

STRESZCZENIE

Language is a social phenomenon, and that is why it is subject to changes and development only in the environment of its users. Speech, on the other hand, mirrors the personal culture of an individual speaker, their interests, not infrequently age, educational background, profession or the relationships with certain social groups or subcultures. And it is the aim of sociolinguistics to analyse language and its relationships with social development, social, economic, political and historical changes. One of the main responsibilities of sociolinguistics is to analyse language varieties, styles and jargons, their characteristic features and functions in the environment of their users. Among others, it concentrates on the phenomenon of sociolects, not infrequently, typical for marginalised social groups, which are frequently perceived by other groups as incorrect or even harmful. Undoubtedly, one may say that prison slang analysed in this thesis lays within the area of interest of sociolinguistics, although it is usually defined as an entirely negative linguistic phenomenon, and – what is more – it is legally forbidden in certain countries, for example, in Poland or Russia.

As a result of this prejudiced attitude the phenomenon of prison slang, also known as prison argot, prison jargon and the language of the underworld, was not the recipient of much attention by students of language and others, although it was already in the 18th century that Victor Hugo – a French poet, novelist and dramatist of the Romantic movement – offered an in-depth literary analysis of this particular language variety. Nevertheless, it was not until relatively recently that the field of prison slang started to attract the attention of the international academic world represented by such names and works as – to name but a few – Clemmer (1940), Maurer (1940, 1981), Sykes (1958, 1959), Cardozo-Freeman (1984), Gambetta (2009), Morawski (1968a, 1968b) and Moczydłowski (1991). Indeed, one may generalise and say that all the scholars mentioned here touch upon the issue of prison slang; however, the treatment of the problem seems to be largely fragmentary since – almost as a rule – this particular element of prison life is usually analysed within a larger socio-cultural panorama of related problems. Nevertheless, there are a few exceptions to this rule, and one may speak of several publications whose only target is the language of the underworld, such as those of Einat and Hassin (1999), Einat and Einat (2000), Einat and Livnat (2012), Stępniać (1973, 1974, 1976, 2013) and Oryńska (1991). Even though the number of works whose authors concentrate chiefly on the linguistic repertoire used by inmates is relatively substantial, it is hardly at all possible to chance upon publications that deal specifically with

the issue of animal metaphors, being – as we hope to show – a part and parcel of this particular language variety. No matter how negatively the picture of prison slang is drawn, it must be admitted that it is a linguistic phenomenon fuelled by creativity, which influences the standard varieties of language, adding some revolutionary flavour, introducing some elements of youth and fostering the feeling of membership. The dynamic and creative nature of prison slang is manifested in, among others, the qualitative and quantitative richness of animal metaphors which forms the main target of this Ph.D thesis.

The thesis falls into two major parts divided into six chapters. The first five chapters, which together form the theoretical part of this work, focus on the analysis of the broadly-understood phenomenon of prison slang, the variety of representative **HUMAN BEING**-oriented studies in the tradition of diachronic semantics, and the discussion of different frameworks within which semantic change is analysed in current linguistic tradition. On the other hand, the major analytical part of this work is aimed at accounting for the zoosemic metaphorisation processes of twelve lexical items related to the conceptual category **THIEVES**.

To start with, the opening *Chapter 1* is meant to provide an in-depth analysis of the phenomenon of slang, its provenance and major linguistic features. In particular, our attention is focused on the work of the English-speaking world's leading researchers of slang, such as Hotten (1860), Partridge, (1958a[2006], 1958b[2006], 1963), Allen, (1993, 2001), Matsell (2008), Green (2011a, 2011b) and Coleman (2012), to name but a few representative scholars. Among others, here an attempt is made to analyse the etymology of the term *slang*, which is accounted for in terms of its relation to urban society. Moreover, we shall follow the terminological meanderings related to the concept of slang and discuss different – not infrequently – contradictory approaches to the study of slang. Finally, an attempt will be made to outline the influence of slang on standard language.

