

INTERDISCIPLINARY DIMENSION OF THE MODERN ENGLISH- LANGUAGE PENITENTIARY DISCOURSE RESEARCH

Shchyhlo Larysa,

Phd in Philology, Associated Professor

ORCID ID 0000-0002-4505-5094

Sumy State University

2, Rymyskoho-Korsakova st, Sumy, 40007, Ukraine

l.schiglo@gmail.com

Volyk Anna,

Student

Sumy State University

2, Rymyskoho-Korsakova st, Sumy, 40007, Ukraine

annavolik111@gmail.com

***Annotation.** The article is devoted to the study of linguistic and translational aspects of English-language penitentiary discourse. The article defines the main concepts of research, such as “penitentiary discourse”, “prison jargon”. The features of the penitentiary discourse in English, the history of its emergence and research are clarified.*

The article examines the linguistic features of penitentiary discourse in English. The analysis of examples of language interaction within the framework of penitentiary discourse showed that they belong to simple (primary) language genres, which represent the result of direct language communication, in contrast to complex (secondary) language genres that arise in conditions of more complex and relatively highly developed and organized cultural communication (mainly written) – artistic, scientific, socio-political, etc. It is presented in such forms as an order, everyday dialogue, interrogation, story, etc.

The study of the peculiarities of the translation of texts of penitentiary discourse and prison jargon in particular showed that the most used methods of translation are literal translation, descriptive translation, in some cases equivalent translation is used. The translation of prison jargon is especially complicated by the fact that such vocabulary is often based on a play on words, a figurative, metaphorical meaning. The article analyzes the translation of language markers of penitentiary discourse into Ukrainian based on the material of the English-language film “The Shawshank Redemption”.

***Key words:** interdisciplinary dimension, linguistic features, methods of translation penitentiary discourse, prison jargon.*

Introduction

One of the relevant areas of language study today is discourse studies – the analysis of the peculiarities of language functioning within the framework of various discourses. The study of discourse is one of the most relevant areas of linguistics today. Discourse as a linguistic unit appeared in linguistics as a result of focusing researchers' attention on the human factor of speech.

Increasing interest is not in language and its phenomena as separate elements, but in their functioning, the influence of extralinguistic factors on them, including the characteristics of communication participants, the communicative situation itself, socio-cultural aspects, etc. This is due to the predominance of anthropocentricity in linguistics, when researchers no longer focus on the system-structural level of language, but on its communicative functionality.

© Shchyhlo L., Volyk A., 2022

Such studies attract the attention of not only linguists, but also translation scholars. In particular, the investigation of understudied types of discourse in the English language, among which penitentiary discourse stands out, is of significant interest today. The penitentiary discourse has its own unique specificity – it is an institutional discourse, within the framework of which the status-role relations of the participants of the discourse are expressed more than in any other type of discourse. In addition, the prison discourse covers the situation of imprisonment, the relationship between prisoners and jailers, which is based on the positions of the former's disenfranchisement and the latter's complete control and power.

All this creates specific communicative conditions, which are reflected both in the speech reality of the English-speaking countries of the world and in artistic and cinematographic works. This determines the relevance of the study of linguistic and translation aspects of English-language prison discourse. The purpose of this article is to establish the linguistic features of English penitentiary discourse texts and their translation into Ukrainian.

Research materials and methods

The transcript of the film “The Shawshank Redemption” and dictionaries of slang vocabulary (“The Concise New Partridge Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English” (2007), “The Routledge Dictionary of Modern American Slang and Unconventional English” (2008)) serve as research material.

One of the most important characteristics of the speech activity of the participants in penitentiary discourse is the use of special prison jargon. In the “Oxford English Dictionary”, jargon is interpreted as special words or expressions used in professional activities or in the speech of a certain group of people, which tends to remain incomprehensible to others (OLD, 2022).

Prison jargon is formed in correctional institutions, which largely determines its specificity. When entering a penal institution, a convict faces new realities, a new social environment and a specific prison subculture. The prison community is a complex social organism characterized by specific connections and relationships between people. Each convict occupies a certain social position and has a set of social ties with members of his / her group and beyond (Zavodna, 2014: 53).

