

**UNIVERSITY OF PARDUBICE
FACULTY OF ARTS AND PHILOSOPHY
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH AND AMERICAN STUDIES**

**THE BEGINNINGS OF CZECH TRANSLATION
THEORIES IN THE 19TH CENTURY (1785 – 1850)**

BACHELOR WORK

AUTHOR: Kateřina Koutková

SUPERVISOR: Doc. PhDr. Bohuslav Mánek, CSc.

2006

**UNIVERZITA PARDUBICE
FAKULTA FILOZOFICKÁ
KATEDRA ANGLISTIKY A AMERIKANISTIKY**

**POČÁTKY ČESKÝCH PŘEKLADATELSKÝCH
TEORIÍ V 19. STOLETÍ I. (1785 – 1850)**

BAKALÁŘSKÁ PRÁCE

**AUTOR PRÁCE: Kateřina Koutková
VEDOUCÍ PRÁCE: Doc. PhDr. Bohuslav Mánek, CSc.**

2006

V období národního obrození plnil překlad velmi významnou roli při konstituování spisovného českého jazyka a moderní literatury. Tato práce se soustřeďuje na vývoj překladatelských teorií a metod tohoto období, na vývoj teoretického myšlení o překladu a jeho uměleckých prostředků. Detailněji se zabývá osobnostmi, které se podílely na zformování těchto teorií a metod od převážně klasicistického pojetí překladu v počátečním a vrcholném obrozeneckém období, až po předromantické a romantické teorie na konci národního obrození. Snaží se o popsání protikladů mezi klasicistickou a romantickou estetikou v evropském překladatelství v 18. století a na začátku 19. století a vlivu těchto teorií na obrozenecký překlad. Velká část práce je věnována procesu vytváření a formulování teoretických zásad překladu, sloužících specifickým obrozeneckým potřebám vytvoření spisovného českého jazyka, lexikálních a stylistických prostředků i forem české literatury. Příklady řešení tohoto úkolu v přístupu významných představitelů klasicistického a romantického pojetí v překladech z anglických autorů jsou ilustrovány na konkrétních textech. Na základě analyzovaného materiálu se tato práce v závěru pokusí shrnout základní charakteristiky ve vývoji obrozeneckého překladu z angličtiny.

Speaking of the National Revival, translating played a very significant role with regard to the constitution of the Czech literary language and modern literature. This work focuses on the development of translating theories and methods of this historical period, as well as on the development of theoretical thought of the translation and its artistic devices. It deals in detail with the personalities who were involved in the formation of these theories and methods, from mostly Classicist approach to the translation at the beginnings and in the middle of the National Revival period up to the pre-Romantic and Romantic theories at the end of this era. What this paper attempts to do is to define the contrast between the Classicist and the Romantic aesthetics in the European translation during the 18th century and at the beginning of the 19th century. It also tries to depict the influence of these theories on the National Revival translation. A great attention in the paper is paid to the process of the creation and formation of the theoretical principles which served for the specific needs of the National Revival movement, namely the formation of the Czech literary language, lexical and stylistic instruments as well as the styles of the Czech literature. To illustrate the individual approaches of the most significant authors concrete texts are used. On the basis of the analyzed material, the conclusion of this work tries to summarize the principal characteristics of the development of the translations from English into Czech in the period of the National Revival.

1. Historical Introduction	2
2. Czech National Revival	7
3. Classicistic Theories	7
3.1. Classicism in European Translation	7
3.2. Classicism in National Revival Translation	8
3.2.1. Preparatory Phase	8
3.2.2. High Phase	10
4. Romantic Theories	20
4.1. Romanticism in European Translation	20
4.2. Pre-Romanticism and Romanticism in the National Revival	21
4.2.1. The Features of the pre-Romantic and Romantic Translation	21
4.2.2. The Developmental Viewpoints of the pre-Romantic and Romantic Translation	26
5. Conclusion	33

1. Historical Introduction

The Czech **medieval** society existed within the context of the Western Christian culture. Characteristically, in the period from the 8th to the 14th century, this culture developed unevenly in individual national environments. The most distinctive feature of this cultural period was duplicity.

The supreme resource of the medieval Western Christian culture is the Holy Writ, or rather the Vulgate, i.e. the Holy Bible as translated into Latin by St. Jerome. The cultural expansion of Christianity is primarily based on written records and documents. The other resource of the Western Christian culture is the folklore, preserved and spread mainly by the word of mouth, which functioned within a fixed set of themes and motifs (the medieval secular literature focused on the lives of legendary heroes from both the domestic and foreign environment, e.g. the ancient world). In this historical period, preserved records in the domestic languages were limited to annotations and short commentaries inscribed into Latin texts.

As the medieval culture developed, the hitherto exclusively oral character of the folklore started to change, writing was used with the aim to preserve it. New literary genres appeared in response, such as the court poetry or canonically noncommittal religious writings. Likewise, foreign texts were adapted for domestic needs and translated into domestic languages, although this type of the translation can be characterized as strongly adaptational. The idea of the translation of literary texts *sensu stricto* appeared as late as at the beginnings of Humanism, with its first attempts to transcribe texts by foreign authors into the domestic one using domestic language medium. The main emphasis was put on the conversion of the meaning of each word in the original text. The issue of the adjustment of the translation to domestic needs and efforts to make it more attractive and intelligible for the domestic reader were deemed secondary.

The Czech medieval culture had certain specific features compared to the Western Christian literary culture. The most important was a brief but very significant evangelistic attempt to use Old Slavic as a liturgical language. In 863 AD, Constantine and Methodius arrived in the Great Moravian Empire to spread Christianity via

language that would be comprehensible for the local Slavs. They also translated the Holy Writ into Old Slavic. Despite several disruptions, the Old Slavic liturgy remained in use in Czech territory until the Late Middle Ages, and played an important part in the first Czech translations of the Bible.

Another distinctive feature of the Czech medieval culture compared to other Western European countries was the exceptional pace of its development from the modest beginnings, which took place under the rule of the last Přemyslids and the first Luxembourgs, i.e. during the 14th century.

The domestication of the medieval Latin culture was a slow process, which started with Czech annotations or translations of isolated words. A gradual need for more systematic approach gave rise to lexicons and thesauri, wordbooks, glossaries, herbariums etc. As of the 13th century, the canonical literature began to be translated into Czech systematically, usually word by word. However, the translations of the other, non-canonical literature were much looser, often resulting in a completely new rephrasing of the text. Tomáš Štítný ze Štítného, the most prominent translator of the **pre-Hussite** period, openly admitted to this approach in a comment to his translation of Robert Holkot's treatise: "... *nemienim' bych jeho řeč latinskú chtěl česky klásti, než z jeho knih bera naučenie mluvíti chci perem, což mi böh dá...*" [I do not intend to translate his Latin words into Czech, but rather, having obtained the knowledge of his books, I would like to write as I deem fit] (Hrala 2002; 14).

The significance of the **Hussite period** for Czech translating is not to be underestimated. It was the period of the expansion of the Czech language, which became one of the first European literary languages. At the same time, Hussitism brought the cultural focus onto religious and ethical issues, obstructing and impeding the foreign secular literature from penetrating the Czech cultural context. This later became a characteristic feature of the Czech culture, with corresponding major consequences for Czech translating as well.

The primary objective of European **Humanism** was the search for "core" cultural texts, their study and adaptation for new language environments. The Humanists concentrated their attention on the ancient culture, sharing a firm conviction that their domestic

language was perfectly capable of expressing all ideas contained in the original ancient texts. Late 15th century Czech Humanists, such as Viktorin Kornel ze Všehrd, Václav Písecký, Řehoř Hrubý z Jelení or one hundred years later Daniel Adam z Veleslavína, often embarked on their translations just to demonstrate that their mother language could express the same as the ancient languages. It was this period which witnessed the creation of theoretical systems of translation and translation methods that had one conscious objective - to reproduce the original text, eventually the outland version via which the translation was realized. At the same time, there began a clear distinction between the original text and the translation. The Humanists also created the first basic translation aids: text interpretations and commentaries, and bilingual and multilingual dictionaries. The Humanists relied mainly on the translation techniques theoretically substantiated by the ancient Romans and used for the translation of the ancient Greek literature (Cicero, Horace, St. Jerome). According to them, the translation was merely a semantic procedure, whereby one language medium was replaced with another.

Levý cites Horace (Ars poetica):

„*Nec verbum verbo curabis reddere fidus interpres*“ [the faithful translator, try not to translate word by word]

(Q. Horatii Flacci, De arte Poetica, pars. I, v. 133-134, Levý 1996; 27)

and St. Jerome: „*non verbum e verbo sed sensum exprimere de sensu*“ [do not replace word by word but meaning by meaning]

(Levý 1996; 28)

In Renaissance, the literarute attempted to transfer ancient literary forms and fill them with domestic language contents (e.g. ode, elegy, eulogy, tragedy, comedy etc.). Metrical prosody was introduced into poetry. The translation was no longer a mere replacement of the language medium, but it was understood as an original literary form. Each Holy Bible translator from Latin claimed their right for an independent interpretation, which broadened and the understanding of the text as well as of the Christian values. The translations of the Holy Bible played a major role in the creation and stabilization of national literary languages.

In the **Post-Hussite** Bohemia, the elites (both the aristocracy and the municipal patriciate) were partially German-speaking, satisfying their “national” cultural needs by German texts. At the same time, there was a decline of the social classes which used Czech language in everyday communication and read the Czech literature, both original works and translations of higher styles. Two contesting groups of intellectuals existed in this period – Latin and Czech Humanists. The main moot point was the issue of the intended audience of the Western cultural education – which layers of the society should have an access to the education. The prominent Latin Humanist Bohuslav Hasištejnský z Lobkovicz disagreed with the idea that education and high culture should be accessible to common masses. The issue of the basic function of the translation - to educate was discussed. The aim of the translation was not to achieve artistic virtuosity but to make the original text as understandable as possible. The Czech Humanists did not insist on finding the most precise translation of each word. The translations were often accompanied by commentaries, e.g. footnotes, annotations, comments in brackets or even explanatory notes integrated in the text. In writings with a broader public appeal, the translators introduced some changes, e.g. they replaced the names of less known foreign personalities by more famous ones. Unlike the Classicists, who tried to improve the original works artistically in their translations, the Humanists, in the attempt to make the works more comprehensible, transposed the text into domestic environment. It is necessary to point out that the Czech Humanists managed to put into sophisticated Czech such works involved in the standard Humanistic repertoire typical for developed European countries. However, the Czech translating never fully completed the development from Humanism to Renaissance. Even in the translations of poetry and fiction the main emphasis was always laid on utility and not beauty. Translations were to serve as an aid for the interpretation of the original text or a means to study a foreign language, but not a work of art. Assuming that the Humanism was primarily a scholarly movement while the Renaissance an artistic stream, the Czech Renaissance literary translating clearly remained weakened for the benefit of the Humanists school. In that period, there existed no translating theories that would compare the translation to art. Also, due to religious censorship, certain text segments, such as erotic scenes, were usually omitted from the translation, mostly from the translation of poetry. Speaking of poetry, poems were commonly translated by means of

rhythmical prose, with little concern for the length of lines or number of verses, the rhyme mostly became the only formal indication of the verse.

The most noteworthy Czech translations of this period were connected with the work of the Fraterniny Unity. A well-known work was the translation of the Holy Bible (so-called *Bible Kralická*). The Bohemian Fraternity translators translated the Hebrew and Greek original using common colloquial language since they supposed that their translation would be widely accepted by the entire nation. They also wrote several theoretical treatises on the translation believing that the translation was not only the substitution of linguistic devices, but the substitution of language devices.