In *Chapter 2* we narrow down the perspective and analyse prison slang. In particular, we delve into the vague etymological roots of such terms as *argot*, *cant*, *lingo* and *jargon*, and explore their relationships with the general notion of *slang*. Here, we make an attempt to define *prison slang* and to discuss its anti-language nature, relying on the findings of the classical study of Halliday (1976, 1978) and observations formulated by Chruszczewski (2011). At the same time, we scrutinise the characteristic traits of prison slang, discussed earlier in Einat and Einat (2000), Einat and Livnat (2012) and Oryńska (1991). Other facets of

prison slang that form the subject of our analysis are the causes and conditionings lying behind its formation, formalised by two major models authored by Clemmer (1940) and Sykes (1958), and the functions this particular language variety plays in the community of inmates, the problem discussed by, for example, Pollock (2006), Cardozo-Freeman (1984), Boroff (1951) and Schulte (2010). At the same time, an attempt is made to provide some evidence that prison slang should not be treated as a harmful offshoot of a sociolinguistic phenomenon, but rather it should be perceived as a linguistic code which serves as the source of novel-sounding and catchy phrases, vivid phraseology and colourful metaphors.

Chapter 3 provides a brief outline of past and present research in the area of diachronic semantics, both in Poland and abroad. To start with, our attention is focused on the early European pillars of semantic diachrony, such as, for example, Darmesteter (1886), Paul (1880), Meillet (1921) and Stern (1931). Likewise, a number of Polish studies dedicated to the analysis of the macrocategory **HUMAN BEINGS** (Kleparski, 1990, 1997, Kiełtyka, 2008, 2014, Kudła, 2014) will be taken into consideration. The review proposed in this chapter offers a panorama of types of semantic changes, coupled with the presentation of various classificatory frameworks and an account of the problems of causes and conditionings lying behind them.

Chapter 4 is devoted to a presentation of the phenomenon of metaphor. We shall also make an attempt to report on the major achievements of the *Rzeszów School of Diachronic Semantics* and the main areas of research of the group of scholars, that is, for example, **FOODSTUFFS**, analysed by Kleparski (2008a, 2008b, 2012), Cymbalista (2009) and Kudła (2009). A justifiably large section is aimed at accounting for the intricacies of the phenomenon of zoosemy, where the discussion focuses on the research within the macrocategory **HUMAN BEINGS** conducted by Kiełtyka (2005a, 2005b, 2008, 2009a, 2009b, 2009c), who offers an in-depth analysis of the subcategory **EQUIDAE**, as well as Kiełtyka and Kleparski (2005a, 2005b), whose aim was to discuss the conceptual microcategories **EQUIDAE**, **CANIDAE** and **FELIDAE**. Further, we discuss animal metaphor in the context of the work of other European scholars, such as, for example, Krzeszowski (1997), Kövecses (2002) and Martsa (2000). Finally, we focus on the relatively novel areas of the study of metaphor that have come to be known as *gustasemy* and *plantosemy*, the target of analysis of such scholars as Cymbalista and Kleparski (2013), Sommer (1988), Sommer and Sommer (2011), Osuchowska and Kleparski (2012), Osuchowska (2011a, 2011b, 2011c) and Bradshaw (2004).

Chapter 5 aims at outlining different methods of analysing meaning shifts, that is componential analysis and the cognitive approach, with a specialised variant of the latter known as *blending theory*. We outline the tradition of conceptual analysis focusing on the works of such figures as Katz and Fodor (1963, 1964), Jackendoff (1983, 1990), Wierzbicka (1996), Tokarski (1984) and others, while the theoretical and methodological frameworks of the cognitive approach are analysed relying on the achievements of such researchers as, for example, Kleparski (1996, 1997), Kiełtyka and Kleparski (2005a, 2005b, 2007) and Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk (1996, 1998). The conceptual blending theory, on the other hand, is sketched on the basis of the works of Fauconnier and Turner (1998, 2002), Fauconnier (1997) and Grygiel (2004b).

Chapter 6 is analytically oriented and it proposes an in-depth study of the etymological roots, diachronic evolution and phraseological productivity of a body of lexical items historically linked to the microcategory **THIEVES** in English prison slang. In the first section of the chapter we concentrate on those lexical items which were present in English already in Old English (henceforth: OE) and, in the course of their development, started to be used in human-specific sense or senses, including a thief-specific sense (*crow, grasshopper, rook, snake, silkworm*). The next section focuses on the body of lexical items that appeared during the Middle English (henceforth: Mid.E) period (*spider, pigeon, rat, dromedary*), while the third section proposes the analysis of several lexical items which entered the English lexicon in the Modern English (henceforth: Mod.E) period (*gopher, gorilla, shark*). Apart from the analysis of the English historical synonyms of the noun *thief* in prison slang, an attempt is made to analyse parallel developments in Polish nouns which either developed thief-specific sense-threads, or, at least, currently function or functioned at one point in time in Polish prison slang. Wherever possible, we point to the cases of English verbal zoosemy, which resulted from the combination of the mechanism of metaphorisation and metonymy, as emerging from Martsa's (2013) proposal.

