

ANNA BIELSKA (ŁÓDŹ)

VULGARISMS IN MACIEJ SŁOMCZYŃSKI'S TRANSLATION OF „ROMEO AND JULIET”

Many factors determine translation. One of them is culture which is inseparably connected with translation. A translator sees a reality from the perspective of his culture. It is especially obvious in the lexical choices he is making to transfer a source text into a target one, and in the way he understands and transmits the original message.

In the article I deliberately chose a great piece of a world literature and its three Polish translations coming from three different periods to show more vivid differences between Polish versions.

In order to achieve this goal, I use textual analysis. Textual analysis is a methodology for studying the content of communication.

Romeo and Juliet is one of the most famous Shakespeare's plays. The story of two families constantly in dispute focuses on an intense but tragic romantic love. The hero and heroine of *Romeo and Juliet* are probably the most prominent literary characters. Appreciated and loved by many readers the story is known worldwide.

Paszkowski, Słomczyński and Barańczak embarked on translating the masterpiece. Paszkowski's translation dates back to the 19th century, whereas two others were written in the 20th. Due to the range of time, the differences between the Polish versions are distinguishable.

Since Shakespeare wrote *Romeo and Juliet* over 400 years ago, it comes as no surprise that many translators rendered the language of the original masterpiece into their mother tongue. However, not everybody is aware that the versions significantly differ not only from the original text but also from each other. Over the years, different translators have applied different lexical elements from a totally dissimilar perspective. None of the translators seems to follow of his predecessors and their version of *Romeo and Juliet*.

Each translator wishes to make their translation truly unique and identified by many Shakespeare's enthusiasts. However, it does not mean that all translations are of an equal success.

In the article I am going to focus on vulgarisms. My intention is to demonstrate that they are highly inappropriate when translating Shakespeare and they result in non-equivalence. My research is based on *Romeo and Juliet* and its three Polish translations. The question arises if the Polish versions have the same charm as the original masterpiece and if the unsuccessful translations contribute to the negative perception of the original text? The article gives the answers to these questions.

Equivalence

Nida was the first linguist who made a great contribution to the field of translation theory. His *A Synopsis of English Syntax* was the first thorough analysis of a major language according to the "immediate-constituent" theory. He established the theory of equivalence that is highly respected up to now.

In a broad sense equivalence is an equality of meaning. In the context of the translation theory the equivalence is "the preservation of relative similarity of cognitive, semantic, stylistic and communicative information contained in the original text"¹.

Examples of vulgarisms

Shakespeare's language is very subtle. Even if the writer applied certain offensive words, they cannot be perceived as strong and vulgar as their current equivalents. The language has changed so as the meaning of many words. Therefore, a translator ought to get familiarized with the etymology of a word before rendering it into his mother tongue.

Act II, Scene IV

Mercutio tells Benvolio:

The pox of such antic, lisping, affecting fantasticoes,
these new tuners of accent! 'By Jesu, a very good
blade, a very tall man, a very good whore!'²

¹ B. Hatim, J. Munday, *Translation: An Advanced Resource Book*, Routledge, New York 2004, p. 117.

² W. Shakespeare, *Romeo and Juliet*, Wordsworth Classics, Great Britain 2000, p. 67.