The climax and at the same time the end of the Fraternity Unity translation tradition is the work of J. A. Komenský. His translation of the biblical psalms commenced the tradition of metrical translations of poetry. Komenský was particularly interested in two issues, which later, during the National Revival, became the basic questions for the Czech theorists of the translation: what are the phonetic qualifications of the Czech language for the metrical prosody and what are the syntactic advantages of the Czech for the translation of poetry.

The **Classicist** translators treated the original in a very loose manner. They aimed to create the work that the author of the original would have created if they had been writing in the same language and at the same historical moment.

After the defeat of the uprising of the Czech Estates in 1620 AD and after the confirmation of the results of the Thirty Year's War by the Peace of Westphalia in 1648 AD, the Czech was considered as a language of "dangerous rebels." During the second half of the 17th century and first half of the 18th century, the Czech estate cultural elite completely changed into a German-speaking elite, while the Czech gained the status of an inferior parlance used by uneducated local masses. The efforts to renew the Czech language and consequently the entire Czech nation were later marked "the Czech National Revival."

In the **Baroque** period, Czech translations were focused mainly on the folk people. Special attention was paid to the prosodic characteristics of the language (rhythm, rhyme), or use of demotic words and expressions. The translations of poetry, which

were not very frequent, did not usually follow the formal structure of the original, but tried to adapt the work for the needs of Czech consumers.

2. Czech National Revival

According to F. Vodička (in: Hrala 2002), the end of the 18th and the beginning of the 19th century in Bohemia was characterised by two parallel cultural development processes. While one process corresponds with the general atmosphere in European literature, i.e. from Classicism, through pre-Romanticism to Romanticism, the other reflected the effort to revive the Czech national literature, to create works of art of a higher style with clear aesthetic functions and to establish a new social base of literary consumers. In the field of translating, both Classicism and Romanticism were perceived above all as instruments of the National Revival. The following sections deal with the way both styles contributed to the development of translating theories in the period of the Czech National Revival. However, from the point of view of Czech translating, for more than fifty years cannot be viewed as one closed and complex epoch because translating methods changed considerably in its course. Levý divides the period of Czech National Revival into three phases, **preparatory** (end of the 18th century), **high** (beginning of the 19th century) and **pre-Romantic** and **Romantic** (second quarter of the 19th century).

In term of translating theory, Levý (1996; 95) describes both the preparatory and high phases of the Czech National Revival as predominantly Classicistic.

3. Classicistic Theories

3. 1. Classicism in European Translation

According to Levý's characteristic (1996; 66 - 70), although Classicistic translators followed the tradition of the Renaissance translators, they applied more individualistic approach to their work. They no longer wanted just to deliver useful information but they were ambitious to show that they had the same artistic qualities and were capable of the same refined forms as the original authors. While the Humanists put emphasis on scientific works, Classicistic translators concentrated above all on fiction, especially poetry, shifting their focus from substance to form. That is why the aesthetics of this period did not permit prosaic translations of poetry, the absolutism of contemporary aesthetic norms was the principal thesis. The Classicists regarded their own tastes as

universal. That is why all motifs contravening Classicistic ideals, i.e. proportionality, taste and elegance, were left out of the translated works. In other words, everything not conforming to the translator's poetics was regarded as barbaric and had to be, therefore, "improved". In order to make literary works generally acceptable and internationally valid, Classicistic translators also left out all specific national characteristics. They sought to improve the original, by removing all limitations, which in their opinion resulted from the author's historical ties with his native environment and mother language. At the same time, however, they were also supposed to remain faithful to the translated work's original spirit, further developing the author's creative intentions. Levý (1996; 68) points out that the term "original spirit" is too unclear and insufficiently definite. The principal cause of Classicistic adaptations was the absolutism of contemporary aesthetic norms.

The translations were designated for the same narrow circle of readers as the originals. The use of professional expressions, dialects and loanwords was reduced in order to make the text more comprehensible not for the general public but for the "high society". The most radical interferences concerned stylistic aspects and form, while the substance was often preserved. When translating foreign poets, the Classicists usually used the type of rhyme they regarded as most suitable for classical poetry in their own language, disregarding completely the original metre. In England, for instance, most of the original and translated poetry was written in heroic couplet. In France, the most frequently used form was the alexandrine. That is why stylistic equalisation was the natural result of adaptation of foreign authors to contemporary tastes.

3. 2. Classicism in National Revival Translation

3. 2. 1. Preparatory Phase

In this phase, all principal translating requirements were based on theses similar to those observed by the Humanists, allowing more or less free interpretation of the original work. That the National Revivalists followed in their footsteps the Humanist translators is clearly demonstrated by the fact that they frequently re-printed their predecessors' translations, represented in this field by František Faustín Procházka. Theoretical translating issues were essentially addressed only by linguists. Here, Levý (1996; 82) quotes Jiřík Petrmann's demand from 1783 that "translations should be based on the

meaning not on words, the fact that individual languages have different means of expression should be taken into account and aesthetic factors should be observed” (Jiřík Petrmann 1783; 36-37). Josef Dobrovský also professed his objections to literal translations and linguistic dependence on the original in his critical comments to translating (1906; 177, 1913; 179). In the area of adoption of foreign terms Dobrovský inclined to lexical substitution, which from the linguistic point of view preferred attributive expressions to descriptive expressions (1779; 131). Dobrovský’s thoughts about translatability of foreign literature in relation to the existing level of advancement of the mother language reflected the most serious problem faced also by the other contemporary translators – the lack of linguistic means necessary for a higher literary style (Dobrovský’s review of Nejedlý’s translation in *Annalen der Literatur und Kunst in dem österreichischen Kaisertum*, September 181; 322).

Among the most important tasks of the preparatory phase was to establish a new social base of the Czech culture, attract the widest possible circle of readers and spectators and create the necessary linguistic means of artistic literature. These objectives affected also translating activities. The works of translators were designated either for the largest segment of the Czech nation, small bourgeoisie and rural population, or for the relatively small group of the intelligentsia.

While the social role was played by the translations of drama and prose (reading for the lower classes), the translations of poetry and drama were very important from the linguistic point of view. The oldest translations included many dramatic works designated directly for the stage rather than for reading. Thanks to Karel Ignác Thám, Václav Thám, J. J. Tandler and Prokop Šedivý Shakespeare’s and Schiller’s plays appeared (using mostly German translations). Some of Shakespeare’s plays were translated as prose, such as F. Josef Fischer’s *Kupec z Venedyku*, *Láska a přátelstvo* and *Makbeth*, *Škûdce šotského vojska*. In 1786, Karel Ignác Thám staged *Macbeth* (as *Makbet*), using colloquial language. The prose designated for the lower classes, especially that published by Václav Matěj Kramerius, was often based on old cavalier novels and travel books. Re-editions of older works were also quite frequent. Belletristic translations were often paraphrased - concentrated only on the original fable, while their genre often changed completely. The fables of Shakespeare’s work were, for

instance, paraphrased in the form of short stories. Thanks to this technique, it was possible to translate even those literary works which would be too difficult to translate in their authentic stylisation. Foreign technical literature featured many records of domestic origin as well as explanatory notes.

In the area of creation of a new literary language the most important role was played by the translations of anacreontic poetry. One of the most prominent translators of poetry in the preparatory phase of the National Revival was Antonín Puchmajer. By adapting Polish translations of foreign originals, he not only created a precedent of cultural policy, but also set a methodological example. Jiří Veselý (in: Hrala 2002; 127) states that Puchmajer criticised his contemporaries for publishing books based on German translations because he was afraid of the fact that the Czech culture might become too dependent on the more advanced German culture. He recommended Polish translations because both languages were similar and because both nations were close politically. According to Veselý (in: Hrala 2002; 127), Puchmajer and his followers treated the originals as templates, where there was the possibility to leave out some parts of the text. Levý (1996; 93) mentions that Puchmajer adopted everything from the original texts in Polish that could be easily transferred into Czech without any significant changes, especially rhymes. The technique of direct copying of rhymes used in the period of the National Revival was supported because it allowed the translator to introduce new words of Slavic origin as neologisms whenever the original expressions had no Czech equivalents.

3. 2. 2. High Phase

While in the preparatory phase translations played above all a popularisation role, at the beginning of the 19th century, translators already had creative intentions, especially linguistic. Instead of just teaching their readers Czech, they also wanted to create new instruments of literary expression.

Modern theoreticians and historians agree that the most important figure of the Czech National Revival in the field of translations was Josef Jungmann. In his review of translating periods, Otokar Fischer (1929; 281) even used Jungmann's name as a synonym of the entire translating period of the Czech National Revival. Jungmann

summarised his long-term translating experience in a theoretical thesis featured in *Slovesnost* (published in 1845 and 1846). As pointed out by B. Mánek (1991; 15), this theoretical work was a direct consequence of a more developed literary process which brought the clearer difference between translations and original work. According to Levý (1996; 95 – 96), Jungmann in *Slovesnost* still inclined towards more liberal Classicistic perception of translating even though his opinion, clearly influenced by Romantic ideology, was more moderate than Dobrovský's. Jungmann pointed out that every language had its own unique interpretation abilities. The very basic principle of Classicism requiring that every work should be translated as if written by an author living in Bohemia led the translators to transfer plots and actions to local conditions. In *Elegie na hrobkách veských*, his translation of Gray, for instance, Jungmann replaced the names of all English personalities by their Bohemian contemporaries (Levý 1996; 96). Foreign names were also sometimes replaced, although rather than using equivalents, i.e. translating their meanings, using Czech names that sound similarly (Levý 1996; 98). Josef Jungmann also shared the Classicistic opinion that the style and prosodic form should be determined by the translator to suit his mother language. Jungmann turned Milton's blank verse into incomplete six-foot trochee. Formal adaptations of Jungmann's followers did not concern only the choice of metric scheme but also the internal rhythmical organisation of verses. The rhymes of Germanic origin (Milton, Schiller) were, for example, translated in compliance with the rhythmical character of Czech by a regular syllabic verse. Even though Jungmann and his school used similar translating methods as Western European Classicists, they applied them with a different intent. They did not narrow the vocabulary, by rejecting vernaculars. In fact, as a result of their effort to observe the principles of Classicistic style, they expanded the existing insufficient Czech lexicon. While the Classicists were choosing "poetic expressions" out of their national languages, Jungmann and his followers were creating their own poetic language. Just like European Classicists, Jungmann was also interested in a linguistic form, yet not for aesthetic reasons. For him, the language was an instrument of the National Revivalist efforts (Levý 1996; 98). In *Slovesnost*, Jungmann presented translations as one of the sources of enrichment of the national language.

From this point of view, the most complicated work translated by Jungmann is Milton's *Ztracený ráj* (Paradise Lost) published in 1811. Here, Jungmann encountered expressions that had no Czech equivalents. That is why he was forced to use archaisms and vernaculars, adopt terms from other Slavic languages or create new derivations from known roots. However, such an approach frequently led to incomprehensibility. To solve this problem, Jungmann and his followers either enclosed a list of obscure words and their explanations (translation of Paradise Lost), inserted notes directly into the texts in brackets or used footnotes. This means that Jungmann effectively adopted the methods of Humanistic translators to overcome the antagonism between his high artistic intentions and the immaturity of the Czech language. For his neologism, Jungmann was the subject to a rather strong criticism of his contemporaries. Veselý (in: Hrala 2002; 127), however, regards Jungmann's efforts to create new words as quite successful, especially in comparison with other authors of the same period. Levý (1996; 111) also mentions Jungmann's struggle for the metrical prosody. Although acknowledging that it had certain justification as a part of general efforts to create a higher artistic style in the Czech literature, in principle he regarded the metrical prosody as an unfortunate episode in the history of Czech translating because of its aesthetic consequences.

One of the basic theoretic theses of Jungmann's *Slovesnost* is the merit of literature.