At the beginning of this work various aims – both general and specific – were set and it is to be hoped that the ones that were most desired have been achieved, if not fully, then at least partially. To start with, one may say that the results of the analysis given in the foregoing have greatly exceeded the expectations about the possible results that the author hoped to achieve. The analysis carried out in this work enables us to formulate various conclusions of both qualitative and quantitative nature. As happens in every analytical venture, some of the conclusions that emerge are well-founded and well-supported by rich evidence, and hence

difficult to argue with. Regrettably, in a number of analysed cases one may speak about a relative paucity of evidential data, which is scantier than one would hope for in any historical analysis of a well-delimited group of lexical items. This is so because some of the metaphorical senses discussed in this work are confirmed by a number of lexicographic works, for example, the thief-specific senses of *grasshopper*, *pigeon*, *rat*, *dromedary*, *gorilla* and *shark* are richly evidenced in dictionaries, both printed and electronic, such as, among others, the *OED*, *DU*, *DSCE*, *RDHS* and *VRL*. Unfortunately, prison slang senses of other analysed lexical items, such as *crow*, *rook*, *snake*, *spider*, *gopher*, and *silkworm* are either documented only by an isolated dictionary, namely *DU*, or by just two: *DU* and *RDMSUE*. Obviously, in such doubtful cases it remains up to the analyst whether to exclude less-documented cases or not, and here we have opted for the latter solution. More generally, one gets the impression that the language of prison is largely chaotic and tends to escape lexicographic record, but we feel that there are good reasons behind it. One may say that that the fleeting and somewhat chaotic nature of prison slang, as well as the lexicographic account that is available, may both be treated as consequences of the extralinguistic secretive nature and general isolationism of the prison world and its inhabitants: a world which many enter, yet very few enter for academic purposes.

Another general observation that may be formulated is one that may be labelled as the feature of *quantitative instability* of prison slang metaphorical resources, which may be related to the fact that prison slang – similarly to other argots – tends to be very ephemeral in nature, and its vocabulary items usually enjoy a short period of functionality for those who use them, and – even more so – for those who want to analyse them. As could be seen, all of the historical synonyms of *thief* which have been analysed, with the exception of *shark*, *spider* and *crow*, fell out of use after a short period of existence, most frequently not long enough for lexicographic works to evidence their short-lived currency in English.

One may venture a claim that the thievish profession is, if not as old as the hills, then at least as old as mankind. However, one of the intriguing observations that emerges from our analysis is that the majority of metaphorical transfers that affected the semantics of the nouns scrutinised in the foregoing took place within the well-defined time frames of the 16th century - 20th century, with the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries being the dominant period of metaphorsation. To be more precise, the earliest thief-specific sense analysed here, *rook*, emerged already in the second half of the 16th century, and its appearance in English was followed by the rise of one of the thief-specific senses of *dromedary*, which emerged towards

the end of the 18th century. Likewise, *shark* started to function as a synonym of *thief* towards the end of the 18th century, while in the first half of the 19th century *crow* surfaced as another historical synonym of *thief*, and its appearance was soon followed by the development of the thief-specific sense of *grasshopper*, the thief-related sense of *pigeon*, as well as *snake* related to the microcategory **THIEVES**. Chronologically speaking, then there appeared *silkworm* employed as a female-specific synonym of *thief*, the thief-specific senses of *pigeon*, another thief-related sense of *dromedary*, and the relevant sense of *gopher*, which all developed in English prison slang in the second half of the 19th century. Further, in the first half of the 20th century metaphorisation processes yielded a thief-related sense of *spider*, two meanings of *rat*, two relevant senses of *gopher*, the relevant sense of *snake* related to the microcategory **THIEVES** and the thief-specific sense of *gorilla*.

Another quantitative observation that may be formulated is that a number of zoosemic synonyms of *thief* are etymologically rooted in Anglo-Saxon times, and their number prevails over those words that appeared in the language in each of the subsequent historical stages. More specifically, five out of twelve nouns that have been targeted (*crow*, *grasshopper*, *rook*, *snake*, *silkworm*) go back to OE vocabulary, four nouns discussed here (*spider*, *pigeon*, *rat*, *dromedary*) derive from Mid.E, and merely three (*gopher*, *gorilla*, *shark*) appeared in Mod.E times. In this context, one may be tempted to ask why there is such a historical distribution of the synonyms that form the corpus of our analysis; yet it seems that this question can hardly be answered.