Prison jargon reflects all the diversity of social relations in penitentiary institutions, therefore knowledge of prison jargon is necessary for persons in such social relations to interact with other members of this community. Conspiracy, secrecy, intelligibility only to a special group of declassified elements is a characteristic feature of prison jargon. One of its features is significant differences between the jargons of inmates of different prisons, so knowing one or another type of prison jargon plays the role of a certain password (Alikbyerov, 2000: 12).

It should be noted that prison jargon of the English language is formed in close interaction with other types of jargon and slang, borrowing a large amount of vocabulary from them. For example, a large number of inter-jargonisms come from youth jargon, especially since there are many people aged 18 to 30 among the prisoners. Youth slang is mobile, expressive, it is one of the sources of replenishment of prison slang (Balabin, 2002: 112).

Another corporate jargon that influences prison jargon is drug jargon. It cannot be classified as criminal jargon, which includes prison jargon, because the distribution of drugs is a criminal offense, while their use is not punishable by law. The jargon of addicts, like prison jargon, tends to a certain secrecy, so it is a more important source of replenishment of prison jargon than youth jargon.

Despite the active interaction with other slangs, prison slangs are a relatively closed system, the import of lexical units from the interslang layer of vocabulary is slow. Borrowed units, as a rule, have synonyms in the actual prison jargon, and contribute to a richer synonymy rather than the formation of prison jargon. On the other hand, many

lexical units of prison jargon are borrowed from other jargons, although they lose some components of meaning.

The study of the specified research material determines the choice of appropriate research methods. The work used: the method of analyzing dictionary definitions to determine the main concepts of the study, the semantic method to determine the semantics of the lexical composition of the penitentiary discourse, the continuous sampling method for the selection of vocabulary when processing the research material and working with subtitles and audio-visual materials.

Discussion

Currently, imprisonment is the most severe sanction applied to persons who have broken the law. The first prison appeared in 1790 in Philadelphia, and in England – in 1816 in London. It can be concluded that the penitentiary system is a relatively young institution of society, which arose about 200 years ago. The emergence of penitentiary discourse, accordingly, can also be attributed to this time.

If talk about the prison as a prototypical place of communication, then, first of all, the peculiarities of the conditions of the communication participants are of great interest. Living conditions in prison society are usually characterized by total control over every step of the prisoner. This raises the question of the rights and freedoms of prisoners.

In the English language, the word “confinement” is often used to denote imprisonment (from a philosophical point of view, this concept is perceived as an artificial lack of freedom, as opposed to a natural one, that is, determined by the laws of the universe, the customs and foundations of society, as well as the internal beliefs of an individual).

The word “confinement” is defined in dictionaries as follows: “Confinement in prison, also known as a penitentiary or correctional facility, is the punishment that courts most commonly impose for serious crimes, such as felonies. For lesser crimes, courts usually impose short-term incarceration in a jail, detention centre, or similar facility” (RDMASUE, 2008).

In the publication “Law Library – American Law and Legal Information” entitled “Prisoners’ Rights” it is said that when establishing such rights and freedoms, the authorities were guided by the following principles: first, prisoners are deprived of the rights and privileges that others have citizens; secondly, prisoners do not lose all their constitutional rights during imprisonment, and thirdly, some constitutional rights are preserved for prisoners, however, they should not conflict with the security requirements of the place of imprisonment (CNPDSUE, 2007).

That is, even the rights available to prisoners can be violated if the circumstances require it. Thus, falling into the conditions of imprisonment, a person loses the right to manage him/herself and his / her time and is completely subordinated to the officials of the correctional institution, who have almost unlimited power over him / her.

According to this, in relation to the penitentiary discourse, the presence of the following communication participants is assumed: employees of the penitentiary system (they may differ in rank), and prisoners, who, in turn, may also have a certain status within the prison community. Therefore, communication can be based on the interaction of the following pairs: “employee of the penitentiary system – employee of the penitentiary system”, “employee of the penitentiary system – prisoner” and “prisoner – prisoner”.

Research results

The prison jargon of the studied linguistic area is a special type of English criminal language, mainly of the thief subculture. It has its own, special lexicon, the components of which may have a stylistic (for example, mocking-ironic) coloring, for example: *bit* – prison term, solitary confinement; *two-time loser* – recidivist; *big day* – day of visits; *college* – a correctional facility for juvenile offenders; *can* – police station; *to fly a kite* – send a letter from prison; *to go over the wall* – escape from prison; *to be buried* – have no

hope of release; *to dance* – to be hanged; *to fry* – to be executed in the electric chair, etc. (Mencken, 2006: 312).