„Ještě nám příliš brzo hleděti k oslavě a chloubě, hled'me zatím více ku potřebě a užitku;“ [“It is far too early to look forward to celebrations and to brag, let us concentrate more on needs and usefulness;”]

(*Slovesnost*, in: Levý 1996; 10)

As mentioned above, the most important work of the National Revival is Jungmann's Classicistic translation of Milton's Paradise Lost. It was originally published in 1811. While its second edition published in 1843 as well as the third edition published in 1889 by Koberovo nakladatelství featured changes carried out by Jungmann himself, the fourth edition containing an analysis by Ladislav Cejp published in 1958 was based on the first edition (1811). The analysis used in this paper is based on the widely available third and fourth editions.

In his 1810 *Předmluva* (Preface) written for the first edition, Jungmann justified his translation by the nation's need to get accustomed to the literary Slavic language, and his use of new words by his effort not to disgrace the grand poem by the common language (1958; 13).

Both editions featured a chapter titled *Životopis Jana Miltona* to which Jungmann referred in his explanation notes. Jungmann also justified his choice by the fact that *Paradise Lost* had already been translated into all advanced European languages. The translation thus contributed significantly to his effort to equalize the Czech literature to the European ones. For the purpose of analysis, it is possible to compare a part of the first canto of Jungmann's translation (see **Appendix 1A**) with the English original (in **Appendix 1B** [1989]) based on the 1667 edition.

From the formal point of view, Jungmann's translation has more verses. As a result, the content of individual verses of both versions is different. Jungmann begins his verses with stressed syllables and ends with three-syllabic or monosyllabic words. According to Levý (1996; 109), Jungmann replaces Milton's blank verse (five-foot iamb) with incomplete six-foot trochee with rising ending.

Because of his use of meter, Jungmann has to modify the amount of syllables. In some cases Jungmann's translation has more syllables than the original, he uses neologisms (*bezsvětlé, zemorodci, bydlitel*) or prefixes (*porokujeme*). In other cases, Jungmann uses fewer syllables by shortening existing terms (*velkosti or mihot*). This approach has a negative effect on lexical aspects. The said changes implemented in the interest of meter make the poem less comprehensible and natural.

Lexically, to maintain the noble character of the original he uses mythological terminology (mythological names of persons and countries). Although the names of some characters have Czech forms (*Šalamoun, Joviš*). However, Jungmann does not substitute them with Slavic gods.

Jungmann's explanatory notes clearly demonstrate lexical difficulties. Cejp's edition, which is based on the first edition, contains a list of less comprehensible terms [*“pozatmělá slova”*] (however, the list was left out from the third edition), such as

blahý – blaženost, blaze, blahoslavím
bohuji – pracuji co bůh
čerpám – vážím, kupříkladu vodu, odtud čerpadlo, viz Tham. Lex.
dnový – rozdílné od denní. Záře vycházela z přivedení dnové jasnosti
dostup – přístup, Zugang
mihota /pol. migota/ - mihání /das Blinkern/ - viz mihotání v Lex. Tham.

(Ladislav Cejp, in: Jungmann: Překlady I, SNKL HU 1958; 337-338)

It is clear that in order to explain some Czech expressions, Jungmann uses also German and Polish synonyms.

This extract from the third edition shows that Jungmann's footnotes explain terms, names and mythological and historical context. However, there is also a connection related to English grammar:

Já to byla; užasli se plukové
nebeští, zpět uskočili nejprvé,
jsouce zděšeni a zvali hříchem¹²⁾ mne,
držíce mne za znamení neštěstí.

¹²⁾ V germánských řečech, mezi kteréž anglická z velké části náleží, hřích (the Sin) ženského

a smrt (the death) mužského pohlaví jest, a tudy se podle ducha jejich jich řečí hřích smrti matkou vtipně představuje. Celá tato, od jiných tuze chválená, od jiných haněná alegorie založena jest na Epist. Jakob. I. 15

(Jana Miliona Ztracený ráj, 3. vyd., 1889 v Praze, nakl. I. L. Kober, Zpěv II.; 64)

One of the first representatives of the new generation of translators to oppose Jungmann and request the maximum possible adherence to the original was Jan Nejedlý (1802, IV and V), his aesthetics and translating methods were related to Czech pre-Romanticism (Levý 1996; 96 – 105).

According to Levý (1996; 106), one of the most underrated theoreticians of translating was Jakub Malý. Levý claims that Malý's article titled *O překládání klasiků* published in 1854 in *Časopis Českého muzea* belongs to the best pieces written on translating before the end of the 19th century. It was the first attempt to present a conceptual analysis of translating. Even though it still theoretically followed Jungmann, it was influenced by the Romantic translating theory originating in Germany which took into account both historical and individual conditionality of the original. In Malý's opinion,

the translator should get “*inspired by the original to an extent when his state of mind is the same as the state of mind of the author at the moment of creation*” (in: Levý 1996; 20). However, the situation in Bohemia in mid-19th century made it impossible to guarantee that the style of the original would be preserved through intuition method. Malý showed his conformity to the perception of literary theory valid at the beginning of the 19th century, by failing to appreciate fully the aesthetic value of localisation elements. He regarded classicality and generality as the same thing. Because in Classical literary works general values prevailed, it was necessary to translate them very precisely. On the other hand, highly localised original works were designated for immediate consumption and their translations should be, therefore, also localised. Malý also stated his attitude to the relation between the substance and form, urging the translators to present the substance of the original works in the same form. If not possible due to linguistic reasons, the translators should use a form customary for the language into which they translate (in: Levý 1996; 22). According to Levý, Malý’s importance was not only in his methodical approach to theory, but also in his substantiation of the situation of the Czech literature when translations methodically differentiated in accordance with the given type of literature (Levý 1996; 107 – 108).

To analyse his extensive work, his translation of Shakespeare’s *Othello* published in 1843 can be used. In the chapter titled *Připomenutí* (1869; 125), Malý himself regarded his 1843 translation as “schoolboyish”, presenting some significant changes. Like Jungmann, he justified his effort to translate Shakespeare’s work by the necessity of measuring up to other European cultures.

His translation can be characterised by the extracts featured in **Appendix 2A** (the original English version is featured in **Appendix 2B**)

For easier comprehension, Malý provides explanatory notes (*Poznamenání*, 1869; 127).

¹⁾ Smysl těch slov jest ten: Kdybych měl tolik bohatství jako Othello, nevyhledával bych jako nyní, křivých cest k jeho dosažení; poněvadž ale moje lakotnost silnější než mé svědomí, tedy buď ubezpečen, že v své službě více nevyhledávám vlastního prospěchu než pánova.

²⁾ t. nejsem, jakým se stavím

In his notes, Malý also explains the various meanings resulting from the play on English words (the original text is featured in **Appendix 2C**)

Des. Dobřes chválil! Ale co když je ženská
černá a přitom rozumná?
Jago. Černá-li která³⁾ a má vtipu dosti,
bělocha snadno najde ke své černosti.

(Jakub Malý, Othello, mouřenín Benátský, v Praze 1868, v komissí u Fr. Řivnáče 1869;
30)

In Poznamenání (1869; 127):

3) t. černých vlasů. Pouhá to hříčka se slovy, an zde Shakespeare slovu fair / krásný/,
jenž také bělovlasý znamená, naproti se staví slovo black / černý/.

The notes also feature quotations of some parts difficult to translate, such as

Jago Na jeho rozkaz vezmu i nejkrvavějšího skutku vinu na sebe¹²⁾.

(Jakub Malý, Othello, mouřenín Benátský, v Praze 1868, v komissí u Fr. Řivnáče 1869;
69)

In his explanatory notes (1869; 127):

¹²⁾ Let him command,
and to obey shall be in me remorse.
What bloody work soever.

Toto místo posavadním překladatelům a vykladačům mnoho vrtochů nadělalo, a
každý z nich jináč, byť i naopak, mu rozumělo. Dle mého zdání potřebuje se
jenom slovo „remorse“ vzítí v smyslu: vina, kterémuž jeho prvotní smysl:
hryzení svědomí, lítost, velmi blízký jest, a hned rozum celé té řeči patrný jest.
Jago tím chce ukazovati, jak velké jest jeho přátelství k Othellovi, an jeho
urážku o vlastní újmě pomstiti se zavazuje.

This type of explanatory notes and comments indicates that for Malý it is no longer
difficult to find the most appropriate Czech term. He struggles to express the meaning
which depends too heavily on the understanding of the original English expressions.

It is obvious from the extract that the number of verses in Malý's translation does not
correspond with the original structure. As a result, the meanings of individual verses of
both versions cannot be identical. Here, Malý applies his thesis mentioned by
Masnerová (in: Hrala 2002; 38) that it is not necessary to preserve the exact number of
verses if it makes unnatural for Czech. However, he maintains the five-foot iamb of the
original text.

Malý's rather liberal approach is also demonstrated by leaving out an entire section based on play on words that is too difficult to translate, as the following extract shows (to compare see **Appendix 2D**).

Des. Víš hochu, kde zůstává zástupník Kassio?

Šašek ¹³⁾ Nevím.

Des. Můžeš se na něj vyptat a pamatovat si to?

Šašek Já budu katechisovat svět, totiž budu se vyptávat a podle toho odpovídat.

(Jakub Malý, Othello, mouřenín Benátský, v Praze 1868, v komissí u Fr. Řivnáče 1869; 70)

¹³⁾ Zde jest vynecháno několik řečí, jenž se točí o nepřeložitelnou hříčku se slovy lie a lay – lež a ležet

The absolute milestone of the Czech translations of English dramatic plays was Shakespeare's *King Lear* (*Král Lear aneb Nevděčnost dětěnská*) completed by J. K. Tyl in 1835 (Masnerová, in: Hrala 2002; 31).

According to Levý, one of the most important leaders of linguistically-orientated critics in 1820s and 1830s was František Palacký. Palacký's criticism focused mainly on linguistic aspects of translations. He also dealt with aesthetic factors, above all with the way the translated work was transposed to the national culture. For Palacký, an advocate of the meter, the language which could follow the meter of the original best was the perfect one. Apart from classical Greek and Hebrew, Palacký saw such quality also in Czech and Hungarian because the quantity and accent in both languages were separated (Palacký 1830; 255 – 261, 363 – 374; Levý 1996; 109 – 110).

Another translator to follow Jungmann's meter theory was František Doucha in his first translation, Thomson's *The Seasons* (*Počasy*, 1842), as well as in his theoretical essay *Připomínka k Počasím J. Thomsona* (third edition).

National Revivalists rarely translated prose because it was not as suitable for their effort to create a noble literary style as poetry. The example of such attempt was Dickens' *Oliver Twist* translated by Mořic Fialka in 1844.

The way Fialka tried to elucidate the original names and environment to his Czech readers (here, Fialka applied the principle requiring that the translated work had a style it would have had, if its author had lived in Bohemia, using Czech) can be illustrated by the extracts featured in **Appendix 3A** with relevant explanatory notes (the English original featured in **Appendix 3B**).

Because prose is designated for a wider circle of readers than poetry, the translator – as indicated by the extracts – tries to follow two contradictory tendencies. He makes an effort to both localise the plot and actions and enlighten the reader on foreign environment. His problems with translation of colloquial language, slang and idioms as well as insufficient familiarity with English lifestyle and environment are, however, more than obvious. When unable to find a Czech equivalent, he frequently uses a similar Slovak expression.

When translating first names and surnames, Fialka shows a high level of inconsistency. Some of the names are translated, some are left in their original form. Sometimes Fialka even combines Czech first names with English surnames (with Slavic endings). The names of some characters retain both their original phonetics and their original meanings (*Pan Bumbal* – Mr Bumble; in Czech “bumble” means *vrávorat*, *pan Důležitý*). In some cases Fialka does not succeed in preserving the phonetic similarity (Artful Dodger; in Czech “artful” means *mazaný* and “dodger” means *lišák*, *podvodník*; in Fialka’s translation “*Ferina*”). Some names are left in their original English form (Chitling).