Shakespeare refers to “pox” as an infectious disease spread by sexual contact. The word has been used since the 15th century, as a “spelling alteration of pockes”³. Next, Mercutio mentions three adjectives. The first one is “antic”, whose original form, *antico*, points to Italian roots. In this context, “antic” is used as ‘grotesque’ as Mercutio makes fun of Tybalt and his sophisticated fencing skills. The next two adjectives are also negative in meaning, i.e. “lisp” and “affecting”. Moreover, Shakespeare includes “fantasticoes” whose spelling denotes foreign roots. This word has a long history. It has its beginning in the 14th century as French “fantastique”, via medieval Latin “fantasticus” and from late Latin “phantasticus”⁴. Considering the context, “fantasticoes” is employed as “a strange person”. Next, Mercutio laughs at the accent of such a sophisticated man when he says “new tuners of accent”. The word “tuner” is composed of two elements “tune” + “er”. In the late 14th century, “tune” meant “a musical sound, a succession of musical notes”. The meaning altered in the mid 15th century when was defined as “state of being in proper pitch”⁵. “Tune” also functions as a verb, “to adjust a musical instrument so that it plays at the correct pitch”⁶. Adding the ending “-er” to the verb, a reader receives an English agent noun ending. “Tuner” as a “device for varying the frequency of a radio or television” was first used in 1909. Then, Mercutio uses three nouns to address Tybalt and people similar to him. He mentions “a very good blade”, where “blade” has its archaic meaning defined as “a dashing or swaggering young man”⁷. “Blade” has also its more popular explanation as “the thin cutting part of a knife, sword etc.”⁸. Next, he says “a very tall man”, where “tall” first was understood as “high in stature”. Then, in the late 14th century the sense evolved to “brave, valiant, seemly, proper” and in the 15th century it was defined as “attractive, handsome”. Finally, it has its contemporary meaning pointing to “being of more than average height”⁹. Mercutio continues with “a very good whore”. “Whore” has a rich etymological history. It is associated with the late Old English *hōre*, also related to Dutch *hoer* and German *Hure*¹⁰.

³ D. Harper, *Online Etymology Dictionary*, 2001–2010.

⁴ Ibidem.

⁵ Ibidem.

⁶ D. Wehmeier (chief ed.), *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*, seventh edition, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2005, p. 1648.

⁷ William Collins Sons & Co. Ltd., *Collins English Dictionary – Complete & Unabridged 10th Edition*, Harper Collins Publishers, New York 2009.

⁸ A. Room, *Cassell's Dictionary of Word Histories*, Cassell & Co., London 2002, p. 65.

⁹ D. Harper, *Online Etymology Dictionary*, 2001–2010.

¹⁰ S. Wehmeier (chief ed.), *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*, seventh edition, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2005 p. 2005.

“‘Whore’ itself is perhaps a Germanic euphemism for a word that has not survived. Some equivalent words in other languages also derive from sources not originally pejorative. Welsh putain ‘whore’ is from Old French, probably via Middle English also Bohemian *nevestka*, diminutive of *nevesta* ‘bride’. German *dirne* originally meant “girl, lass, wench”. Among other languages, Greek *porne* ‘prostitute’ is related to *pernemi* ‘sell’, with an original notion, probably of a female slave sold for prostitution; Latin *meretrix* is literally ‘one who earns wages’”¹¹. Polish translators have a wide range of words to choose from when rendering this fragment. As the result, a reader encounters three different versions.

Paszkowski translates as follows,

Niech kaci porwą to plemię śmiesznych, sepleniących,
przesadnych fantastyków, z ich nowo kutymi terminami!
Na Boga, doskonała klinga! Dzielny mąż! Wspaniała
dziewka!¹²

The translator reflects the source culture and starts with “niech kaci porwą”, which does not include the original word “pox” but denotes anger and indignation. The phrase also tells the reader that Mercutio wishes that something wrong happen to this “plemię [...] fantastyków”. Shakespeare’s beginning presents the same sense, though with different lexical elements. Paszkowski also enlists three adjectives to address “fantastyków”, i.e. “śmiesznych, sepleniących, przesadnych”. The first one, “śmiesznych”, literally corresponds to “antic”, similarly to “sepleniących” and its direct equivalent “lispings”. “Przesadnych” does not carry exactly the same meaning as “affecting” but, as well as the original, it evokes negative feelings towards a person who is being referred to. Next, Paszkowski uses “fantastyków”, which has its roots in Greek as *fantasia* from *fajnejn*, ‘to appear’¹³. Unlike Shakespeare’s “fantasticoes”, Polish “fantastyków” does not sound as if it was borrowed from a foreign language, though its history refers to Greek. Despite this difference, Paszkowski’s lexical item is equivalent to the one used by Shakespeare. “New tuners of accent” is reflected in “nowo kutymi terminami” that has only one lexical element, “nowy”, comparable to the original. “Accent” is changed into “termin” and “tuners” into “kuty”. Although lexically these words have lit-

¹¹ D. Harper, *Online Etymology Dictionary*, 2001–2010.

