

**University of Pardubice
Faculty of Arts and Philosophy**

Czech Translation in the National Revival: Theory and Practice

Pavel Krupička

**Bachelor Paper
2009**

Univerzita Pardubice
Fakulta filozofická
Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky
Akademický rok: 2008/2009

ZADÁNÍ BAKALÁŘSKÉ PRÁCE
(PROJEKTU, UMĚLECKÉHO DÍLA, UMĚLECKÉHO VÝKONU)

Jméno a příjmení: **Pavel KRUPIČKA**
Studijní program: **B7310 Filologie**
Studijní obor: **Anglický jazyk pro hospodářskou praxi**
Název tématu: **Teorie a praxe prvních novočeských překladů**

Z á s a d y p r o v y p r a c o v á n í :

Autor se seznámí s vybranými dobovými překlady do češtiny a s dobovou teorií v období 1785-1860. Ve svém výkladu se věnuje především realizaci klasicistických a romantických teorií a jejich představitelům. Svá zjištění shne v závěru.

Rozsah grafických prací:

Rozsah pracovní zprávy:

Forma zpracování bakalářské práce: **tištěná/elektronická**

Seznam odborné literatury:

J. Levý: Umění překladu. Praha 1963 a násl.

J. Levý: České teorie překladu. Praha 1957 a násl.

Překlad literárního díla (sborník studií), 1970.

B. Mánek: První české překlady Byronovy poezie, 1991.

M. Hrala (ed.): Kapitoly z dějin českého překladu. Praha: Karolinum, 2003.

D. Žváček: Kapitoly z teorie překladu.

Vedoucí bakalářské práce:

prof. PhDr. Bohuslav Mánek, CSc.
Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky

Datum zadání bakalářské práce:

30. dubna 2008

Termín odevzdání bakalářské práce:

31. března 2009



prof. PhDr. Petr Vorel, CSc.
děkan

L.S.



Mgr. Šárka Bubiková, Ph.D.
vedoucí katedry

V Pardubicích dne 30. listopadu 2008

Prohlašuji:

Tuto práci jsem vypracoval samostatně. Veškeré literární prameny a informace, které jsem v práci využil, jsou uvedeny v seznamu použité literatury.

Byl jsem seznámen s tím, že se na moji práci vztahují práva a povinnosti vyplývající ze zákona č. 121/2000 Sb., autorský zákon, zejména se skutečností, že Univerzita Pardubice má právo na uzavření licenční smlouvy o užití této práce jako školního díla podle § 60 odst. 1 autorského zákona, a s tím, že pokud dojde k užití této práce mnou nebo bude poskytnuta licence o užití jinému subjektu, je Univerzita Pardubice oprávněna ode mne požadovat přiměřený příspěvek na náhradu nákladů, které na vytvoření díla vynaložila, a to podle okolností až do jejich skutečné výše.

Souhlasím s prezenčním zpřístupněním své práce v Univerzitní knihovně Univerzity Pardubice.

V Pardubicích dne 20.6. 2009

Pavel Krupička

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank prof. PhDr. Bohuslav Mánek, CSc. for his worthful advices and guidance which made finishing this paper possible.

Abstract

This paper focuses on literary movements influencing Czech translation theories in the time of the Czech National Revival. The central point of focus is then the movement of the Czech Pre-romanticism translation theories and literary aesthetics as the result of the characteristic developmental situation related to the linguistic and aesthetic phenomena connected with the needs of the Czech language, culture and national self-awareness. Czech Pre-romantic translation theories are the result of a complicated situation of the turn of 18th and 19th century when the Classicistic translation theories and aesthetics did not completely vanish from the Czech approaches to translation and literature and thus started to interfere with newer theories. The essential part of the paper is devoted to the developmental stages of Czech Pre-romanticism and to the authors and translators who significantly contributed to the development of the Czech lexis, stylistics and aesthetics in order to enhance the qualities and overall perception of the Czech language in the second phase of the Czech National Revival. The approaches of individual Czech translators are demonstrated by the means of analysis of selected translations of English Pre-romantic prose and poetry. The degree to which Czech translators followed Pre-romantic translation tendencies, is described in the conclusion.

Key words:

Translation theories, Czech National Revival, Czech Pre-romanticism, Czech Ossianism

Souhrn

Tato práce je zaměřena na literární směry ovlivňující české teorie překladu v době Národního obrození. Práce se soustředí především na teorie překladu českého předromantismu a estetiky jako následku specifické vývojové situace lingvistických a estetických jevů, přímo souvisejících s úrovní českého jazyka, kultury a národního sebeuvědomění. České předromantické teorie překladu jsou důsledkem složité situace přelomu osmnáctého a devatenáctého století, kdy z českého literárního prostředí ještě nestačily plně ustoupit tendence klasicistické a již byly nahrazovány tendencemi novějšími, což vyústilo v jejich vzájemnou propojenost. Podstatná část práce je věnována vývojovým stádiím českého předromantismu a autorům a překladatelům, kteří významnou měrou a za účelem pozvednutí úrovně slovní zásoby, stylistických a estetických prostředků přispěli k rozvoji českého jazyka ve druhé fázi národního obrození. Přístupy jednotlivých překladatelů jsou v práci znázorněny pomocí analýzy vybraných českých překladů anglické předromantické prózy a poezie. Míra, do které překladatelé akceptovali teorie českého předromantismu je popsána v závěru.