Along with other National Revivalist translators, Fialka also adds a list of less known expressions, such as

dáti se do křížku – když se dva do sebe pustí ke rvačce
dymník – komín
dymnikometný – kominický
kaučuk – gummi elastikum, pružné kly
mezera – prostor mezi něčím, Zwischenraum

(*Oliver Twist aneb Mladictví sirotka*, zčeštil M. Fialka z anglického C. Dickensa /*Boza*/, v Praze, 1844, tisk a sklad Jaroslava Pospejšila; 458-9).

Following Jungmann's example, Fialka uses even Latin and German explanations. His dictionary demonstrates a lexical instability of Czech language characteristic for the period.

Levý (1996; 114) summarises that in the 1820s the translators finally recognised linguistic conditionality of literary works. Although not yet discovering the Romantic overvaluation of active participation of a language in artistic production, they nevertheless understood that poet's work was passively determined by the language used. The biggest advantage of the Czech language at that time was considered to be its conciseness and flexibility (especially its relatively free word order). Other advantages, appraised mainly by poets, included its suitability for the meter and its melodiousness. Its euphonic qualities were clearly demonstrated by the numerous translations of opera librettos carried out after 1824. Levý (1996; 121) mentions Jirát and Eisner's typization of the techniques used by two different literary generations. While Puchmajer, Štěpánek, V. Thám and other translators of their generation used stress and regarded opera librettos as dramatic works, Jungmann and his group respected the needs of opera texts because they corresponded with their linguistic aesthetics.

Levý (1996; 123 – 125) accentuates Jungmann's personal contribution to the solution of literary tasks during the high phase of the Czech National Revival. He defined the importance of translations as an instrument of creation of a new Czech poetic language designated for higher styles - prose and poetry. Jungmann was also a leading theoretician of meter-based translating and indirectly also of opera translations. In addition to formulating theoretical requirements, he also focused on their practical implementation. As a result, his literary work is beyond any comparison with the efforts of his predecessors. Jungmann was the author of the very first epos in Czech (Milton's *Paradise Lost*; *Ztracený ráj*), first sonnets (*Létaví mravenci*, *Těžké vybrání*), one of the first ballads (*Bürgenova Lenora*) and one of the first translations of opera librettos (*Únos ze serailu*). His adaptation of Milton remained the best translation from English until 1860 (except for the translations of Shakespeare's work). Jungmann's mastery was clearly demonstrated by his combinations of new instruments of the Czech literature with new translating solutions. His choice of original literary works forced him to

introduce various stylistic nuances, needed in the given development stage of the Czech literature.

The importance of the need to overcome the difficulty of ensuring translating at the same stylistically equal level as the originals written in the communication language of highly cultivated social classes, which did not exist in Bohemia at the time was also highly appraised by Veselý (in: Hrala 2002; 130).

The bibliography of contributions to the translating theory (Levý 1996; 242 - 249) clearly shows the progress from marginal comments in grammar books and letters of linguists to separate theses and articles published within the context of literary-scientific theory.

4. Romantic Theories

4. 1. Romanticism in European Translation

From the point of general propositions of European Romantic translating Levý mentions (1996; 71 – 74) several basic characteristics. As opposed to the Classicists the Romanticists concentrated more on a national and historical costume. They tried to preserve the unique, i.e. national, historical and individual features. The Romanticists showed that every language had its own expressing oddities and that the language actively participated on the creation of the work. The individualist cult encouraged the translator to the effort to preserve also the individuality of the author. Therefore, they requested absolutely faithful translation. An ideal was the literal translation as it was proclaimed in the Introduction to the Essay in English literature by Chateaubriand who actually realized the principle of prosaic interlinear translation of the poem Milton's Paradise Lost by translating it. The Romanticists were more concerned with the preservation of own individual formal features of the author, i.e. word order, word selection and the whole way of expression, rather than with the preservation of the general prosodic form, common to a whole range of authors, for instance five-foot iamb. Romantic translating theories worked out in the most extreme consequences by German idealist philosophers, tried to preserve the foreign linguistic material. The Romanticists perceived the problems of translation more complicated than the Classicists because preserving the individuality of the author and the nation, psychically removed from the

author, was difficult. The Romanticists required preserving the peculiarity of the actual linguistic material. Logically, the requirement of absolute faithfulness was thus more connected with the thesis of the impossibility of the translation. The impossibility of identifying oneself with the original led to the knowledge of the subjective interventions of the translator into the work, to the term of translator's interpretation. Exactly that subjective distortion of a translation were to be cut to the minimum. Moreover, the Romanticists were aware of the fact that the translation was conditioned by historical period in which it was done and as such it was momentary. Translations had to be re-done to keep them in accordance with the contemporary situation of the language. During the Romantic period translations and original works distanced each other because the original work laid down the requirement of the originality and the translations were expected to be faithful. In his evaluation Levý (1996; 74) considers the notification of national and period particularity of the work as well as the requirement of preservation of author's individual style to be a great contribution of the Romanticism to the translating theory. However, according to Levý (1996; 74) the Romanticists did not manage to develop artistic instruments with which they could achieve such goals. Therefore, the practice in majority of literatures declined in many aspects. According to Levý (1996; 73), the most dangerous principle of Romantic translating theory was the requirement of the translating language. Therefore opposing theoretical systems of translating crystallized by the beginning of the 19th century. Both polar methods: adaptative translation ("liberal") and literal ("faithful") translation, and the oscillation between those two extremes was formed by the development of translating methods in the new Czech literature.

4. 2. Pre-Romanticism and Romanticism in the National Revival

4. 2. 1. The Features of the pre-Romantic and Romantic Translation

According to Levý (1996; 125 - 145), the development stages which took one and a half century in other cultures took place much later in the Czech literary environment and thus faster in the course of several decades. That was why works of some authors underwent qualitative changes that made their total classification even more difficult. Besides the methodical individuality of stages in the Czech literature was disrupted particularly because of the fact that the Czech literature subordinated cultural needs more directly than it was with other literatures. Therefore it is much more difficult to

divide the Czech literary and translating development into periods. Levý therefore does not mention any detailed classification of this stage. He is concerned with specific features of pre-Romantic and Romantic translating aesthetics realized in the 20s and 30s according to the needs of the Czech cultural situation during the National Revival period.

In the pre-Romantic period the anti-adaptative theory in European literatures brought the **requirement of the revision** of the existing translating practice. In Bohemia there was actually nothing to be revised, almost everything was still missing. An example of such experiment was however V. A. Svoboda who in 1847 published Schiller's anthology preceded then only by sporadic Jungmann's translations and Jan Ev. Purkyně's anthology. In case of translations from English Levý however, does not mention any similar example.

The requirement of the Romantic translating theory – literal translation – was considered an inferior translating method from the beginning of the new Czech translation. This requirement was also included in the introduction to V. A. Svoboda's anthology from Schiller. Among the most consistent theoreticians of the so-called faithfulness was in Czech lands August Schleicher. In 1843 Jan Erazim Vocel fought against Jakub Malý's adaptations in the translation of Othello. In consequence of the attempt to preserve the linguistic form of the poetic original there appeared two different types of the poetic translation: either translators could concentrate on the literality and translate poems by means of prose, or they could concentrate on the faithfulness to the metric form and then translate by the measure of the original.

In this period, the aesthetics and translating in different rhythmical schemes were contradictory. The reason was the fact that they formally drew away from the original and still the rhythm and the rhyme allowed them neither faithfulness to the expression nor the word order of the original text. Jan Erazim Vocel reproved Doucha for his translation of Thomson's *The Seasons* because he transformed Thomson's rhymeless iambs into Czech hexameters of regular meter which was of course contrary to the original. The formal faithfulness covered not only the meter but also the details as various deviations from the basic scheme or endings of verses and hemistiches. Those

suggestions were strongly linguistically conditioned, therefore by translating to another language they might become inorganic ballast. In the 1850s such faithfulness became a target to attack for the new generation of translators. In 1855 V. Zelený criticized Doucha's translation of Othello and compared it to Malý's translation from 1843. In 1840s not only the rhythmical fluency of verses but also the verse itself in connection with the original were considered, i.e. to what extent the translator sensed its meter. In Levý's evaluations such technique of overwriting poems was in accordance with the development needs of the Czech verse at the end of the 1850s: after a relative stabilisation of the prosodic system the acquisition of various artistic strophes represented other step to the enlargement of the formal vocabulary. With its meticulous faithfulness to the form the most procreative translator of this period, František Doucha, and to a smaller degree also some other Czech Romanticists enlarged the Czech literature with new strophic forms – for instance cansonas, sestinas, ghazals, which were popular among the Romanic nations.

Doucha's Romantic translating method may be demonstrated on his translation of the drama Romeo and Juliet. The extracts (see **Appendix 4A**) are taken from the third edition, i.e. from the reworked first edition published in 1847. (The corresponding parts of the English text are featured in **Appendix 4B**)

It is obvious from the above extracts that Doucha strives for being faithful to the original - in verse organization, substance sequence of the meaning in verses. As V. Zelený remarked in 1855 (Levý 1996; 129-130), in comparison with Malý's Othello this damages the facility and spontaneousness of the text.

The quest for almost meticulous literalness of the translation causes difficulties to express the meaning in general. He is not successful in sensing the multiple meaning of idioms and plays on words. The text is rather clumsy, probably due to translator's lower knowledge of idioms, he misses for instance ambiguity in erotic senses, perhaps also by reason of certain moralistic tendencies of the National Revival literature. The editor of the English edition, Evans, draws attention to the general association of a fish /poor-John/ with woman, with sexual passivity (Shakespeare, 1984; 54).

In his strive for faithful translating he explains English idioms in his explanatory notes listed in Poznamenání. In Poznamenání he also mentions:

Sluší se psát jména důsledně buď Merkurio a pak též Lorenzo, anebo Merkuzio a Lorenzo /Shak. píše Merkutio, Laurence/; volím způsob Merkuzio, protože se víc srovnává s ital.

(Romeo a Julie, Truchlohra v pěti jednáních od Viléma Shakespearea, přeložil František Doucha, Třetí vydání /druhého překladu vydání druhé/ v Praze, Nákladem knihkupectví I. L. Koberova, 1883; 126)

On the contrary with the translators of the previous periods, Doucha stipulates and implements the requirement of uniformity in mentioning foreign names in the work. His inclination to use Italian style of personal names is also interesting. It may correspond with his quest for faithfulness, in this case the environment in which the drama takes place.

Another characteristic translating type – translating verses by means of prose was also present in pre-Romantic and Romantic translating. In 1820 Jan Nejedlý published the prosaic translation of Young's Night Thoughts (*Kvílení noční*), in 1828 Čelakovský published his prosaic translation of Scott's epic poem The Lady of the Lake (*Panna jezerní*) of which only a few cantos were translated in verse. This translation represented the category of translations by means of prose where the prose was intentionally used on the contrary with the faithful descriptive translations promoted in theoretical thesis by the Western European Romanticism. Čelakovský used the Polish translation. The rhythmical prose of a similar type as The Lady of the Lake was the product of the strange situation that occurred before the beginnings of Czech Romanticism. Čelakovský's solution of verse translation by means of prose may be illustrated in the extracts of the 1st and the 9th cantos (in **Appendix 5A**; the corresponding passages of the English original text are featured in **Appendix 5B**).