¹² W. Shakespeare, trans. by J. Paszkowski, *Romeo i Julia*, Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, Warszawa 1964, p. 96.

¹³ A. Brückner, *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*, Wiedza Powszechna, Warszawa 1993, p. 118 (translation mine).

tle in common, the main sense is preserved as the goal was to make fun of the French-like people. Moreover, Paszkowski translates “a very good blade” in a literal sense as “doskonała klinga”. These two phrases share the same meaning. The Polish translator intensifies the adjective describing “klinga” as a reader finds “doskonała”, instead of “bardzo dobra”. It does not change anything in the overall understanding of the fragment and sounds good in Polish. The lack of a literal translation may be only noticeable if the following phrases are concerned as Shakespeare repeats “very” every time he refers to somebody. Therefore, the next phrase includes “a very tall man” which has been translated into “dzielny mąż”. A concentration on the source culture is also evident when considering the late 14th-century understanding of the word “tall”, “dzielny” is its literal counterpart. Paszkowski reflects “whore” in “dziewka”. This translation is similar to Shakespeare’s language as it does not sound vulgar. Vulgarism would be not only improper but also deprived of original intentions.

Słomczyński’s translation is less adequate to Shakespeare’s language. He renders:

Ach, franca na takich błazeńskich, sepleniących, afektowanych pomy-leńców; tych stroicieli nowej wymowy! – „Ach, na Jezusa, jaka prze-wyborna klinga! – jaki przewysoki człowiek! – jaka przedobra kurwa!”¹⁴

“Pox” finds its literal translation, “franca”. Apart from its old-fashioned usage, connected with syphilis, “franca” has its more contemporary meaning. Currently it refers to a woman in an offensive manner, which can be compared to ‘bitch’. The three more adjectives have been also directly translated as their key role is to slander “pomyleńców”. Among them, Słomczyński uses “afektowanych” that is copied from the original “affecting”, in terms of both lexis and meaning. Next, a reader finds “pomyleńców” as a counterpart referring to “fantasticoes”. The difference concerns the fact that Polish word brings strong, negative connotations that are not easily recognized as humorous. Słomczyński does not also employ a borrowing or a foreign ending to render the original goal. As the lexis is dissimilar and the meaning does not correspond to Shakespeare’s message, the noun “pomyleńców” is not equivalent to the master copy. More adequately, the translator conveys “tuners” to “stroicieli”. He uses the verb “tune” and adds the appropriate ending to create a doer of this action. Shakespeare’s “very” is replaced by the prefix “prze-” as

¹⁴ W. Shakespeare, trans. by M. Słomczyński, *Romeo i Julia*, Wydawnictwo Zielona Sowa, Kraków 2008, p. 54.

Słomczyński repeats “przewyborna”, “przewysoki” and “przedobra”. The only inexcusable mistake concerns “whore” and its Polish counterpart “kurwa”. The translator rendered the word too literally, unaware that Shakespeare’s style is far from using such vulgarism and sexually explicit implications. Once more, the word is not equivalent to the original. If the text is not equivalent, it does not bring the reader closer to Shakespeare’s times, his language and culture.

Compared to Paszkowski and Słomczyński, Barańczak presents the most contemporary language. He renders:

Farsz! Farsz, którym się faszeruje cała fura afektowanych
fanfaronów – tych, co to się zgrywają, pretensjonalnie se-
plenią, żonglują sztucznymi słówkami! „Na Jowisza, arcy-
dzielna klinga! arcyciekawy osobnik! Arcydupiasta dziewczka!”¹⁵