Klíčová slova:

Teorie překladu, české Národní obrození, český předromantismus, český ossianismus

Table of contents:

1. Introduction, Czech translation theories up to the 18 th century	1
1.1. Middle Ages and the Hussite movement.....	1
1.2. Progress to Humanism and Renaissance	3
1.3. From Humanism to Baroque	7
2. The National Revival	7
2.1. General characteristics of the period	7
2.2. Classicism.....	8
3. Pre-romanticism	8
3.1. European Pre-romanticism and Romanticism.....	8
3.2. Formation of the new movement in the Czech lands	10
3.2.1. Impulses for development of Pre-romanticism.....	13
3.3. High phase of Czech Pre-romantic prose	15
3.3.1. Romantic influences on the High phase of Czech Pre-romanticism	15
3.3.2. Translating poetry by the means of prose.....	17
3.3.3. Czech Ossianism.....	19
3.4. The Fade-out phase of the Czech Pre-romanticism.....	25
4. Conclusion.....	33

1. Introduction, Czech translation theories up to the 18th century

1.1. Middle Ages and the Hussite movement

The translation in the period of the Middle Ages is bound to a time span of approximately 8th to 14th century and functions predominantly as a part of religion. The religion, regarded Europe-wide, encounters individual and special characteristics of its development (e.g. the pace of development) in every country. However, all these varieties of development have one feature in common and that is duplicity (Veselý in: Hrala 2002, 11). Veselý characterizes here two different branches of the Christian culture. His division relies on different purpose of the middle age Western Christian culture writings. The first (canonical) branch of the Christian culture serves mainly to the purpose of “passing the Christianity on” by the means of written language (e.g. Latin texts), which was realized mainly at universities and monasteries. The superior source for the writings of the first branch was the Holy Writ, which was translated into Latin as Vulgate by st. Jerome. The first branch also includes documents, which function as essential and binding rules for the Christian Church as a whole (e.g. canonical texts, various assessments of popes and similar documents). The last, but equally important, part of the first branch of Christian culture in this period of time is the culture intended to be spread among the “masses”.

The second (secular) branch of the Western Christian culture in the Middle Ages is then fully related to folkloric, and above all, oral spread of Christianity and all its aspects (e.g. patterns which served as a mnemonic aid for people to be able to remember particular transmitted pieces of work). If regarded contrast-wise, the source of information for the second branch of Western Christian culture is of a completely opposite character than The Holy Writ. The second branch relies predominantly on legendary myths, both of foreign and domestic origin (Veselý in: Hrala 2002, 12). When speaking of the Christian literature of the early Middle Ages, there were many attitudes to what should be transmitted by native languages of people and what should stay hidden from the people’s minds, written solely in Latin. As there are several attitudes to it, Veselý considers this stage when people initiate a wide debate as a

starting point for the reformation (Veselý in: Hrala 2002, 11). It is almost impossible to mark this period of time as a period with real translation theories. As far as Czech translation theories are concerned, Levý (1996, 17) considers this époque a pre-historic phase of the translation of European countries (namely Czech lands). The primary task of the first translating attempts in the Middle Ages was to **familiarize** the reader with the text regarding the reader's information and knowledge level. The "pre-historic" aspect of this stage of translation is supported by Veselý, who claims that the "familiarizing" function disappeared from the main focus of translators no sooner than in Humanism when translators focused **mainly on how to transmit texts from the source language to the target one with the use of its linguistic property** (Veselý in: Hrala 2002, 12). However, the "pre-historic" phase of the translation started to change rapidly. The development of the Czech Christian culture (and thus first translation attempts) in comparison to the rest of the Western Christian culture was significantly faster. The important fact to mention here is the attempt to evangelise Czech lands. The efforts of Constantine and Methodius, who came to Czech lands in 863 and brought liturgical texts translated into Slavonic languages, were accomplished by translating the Holy Writ into Old Slavic and the fact that the Roman curia permitted spreading Christianity in Old Slavic. Moreover, liturgical texts used by Constantine and Methodius played significant role in first attempts to translate the Bible into Czech (in late Middle Ages).

It is as late as in the 13th century when the translating efforts become coherent and it is canonical material, what is in the centre of focus. This material was translated word by word so that the Christian material could not be distorted in translation. The situation with translation of materials of more general topics of the Middle Ages is completely different as far as the method of translation is concerned. The translation rule "word for word" was not applied here. The most significant translator of the late Middle Ages, Tomáš Štítný ze Štítného, goes even farther and experiments with the source material composition-wise. This is shown on his translation of the legend Of the Revelation of St Brigitta:

„V knihách čtvrtých této svaté ženy také něco vezmu, ale mnoho nechám, chtě odbytí skuoro, abych mohl psáti jiného něco, neb některému nemohu rozuměti a některé nenie tobě užitečno.“

[I will not translate all from the fourth script of this saint woman but only selected parts so that I could translate other parts, finding them more useful for you] (Hrala 2002, 14). As the 14 century slowly ends, Czech medieval culture reaches its most valuable stage. This is also a period of time when the trace of Hussitism begins to appear. According to Levý (1996, 26), the Hussite period enriched medieval literary genres of two important categories, which had a considerable effect on translation. In comparison to the Pre-hussite period, translation was thus assigned more functions. Even though the translating practice stays the same as in the earlier times of the Middle Ages, the two above-mentioned categories cause essential boom of the Czech language (Veselý in: Hrala 2002, 15). In this period of time the Czech language gains the status of one of the first languages in Europe with stable literary corpus. Moreover, the Hussitism strengthened the joint of the Czech literature with morality and religious context and thus prevented Czech culture from being “intervened” by secular Renaissance works depicting various examples of loosely manners. According to Veselý (in: Hrala 2002, 16), this fact affected further development of translation approach to “scandalous” works (or e.g. works containing vulgarities etc.) of world known authors in later periods and even today.

