wtedy coś w rodzaju dyfuzji, o braćce moj.

Więc za szacunku, chłopce, mówisz do ministra.

— Fak — powiedziałem odszczerbując jak pies. — Oďucz się ode mnie, ty i twój ludzie.

— O.K., O.K. — powiedział bardzo szybko ten Zewnętrzny Wewnętrzny. — Mówię do mnie, tak jak do swoich przyjaciół, czyż nie, synu?

— Wszyscy są moimi przyjaciółmi — odpowiedziałem — z wyjątkiem moich wrogów.

— A kim są wrogowie? — zapytał minister, podczas gdy wszystkie nieuprzejmości meną bagnice bazu, bazgu, bazgu.

— Powiedz to nam, mój chłopcu;

— Wszyscy, którzy wypracują mi krzywy — rzekłem — są moimi wrogami.

— Zawsze pomagamy przyjacielom, nieprawda? Wtedy wziął mnie za rękę a ktoś szatun. — Uśmiechnięte się bezmyślnie jak czubek i wtedy pstryk pstryk trzask pstrzyk buk robił zdjęcia mi i Wewsiewnolinew: dwóch frendów razem.


Wtedy wieńczone, bracło, zęby błyskacze pudło i wytulam dobrze, co to za sf. To było stereo. Postawił mi przy leżka i otworzył pudło, a jakiś men wlewał wyczekę do kontaktu w ścianie.

— Co gramy? — zapytał jakiś men z glazami na nosie, a zrywał piękną, błyskaczące okładki płyty pełnych muzyków — Mozart, Beethoven, Schoenberga? Karla Orfii?

— Dziewiąta — powiedziałem. — Wspanialą Dziewiątą.
My little sister Nettie is got a boyfriend in the same shape almost as Pa. His wife died. She was killed by her boyfriend coming home from church. He got only three children though. He seen Nettie in church and now every Sunday evening here come Mr. ______ I tell Nettie to keep at her books. It be more then a notion taking care of children ain't even youm. And look what happen to Ma.
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Michał Kłobukowski: Kolor Purpury, Wydawnictwo Ryton 1992, str. 7

[...]

Drogi Panie Boże!

Sprowarzili sobie dziewczynę skądś spod Grzy. Dziewczyna w mojem wieku, ale i tak się pobrali. On siedzi i wciąż na niej leży, a ona ma minę jakby się nie mogła połączyć, co się właściwie dzieje.

Pewniakiem jej się zdawało, że go kocha. Ale u nas w domu tyle dzieci i co i rusz tegoż czegoś chce.


Sources of examples


J. Baldwin — Tell me how long the rain’s been gone. Vantage Books 1975.


H. Beecher Stowe — Uncle Tom’s Cabin. Tauchnitz 1884.


D. Defoe — Robinson Cruso, przygody na bezludnej wyspie, translated by J. Zawisza-Krasucka. Wydawnictwo „Gazety Polskiej w Brazylii” 1940.
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