The translator starts with “farsz”, which may bring also some French connotations as *farce* means ‘stuffing’. The first verse and the beginning of the second one abound in {f}, i.e. “*farsz*”, “*faszeruje*”, “*fura*”, “*afektowanych*” and “*fanfaronów*”. Barańczak renders “antic” into “tych, co to się zgrywają”, which reflects the same sense as the original. The only difference concerns the lexis as Barańczak provides his reader with a longer version of a one-word adjective “antic”. He also emphasizes “lispings” by adding the adverb “pretensjonalnie”. The goal is to mark “seplenią” in a negative way. Moreover, “turners of accent” is translated into “żonglują sztucznymi słówkami”. Lexically, the Polish phrase cannot be compared to the original as it does not share any similar items to the English version. Nevertheless, the communication aim is preserved as Shakespeare’s intention was to make fun of the strange, artificial accent. Barańczak follows the same goal which he reflects in his translation. English author employs “fantasticoes”, which did not and does not exist in his language but it focuses reader’s attention to a foreign-sounding word, which adds humor to the verse. Barańczak does the same as “fanfaron” derives from French *fanfaron*, meaning ‘braggart’. Shakespeare’s “By Jesu”, is changed into “Na Jowisza” as “in ancient Roman religion and myth, Jupiter or Jove was the king of the gods, and the god of sky and thunder”¹⁶. Following another stylistic device, Barańczak repeats the prefix “arcy-” to render Shakespeare’s adverb “very” that was rewritten three times. Without focusing on the archaic

¹⁵ W. Shakespeare, trans. by S. Barańczak, *Romeo i Julia*, Wydawnictwo „W drodze”, Poznań 1994, p. 71.

¹⁶ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Main_Page.

usage of the adjective “tall” when referring to “man”, the translator reflects it as “arcyciekawy osobnik”. The main sense has been conveyed, though. Unlike Słomczyński, Barańczak is more subtle in his words as instead of “kurwa”, he writes “arcydupiasta dziewczka” which adds humor to the verse and, simultaneously renders the same original intentions.

Act III, Scene V

After hearing his daughter unwillingness to marry Paris, Capulet bursts with anger. He shouts and calls Juliet names “Or I will drag thee on a hurdle thither. / Out, you green-sickness carrion! Out, you baggage, / You tallow-face!”¹⁷. Although “hurdle” is derived from Old English *hyrdel* meaning “frame of intertwined twigs used as a temporary barrier”¹⁸, here in the context it should be defined as “a sledge on which criminals were dragged to their executions”¹⁹. The word “carrion” is explained as “the decaying flesh of dead animals”²⁰, which indicates something repulsive. Capulet addresses Juliet as “baggage” which is an offensive word denoting “a pert young woman [or] an immoral woman or prostitute”²¹. He also uses “tallow” which is explained as “odourless, tasteless, waxy white fat, consisting of suet or similar vegetable substances. Tallow was used chiefly to make soap and candles”²². As “tallow” is defined as white fat, in this context it refers to Juliet’s pale face. The girl is white in her face, which is perfectly understandable in these circumstances as strong emotional distress is impossible to be hidden. All of these offensive words find different translations. The difference is mainly focused on the formality scale.

Paszkowski translates into “Albo cię każę zawlec tam na smyczy. / Rozumiesz? ty błednico, ty tłumoku; / Lalko łojowa”²³. “Hurdle” and “smycz” have lexically nothing in common, although both words refer to some kind of compulsion and thus the Polish word matches the context. Moreover, “you

¹⁷ Ibidem, p. 96.

¹⁸ D. Harper, *Online Etymology Dictionary*, 2001–2010.

¹⁹ William Collins Sons & Co. Ltd., *Collins English Dictionary – Complete & Unabridged 10th Edition*, Harper Collins Publishers, New York 2009.

²⁰ S. Wehmeier (chief ed.), *Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary of Current English, seventh edition*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2005, p. 226.

²¹ Collins Sons & Co. Ltd., *Collins English Dictionary – Complete & Unabridged 10th Edition*, Harper Collins Publishers, New York 2009.

²² *Encyclopedia Britannica* (1983), Chicago.