1.2. Progress to Humanism and Renaissance

The time span from 14th to 16th century means a fundamental change to the Western Christian culture. As the towns keep developing and education getting more available, the Western Christian culture divides into two branches. The first branch is the **culture of the court and high bourgeoisie** and functions as a contrast to the second branch of the culture, which is the culture of **broad masses of “ordinary” people**. The first branch is rapidly spread, mainly due to the growing number of copying manufactures and the pace of spreading is further amplified by the invention of the letterpress (half of the 15th century). The growing pace of spreading is not the only feature of this branch however. The form of the texts changes as well. Versed character (e.g. mnemonic aids) of epic works begins to vanish and is gradually replaced by prose. The lyrical-epic and lyrical works remain in verse. Another important feature concerning this branch of literature is that the author of translation (or rather transmission, at this stage of development) is generally considered a craftsman who tries to fit “given form with

given meaning” (Veselý in: Hrala 2002, 16). Later on, the two above-mentioned branches are completed by the third one, which is a combination of their features. The third layer is of written form (similarly to the first branch) and is supposed to be for “ordinary people” (the feature of the second branch). The third branch plays an important role in making the contents of texts formerly available only to the higher layers of society, available also to its lower layers. As the texts for higher layers of society is written in Latin and in elevated style, translators face the problem of translating both language-wise and style-wise (as there is a need for the translations have the comprehensibility level suitable for people from of lower status). This problem offers the translators immense variety of possible approaches to choose from.

The first culture, which served as a source of texts used for the above-mentioned purpose, was the culture of ancient Rome and Greece. The translation of ancient texts became one of the main features of European Humanism and its “national” varieties. Humanistic thinkers and translators believed that it was possible to translate ancient text into their native languages without any distortion of meaning or form of the original. These people ignited the idea that their native languages were a unique tool of at least the same quality as ancient languages and devoted their studies and work to improving the corpuses (e.g. creating vocabularies) of their native languages and defended them against the opposing group of “Latin-humanistic” thinkers, who considered **Latin** to be the **sole** language, which should be the ancient texts translated to. Latin Humanism is represented by the group of authors lead by Bohuslav Hasištejnský z Lobkovic. These authors shared the opinion that it is unacceptable that members of patriciate and nobility, lower nobility and “ordinary” people can access education and claimed that education should be available only to the highest level of the society. The conflict between Latin and non-Latin humanistic approach to foreign sources ignites, besides the discussion about the language, the discussion about the availability of education as well.

Opposing Non-Latin Humanism was represented e.g. by Viktorin Kornel ze Všehrd, Václav Písecký, Řehoř Hrubý z Jelení or Mikuláš Konáč z Hodiškova and was, similarly to the European Humanism, driven by the desire of thinkers to search whether the Czech (i.e. native) language is capable to transmit the meaning from the foreign

language in the same quality as the foreign languages do. In translation they often replace one-word expressions by two-word ones in order to be precise. Czech humanists used even notes in the text (e.g. brackets with explanatory notes and footnotes) and a certain degree of localization (however the localisation principle is more common in the European Humanism). The purpose of the notes is to help readers with poor information base to understand the translation.

Humanistic translation is the first larger attempt to translate from the source language not word by word but with paying attention to the overall meaning of the text. Veselý (in: Hrala 2002, 18) names this translation a “semantic operation”, which relies on replacing one language medium by another. This theory is in accordance with ideals of ancient translators, e.g. Cicero, who claimed that, concerning translation, “*there is no need to count words, but it is better to regard their meaning*” (in: Levý 1996, 27, translated by the present author). This ancient theory is later developed by St Jerome, the translator of Vulgate: „*non verbum e verbo sed sensum de exprimere de senso*” [do not translate word by word but meaning by meaning] (in: Levý 1996, 28).

Whereas the theories of humanists are focused on adaptation of original works and making them available for various layers of the society (e.g. by the means of vulgarisation – making the language of the translation more plain), the artists of Renaissance are interested more in the form of the documents and completing this form with the domestic context and the native language. The period of Renaissance is strongly influenced by Humanism (and the educational purpose of translations), however and this is why Levý (1996, 40) claims that the stream of Renaissance is, compared to the one of Humanism, much weaker. According to Levý, the progress from Renaissance to Humanism was not fully completed anywhere in Europe and the situation in Czech lands is thus not exceptional (1996, 41). As mentioned above, the principle of usefulness (connected with educational purpose) is recognized in Renaissance as well. Relying on this principle limited the Renaissance translation from development, which affected mainly the translation of poetry. In Renaissance, poetry is translated mainly by prose and if there are any attempts to translate poetry by poetry, the result is only a rhymed, in most cases also verseless translation with non-corresponding

line length (in relation to the original). Humanistic concept of usefulness also means a certain kind of censorship of translated works: translators intentionally leave out “unnecessary” aspects (e.g. erotic scenes) (Veselý in: Hrala 2002, 22-23).