The nature of zoosemic transfers taking place in prison vocabulary is interesting in many ways. Significantly, the vast majority of thief-specific metaphorical senses are entrenched in the conceptual macrocategory **MALE HUMAN BEINGS** and hardly at all **FEMALE HUMAN BEINGS**, with the exception of *silkworm* which at a certain point of its evolution developed the sense ‘well-dressed women who visit jewellers’ shops, and, under cover of making a purchase, are shown a good many valuable articles of jewellery; they spend a small sum and ‘palm’ as many articles as they conveniently can’. This observation stands in sharp contrast to the results of earlier work on animal metaphorisation processes which reveals that – as shown by Klepanski (1990, 1997) and Kiełtyka (2008) – such pejoratively charged metaphors tend to pervade predominantly female-specific vocabulary, at least in standard varieties of English. One may hypothesise that one of the reasons behind this state of affairs is that – extralinguistically speaking – the presence of a female element behind prison walls, though certainly much desired, is scarce to say the least. More generally, it seems that

inmates are prone to coin metaphors for those objects, both animate and inanimate, that are immediately necessary and required, and – above all – close to and available in their daily routine. In other words, one may generalise and say that since male and female prisoners are never detained together their mutual interaction of whatever kind is strictly controlled and limited, and that is why – one may conjecture – the number of female-specific synonyms of *thief* and other criminal professions is largely limited. To focus on the key point of women it remains for sociologists to answer why a large number of female-specific metaphors in prison slang must be qualified as synonyms of *prostitute*, for example, *swinging door*, *flash moll*, *flee bag*, *night hunter* and others.

Even a cursory look at the metaphorical transfers that affected English lexical items analysed in the foregoing, as compared to the relevant corresponding vocabulary in Polish, shows that the metaphorisation paths in the two languages have been entirely different, with the exception of one of the metaphorical senses of English, *rat*, and its Polish equivalent, *szczur* ('rat'). Generally speaking, the nominal metaphorical senses that serve in prison slang communication in the two languages in no way overlap. For example, *crow*, *rook*, *pigeon*, *snake*, *gorilla*, *rat* and *shark* used in English prison slang all serve as synonyms of *thief*, while in the language of the Polish underworld there are only a few equivalents which may be accommodated within the conceptual microcategory **THIEVES**, for example, Polish *rekin* ('a shark') and *szczur* ('a rat'). One may say that both English and Polish nouns most frequently convey a different kind of thievish art, or thievish art viewed from a different point of view. Such nouns as *goryl* ('a gorilla') *gawron* ('a rook') and *golqb* ('a pigeon') are evidenced in the language of the Polish underworld, but we may hardly point to any links between the semantics of these nouns and the conceptual microcategory **THIEVES**. At the same time, there are Polish nouns that – in contrast to the corresponding English lexical items – have failed to be affected by metaphorisation in the language of the underworld, such as, for example, *suseł* ('a gopher'), *dromader* ('a dromedary'), *pajak* ('a spider'), *jedwabnik* ('a silkworm') and *konik polny* ('a grasshopper').

Another general observation that may be worded is that more than a half of the analysed nouns – apart from being related to the conceptual microcategory **THIEVES** – are also conceptually entrenched in the macrocategory **INANIMATE OBJECTS** in prison usage (*crow*, *snake*, *spider*, *pigeon*, *rat*, *gopher*, *rook*), while the remaining five (*grasshopper*, *silkworm*, *dromedary*, *gorilla*, *shark*) are linked exclusively to the conceptual macrocategory **HUMAN BEINGS**. What is intriguing is the fact that in English prison slang the majority of

non-human-specific senses evolved after the coinage of the thief-specific senses, and this holds true for the semantic evolution of *crow*, *snake*, *spider* and *pigeon*. It seems that this piece of evidence may be interpreted as certifying to certain human-specific centeredness of prison slang zoosemic paths of metaphorisation processes and the structure of the Great Chain of Being, but this conjecture requires verification by large-scale analysis to be of any real value.