²³ Ibidem, p. 147.

green-sickness carrion” is translated into “ty blednico”. The Polish language dictionary defines “blednica” as “a form of severe anemia characteristic for girls at the age of puberty”²⁴. “Carrion” and “blednica” are lexically far apart. English word is stronger as it points to something more offensive and disgusting, whereas Polish word focuses on less offensive girl’s pale face. Both lexical elements are equivalent as they communicate the original message which is to show Capulet’s anger and an insult to Juliet. Paszkowski translates “baggage” into “tłumoku” which is an offensive word pointing to a slow and unintelligent person. The Polish counterpart functions well in the sentence. It is offensive just like the original but does not evoke too vulgar connotations which would have never been used by Shakespeare. Finally, the translator applies “lalko łojowa” that corresponds to “tallow” as its Polish counterpart. Instead “face” Paszkowski applies “lalko”, which also matches the context perfectly. The whole translated fragment ought to be perceived as equivalent to the original.

Less subtle in the translation is Słomczyński who renders “[...] lub każę / Zawlec cię w pętach. Precz, ty ladacznico, / Wymoczku, ścierwo!”²⁵. “Or I will drag thee on a hurdle thither” has its similar counterpart, “lub każę / Zawlec cię w pętach”. The Polish phrase points to a compulsion and thus fits the context. To reflect “baggage” Słomczyński applies “ladacznico” which suggests an immoral woman, a prostitute. Nevertheless, his translation is stronger than Paszkowski’s who refrains from using such offensive words which could be placed on the bottom of formality scale. Słomczyński also employs “wymoczek”, which playfully refers to a pale and thin person. However, the unacceptable word in Shakespeare’s language is “ścierwo” that is too vulgar to be originally used by the English author. Of course “ścierwo” can refer to a dead and decomposing animal but since it refers directly to Juliet, the second meaning should be considered here, which points to the vulgarism. Such a strong insult makes the translation not equivalent to the original.

Barańczak refrains from hurling too vulgar insults on Juliet. He translates, “Bo jak nie, to cię na taczce zawiozę! / Precz mi stąd, anemiczna mizeroto, / Błady wymoczku!”²⁶. Comparing all three translations, “taczka” as a ‘means of transport’ is the closest in meaning to “a hurdle”. The translator emphasizes Juliet’s white face by writing “anemiczna” and “mizerota”. Both words indicate pale skin and a thin person, which of course, communicates Shakespeare’s message. Moreover, in the next verse, Barańczak once again repeats his previous statement but with different words, i.e. “blady” and “wymoczku”. In this

²⁴ M. Szymczak, ed., *Słownik języka polskiego*, PWN, Warszawa 1988, 1989, p. 173 (trans. mine).

²⁵ Ibidem, p. 94.

²⁶ Ibidem, p. 124.

translation a reader finds the highest number of words indicating paleness, i.e. “anemiczny”, “mizerota”, “blady” and “wymoczek”. Neither Paszkowski nor Słomczyński applies as many as four similar words. Such emphasis serves to illustrate better Juliet state of mind and her depression.

Barańczak's verses should be considered as valuable as those translated by Paszkowski. Both versions reflect the source culture, although Paszkowski's old-fashioned words, i.e., “blednico” and “lalka łojowa” bring the reader even closer to Shakespeare's times. Moreover, both translations are accessible to a target reader who will find the language natural. The only exception is Słomczyński whose version appears not subtle enough to translate Shakespeare.

Act IV, Scene II

Capulet is angry with his daughter who dared to oppose to his will but he hopes that Friar Lawrence will have a positive influence on the rebellious girl. Capulet calls Juliet, “A peevish self-willed harlotry”²⁷. The adjective “peevish” is derived from *peyvesshe*, dating back to the 14th century, which meant “perverse, capricious, silly”²⁸. Moreover, the noun “harlotry” is built of two components, i.e. “harlot” + {-ry}. The archaic and obsolete word, “harlot” is defined as “a prostitute; a promiscuous woman”. It has its roots in the 12–14th century as an Old French form denoting, “young fellow, knave”. It is also derived from Medieval Latin *harlotus*, meaning “vagabond, beggar”. The original sense, to the 17th century, was “vagabond, beggar, rogue, also generally fellow”²⁹. Taking into account Shakespeare's language and style, the meaning denoting “prostitute” should not be considered by Polish translators.