The period of Humanism and Renaissance is accomplished by the efforts of the Czech Brotherhood Society. Translation theories of this society rely on the humanistic approaches, but are enriched of new aspects. These aspects are the passion for and interest in the translation. The addition of these new aspects to the work of a translator resulted in the high stylistic, lexical, morphological and syntactical level of the translation. What is considered a peak of the efforts of Czech Brotherhood Society translation is the Bible kralická [The Kralice Bible], which is the first Czech complete translation of the Bible. The Kralice Bible is an example of a sensitive approach to the original (Greek and Hebrew) text (e.g. replacing foreign institutions by the Czech ones, localization). The period of late Renaissance also brought more precise translation of poetry (recognizable also in the translations of bible). The late Renaissance period of the Czech Brotherhood Society is crowned by the work of Jan Amos Komenský. According to Levý (1996, 51), Komenský tries to partly abandon humanistic approaches and forms a theory which functions as a compromise of the meaning and form transition: „*Vidím, že někteří radí k volnějšímu překladu Bible, přizpůsobenému duchu jazyka [...]. Nevím však, zda je bezpečné odstupovat od písmene.*“ [I found, that some people advise to translate the Bible in a more free way but I doubt that it is a good approach because the form is thus neglected], (J. A. Komenský: Latin Letter to L. Warner of 4th January 1663, in: *Korespondence Jana Amose Komenského*, vyd. J. Kačaba, Praha 1898, p. 277). Speaking of the form of the translation, Komenský is interested in two main fields. The first field is whether the Czech language has a mature phonetic system and the second field tries to examine syntactic advantages advancing Czech language against the other languages (e.g. French with “too long syllables”, German with “too short syllables” and “accentless” Polish), (Levý 1996, 53-54).

Translation approaches used in the era of the Czech Brotherhood Society formed basic theories, which were (in a time-distorted form) used throughout the following 150 years.

1.3. From Humanism to Baroque

Whereas humanistic translation approaches were aimed at the function of reproduction (i.e. making the translation available to certain groups of people), the approach of Baroque focuses more on the aspect of transmitting the form of the original. As mentioned above, the first attempts to do this are noticeable in the period of late Humanism and are performed mainly by the Czech Brotherhood Society. The interest in reading Czech translations of foreign texts stagnates in the Baroque. According to Levý (1996, 64), it is caused by the fact that many people who would potentially be interested in reading the translations, were made to emigrate or resigned and accepted German as their first language. This fact is directly connected with the defeat of the Czech Estates in 1620 and the subsequent Austrian-Hungarian domination over our country (Levý 1996, 65). The Czech speaking elites were thus replaced by the German speaking ones and artistic translation functions on the “folk” level (inspired mainly by the lexical features of orally transmitted works). In comparison to the rest of Europe, the development in our country is, mainly due to counter-reformation, delayed. The Czech Baroque period thus spreads over the same time span as the new theoretical stream called Classicism, gradually gaining its influence in Europe.

2. The National Revival

2.1. General characteristics of the period

Jiří Rak (in: Bělina et al., 60) classifies the period of the Czech national Revival as “nothing more and nothing less” than a part of the European development. According to him, it is no exception to the sequence of cultural and aesthetic movements in comparison to the culture of Western Europe. At the same time, however claims that the period of the Czech National Revival features a special manner of facing problems which were brought to the Czech lands by the new movements. These problems are connected mainly with the identity of the Czech nation in context of Austrian-Hungarian Empire. Together with the national self-awareness, the needs to elevate the language are defined as well. The situation of the Czech language is obvious from Jungmann’s opinion of it: “*S tou dobou počíná se vzkříšení jazyka českého, kterému protivníci jeho takřka již umíráčkem zvonili, a o kteréhož konečné záhubě otevřeně jednali*” [This is the beginning of the revival of the Czech language, which was almost doomed to extinction and openly considered dead already] (Jungmann 1849, 353).

However the situation of the Czech language started to improve with Classicistic and, later on, Pre-romantic movement influencing not only Czech translation theories but the literature as a whole as well.

2.2. Classicism

As the 18th century is approaching its end, Czech thinkers and linguists try to renew the continuity of development of Czech translation (Levý 1996, 66). The methods and approaches they use are related to those of the older periods, especially the period of Humanism. At the same time, however, they are influenced by the Classicistic methods. Classicistic translation theories advance the theories of Renaissance but are significant for higher confidence of the translators, who tend to have more independent approach to the translation. Translators thus do not only want to convey certain knowledge but strive to prove that they are able to create the piece of art of the same value as the original text. These efforts are recognized in the choice of the works to translate and the approach to translation itself. While humanistic translation was focused on the literature of fact, thinkers interested in Classicistic translation choose predominantly fiction and poetry. The centre of focus is thus moved from the content towards the form. This tendency also caused a different approach to the translation of poetry arise. The only accepted Classicistic method of translating poetry is translation by poetry again. The efforts of Classicistic translators to reach the perfection in translation are recognizable also in the “refining” way of treatment of the original. Classicists believed that it was their duty to compete with authors of the original works (Levý 1996, 67-68) in the quality of the work. It was dissatisfying for them to reach the same level of quality and they tried even to “improve” the original by adding their own ideas or omitting facts they considered irrelevant for the Czech reader (principle of compensation).

3. Pre-romanticism

3.1. European Pre-romanticism and Romanticism

Czech Pre-romanticism is the period directly influenced by several movements (i.e. Czech Classicism which is slowly fading away, European Pre-romanticism and Romanticism). Since a brief overview of the Classicistic theories is given in the previous subchapter (the subject of the Classicistic theories will be given more space in

the following chapters in relation to Czech Pre-romanticism), this section will briefly characterize the influence of European Pre-romanticism and Romanticism.