Taking into account the internal structural organization within the studied fragment of the lexical and phraseological system of English-language prison jargon, it is possible to distinguish five main semantic blocks, unequal in volume and heterogeneous in structure, with unclear boundaries, which in the nominative-classification aspect unite many lexical units denoting the most significant concepts, objects, phenomena and signs of prison reality for prisoners. Each of these semantic associations can be divided into smaller ones, for example:

1) prison life (clothes, shoes, food): *glitter* – salt; *Nike down* – wear only “Nike” clothes and shoes (RDMASUE, 2008: 437–695);

2) prison population (types of prisoners, their characteristics, relations): *crab bait* – a recently arrived prisoner; *hang on the leg* – to serve before the administration (RDMASUE, 2008: 241–480), *catch a dummy* – refuse to talk (CNPDSUE, 2007: 122);

3) crimes and punishments (types of illegal acts, methods of committing them, legal consequences of committing crimes): *four-cornered* – caught red-handed; *punch it* – make an escape; *GE* (< *general electric*) – electric chair (RDMASUE, 2008: 390, 784, 424);

4) characteristic features of the prison as a total institution (premises, territories, internal order, security and supervision, types of correctional institutions, informal prison norms, customs, values): *junk tank* – a cell where drug addicts are kept; *gallery 13* – prison cemetery; *airmail* – objects that prisoners throw at guards or other prisoners (RDMASUE, 2008: 584, 416);

5) what is most in demand in prison (alcohol, cigarettes, drugs, sex, money): *dove* – five-dollar bill; *run, Johnny, run* – cheap loose tobacco; *fix your bones* – use drugs, especially when breaking (RDMASUE, 2008: 313, 833, 370).

The lexical-semantic features of the researched slang nominations also are quite vividly revealed on the example of the lexical-semantic paradigm “personal naming” in the form of a set of numerous lexical-semantic subclasses with varying degrees of detail, the elements of which are combined on the basis of the following aspects:

a) profession/occupation: *badge* – security guard (RDMASUE, 2008: 35);

b) level of intelligence: *jerkwater* – a stupid person (RDMASUE, 2008: 563);

c) sexual orientation: *boy-gal* – homosexual (RDMASUE, 2008: 119);

d) nature of the committed crime: *accelerator* – firebug (RDMASUE, 2008: 2);

e) propensity to commit crimes: *boomerang* – recidivist (RDMASUE, 2008: 109);

e) features of character / behavior: *breeze* – a calm, restrained person (RDMASUE, 2008: 125);

f) membership in a criminal group: *ride* – gang member (RDMASUE, 2008: 814);

g) belonging to a certain part of the world: *slant-eye* – a native of South Asia (RDMASUE, 2008: 895);

h) age: *seed* – child (RDMASUE, 2008: 853).

The division into lexical-semantic subclasses is subjective, since most lexemes are grouped on the basis of several features and, therefore, can simultaneously be included in several subclasses, for example: *crank* – a guard who enjoys making life difficult for prisoners (RDMASUE, 2008: 244) (here the name of a person is characterized by such differential terms as “gender” + “profession” + “characteristics of behavior” + “relationships with others”).

Among the sources of replenishment of the prison jargon of the studied linguistic area can be attributed both standard and spatial methods of word formation:

1) semantic derivation:

a) metaphor: *hog pen* (pig pen, stable) “dispatch point of security in the prison” (CNPDSUE, 2007: 336);

b) metonymization: *shelf* – solitary confinement in prison (RDMASUE, 2008: 861);

2) rhyming slang:

a) formation with internal rhyme (when both elements are present in the structure of slangism, rhyming with each other) (Coleman, 2012: 161): *swap lies and swat flies* – to participate in a long and useless conversation; *little Joe in the snow* – “cocaine” (RDMASUE, 2008: 964, 622);

b) formation with an external rhyme (when the structure of slangism contains only the first component that rhymes with the intended second element): *gibbs* (<lips) – “lips” (RDMASUE, 2008: 431);

3) suffix: *cellie, celly* – “cellmate” (CNPDSUE, 2007: 125);

4) abbreviation: *V* (< *visit*) – “visit”; *seg* (< *seggie*) – “isolator”, “prisoner” (RDMASUE, 2008: 1028, 853);

5) alliteration (repetition of the initial components of a complex word / phrase [20, p. 166]): *band box* – “district prison” (RDMASUE, 2008: 43);

6) allusion (a figure of speech that implies a reference to a cultural-historical fact) (Coleman, 2012: 29) *Klondike* – solitary confinement cell (RDMASUE, 2008: 597) and others.