Paszkowski translates into “Cięta, uparta to skóra na buty”³⁰. In this fragment, “peevish” corresponds to “cięty” and “self-willed” to “uparty”, which are equivalent as their meanings are very similar. The translator employs “skóra na buty”, which is offensive when it refers to people. Although Capulet is mad at his daughter and he verbalizes his emotions. Not only Paszkowski but also other authors employ “skóra na buty” to offend another person, e.g. Fontaine La de Jean in a translated poem, “Chłop, lis i pies”. Paszkowski chose an offensive but not a vulgar word, which communicates the original message, matches Shakespeare's style and reflects the source culture.

²⁷ Ibidem, p. 104.

²⁸ D. Harper, *Online Etymology Dictionary*, 2001–2010.

²⁹ A. Room, *Cassell's Dictionary of Word Histories*, Cassell & Co., London 2002, p. 273.

³⁰ Ibidem, p. 160.

Słomczyński decided to render into “uparta, zakuta łajdaczka”³¹. He translates “self-willed” into “upary”, which sounds natural and keeps the original sense. The next word, “peevish” is reflected in “zakuty”, which points to somebody unintelligent. The original meaning points to silliness rather than stupidity, which proves that the translated word has stronger overtone than the original. The final word “łajdaczka” brings negative association but not the same as Shakespeare’s “harlotry”. The Polish word has sexual innuendo as it refers to a woman leading indecent and immoral life. It is too strong to match the original counterpart as Słomczyński’s word is to be placed on the bottom of the formality scale, where a vulgar register is. Słomczyński communicates the original message as he also reflects Capulet’s irritation. Nevertheless, the word “łajdaczka” is not equivalent to the original due to its different register, not characteristic for Shakespeare.

Barańczak applies less vulgar register as in his fragment a reader finds “krnąbrne, grymaśne ladaco!”³². “Krnąbrny” accurately matches “self-willed” as they both share a similar meaning. The next word, “grymaśny” corresponds to “peevish”. They both share an identical meaning as Polish word denotes “sulky” and the English one “capricious”. As there is no inconsistency in meaning, Barańczak accurately communicates the original aim. The same situation refers to “ladaco”, which is translated from “harlotry”. This Polish noun is defined as a good-for-nothing person, a wastrel. Considering these meanings, Barańczak’s fragment is equivalent to the original.

Act IV, Scene IV

Capulet calls one of the servants “a merry whoreson”³³. The noun, “whoreson”, refers to “a bastard, scoundrel, wretch”³⁴. It does not have such strong and vulgar implications as contemporary “son of a bitch”. This explanation proves that Shakespeare’s language is subtle and far from being vulgar. Despite original lexis, not all translators reflect this language subtly.

Paszkowski renders this phrase into “Wesołe ladaco!”³⁵, which accurately reflects the original. “Ladaco” corresponds to “a wastrel”, which has similar meaning to “a scoundrel, wretch”. Since the translator does not apply a vul-

³¹ Ibidem, p. 104.

³² Ibidem, p. 137.

³³ Ibidem, p. 107.

³⁴ Collins Sons & Co. Ltd., *Collins English Dictionary – Complete & Unabridged 10th Edition*, Harper Collins Publishers, New York 2009.

³⁵ Ibidem, p. 166.

gar register and communicates the original sense, his version is equivalent to Shakespeare's "a merry whoreson".

Słomczyński is too literal to reflect Shakespeare's style. The translator does not seem to check all possible word meanings and focuses on the most popular definition, regardless of the fact that Shakespeare lived in a different era and his language does not point to obvious explanations. He demonstrates his lack of understanding in "wesoly skurwysyn!"³⁶. This translation is too vulgar to reflect the original sense as "skurwysyn" is a strong and highly offensive form of addressing another person, which is similar to "son of a bitch". Unfortunately, this fragment cannot be considered equivalent to the original.