Levý (1996, 70-74) claims that, in contrast with Classicism (which in the name of the “compensation principle” ignores unique national and individual features of the works to translate), Pre-romantic and Romantic theories focussed their attention directly to the features which were neglected by Classicism. The attitude to translation started to change with the help of French Encyclopaedists who admitted that it is important to transmit above-mentioned features of the work correctly. Levý (1996, 70) cites D’Alembert’s work *Morceaux choisis de Tacite* (1763, p. 21) where D’Alembert states that translation “can help with recognition of unique features of different authors, époques and nations” (back-translation). Only thus, it is possible to depict what Levý titles “**national and historical costume**”. Pre-romantic and Romantic translators and tinkers therefore despised not only by the Classicistic translation theories but also by the rules of Classicistic writing at all. The best way to achieve the translation meeting all newly introduced criteria was the faithful, word-for-word translation. Whereas Classicists regarded authors of the original works as their competitors, Pre-romantic and Romantic thinkers and translators claimed that the author of the translation should be subordinated to the author of the original work. Levý therefore highlights translators’ attempts to faithfully depict all possible individual and unique qualities of the original (e.g. language and its varieties, local individualities, traditional habits of particular countries or people etc.). As far as linguistic features of the translated work are concerned, Pre-romanticists and Romanticists tried to preserve features as word order, word choice and unique characteristics of the style of original works. The issue of translation is therefore regarded as more complicated than it used to be in the period of Classicism. The new “pessimistic” view of the possibility of translation has its ground in the theory which says that it is the unique features of the original which is the most complicated thing to translate. This approach caused that many Pre-romantic and Romantic translators viewed the task of faithful, word-for-word translation as impossible or almost impossible (in contrast to Classicists, the approach of who was not so conservative and therefore allowed opinions that the translation as a task is in fact possible).

The development of Classicistic, Pre-romantic and Romantic translation theories in Europe is the matter of the time-span with its end close to the turn of the 18th and 19th centuries. Czech authors and translators experience them considerably later, with the delay of approximately half a century (this situation is a logical result of the development of former translation theories in the Czech lands).

3.2. Formation of the new movement in the Czech lands

According to Vodička (1948, 324), the movement of Pre-romanticism is possible to be divided into three parts. First part is called **Preparatory phase** and will be dealt with in this subchapter. The Preparatory phase includes Jungmann's work *Atala*. The following part is titled a **High phase** and features works connected with the idea of Ossianism and forged manuscripts titled *Rukopis Královédvorský* and *Rukopis Zelenohorský*. The final part of Pre-romanticism is, according to Vodička, the **Fade out phase**.

In his article *Tendence k jednotnému literárnímu směru Preromantismus (Sentimentalismus) Vztahy k jiným literaturám* (in: *Dějiny české literatury*, Československá akademie věd 1960, 166) Vodička emphasizes that the situation at the beginning of the 19th century stresses sentimental aspects of life rather than rationality. Vodička adds that it is possible to assign this movement a higher position of developmental stage of the Czech society. As stated in the previous subchapter, Pre-romantic (and subsequently Romantic) period of Czech literature and translation theories is no exception to the fact that every cultural movement arrived to the Czech lands with delay (in comparison with the Western Europe). This delay resulted in idiosyncrasies which marked almost the whole Pre-romantic movement. Since the delayed Czech Classicism still had an impact on the art in the Czech lands while opposite tendencies inclined rather to more up to date Romanticism, the situation in the first three decades of the 19th century was typical for the combination of influence of both Classicistic and Pre-romantic approaches to literature and translation (Vodička 1948, 317, Levý 1996, 125). Moreover, as Levý (1996, 125) points out, whereas the change from one movement to another was fluent in Western Europe, the change in the Czech lands happened (due to the delay in development) in faster pace. Another

complication which contributed to the unnatural development of literature and translation during the first three decades of the 19th century was the fact that the development was so fast that it was impossible for particular representatives of every movement to leave the stage and be substituted by authors worshipping newer approaches. The time period for such an exchange was not long enough and authors and translators from the beginning of the 19th century (e.g. Jungmann) did not leave the stage until the newer theories (Pre-romantic) were (again hastily) changing into the Romantic ones. Together with developmental issues of the translation, Levý (1996, 95, 125) mentions a special situation of the Czech language and its needs in the Czech national revival. Linguistic, cultural and literary needs of the Czech language of this period interfere with the overall situation of the Czech culture and are subordinate to the linguistic development in the way of enriching Czech language of more expressive layer of lexis.

“... těžisko umělecké translatury se posouvá z knížek lidového čtení a literatury senzační a módní k těm dílům, která právě svou náročností nutí překladatele k tvůrčímu obohacování domácí literatury.”

[... the main point of focus is thus a shift from the folk and sensational literature towards the works which, by their high demands on translation, force translators to perform creative work which is necessary for enriching our native literature] (Levý 1996, 95).

It is the first decade of the 19th century which is possible to be marked as a moment of time when Pre-romanticism starts to enter the Czech stage (however still strongly influenced by and clashing with Classicism, as will be shown in this subchapter). Vodička (1948, 125-127) enters the issue of the clash between Classicism and (Pre)-romanticism by listing examples of general features of these two movements, regarding literature itself saying:

“Slova klasicistický a romantický jsou bez zřetele na periodisaci běžnými pojmenováními pro označení literárních jevů; obsah jejich významu jest vymežován vlastnostmi, na nichž se literární veřejnost celkem dobře shodne.”