Levý (1996; 133) emphasizes both syntactic and rhyme solution of the translation. While translating the couplets in the original, Čelakovský uses a simple sentence for each verse. To correspond with the couplets two clauses are connected into coordinated sentences or in dual compound sentences. The metrical principle of the original is thus expressed by means of syntactic symmetry. The rhyme of the sentences is supported by the inclination to the postposition of adjectives and verbs. Up to this, by changes in word order Čelakovský puts the climax at the beginning thus increasing the cadence of

the sentences. The duality is expressed also by means of contrasting connection of clauses, e.g. *jako...tak* (both...and). Nevertheless the language of the poem is rather moderate. The mentioned explanatory note in *Poznamenání* illustrates Čelakovský's explanation of geographical terms, historical associations, persons, which is kept in accordance with the original. He also explains some allusions of various superstitions however, he does not try to localize them. With this work Čelakovský continued in the development line of Czech pre-Romantic translating.

The Western European Romantic requirement of the faithfulness to the individual style was in the Czech translating criticism of this period applied very seldom, particularly in the case of Homer. The characteristic feature of the Czech development was a weakened interest in unique styles of individual authors. The consistent effort to involve the above-the-individual, i.e. historical, mainly national features of foreign literatures, above all in their most expressive product, in the folk poetry was rather more important. This was natural with the nation whose national idea gave right to the Czech literature to exist. The Romantic cult of folklore was supported by matching the folklore and the nationality. Echoes of folklore poetic art were also in favour. The interest in folklore poetic art included songs, proverbs, saws both Czech and foreign, mainly of Slavic languages. Speaking of English Čelakovský's *Balady staroanglické a skotské* from 1855 were popular. The translations from Slavic folklore poetry further enriched the Czech lexicon however, the loanwords did not represent the mere enrichment of the Czech language. They also acquired the local colouring value. Classical paraphrases posed as the work of a foreign author but stylistically they reshaped the original into the contemporary work of local literature (for instance Pope's *Odyssey* wanted to be the English version of Homer but in fact it was another Classical poem by Pope). The Romantic paraphrases on the contrary posed as the original work however, they tried to vary from the original literature by taking over motives as well as stylistic principles of the foreign environment.

The requirement of Romantic theses of historical atmosphere preservation resulted in the Czech translating of this period in the strive for linguistic archaisms while translating the Classics as described by Antonín Liška in his article called *Domněnka o*

zčeštění Homéra published in *Krok* magazine in 1827. It was František Palacký who came out against this as he was afraid of the literature comprehensibility.

The requirement of special translating language which was created by idealist theorists of the most extreme Romanticism in Germany served to the national idea in Bohemia. Czech translators used the special translating language only in those cases when they looked for any support against germanization while the Czech language was converging with another language, i.e. besides the Slavic languages also, though exceptionally, with Greek. The evidence of it was Šír's prologue to the first volume of *Výbor ze spisovatelů řeckých*. Šír requested the Czech to master the advantages of Greek and therefore he kept the Greek word order and translated literally regardless the prosodic form of the original.

The Romanticists' attitude of not considering the translation as an equal work of domestic literature but rather as a means of learning the original strengthened publishing bilingual editions in the 1830s – 1850s – the original was printed opposite the translation. This was particularly in the genres which were translated for their national or historical individuality: in case of popular poetry and especially in case of translations from Slavic languages.

4.2.2. The Developmental Viewpoints of the pre-Romantic and Romantic Translation

In Levý's evaluation the influence of Romantic aesthetics on Czech translating was at less gifted author misleading. It brought a certain enrichment only to a limited group of authors whose Romantic subjectivism was adjusted by their objective attitude to the reality. This is the case of Čelakovský and to a smaller extent also of Hanka. The main contribution of the 1830s and 1840s theory to the history of the Czech translation was the fact that for the first time in the new Czech translation the reproduction aspect took the priority over all other aspects. This marked the end the National Revival era and the 1830 and 1840s theory included the presumptions for further development of the Czech after-the-National-Revival translation.

B. Mánek (1991) is in his works devoted to the Romantic translations from English in more details but with a rather different tone. Following the bibliography of Czech translations from the 19th century English and American poetry he reflects the question of selection of the work to be translated. According to Mánek it is the indicator of what from the world literature was considered important to make accessible in Czech for wider masses of the forming nation. It is the selection of works by which he supports the influence of European pre-Romanticism and Romanticism on the Czech literature during the National Revival.

In Mánek's classification (1991; 8 – 12) the poetry of Sentimentalism and pre-Romanticism forms a vast group of translations – J. Thomson, T. Gray, O. Goldsmith, E. Young, J. Macpherson and with them associated ballads and contemporary literary output inspired by them – T. Percy, W. Scott, translated by J. Jungmann, J. Nejedlý, V. Nejedlý, B. Tablic, F. Palacký, F. L. Čelakovský, S. K. Macháček, J. Hollmann or F. Doucha. Mánek involves also Milton's *Paradise Lost* (1667), though it is often considered the peak of English Renaissance (Craig, Hardin, *Dějiny anglické literatury*, 1963 [A History of English Literature]; 379 – reference in: Mánek 1991; 9) or even of Baroque (Sypher, Wylie, *Od renesance k baroku*, 1971 [Four Stages of Renaissance Style]; 19 – reference in: Mánek 1991; 9), because there was a group of the English representatives of the so-called “true poetry” who professed Milton, later called Sentimentalists or pre-Romanticists. Opposite to Levý, Mánek emphasizes Jungmann's choice of Milton's *Paradise Lost* for translation due to the revived interest in this work in European literatures at the turn of the century just in connection with the Sentimentalist and pre-Romantic schools and not only as a historical monument that would only serve as the basis for expanding possibilities of the period literary language. The translations of this poem emerged above all in the 1810s and 1820s. F. Doucha's translation of the whole Thomson's *The Seasons*, (1730, 1744), a work that marked the end of Classicism and the beginning of Sentimentalism, was published in 1842. Since 1836 some extracts appeared in magazines.

Mánek's classification involves another group which represented the part of the period English Romantic poetry – W. Scott, G. G. Byron, T. Moore in translations by F. L. Čelakovský, J. Hollmann, K. F. Dräxler, J. Malý, J. J. Kalina, J. J. Kolár, K. Sabina, F.

L. Rieger. The existence of those translations corresponded with the key epochs of the development of Czech Romanticism that proceeded in the 1830s to 1850s, which was influenced by the attitude to the work of K. H. Mácha: translations of Byron in the mid-30s, Sabina's and Rieger's translations of Moore, Sabina's translation of Chasles's essay on contemporary English poetry at the beginning of the 1840s. There was a great boom in the 1850s when E. B. Kaizl, J. V. Frič, L. Čelakovský, F. Doucha and J. Čejka introduced J. Burns, G. G. Byron, T. Campell, T. Moore, P. B. Shelley, A. Tennyson and first Americans as H. Longfellow, E. A. Poe, W. C. Briant or Ch. F. Hoffman to Czech readers.

According to B. Mánek, an independent group is formed by the translations of Shakespeare. Although his work was perceived as above-the-genre during the Czech National Revival the increase of interest in Shakespeare was connected with the beginning of Romanticism in European literatures. However, the Czech translators treated his works to a large degree from the Romantic perspective. The first Czech interpretation and prosaic paraphrase of several passages of Shakespeare's Sonnets in the essay by A. J. Vrt'átko (*Duševní život západní Evropy v posledních stoletích*, Květy 5, příloha X, 1838; 37 – 40 - reference in: Mánek 1991; 11) was also Romantic. The line of the Sonnets as poet's "keys to the heart" was then followed by several extracts by E. B. Kaizl (*Shakespearovy znělky. Obrazy života 2*, 1860; 21 –23 – reference in: Mánek 1991; 11). It was the ballad which was preferred by the Romanticists. It resembled both folk art and the remembrance of famous history at the same time. It corresponded with the interests of the National Revival and therefore it was often imitated and translated. B. Tablic and V. Nejedlý published their translations of English ballads adapted by T. Percy and D. Mallet. However, compiling social problems in new forms, as required by Romanticism, met serious problems. In this context the Czech reception of Byron was very typical.

The idea of Romanticism promotion in the Czech literature meant the period of clashing with fears that it could have a harmful influence on national interests of the Czech literature. This struggle took place particularly in the discussion about Byron and his influence on Mácha. So the translations of his works played an important role in this connection.

Bohuslav Mánek (1991; 23 – 46, 127 - 130) again classifies this development on the basis of the bibliography. He classifies five stages of the Czech translations of Byron:

Firstly, 1823 – 1836 – the period of initial reception before publishing Mácha's *Máj*, first significant display of Czech Romanticism. The first so far found translation was printed even during Byron's life in *Čechoslav* magazine in 1823. Its author was the poet Karel Ferdinand Dräxler, publishing under the pseudonym Manfred. His poem *Nesmrtelnost "dle Byrona od Manfreda"* ("according to Byron by Manfred") was only a very loose translation of one of the Hebrew Melodies (1815) – the poem When Coldness wraps this suffering Clay. Seven years later Jan Nepomuk Lhota translated the tale *Mazeppa*, in National Revivalist graphics written as *Maceppa*, original *Mazeppa* (1819), attractive for Slavic themes, for the victory of the Slavic Russian army over the Swedes at Poltava. With regard to the level of the Czech poetic language and verse it represented a translating problem. Therefore he decided to translate it by means of prose (published under his name J. L. Květoslav Bystřický, schoolmate of K. H. Mácha), and he managed it successfully.

When translating *Mazeppa* by means of prose, technical demands of the translation played an important role. The literary mature original was translated into the language with disrupted developmental continuity that had not settled yet in the new epoch and that – in the period of the translation – disposed with only a few perfect poetic works usually of a different character which had a limiting effect on the language as a translating instrument. Another aspect was the translating poetics of pre-Romanticism and Romanticism which permitted the translation of verses by means of prose. According to Levý's classification which divides translations into artistic and literal, Lhota's translation ranks in the category of artistic translations where the fable was the organizing dominant.

In another published translation (1834) Jakub Malý tried to express also the main formal features of the original, Byron's short love poetry called *Stanzas for Music*: "There be none of Beauty's daughter" (1815). Also the translations of the Hebrew Melodies (1815) by J. J. Kolár, J. J. Kalina, E. B. Kaizl were not random. The reason was that those poems were the most ideologically acceptable from all of Byron's work in the

Revivalist conditions. They were not evidently Romantic and there was a rich repertoire of means of expressions for the biblical themes of the collection. Both the Czech Baroque poetry and the developing new Czech poetry made it easier in terms of translational mastering and it protected it from the censorship interventions. The topic of outcasts, oppressed nations as well as individuals longing for freedom, contrast of adverse presence and famous past reverberated with patriotic line in the literature before the March.

Those translations are the evidence of the fact that in the 1830s translators chose only those Byron's work to be introduced to the Czech literature which were less conflicting. The Revivalist syncretism endured and the used translating procedures incorporating foreign works into the context of the domestic literature as close as possible only intensified the resistance of the Czech opponents of Romantic literary works.