Barańczak combines "merry" and "whoreson" to create one word, "błaźnie!"³⁷ He does it successfully as the word is not vulgar and reflects Shakespeare's intentions.

Both Paszkowski and Barańczak reflect the source culture as they successfully translate the original words. Their translations are of equal value and the target reader will find both texts accessible. This favorable opinion does not refer to Słomczyński who seems to misunderstand Shakespeare's intention.

The comparison

Słomczyński's newer translation was supposed to replace Paszkowski's rewriting then seen as outdated. His interest in Shakespeare's is predominantly literary, therefore he rules out theatrical conventions. His translation was to remind that Shakespeare was not our contemporary. Moreover, he emphasizes many times the lack of time he had to translate Shakespeare's plays as he was always pressed for time. Most fragments I have analyzed demonstrate that Słomczyński misunderstood the original communication aim by applying words not subtle enough to match Shakespeare's language. Shakespeare would have never thought of or used any vulgarisms or obscene words. Słomczyński seems to be unaware of this fact, which makes his translation less suitable when compared with Paszkowski's and Barańczak's versions. Słomczyński's translation does not often let a Polish reader to go back Shakespeare's times and it is not modern enough to be considered suitable for a contemporary target reader. Taking these facts into consideration, this translation is the poorest in quality and contributes to the negative perception of the original masterpiece.

³⁶ Ibidem, p. 109.

³⁷ Ibidem, p. 144.

References

- Brückner, A., *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*, Wiedza Powszechna, Warszawa 1993.
- Collins Sons & Co. Ltd. *Collins English Dictionary – Complete & Unabridged 10th Edition*, Harper Collins Publishers, New York 2009.
- Encyclopedia Britannica*, Chicago 1983.
- Harper D., *Online Etymology Dictionary*, 2001–2010.
- Hatim B., Munday J. *Translation: An Advanced Resource Book*, Routledge, New York 2004.
- Nida E.A., *Toward a Science of Translating*, Brill, Leiden 1964.
- Room A., *Cassell's Dictionary of Word Histories*, Cassell & Co., London 2002.
- Szymczak M. (ed.), *Słownik języka polskiego*, PWN, Warszawa 1988, 1989.
- Wehmeier S. (chief ed.), *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English, seventh edition*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2005.

Sources

- Shakespeare W., *Romeo and Juliet*, Wordsworth Classics, Great Britain 2000.
- Shakespeare W., trans. by S. Barańczak *Romeo i Julia*, Wydawnictwo „W drodze”, Poznań 1994.
- Shakespeare W., trans. by J. Paszkowski *Romeo i Julia*, Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, Warszawa 1964.
- Shakespeare W., trans. by M. Słomczyński *Romeo i Julia*, Wydawnictwo Zielona Sowa, Kraków 2008.

Internet sources

- www.sjp.pl (*Słownik języka polskiego*, 2011)
- http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Main_Page.

Streszczenie

Wulgaryzmy w „Romeo i Julii” w tłumaczeniu Macieja Słomczyńskiego

W artykule została poruszona kwestia wulgaryzmów, które wystąpiły w polskich tłumaczeniach tragedii „Romeo i Julia” Williama Szekspira. Najstarszy analizowany tu przekład datuje się na połowę XIX wieku i jest autorstwa Józefa Paszkowskiego. Kolejny należy do Macieja Słomczyńskiego z 1983 r., najnowszy, Stanisława Barańczaka, pochodzi z roku 1990. Wulgaryzmy wpływają nie tylko na zniekształcony obraz języka Szekspira, którego cechuje subtelność, ale również na brak ekwiwalencji. Oceniając trzy polskie tłumaczenia, autorka dokonała krytyki przekładu Słomczyńskiego, który wykazał się brakiem zrozumienia języka Szekspira i czasów elżbietańskich.