[Expressions Classicistic and Romantic stand for titles of literary phenomena, regardless time époques they represent. Their meaning is restricted by features widely accepted by literary public] (Vodička 1948, 125). According to Vodička, Classicist

features of art are: Lucidity of expressions and ideas, well-balanced composition, refusal of everything random and randomness itself, refusal of everything eccentric and unusual, tendencies to intellectualism and rationalism or refusal of everything showing features of individualism as a feature not being able to fit the scheme of generalizing abstraction. Vodička further claims that due to its values, Classicism is suitable mainly for the art of painting, sculpture or architecture and therefore is linked to the art of antiquity.

On the contrary, (Pre)-romantic features of art are: Indeterminateness of expressions and ideas, imagery, symbolism, tendencies towards random phenomena and randomness, tendencies towards individual and subjective uniqueness (which sometimes reaches even an extreme level, emotionality, sentimentality, mysticism and intuitiveness. As Vodička emphasises, the above-mentioned division of characteristic features is “basic antithetic definition of features of art, independent of time and art époques” (translation). Vodička (in: *Dějiny české literatury*, Československá akademie věd 1960, 167) also emphasizes the role of the nature:

“V nové literární koncepci dostalo se přírodě místa velmi významného. Byla tematem, která volala po zobrazení, neboť představovala vyšší model dokonalosti, než dosavadní společnost. Byla veliká, mohutná, vznešená, byla však zároveň prostá...”

[A new conception of literature enabled the nature to become a very important of works. The nature was a topic which had to be introduced as it contained a higher model of the society. The nature was immense, majestic but unadorned at the same time...].

In addition to this classification of values of the two antithetic movements Vodička admits that neither Classicistic nor Romantic works are possible to classify as purely Classicistic or Romantic (1948, 126).

“I v obdobích označovaných jako klasická nebo klasicistická najdeme díla, která vzhledem k jiným dílům projevují sklon k romantičnosti, a obráceně, v období označovaném jako romantické jsou díla s tendencemi klasicizujícími.”

[Even in periods labeled as the Classic or Classicist ones, there are works which, related to other works of the period, incline towards Romanticism. And of course, on the contrary, there are Classicism-inclining works, again related to the works of the same period, in the period of Romanticism] (Vodička 1948, 126). The indefiniteness of the Pre-romantic movement in its very beginnings is supported also by the classification

of the person of Josef Jungmann. Both Levý (1996, 100-101) and Vodička (1948, 129) assign Jungmann and his translation of Chateaubriand's *Atala* (published in 1805) a status of an impulse which, in fact, ignited the movement of Pre-romanticism. Levý (1996, 102) classifies Jungmann's work (related to the Czech National revival) as "experimental" and "linguistically exclusive". Levý (1996, 102) further says that new approaches to creation of the Czech lexis resulted in incomprehensibility of the texts. This is why e.g. *Atala's "pozatmělejší slova"* [obscure words] are clarified either in brackets in the text of *Atala* or in the footnotes. Examples of such words, together with their clarification are attached in appendices (1). Another essential contribution of Jungmann's *Atala* to the new Czech literary movement is obvious from comparison of purely classicistic treatment of the sentence with Pre-romantic treatment of it. Vodička (1948, 80-81) compared four analyses of approximately two-hundred-sentence units from works from the very end of 18th century with the structure of the sentence in Jungmann's *Atala* and on the basis of this comparison (which regarded mainly verb forms and their distribution in the sentence) assigned *Atala* a status of the milestone of the Czech prose. The reason for is, that in comparison to all of the four attached analyses, Jungmann's translation features extremely low percentage of sentences ended with verb forms. Analyses summary is attached in the appendices (2). Jungmann's affiliation with both Classicism and Pre-romanticism is also obvious from Mánek's (1991, 8-9) classification of works which were translated within the whole period of the Czech National revival. However, according to Mánek's classification, Jungmann is not the only one who belongs to both Classicism and Pre-romanticism. In the Classicistic period, Jungmann and others (J. Nejedlý, B. Tablic) were mostly translating authors such as J. Dryden, G. Lyttleton and M. Prior. Pre-romantic authors translated by Jungmann and others (J. Nejedlý, V. Nejedlý, B. Tablic, F. Palacký, F. L. Čelakovský, S. K. Macháček, J. Hollmann, F. Doucha) are: J. Thomson, T. Gray, O. Goldsmith, E. Young, J. Macpherson (Ossian), T. Percy and W. Scott.