Another observation is related to the fact that the majority of animal-specific nouns which underwent the process of zoosemic transfer and started to be used as synonyms of *thief* also developed other human-specific senses in the language used behind prison walls (*crow*, *rook*, *snake*, *spider*, *pigeon*, *rat*, *gopher*, *gorilla*, *shark*), for example, *shark* developed the sense ‘a sharper’ in the 16th century, *rook* was also employed in the sense ‘a knave’ (17th century), *crow* – apart from its thief-specific sense – also started to be used in the sense ‘a man that attests to the honour of those professional gamblers with whom he works in league’ (19th century), *pigeon* evolved to be used in several human-specific senses, such as ‘a dupe’ (18th century), ‘an informer’ (19th century) and ‘the best embezzler’ (20th century), and the noun *snake* – in the first half of the 20th century – developed the sense ‘a crooked individual’. The evolution of *rat* is intriguing because its history abounds in the formation of various human-specific senses, such as ‘drunken men or women’ (17th century), ‘a clergyman’ (19th century), ‘a spy for the police’ (20th century) and ‘a policeman’ (20th century). Within the time frame of the 20th century, the noun *gopher* started to be used in the sense ‘a gangster or other hard character’, *gorilla* developed the sense ‘a brutal mobster’, and *shark* – in the same century – was used in the sense ‘a man that sells jobs to tramps’. Among the twelve analysed nouns there are merely three (*grasshopper*, *silkworm*, *dromedary*) which remained related exclusively to the conceptual microcategory **THIEVES**, and hardly at all to any other human-specific conceptual microcategories, not to mention other nonhuman-specific categories.

The analysis carried out in this work continues and follows – to some extent – zoosemy-oriented research proposed earlier in the works of, for example, Kleparski (1997, 2002, 2007), Kiełtyka (2005a, 2005b, 2007, 2008), Kiełtyka and Kleparski (2005a, 2005b, 2007) and Górecka-Smolińska (2008, 2009a, 2009b, 2011). However, the spirit of this work is of somewhat different nature since our discussion has been located on the borderline of historical semantics, sociolinguistics and culture studies, though not in equal proportions. We feel justified to claim that the analysis carried out in this work is an attempt to go one step further not only in analysing traditionally targeted nominal developments within the corpus of

animal-related lexical items, but we also delve into demonstrating and formalising selected verbal transfers, though this is by no means the first linguistic move in this direction. Following the findings of Martsa (2013) and Kiełtyka (2013, 2015, 2016), we have made an attempt to signal how verbal metaphorisation could be approached and handled. In doing this we restricted our attention to merely one category of verbs, namely those that are related to the motivating animal names through the combination of metonymic and metaphoric mappings, as defined in Martsa (2013). Obviously, to make the picture complete future research must necessarily target other categories, that is verbs related to the motivating animal names through metonymic mappings, and separately through metaphoric mappings.

In its shape, the cognitive methodology employed in our analysis is based on the ideas developed in Kleparski (1997, 2002, 2007) and Kiełtyka (2008, 2009a, 2009b, 2009c), but – at the same time – one can speak of certain innovations that have been introduced because the methodology employed here incorporates the views of Jackendoff (1976, 1983, 1990) and the achievements of later cognitivists. Hence, one can speak of a certain eclecticism of the method which is a corollary of our taking into analytical consideration verbal transfers of selected animal-specific items. To the best of our knowledge, linguists either Polish or of foreign provenance, have thus far hardly ever targeted zoosemic evolution of verbs and they have traditionally centred on scrutinising the development of animal-specific nouns.

In any academic field the general rule is that new tasks necessarily require either new tools or modification of the tools that one has at disposal. Here, to meet the tasks set to this work, new tools had to be forged, and the novel elements of the methodology employed in this work have been applied in the analysis of the relevant verbal transfers. Among others, we have given a new meaning to the notion of *agent noun*, understood here as the noun developed from the base noun, perceived as the performer of the activity, that gives rise to the novel verbal sense. Further, under the term *catalytic converter* we understand the conceptual location (or locations) which can be proved to be related to the meaning of the base noun, the agent noun and the activity performed by the agent. The function of the thus-understood catalytic converter is to connect all the three elements together to form a novel verbal sense and to show in what way these three elements of the derivation mechanism are related. Moreover, the mechanism that has been labelled as *substitution* may be said to be a combination of the principles referred to as *highlighting* and *hiding*, which have been known since the time of Lakoff and Johnson (1980), because it involves the exchange of one location for another by way of simultaneous hiding and highlighting of the appropriate values. Another

novel concept that has been proposed is labelled *overt elements*, understood as the entirety of those elements which are easily identifiable in terms of a given definition of a noun, while the notion of *background elements* has been used in reference to those locations that may be identified as related to a noun, not infrequently, representing the salient instinctual character and behavioural features of animals, but they are in no way worded in the definition and have a dormant character. We have also distinguished the category of other values that have been labelled as *temporarily irrelevant values*, the term that stands for those conceptual locations that are in no way important for the construal of the novel sense of the agent noun, and hence remain backgrounded.