As the analysis of the translation of such slang elements shows, their transmission in the Ukrainian language is significantly difficult given the fact that in most cases figurative meaning is used, as well as word play to create slang vocabulary. Jargon vocabulary of penitentiary discourse can be a translation difficulty for the translator, which can be solved by applying various methods of its translation into Ukrainian. At the same time, it should be taken into account that it is often difficult for the translator to find the equivalent of an English word in the translation language, which is due to the metaphorical nature of most of such English jargonisms (Nyzenko, 2012).

The same methods can be used for the translation of reduced vocabulary and jargon as for the translation of literary vocabulary. There are two ways to translate text: 1) literal translation (direct); 2) indirect translation (indirect) (Kiyak, 2009: 34–35).

The first method is not adequate, because when translating vocabulary, the originality of the language is lost, the norms of the translated language are violated, and the meaning of jargon is often lost. If a literal translation is not possible, the translator has to resort to an indirect method of translation.

International slangisms and jargonisms during translation are transferred by calque (loan) translation and do not require additional interpretation, for example: *bucks* – “бакси”, *crack* – “крек”, *hacker* – “рекер”, *rap* – “реп”, *yuppie* “яппі”. New works built on the basis of such units, as well as punning and updated versions of them, are a difficulty for the translator.

New works built on the basis of such units, as well as punning and updated versions of them, are a difficulty for the translator. For example, the word *buck* – “dollar” became the basis of new formations *megabucks*, *gigabucks*, *extrabucks*, denoting “a big pile of money”, the colloquial phrase *to make / earn a quick / fast buck* – “get rich quickly” in an updated form formed on its basis *to make / earn megabucks* means “to earn crazy money” (Nyzenko, 2012).

Within the framework of the penitentiary system, the life and interaction of the participants of communication are routinized, and they themselves are in unequal positions. Accordingly, the set of topics and communication situations of the basic pair of communicators within the framework of this discourse is limited. It can be giving instructions, instilling discipline, various orders (raising, roll call, escorting for meals or to the place of work, checking cameras, etc.). In these cases, the language interaction is minimized and limited to only one line of the guard, spoken in a commanding tone, which requires the prisoner to act at the level of only actual obedience. For example, the head of the prison says the following phrase to the newly arrived prisoners: *You're going to be good boys, aren't you? You're going to be good boys. You're going to be good, good, good*

boys (Darabont, 1994) / *Ви ж будете хорошими хлопчиками, чи не так? Ви будете хорошими хлопчиками. Ви будете дуже, дуже, дуже хорошими хлопчиками.*

In this case, the jailer uses the derogatory term *good boys* for the newly arrived prisoners, belittling their importance and status. As a method of translation, the literal translation is used here – *хороші хлопчики*, which allows to accurately reproduce the stylistic effect of such an address in the context of penitentiary discourse.

In another example of a communicative situation in the conditions of penitentiary discourse, the convoy of prisoners to breakfast is organized: “*Single file,*” he shouted, “*single file and ten paces between youse. Single file*” (Darabont, 1994) / «*По одному, – вигукував він. – По одному. Дистанція десять кроків. По одному*». Utterances within penitentiary discourse are short, often orders or instructions that prisoners must follow. In the given example, the special vocabulary of penitentiary discourse is used – the expression *single file*, which is translated into Ukrainian using the translation transformation of generalization as *по одному*.

Conclusions and perspectives

As the study showed, penitentiary (prison) discourse is a type of status-oriented communication that takes place in prison conditions between penitentiary officials and prisoners. The main characteristic that distinguishes this type of institutional discourse from others is the complete subordination of one of the parties to the communication to the other, who exercises total control over the life of the first party and has the right to apply appropriate disciplinary sanctions, which largely determines the features of the course of communication and the text that is obtained as a result of it.