Secondly, 1836 – 1850 – the period of conceptual discussion and supporting Romanticism with the core in 1838 – 42 (bibliography 10-15). In the 1830s the opposing opinions to Byron and his unsuitability for the Czech literature were expressed above all in reviews of Mácha's *Máj* (1836). According to V. Jiráček (*Duch a tvar*, 1967; 109 – 126 – reference in: Mánek 1991; 33) in the dispute about Byron's work principal conceptual questions of the Czech literature and its development were being solved. The dissenting attitude to Byron and Romanticism in general could be seen at Chmelenský, Tyl or Jan Kollár. Around 1840 there was a great opinion clash – the discussion on “harrow characters”, Byron and Byronism. According to P. Vašák's summary there was a larger variety in its treatment. The positive opinions on Byron strengthened. Sabina refused any fears of the national language's destiny but simultaneously he could see the necessity of further development of the domestic as well as translational literature. It was Sabina who was the major advocate of Macha's poetry, of Byron and Romanticism on the whole in the 1840s. He published several translations of Moore's poems and in 1841 he translated for *Květy* magazine an article by Philarète Chasles called *Novější básnická literatura anglická* where some more information on other Romanticists was provided. Josef Jiří Kolár translated the text from the Hebrew Melodies *Vidění Balšazára* concerning the biblical topic of the loss of the ruler's – tyrant's authority. Josef Jaroslav Kalina (1841) translated the whole tale *Parisina* (1816). However, Kolár

translated only a passage from the beginning of *Parisina*. Kalina's translation of the whole poetic story *Parisina*, of the extract from *The Corsair* and the collection of *Hebrew Melodies* as well as Kolár's translation of the passage from the beginning of *Parisina* are results of the solution of the dispute leading to the acceptance of Byron in the Czech literature.

In the 1830s and 1840s it was Matěj Milota Zdirad Polák (in: Mánek 1991; 37 – bibliography 19–23) who was rather intensively interested in translations from Byron. Discussions around the year 1840 disproved the opinion of negative attitudes to Byron and Byronism – Romanticism in the context of social reception of Mácha's poetry, and it created space for further development of the Czech literary Romanticism. However, the large and influential part of opponents did not change their opinion. There appeared some judgements about too big share of “foreign” elements in the existing Czech literature introduced particularly by translations, as for instance by J. E. Vocel (1843). In discussions about the development of the Czech literature in the 1850s the interest in positive perception of Romanticism was markedly asserted and it signified a rebirth for the Czech literature, even though it was still refused as too individualistic, insufficiently acknowledging moral ideas or even harmful to national interests of the Czech literature, it was expressed for instance by Ludovít Štúr in the chapter called *Byron* in his book *O národních písních a pověstech plemen slovanských* from 1853 (p. 18, in: Mánek 1991; 41). In the dispute about the question of connection between the Czech literature and the development of European literatures František Bronislav Kořínek advocated for Romanticism in his two important treatises from 1853 and 1854. He highlighted the folklore and the language of F. L. Čelakovský (Mánek 1991; 43) rather than Mácha's works even though only from the point of view of “the connection of national and modern elements” in the Czech literature.

Thirdly, 1852 – 1864 - *Máj* translation epoch with the increased reception of Byron started. With the rise of Romanticism at the generation of Mácha's *Máj* followers at the beginning of the 1850s, Byron was increasingly represented, especially typically Romantic poems *Tma* and *Sen* – translated by Fr. Doucha. Among the well-known translators of that time were Ladislav Čelakovský and Edmund Břetislav Kaizl. Ladislav Čelakovský published in magazines the whole *Hebrew Melodies* except one

poem. Kaizl translated the story The Prisoner of Chillon (*Vězen chillonský*), the first Czech extract from Childe Harold's Pilgrimage and also several poems from the Hebrew Melodies. The extract from the Childe Harold's Pilgrimage may demonstrate Kaizl's attitude to translation – the first and the last strophe of his *Loučení Childe Harolda* (see **Appendix 6A**; the original text is featured in **Appendix 6B**).

It is obvious from the extract that Kaizl tries to achieve a literal translation and to preserve the form too – he strives for expressing the rhythmic and rhyme form of the original. He concentrates on a quatrain, the basic unit is the verse and he does not add any verses. His translation is quite fluent. With regard to the rhyme however he must treat freely the semantics of the text, the motives or even he must insert words in order to keep the rhyming (for instance *ples, stráň*). He has not any problem with not understanding the English terms.

Kaizl's translation demonstrates the Romantic conceptions of translation theoretically formulated in the 1840s which emphasized the literality and maximum preservation of the original form. According to Mánek (1991; 110) Kaizl's faithfulness to the original is rather superficial.

In the first half of the 1850s a significant contribution to the enforcement of Romanticism was Pichl's anthology called *Společenský krasořečník český* (1852-53).

Besides Byron also Thomas Moore was systematically translated (Mánek 1991; 45), and the first translations of contemporary poets as A. Tennyson, H. W. Longfellow or E. A. Poe appeared. Up to this, in the 1850s there were several small examples of translations from P. B. Shelley and W. Wordsworth, i.e. the Romanticists of the “*jezerní škola*” (“Lake School”). The translators endeavoured to get a wider view of the English and American poetry by means of translation.

Fourthly, 1867 – 1871 – the *Máj* translation epoch was topped off.

Fifthly, the last epoch had two partial stages: 1872 – 1890 – *Lumír* translation, 1891 – 1919 – continuation realized by the translators methodically dependent on the *Lumír* followers.

The last two epochs are not discussed since they are beyond the terms of this work.

Levý (1996; 159 - 161) in his view accentuating the language standpoint in the National Revival translations adverts to the fact that the main point of the polemics over the Byronism was not how the translators solved the problems of linguistic re-stylization but how they treated the ideas of the original. The authors from the circle of *Lada Niola* as well as *Máj* translated freely and in their critical manifestations they fought against the literality. *Máj* followers thus opposed the “faithfulness” of the Romantic translators from the previous decades and they used the similar method as the last Jungmann followers, as for instance Malý. However, there was a difference in the purposes why they used the adaptative method. Malý adapted regarding the elegance. According to Levý the linguistic questions were almost solved and the new generation of translators considered them as insignificant. The main effort was directed to the matter itself. When solving the questions of linguistic re-stylization it did not concern the needs of the Czech language any longer but it rather concerned the best way of reproduction. What was important was the problem of stylistic equivalents for individual languages and the questions of stylistic substitution.

5. Conclusion

The literature of the National Revival faced the difficult task of creating the means for the development of the Czech literature both in the lexical and stylistic sphere and also in the sphere of form, of creating fully valid works of the national literature comparable with the literary works of advanced European literatures. The translation played an important part in the fulfilment of this task. Because the translation of poetry served this purpose better than prose, it was poetry that was most frequently represented among the key translated works.

Especially at the beginnings the Revivalist translation was of fundamental importance for enriching the vocabulary of the modern Czech language. In their search for missing equivalent expressions for the translation the translators helped themselves by creating neologisms or taking over words from other Slavic languages, especially Polish. The level of the vocabulary and the nature of lexical difficulties can be seen from the explanatory notes provided. As can be seen from the extracts given above, the translators explained the meaning of the less comprehensible words ("*pozatmělá slova*") to the reader by means of a synonym in brackets or in the explanatory notes by means of

a Czech explanation or German or Latin synonyms. A further enrichment were the explanations of foreign geographical, historical and mythological names and terms. The example of the vocabulary of less comprehensible words ("*pozatmělá slova*") in Jungmann's *Ztracený ráj* (Paradise Lost) shows that, despite the criticism of that time, many of the words thus created took root and became a part of the Czech vocabulary.

The Romantic translators already had a wider vocabulary at disposal and they no longer had to explain individual Czech words, as shown by the explanations, which concern rather life and context. Nevertheless, a certain lack of stability could be seen in the language, which worsens the intelligibility of the text.

Due to the fact that in the initial phases of the Revivalist translation, mainly Classicist, the translators did not know much English and therefore worked on the basis of the translations in other languages, especially Polish and German, they did not have to deal with the need to face up to the English expressions and idioms. References to an English expression rarely occurred in the explanatory notes. These difficulties only appeared later on, when the translations were made from the English original, mainly thanks to the efforts of the Romantic translators. In their efforts for the faithful translation difficulties appeared that stemmed from the insufficient knowledge of English and low standard of the English dictionaries available. In the translations some mistakes occurred more frequently because of misunderstanding of English expressions. English expressions were therefore more frequently explained in explanations, as well as English life and institutions. Comparing Malý's Classicist translation and Doucha's Romantic translation it is evident that the representatives of both methods had problems with understanding the English original correctly, but the Classicist principle of a looser translation adapted to the language of the translation made it possible to avoid some expressions that were difficult to translate, for example, by omitting whole passages.

Similar lexical problems were also tackled by the translators of prose, as can be seen from Fialka's translation extract. Due to the fact that prose was intended for a wider range of readers, more localisation was used in the translation, although not consistently, as could be seen from the way of translating proper names into Czech.

Only at the end of the National Revivalist the number of vocabulary errors decreased because the knowledge of English, as illustrated by the extract from Kaizl's translation, already permitted relatively accurate expressing of meanings, although rather verbatim in nature.

Only the following generation of translators was able to use the thus created richness of the linguistic means as well as their own knowledge of English for the faithful translation of the original from the viewpoint of stylistic qualities and links to the English context.

From the point of view of style the Revivalist efforts to create a higher style were better served by translations of poetry, represented in particular by the translations of Jungmann and Nejedlý. To achieve this they used pathetic language with a rich abstract vocabulary and mythological themes. The Classicist perception of translation also suited the Revivalist need for the creation of a usual form that would be in accordance with the possibilities of the expression of the specific language, in this case Czech. Jungmann promoted the hexameter as such a form. How the effort to maintain this form affected the sense of the verses is clear from his translation of *Paradise Lost*.

The Classicist translators, in keeping with their concept of translating in a form usual for the language of the translation, did not have to struggle much with the difficulties of transferring the form of the original English verses with regard to the difference in particular in the stress in English and Czech. They resolved the problem how to keep the meter and at the same time to keep as much as possible to the content of the verse.

The Romantic concept of the faithful translation, i.e. also from the viewpoint of the form, forced the translators into greater richness in form and thus also to the transferring new forms into the Czech literature. The conflict between faith to the form or to the content was resolved by inclining either more to the content or to the form, as could be seen from the extracts from Čelakovský's *Panna jezerní* (*The Lady of the Lake*), Doucha's *Romeo a Julie* (*Romeo and Juliet*) and Kaizl's *Loučení Childe Harolda* (*Childre Harold's Pilgrimage*). Whereas in the case of Čelakovský the basis was the content unit of the verse, Doucha tried to maintain the motifs and the content sequence of the verse so he translated the verse in less intelligible and accurate one, which forced

him to a larger number of verses. In his effort to be faithful first and foremost in the rhythm and rhyme of the verse Kaizl crumbled the poem and lost the deeper content.

As noted by Mánek (1991; 108), these translations, especially Doucha's, became the basis of the lumír-ruch style, which was already able to translate even the more complex internal division of the verse. Through the fulfilment of the Revivalist utilitarian approach to the translation as an instrument for the construction of linguistic means for the development of the new Czech literature a background was created for understanding the significance of a literary work and of the translation, especially in its aesthetic sense.

Tato práce popisuje formující se teorie překladu v období národního obrození na základě moderních, historických a teoretických studií a dobových materiálů se zřetelem na překlady děl anglických autorů. Historický úvod popisuje vývoj českého překladatelství od středověku po pobělohorské období, v němž vrcholem českého překladatelského úsilí jsou překlady humanistů a díla jednoty bratrské. Další kapitola je věnována charakteristice klasicistického přístupu k překladu v evropské literatuře, podrobně popisuje vytváření teoretických tezí překladu od okrajových poznámek jazykovědců v přípravném období obrozeneckém až po formulování klasicistických teoretických statí ve vrcholném období obrozeneckém, za jehož nejvýznamnější postavy lze považovat Jungmanna a Malého. Na ukázkách z překladů Jungmannova Ztraceného ráje, Malého Othella a Fialkova Olivera Twista jsou ilustrovány klasicistické přístupy volného překladu, analyzovány z hlediska řešení v oblasti lexika, formy a stylu. Následující kapitola obdobně podává charakteristiku romantických teorií překladu v evropských literaturách a podrobné charakteristiky obrozeneckého romantického překladu s ukázkami řešení rozporu mezi snahou o věrnost originálu ve formě a v obsahu v díle nejvýznamnějšího českého romantického překladatele Františka Douchy v jeho překladu Romea a Julie a v překladu poezie rytmizovanou prózou Čelakovského Panny jezerní i Kaizlova překladu Loučení Childe Harolda. V závěru jsou shrnuty charakteristiky vývoje obrozeneckého překladu, konkrétně z anglických autorů, od hledání prostředků lexikálních, stylových a forem k jejich zformování na takovou úroveň, že na konci období je již vytvořen předpoklad pro český překlad v především jeho estetickém smyslu.