The immediate conclusion that emerges from the analysis of verbal transfers affecting animal-specific lexical items is that the transfers – scarce as they are – affected primarily those lexical items that have remained in the language for the longest period of time. To be more precise, we have discussed four human-specific verbs which evolved from animal-specific nouns within the limits of Anglo-Saxon times, including two sense-threads developed by the verbs *to crow*, *to rook* and *to snake*. Later, in the analysis of Mid.E data we observe that the working of the mechanism of verbal zoosemy affected such animal-specific nouns as *spider*, giving rise to two human-specific verbal sense-threads, *pigeon*, from which one verbal sense evolved, and verbal *rat*, which – at that time – started to be used in the human-specific sense. In the case of the Mod.E noun *shark*, we singled out two verbal human-specific senses.

Our analysis of verbal transfers may be viewed as a certain advancement when compared to the analysis proposed earlier since it enables us to formulate certain specific observations, because the nature of the analysed verbal transfers is interesting in many ways. To start with, the majority of verbal senses are related to the language of the underworld. To be more specific, during their semantic shift such animal-specific verbs as *to crow*, *to rook*, *to snake*, *to pigeon*, *to rat* and *to shark* developed seven crime-specific verbal meanings, and there are merely two sense-threads which are hardly related to the language of the underworld, and these are the two sense-threads of *to spider*. These verbal senses of *spider* may be said to be exceptional in yet another way. Namely, the verbal crime-related senses of *to crow*, *to rook*, *to snake*, *to pigeon*, *to rat* and one sense-thread of *to shark* all developed immediately after the transfer of the corresponding prison slang nouns which – in our terminology – served as agent nouns. Significantly, the time span between the transfer of these agent nouns, and the transfer of the relevant verbs was no longer than fifty years. In contrast, somewhat exceptionally, one of the verbal sense-threads of *to shark* took over a

hundred years to surface in English prison slang, while the chronology of the two verbal sense-threads of *to spider*, in no way related to the language of the underworld, is hard to determine in this respect since it can in no way be proved when the relevant agent nouns were coined.

Another striking observation relates to what may be termed as *verbal longevity* of animal-specific verbs since – in contrast to zoosemically transferred thief-specific nouns, the majority of which are no longer used in prison slang – at least five out of the nine verbal developments that have been analysed here remain in the system of language, either in standard variety or in prison slang (two senses of *to rat*, two senses of *to spider* and the sense of *to pigeon*). This observation raises the question of the possible causes behind the relative verbal longevity of the products of animal metaphorisation processes over the relatively short-lasting life of the animal metaphorisation processes that affected those nouns.

All the observations and conclusions notwithstanding, we are aware that our analysis has left many problems and issues unanswered, and thus the area is still open for future research. There are several points that await further elaboration and refinement, and one of such points is our dissatisfaction with the shape and status of what has been termed as *attributive values*, alternatively labelled as *attributive locations* or *attributive elements*. To be more specific, we observe the internal complexity of certain attributive values that have been proposed, such as, for example, (ONE THAT ‘KEEPS WATCH’) or (ONE THAT ‘ATTESTS’). The semantic information present in such values could ideally be further split into smaller conceptual particles attributive to different conceptual domains.

Another somewhat dissatisfying aspect of our analysis is the fact that certain meanings have been evidenced in merely a few dictionaries, for example, the *OED*, *RDMSUE*, *DSCE*, *RDHS* or *VRL*, or even in a single isolated dictionary, for example, *DU*. In many other cases, we were forced to rely on the data available in Internet dictionaries and forums, some of which may be somewhat justifiably considered to be not sufficiently reliable for any scholarly venture. Unfortunately, the ephemeral nature, as well as the secretive character of prison slang vocabulary, are – all too frequently – the reasons why certain prison slang senses of lexical items escape lexicographic record, and thus it is difficult to provide evidence and confirm them.

Finally, we have dealt with the phenomenon of verbal zoosemy only to a limited extent, because we have merely concentrated on a single group of animal verbs, namely those

which appeared in the system of the English language as a result of the combination of the metaphorical and metonymic transfers, as viewed by Martsa (2013). To be more precise, the cognitively couched apparatus developed in our work allows us to analyse and describe the stages of the development and the resultant meaning of only those verbs whose evolution was conditioned by the two metaphorisation mechanisms. It must be admitted that in order to be applied to other categories of animal verbs, the tools developed here may require further elaboration and refinement.

.....
miejsowość i data

.....
podpis