3.2.1. Impulses for development of Pre-romanticism

Vodička (1948, 317-321) characterizes several impulses which ignited the development of Pre-romanticism in the Czech lands. These impulses came into existence as a consequence of the state of literature at the turn of the 18th and 19th century. According

to Vodička, Czech literature was firstly missing a stylistic differentiation. The **absence of different stylistic layers of Czech** (which had mostly the layers solely for the communicative function) ignited a need for a style which would represent higher, aesthetic function. This impulse ignited the formation of the high style prose. Another impulse responsible for formation of higher prosaic styles was **the situation of Czech poetry**. Czech accentual prosody of the turn of the 18th century was not suitable for further intended development of stylistic and lexical layers of the Czech language and therefore translation as well. Translation of poetic pieces of art by the means of prose enabled translators to enrich Czech more easily. Third impulse which ignited the birth of higher prose was the **situation of older Czech prose**. Features typical for older Czech prose contrasted with Pre-romantic intentions are for example: purely communicative function of the art vs. its mature phonetic property and poetic imagery, traditional language vs. language of higher style full of special features (e.g. lexical, phonetic and stylistic layer), sentences with a verb at the end vs. sentences finished in a different way (e.g. termination with a phonetically interesting word which fits the structure of the particular sentence), old syntactically linked period vs. periods with pathetic and phonetically interesting sections, clear story line vs. free composition of typical motifs, prose with the outer world described only as ordinary background settings vs. prose focused solely on the description of the outer world, different locations etc., plain description vs. tendencies leading to colorful portraying or, for example, didactic tendencies of prose vs. prose with a high degree of evocativeness. Vodička characterizes the above-mentioned impulses as the **internal** ones (as they were caused by the situation of the Czech language and internal needs for a different kind of art). However, Vodička adds also **external** impulses for ignition of the Czech Pre-romanticism. External impulses come from abroad and are further divided into two categories which are titled: **Impulses within literature** and **impulses outside literature**. Impulses considered by Vodička as external and within literature are foreign authors (Chateaubriand, Gessner, Macpherson and Scott) and their works which inspired Czech authors to creation of translations. The character of these foreign works suited very well the needs of the Czech language and prose in the first decade of the 19th century. Impulses outside literature are related mostly to the historical development of the society. Vodička sees the literature and society in progress as two

items which are mutually connected: Progress of the society reflects in the art (i. e. the interpretation of the world and humans is continually renewed and actualized as the society progresses on). The situation in the context of the Czech National revival (i. e. increasing national and linguistic confidence and sovereignty) caused advancement to newer forms of prose. The prose of a “high style” which is full of special linguistic features and evocative aesthetics.

3.3. High phase of Czech Pre-romantic prose

Previous subchapters dealt with the ignition of Pre-romanticism in the Czech lands in the time span of approximately ten years from the beginning of the 19th century. This subchapter will deal with the “cult of Ossian” and literature, the style of which was influenced by it (i.e. manuscripts *Rukopis královédvorský* and *Rukopis zelenohorský*). Vodička in his article *Tendence k jednotnému literárnímu směru Preromantismus (Sentimentalismus) Vztahy k jiným literaturám* (in: *Dějiny české literatury*, Československá akademie věd 1960, 170) sees the Czech Pre-romanticism as a movement related to foreign literatures mainly by attributes shared all over the European Pre-romanticism. Works included in this movement were regarded as a cult and many Czech translators and authors found them highly appropriate to use as they strived to help Czech language, culture and Czech national awareness. This is supported by Vodička (in: *Dějiny české literatury*, Československá akademie věd 1960, 170) mentioning the “characteristic interest” in works which reflected individualities of particular nations and František Ladislav Čelakovský who is cited in Vodička’s article *Požadavek „básnické prózy“* (in: *Dějiny české literatury*, Československá akademie věd 1960, 208). Čelakovský, in his strive for awakening of the Czech national identity says (about the work of Walter Scott, *Ivanhoe*): “*Kýž bychom my jenom jedním tak vypracovaným původním románem vykázati se mohli.*” [Were we only be capable of creating such a brilliant piece of art.]

3.3.1. Romantic influences on the High phase of Czech Pre-romanticism

As the High phase of Czech Pre-romanticism was progressing on, it was interfering with Romantic influences. Vodička’s term “High phase” of Pre-romanticism corresponds with Levý’s title for one period of the Czech National revival. Levý

divided the revival into two periods which are called the Preparatory phase and the High phase (Levý 1996, 81, 95). Levý's understanding of the High phase of the Czech national revival also includes Romantic aesthetics and approaching translation (Levý 1996, 125-145). However Levý classifies the development of Czech literature and translation in the second and third decade of the 19th century as complicated, he claims that it is possible to detect basic Pre-romantic and Romantic features of works and translations. From this classification it is obvious that Levý's treatment of Pre-romanticism is approximately one decade delayed when compared to the classification of Vodička who assigns the third decade of the 19th century the "fading" phase. Levý (1990, 126-127) claims that Romanticists tend to the translating method of word-for-word translation which was despised by translators of earlier periods (Classicistic translators praised the approach of adaptation). Levý adds that the requirement for such a way of translation is highlighted predominantly by the less skilful translators. Levý shows the romantic efforts to reach the word-for-word perfection on the example of Jan Erazim Vocel who criticized the approach of Jakub Malý to the translation of Othello. Malý, in accordance with Romanticism refused to adapt the willow as a symbol of grieving and left the phrase "O willow, willow, willow" without translation. Levý claims that Vocel's criticism of Malý depicts Romanticists' efforts to provide word-for-word translation even when the unique national characteristics of the original make it almost impossible. The ideal of Romanticists becomes obvious when Levý cites critics of Antonín Liška's translation of Homer's Odyssey: "...*kdyby původní text zahynul, z jeho překladu lze bylo Homéra znovu zřécti*" [...if the original text was lost, Homer would be given birth again from the translation], (Antonín Liška: *Předmluva* [Preface] to the translation of Homer's Odyssey, published in 1844). Levý (1996, 127) illustrates the word-for-word translation approach by giving example of Václav Hanka and his translation of *Slovo o pluku Igorově* (published in Praha 1821, pp. 5-7). The excerpt of this work is attached in the appendices (3).