Appendices

Appendix 1A

... Zříš onyno
plané, vyprahlé a pusté roviny,
sídlo zkázy, bezsvětlé, krom sinalých
mihot toho bledého a strašného
plamene? Tam pojd'me z jeku ohnivých
těchto vln, a jestliže tam oddechu,
oddechněme sobě: tam svá ubitá
shromáždívše vojska porokujeme,
kterak bychom vrahu svému napotom
ublížili nejvíce, jak ztráty své
nabyli, a znikli této ukrutné
psoty; jaké pookřání v naději,
a kdy nic, co zbývá rady v zoufání?

verš 190

Takto mluvil Satan k druhu blízkému,
vzdvihna hlavu nad vlny a očima
plaje jiskřícíma; těla ostatkem
plyna ležel, rozprostřený v šíř a dél,
s mnohá jitra: velikosti tak náramné,
jako, o nichž líčí bájka, potvorní
Titanové⁷⁾ zemorodci válčivší
s Jovem, Briarej a Tyfon, bydlitel
sluje Tarsu starého, ...

verš 211

⁷⁾ *Titanové*, synové nebe i země. Jeden z nich, Gyges, měl sto ruk a padesáte hlav. *Tyfon* (Typhoeus) maluje se od básníků jako soptící ohněm potvora. Před ním bohové do Egypta utekli, v zvířata se proměnivše; posléz ho Jupiter hromem odklidil. *Tarsus*, město v malé Asii, v krajině Cilicii.

(Jana Miliona Ztracený ráj, 3. vyd., 1889 v Praze, nakl. I. L. Kober; 10)

Appendix 1B

Seest thou yon dreary Plain, forlorn and wild,
The seat of desolation, void of light,
Save what the glimmering of these livid flames
Casts pale and dreadful? Thither let us tend
From off the tossing of these fiery waves,
There rest, if any rest can harbour there,
And reassembling our afflicted Powers,
Consult how we may henceforth most offend
Our Enemy, our own loss how repair,
How overcome this dire Calamity,

verse 180

What reinforcement we may gain from Hope,
If not what resolution from despair.“

Thus Satan talking to his nearest Mate
With Head uplift above the wave, and Eyes
That sparking blaz'd, his other Parts besides
Prone on the Flood, extended long and large
Lay floating many a rood, in bulk as huge
As whom the Fables name of monstrous size,
Titanian, or Earth-born, that warr'd on Jove
Briareos or Typhon, whom the Den
By ancient Tarsus held, ...

verse 200

(John Milton Paradise Lost, Penguin Books, 1989; 10)

Appendix 2A

Jago

...

Neb, příteli,
tak jisto, jako že jste Roderigo,
kdybych byl mouřenín, nebyl bych Jago¹⁾.
Když sloužím jemu, sloužím sobě jen;
ne z lásky snad anebo povinnosti,
jak Bůh můj svědek, jenom na oko
a pro svůj prospěch! Jest-li že
mé chování kdy zradí povahu
a pravý způsob mého srdce, vstrčím
své srdce na rukáv, by klofaly
je kavky. – Nejsemt' já co jsem.²⁾

....

Jago Zatřeste otcem
jejím a zbud'te ho, nepus'te více,
radost mu otravte a po městě
rozneste jej, poštvěte příbuzné;
pod lahodným-li žije nebem, trapte
jej mouchami, a pakli radost mu
jest radostí, přineste tolik muk
by barvu změnila.

(Jakub Malý, Othello, mouřenín Benátský, v Praze 1868, v komissí u Fr. Řivnáče 1869;
2-3)

Appendix 2B

...

For, sir,
It is as sure as you are Roderigo,
Were I the Moor, I would not be Iago:

In following him, I follow but myself.
Heaven is my judge, not I for love and duty,
but seeming so far my peculiar end:
For when my outward action doth demonstrate
The native act and figure of my heart
In compliment extern, 'tis not long after,
But I will wear my heart upon my sleeve
For daws to peck at – I am not what I am.

...

Iago
Call up her father,
Rouse him, make after him, poison his delight,
Proclaim him in the streets; incense her kinsmen,
And, though he in a fertile climate dwell,
Plague him with flies: though that his joy be joy,
Yet throw such chance of vexation on't,
As it may lose some colour.

(William Shakespeare, *Othello*, edited by Kenneth Muir, Penguin Books, 1968; 53)

Appendix 2C

Desmona
Well praised: How if she be black and witty?
Iago
If she be black, and thereto have a wit,
She'll find a white that shall her blackness fit.

(William Shakespeare, *Othello*, edited by Kenneth Muir, Penguin Books, 1968; 81)

Appendix 2D

Desdemona Do you know, sirah, where Lieutenant Cassio lies?
Clown I dare not say he lies anywhere.
Desdemona Why, man?
Clown He's a soldier, and for one to say a soldier lies is stabbing.
Desdemona Go to! Where lodges he?
Clown To tell you where he lodges is to tell you where I lie.
Desdemona Can anything be made of this?
Clown I know not where he lodges, and for me to devise a lodging, and say he lies here, or he lies there, were to lie in mine own throat.
Desdemona Can you inquire him out? And be edified by report?
Clown I will catechize the world for him, that is, make questions, and by them answer.

(William Shakespeare, *Othello*, edited by Kenneth Muir, Penguin Books, 1968; 122-123)

Appendix 3A

„Inu, co v domě zásob míti musím, abych to děťátkám do kuleše^{x)} přimíchala, když jim je nanic,“ odpověděla paní Mannová, otvírajíc jarmaru v rohu a vyndávající lahev a sklenici. „Je to borovička^{xx)}“

„Dáváte dětem to kuleše, paní Mannová?“ ptal se pan Bumbal, oči nespouštěje z rukou jejích, ana mu nápoj míchala.

^{x)} Kuleše aneb kuleša u Slováků druh škubáneků čili kaše ovesná

^{xx)} Borovička slvsk jalovcová pálenka, anglicky džin-oblíbený Angličanům nápoj

(Oliver Twist aneb Mladictví sirotka, zčeštil M. Fialka z anglického C. Dickensa /Boza/, v Praze, 1844, tisk a sklad Jaroslava Pospejšila; 17).

U stolu za ním seděli Ferina, Karlík, Chitling, s velikou pozorností whist hrajíce přičemž Ferina s hastrošem^{x)} proti Karlíkovi a Chitlingovi hrál.

^{x)} s hastrošem hrát, anglicky to take dummy, způsob whistu, když se hráče nedostává a jeden dvojnásobně hrou vládne

(Oliver Twist aneb Mladictví sirotka, zčeštil M. Fialka z anglického C. Dickensa /Boza/, v Praze, 1844, tisk a sklad Jaroslava Pospejšila; 403).

Anežka Flemingovna

(Oliver Twist aneb Mladictví sirotka, zčeštil M. Fialka z anglického C. Dickensa /Boza/, v Praze, 1844, tisk a sklad Jaroslava Pospejšila; 401).

Appendix 3B

“Why, it’s what I’m obliged to keep a little of in the house, to put into the blessed infants’ Daffy¹⁾ when they ain’t well, Mr Bumble,” replied Mrs Mann as she opened a corner cupboard, and took down a bottle and glass. “It’s gin. I’ll not deceive you, Mr. B. It’s gin.”

“Do you give the children Daffy, Mrs Mann?” inquired Bumble, following with his eyes the interesting process of mixing.

(Charles Dickens, Oliver Twist, Penguin Books, 1970; 51)

¹⁾ Daffy: So called after a seventeenth-century clergyman, daffy was a medicine for children. It was a mixture of senna to which gin was commonly added, and hence became the slang name for gin itself.

(Charles Dickens, Oliver Twist, Penguin Books, 1970; 487)

At a table behing him sat the Artful Dodger, Master Charles Bates and Mr Chitling, all intent upon a game of whist; The Artful taking dummy against Mater Bates and Mr Chitling.

(Charles Dickens, Oliver Twist, Penguin Books, 1970; 229)

Young Agnes Fleming

(Charles Dickens, Oliver Twist, Penguin Books, 1970; 457)

Appendix 4A

Sam. Na mou věru, Gregorio, toho uhlí na podpal nebudeme snášet¹⁾.

Greg. Ba ne; toť bychom byli uhlíři napálení.

Sam. Jáť myslím, když nás dopálí, že uhlídáme, jak vytasit.

Greg. Ano, vytasíš, co živ, svou palici z úhlův obojku.

Sam. Já hbitě udeřím, když mne někdo popudí.

Greg. Nebýváš ale hbitě popuzen, bys udeřil.

Sam. Z domu Montekova mne pes popudí.

Greg. Popudit jest „pudit dál“, a statný být jest „pevně stát“; proto jsili popuzen, utíkáš.

Sam. Z toho domu pes mne dopudí, bych stál. Budu zdi hájit proti každému, ať děvečka u Monteků.

(Romeo a Julie, Truchlohra v pěti jednáních od Viléma Shakespearea, přeložil František Doucha, Třetí vydání /druhého překladu vydání druhé/ v Praze, Nákladem knihkupectví I. L. Kbrova, 1883; 5)

¹⁾ „uhlí snášet“ tj. nedám se urážet a příkoří líbit. Přísloví „to carry coals“ ke kterému se zde víže čtverá hříčka se slovy coals uhlí, colliers uhlíři, choler zlost, dopálení a collar obojek, zavírá v sobě smysl opovázlivosti. Shak. užívá totéž v „Jindřichu V.“; 3,2: „že by mohli uhlí vozit“

(Romeo a Julie, Truchlohra v pěti jednáních od Viléma Shakespearea, přeložil František Doucha, Třetí vydání /druhého překladu vydání druhé/ v Praze, Nákladem knihkupectví I. L. Kbrova, 1883; 126)

Greg. Musí se to pojmout smyslem, jakým kdo cítí.

Sam. Mne ucítí; v tom se dovedu postaviti; známoť, že jsem hezký kousek masa.

Greg. Máš dobře, masná ryba nejsi; kdybys byl, měl bys jméno „mořský oslík“⁽²⁾.

Vytas nástroj, tu jde cosi z domu Montekův.

(Romeo a Julie, Truchlohra v pěti jednáních od Viléma Shakespearea, přeložil František Doucha, Třetí vydání /druhého překladu vydání druhé/ v Praze, Nákladem knihkupectví I. L. Kbrova, 1883; 6)

2) „Mořský oslík“. V orig. kde jest žert o rybě, kladeno Poor-John /Cabeljan/ ve smyslu „hlupec“, s čímž se srovnává česky té ryby název „mořský oslík“ – hodil by se též „okoun“ ve smyslu „klacek“ /srov. okouněti se = klackovati se/. Hned potom „tu jde cosi“

přeloženo, ale čtené „here come“ /srov. vyd. 1599, jak je uveřejnil Tycho Mommsen, verš 30,

Prolegom str. 27 /jiné vydání mají two, t.j. jdou tu dva atd./ v mém prvním překladě/

(Romeo a Julie, Truchlohra v pěti jednáních od Viléma Shakespearea, přeložil František Doucha, Třetí vydání /druhého překladu vydání druhé/ v Praze, Nákladem knihkupectví I. L. Kobrova, 1883; 126)

Rom. V tomť láska dopouští se provinění. –
Strast má až těžko na prsou mi leží;
tvá soustrast rozplodem ji více stěží:
tou láskou, kterouž ke mně projevuješ,
žal můj, až přílišný již, rozmnožuješ.
Jest láska dým, ze vzdechův páry spojen:
očištěna, blysk v očích milců strojen;
však mořena, že slzí milců moře.