On the linguistic level, one of the most significant markers of penitentiary discourse is prison jargon. Such vocabulary is mainly built using metaphor, metonymy, and other stylistic techniques, designed not only to give such vocabulary more expressiveness, but also to implement the function of conspiracy, encryption, hiding information from others – primarily, from guards and other employees of the penitentiary.

The most used methods of translation of texts of penitentiary discourse and prison jargon are literal translation, descriptive translation, in some cases equivalent translation is used. The translation of prison jargon is especially complicated by the fact that such vocabulary is often based on a play on words, a figurative, metaphorical meaning. Translational transformations are used quite often – this is mainly a generalization of the meaning of the source word, as well as a reduction of the stylistic effect of the source lexeme.

We see the perspective of further research of modern English-language penitentiary discourse in the context of a synergistic paradigm of scientific knowledge, which is outside the traditional disciplinary paradigm, synthesizes natural and humanitarian knowledge on a specific methodological foundation, and hence enables the solution of linguistic problems in an interdisciplinary (and more broadly, transdisciplinary) dimension.

REFERENCES

- Alikbyerov, 2000 – Alikbyerov V. I. *Sleng ta pereklad* [Slang and translation]. Kyiv: Lileya, 2000. 32 p. [in Ukrainian].
- Balabin, 2002 – Balabin V. V. *Suchasnyj amerykans'kyj sleng yak problema perekladu* [Modern American slang as a problem of translation]. Kyiv: Logos, 2002. 313 p. [in Ukrainian].
- Chernova, 2013 – Chernova A. V., Avanesyan A. A. *Do problem kinoperekladu yak vydu xudozhn'ogo perekladu* [To the problems of film translation as a type of literary translation]. URL: http://confcontact.com/2013_04_17/30_Chernova.htm [in Ukrainian].
- Coleman, 2012 – Coleman J. *The Life of Slang*. Oxford University Press, 2012. 354 p.
- Darabont, – Darabont F. *The Shawshank Redemption*. URL: <http://www.dailyscript.com/scripts/shawshank.html>

- Kiyak, 2009 – Kiyak T. R., Naumenko A. M., Oguy O. D. Perekladoznavstvo [Translation studies]. Kyiv: 2009. 544 p.
- Mencken, 2006 – Mencken H. L. The American Language. An Inquiry into the Development of English in the United States. Alfred A. Knopf, Inc. New York, 2006. 651 p.
- Nyzenko, – Nyzenko Ya., Grigorenko N. Osnovni trudnoshhi adekvatnogo perekladu nestandartnoyi leksyky anglijs'koyi movy [The main difficulties of adequate translation of non-standard vocabulary of the English language]. URL: http://www.rusnauka.com/16_NPRT_2012/Philologia/6_111668.doc.htm [in Ukrainian].
- O'Sullivan, 2011 – O'Sullivan C. Translating Popular Film. Palgrave Macmillan, 2011. 243 p.
- Orero, 2004 – Orero P. Topics in Audiovisual Translation. Benjamins Translation Library. Barcelona, Benjamins Translation Library, 2004. 227 p.
- OLD, – Oxford Learner's Dictionaries. URL: <https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/>
- Pettit, 2009 – Pettit Z. Connecting Cultures: Cultural Transfer in Subtitling and Dubbing. New Trends in Audiovisual Translation. Bristol / Buffalo / Toronto: Multilingual Matters. 2009. P. 44–57.
- CNPDSUE, 2007 –The Concise New Partridge Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English / ed. by T. Dalzell (senior ed.). London, New York: Routledge, 2007. 721 p.
- RDMA SUE – The Routledge Dictionary of Modern American Slang and Unconventional English / ed. by T. Dalzell. London: Routledge, 2008. 1104 p.
- Yefimov, 2004 – Yefimov L. P., Yasinetska O. A. Stylistyka anglijs'koyi movy i dyskursyvnyj analiz: uchbovo-metodychnyj posibnyk [Stylistics of the English language and discursive analysis: teaching and methodical manual]. Vinnytsia: Nova Knyga, 2004. 240 p. [in Ukrainian].
- Zavodna, 2014 – Zavodna L. Suchasnyj poglyad na molodizhnyj sleng [Modern view of youth slang]. Kyiv: Nova ped. dumka. 2014. No. 1. P. 52–55 [in Ukrainian].

Received: 10 June, 2022