(Romeo a Julie, Truchlohra v pěti jednáních od Viléma Shakespearea, přeložil František Doucha, Třetí vydání /druhého překladu vydání druhé/ v Praze, Nákladem knihkupectví I. L. Kobrova, 1883; 12)

Appendix 4B

Sampson	Gregory, on my word, we'll not carry coals.
Gregory	No, for then we should be colliers.
Sampson	I mean, and we be in choler, we'll draw.
Gregory	Ay, while you live, draw your neck out of collar.
Sampson	I strike quickly, being moved.
Gregory	But thou art not quickly moved to strike.
Sampson	A dog of the house of Montague moves me.
Gregory	To move is to stir, and to be valiant is to stand: therefore if thou art moved thou run'st away.
Sampson	A dog of that house shall move me to stand: I will take the wall of any man or maid of Montague's.

(William Shakespeare, Romeo and Juliet, The New Cambridge Shakespeare, Edited by G. Blackmore Evans, Cambridge University Press, 1984; 54)

Gregory They must take it in sense that feel it.
Sampson Me they shall feel while I am able to stand, and 'tis known I am a pretty
 piece of flesh.
Gregory 'Tis well thou art not fish; if thou hadst, thou hadst been poor-John. Draw
 thy tool, here comes of the house of Montagues.
(William Shakespeare, *Romeo and Juliet*, *The New Cambridge Shakespeare*, Edited by
G. Blackmore Evans, Cambridge University Press, 1984; 55)

Romeo Why, such is love's transgression:
 Griefs of mine own lie heavy in my breast,
 Which thou wilt propagate to have it pressed
 With more of thine; this love that thou hast shown
 Doth add more grief to too much of mine own.
 Love is a smoke made with the fume of sights,
 Being purged, a fire sparkling in lovers' eyes,
 Being vexed, a sea nourished with loving tears.

(William Shakespeare, *Romeo and Juliet*, *The New Cambridge Shakespeare*, Edited by
G. Blackmore Evans, Cambridge University Press, 1984; 62)

Appendix 5A

Jelen napojiv se v večer do vůle v toku Monanském, v němž pohrávala luna, ustlal své
lože půlnoční v pustých Glenartnu leštinách, a kdy slunce červené ohně metalo po
vrcholích Benvoirlichu, již jekotné psů krvelačných štěkání se rozléhalo v oužlabinách
skalních, a v podáli slyšeti temný rohů zvuk s dupotem koňským.

(Panna jezerní, Báseň v šesti zpěvech Waltera Skotta z anglického přeložil F.L.
Čelakovský, v Praze 1828 Vedením a nákladem H. Pospíšila; Zpěv první; 11)
Uhlédne pak hubitele prvního, bujným vyrazil z houštiny skokem, a napřaženým letem
ubíhal svoboden v širou pusté lada Uam-Varšké.

(Panna jezerní, Báseň v šesti zpěvech Waltera Skotta z anglického přeložil F.L.
Čelakovský, v Praze 1828 Vedením a nákladem H. Pospíšila; Zpěv první; 12)

In Poznamenání

Uam-Var, hora severovýchodně ode vsi Kallender v Mentleité ležící, znamená tolik, co
velká roklina nebo jeskyně. Zde podle pověsti měl jakýsi obr před věky bydleti;
v posledních časech byla tu skrýš lotrů a loupežníků, teprve o polovici minulého století
odtud vypuzených.

(Panna jezerní, Báseň v šesti zpěvech Waltera Skotta z anglického přeložil F.L.
Čelakovský, v Praze 1828 Vedením a nákladem H. Pospíšila; I., Zpěv první; 200)

Jako chmúra v pršky, tak tu rozlícenost lidu se v slzy rozplývá. Ruce a oči obracejíce
k nebi vzývají o požehnání na hlavu ctihodnou jenž, výše své vlastní pokládá krev

národu, pro jenž jediné dýše. Kmetové na srázu života blahoslaví hrdinu, jenž udusil v pýři domácí válku, a matky vyzdvihující dítky ukazují na zachovatele jich otců, an se v oběť vydává a vítězí nad záští bezprávím; i otrlé srdce vojákův želem se hnulo: jakby za rakví milého vůdce s nachýlenou tváří a zbraní provázejí do vrchu Douglasa, a ne bez lítosti v zámecké bráně vypouštějí z dozoru čestného vězně.

(Panna jezerní, Báseň v šesti zpěvech Waltera Skotta z anglického přeložil F.L. Čelakovský, v Praze 1828 Vedením a nákladem H. Pospíšila; 29, Zpěv pátý; 151-152)

Appendix 5B

The stag at eve had drunk his fill,
Where danced the moon on Monan's rill,
And deep his midnight lair had made
In lone Glenartney's hazel shade;
But, when the sun his beacon red
Had kindled on Benvoirlich's head,
The deep-mouth'd bloodhound's heavy bay
Resounded up the rocky way,
And faint from farther distance borne,
Were heard the clanging hoof and horn.

(The Lady of the Lake by sir Walter Scott, Bart., with introduction by J. V. Saunders, M. A., Blackie and Son Limited, London, ...; Canto First; 16)

Then, as the headmost foes appear'd,
With one brave bound the copse he clear'd,
And, stretching forward free and far,
Sought the wild heaths of Uam-Var.

(The Lady of the Lake by sir Walter Scott, Bart., with introduction by J. V. Saunders, M. A., Blackie and Son Limited, London, ...; Canto First; 16)

The crowd's wild fury sunk again
In tears, as tempests melt in rain.
With lifted hands and eyes, they pray'd
For blessings on his generous head,
Who for his country felt alone,
And prized her blood beyond his own.
Old men, upon the verge of life,
Bless'd him who staid the civil strife;
And mothers held their babes on high
The self-devoted Chief to spy,
Triumphant over wrongs and ire,
To whom the prattlers owed a sire.
Even the rough soldier's heart was moved;

As if behind some bier beloved,
With trailing arms and drooping head,
The Douglas up the hill he led,
And at the Castle's battled verge,
With sighs resign'd his honour'd charge.

(The Lady of the Lake by sir Walter Scott, Bart., with introduction by J. V. Saunders,
M. A., Blackie and Son Limited, London, ...; Canto Fifth; XXIX; 118-119)

Appendix 6A

1

Můj rodný břehu, Bůh tě chraň!
Již vln tě halí mrak,
Zde sténá bouř, řve vodní pláň,
A křičí mořský pták;
Kde v proud se hroužící slunce, tam
Nás žene tajná moc,
V ten čas jdu k dálným krajinám,
Ó vlasti – dobrou noc.

2

Jen krátký čas, až mine mrak,
a ranní vstane zář,
Pláň vodní zří a nebe zrak,
Ne matky vlasti tvář.
Teď pustý už můj starý hrad,
Krb můj opustil ples,
A koukol bují odevšad,
jen u vrat vyje pes.

3

„Můj panošíku, dál jen dál!
Co pláčeš, běduješ?
Či vln tě leká prudký val,
Či bouří se třeseš?
Pryč s slzou tou, již v oku máš,
Lod' prudká jako šíp,
Že nejprudší sokol náš
Neletěl by líp.“

(Loučení Childe Harolda, E. B. Kaizl, in Společenský krasořečník český, od Dra J. B.
Pichla, III. v Praze 1853, tiskárna a náklad Jaroslava Pospíšila; 246)

...

10

Juž s tebou, lodi, poletím,
Tím proudem divokým.

Necht' kamkoli se poplavím,
Jen ne k břehům svým.
Aj vítěz modrá, vodní pláň!
Až přejdu její moc,
Pak vítěj poušť, jeskyně, straň! –
Má vlasti, dobrou noc.

(Loučení Childe Harolda, E. B. Kaizl, in Společenský krasořečník český, od Dra J. B. Pichla, III. v Praze 1853, tiskárna a náklad Jaroslava Pospíšila; 248)

Appendix 6B

1

'Adieu, adieu! my native shore
Fades o'er the waters blue;
The Night-winds sigh, the breakers roar,
And shrieks the wild seamew.
Yon Sun that sets upon the sea
We follow in his flight;
farewell awhile to him and thee,
My native Land - Good Night.

2

A few shor hours and He will rise
To give the Morrow birth;
And I shall hail the main and skies,
But not my mother Earth.
Deserted is my own good hall,
Its hearth is desolate;
Wild weeds are gathering on the wall;
My dog howls at the gate.

3

'Come hither, hither, my little page!
Why dost thou weep and wail?
Or dost thou dread the billows' rage,
Or tremble at the gale?
But dash the tear-drop from thine eye;
Our ship is swift and strong:
Our fleetest falcon scarce can fly
More merrily along.'

...

10

'With thee, my bark, I'll swiftly go
Athwart the foaming brine;
Nor care what land thou bear'st me to,
So not again to mine.

Welcome, welcome, ye dark-blue waves!
And when you fail my sight,
Welcome, ye deserts, and ye caves!
My native Land - Good Night!

(Lord Byron, *The Complete Poetical Works*, edited by Jerome J. McGann, Volume II, *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage*, Oxford, At the Clarendon Press, 1980; 13, 15-16)

FORMULÁŘ PRO ZPŘÍSTUPNĚNÍ PRÁCE V ELEKTRONICKÉ FORMĚ – ČESKY

Typ dokumentu	Bakalářská práce		
Autor	Koutková Kateřina		
E-mail adresa autora	koutkovak@seznam.cz		
URN			
Název závěrečné práce	Počátky českých překladatelských teorií v 19. století I. (1785 – 1850)		
Stupeň studia	Bakalářské studium		
Katedra	Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky		
Vedoucí práce, školitelé	Vedoucí práce: Doc. PhDr. Bohuslav Mánek, CSs.		
Klíčová slova	Národní obrození překladatelské teorie klasicistické teorie překladu romantické teorie překladu		
Datum obhajoby	2006		
Označení rozsahu zpřístupnění	Souhlasím se zveřejněním celé práce	Datum: 27.3. 2006 Podpis autora: <i>Koutková</i>	
Abstrakt	Práce popisuje formující se překladatelské teorie v období národního obrození (1785 – 1860) na základě dobových materiálů a moderních historických a teoretických studií. Specifikuje klasicistické a romantické teorie překladu.		
Název souboru	<i>The_Beginnings_of_Czech_Translantion_Theories</i>	Velikost souboru	5 MB

FORMULÁŘ PRO ZPŘÍSTUPNĚNÍ PRÁCE V ELEKTRONICKÉ FORMĚ – ANGLICKY

Type of Document	Bachelor work		
Author	Koutková Kateřina		
Author's E-mail Address	koutkovak@seznam.cz		
URN			
Title	The Beginnings of Czech Translation Theories in the 19th century (1785 – 1850)		
Degree	Bachelor		
Department	Department of English and American Studies		
Advisory Committee	Doc. PhDr. Bohuslav Mánek, CSc. , supervisor		
Keywords	National Revival Translation Theories Classicistic Translation Theories Romantic Translation Theories		
Date of Defense	2006		
Availability	Unrestricted		
Abstract	This work describes translation theories in the period of the National Revival (1785 – 1850) on the basis of the period documents and modern historical and theoretical studies. It specifies Classicistic and Romantic translation theories.		
Filename	<i>The_Beginnings_of_Czech_Translantion_Theories</i>	Size	5 MB