Czech Pre-romantic and Romantic approaches to translation of poetic texts are, according to Levý (1996, 128) connected with two contradictory theories. One theory says that the best way to translate poetry is to use the same metrical scheme as in the original. The opposing idea is to translate poetry by the means of prose. The second idea

thus best suits Pre-romantic and Romantic ideals of translation. Levý mentions even the third option: To translate by the different metrical system. At the same time however claims that it was impossible for Pre-romantic and Romantic translators. Levý points out that translation by the means of a different metrical system is not suitable since the translation becomes formally unrelated to the original and moreover, this approach does not allow a translator to faithfully translate either the correct meaning of the words of the original or keep the word order of the original.

3.3.2. Translating poetry by the means of prose

Levý (1996, 130-131) considers this mean of translation as significant and documents several Czech prosaic translations. The first listed Czech translator following the prosaic mean of translation is Jan Nejedlý who translated and in 1820 published *Kvílení aneb rozjímání noční* (translation of Young's Night thoughts). Eight years later, in 1928, Čelakovský translated and published prosaic translation of Lady of the Lake, a poem by Walter Scott. This translation is typical for duality in approach. Most of the poem is translated by the means of prose but there is a minor number of songs which are translated by the means of verse. According to Závodský (1982, 135), the task of Čelakovský's translation was supposed to function as a support for newly forming Czech fiction (of course together with other authors and their works). By claiming this, Závodský only confirms the theories of Levý and Vodička (i.e. the role of translation as one of the pillars supporting development of the Czech language and culture). Čelakovský was also influenced by Ossianism. This fascination with Ossian's poems later changed into fascination with Walter Scott. Reasons why Čelakovský translated Lady of the Lake mostly by prose are purely Pre-romantic as Závodský proves by quoting Čelakovský's letter to Josef Vlastimil Kamarýt from January 20th 1825. Kamarýt objected to the form of the translation and advised Čelakovský to translate Scott's work in verse. Čelakovský replied: "*Jazyk anglický, zvláště Skotův, tuze stručný, a to nejde tak v českém, leda bych chtěl Neskota vytvořiti...*" [...English language, especially Scott's English, is far too concise and this makes translation in Czech verse (unless I intended to murder Scott's work) impossible.] (in: Závodský 1982, 136-137). This approach is confirmed by Levý (1983, 232-233), who claims that the average length of the Czech word is 2,4 syllables, while the average length of the English word

is only 1,4 syllable. Čelakovský's letter also reveals one more important aspect of translation in Pre-romanticism: Translating from translation: "*Já raději se držím překladatele polského Szenkiewicza, který též prosou překládá...*" [I rather follow the Polish translator Szenkiewicz who also translates Scott by the means of prose] (in: Závodský 1982, 137). Polish translation by Karol z Kalinówki is for the purpose of comparison attached in the appendices (4).

Čelakovský's approach to translation shows (besides translating poetry by prose) another widely spread tendency in translation of the beginnings of the 19th century. This tendency is to use translations by other authors for the purpose of the own success in translating a particular work. According to Levý's characteristics of this method of translation (1996, 77-78), it was not considered to be devaluating in relation to the original text. Levý proves it by citing Josef Jungmann's letter to Antonín Marek from 29th December 1810 where Jungmann says: "*Přítom chci pomaličku překládati Dona Quijota, zatím podle Floriána, nemaje španělského, časem podle originálu to přejdu.*" [Besides it, I intend to slowly translate Don Quixote by consulting the translation by Florian. I choose this approach since I do not have the Spanish original but later on I will revise it following the original] (Levý 1996, 77). In his letter, Jungmann is talking about the translation of Don Quixote by Jean-Pierre Claris de Florian. Later on, as the influence of Romanticism begins to prevail over the one of Classicism and precise word-for-word translation is required, the "translation from translation" appears as a method which leads to the considerable distortion of the original works. Such an approach is depicted by Levý's citing Jakub Malý who said:

"Když pak často již i to rozdíl činí, béřeme-li ku příkladu to neb ono vydání textu, ježto jsou nestejně správnosti, jakýž teprv rozdíl jest v tom, překládáme-li z jazyka původního anebo zase jen z cizího překladu!"

[Very often, the difference from original is made by the slightest nuances, as far as different editions of translation are concerned. The difference is logically bigger if we consider direct translating in comparison to translation from another translation].

As far as common literature is concerned, in the period of Pre-romanticism, the most popular translations functioning as a source for Czech translators were the German ones. Czech translators of the National Revival used this language on a very proficient

level. Another category of texts in the National Revival was the category of texts which were supposed to form and enrich Czech language. Levý explains the lack of interest in German by the needs of Czech authors and translators to liberate from the influence of German (1996, 78) and says that Revivalists' language preferences in this area of translation were aimed at Polish. The justification of Polish as a language which is incomparably more suitable for Czech efforts to translate foreign texts is explained by Levý's (1996, 78) citing Antonín Jaroslav Puchmajer who preferred Polish because it has, similarly to Czech, Slavonic origin. Puchmajer further reasons the choice of Polish by the possibility of enriching the Czech language of refined "Slavonic style" of expressions and thus continually diminishing the negative influence of the "German-like" degraded Czech language which, according to Puchmajer, spoils Czech literature.

Another feature of Pre-romantic translation efforts is the use of diminutives. Even though Levý mentions it in relation to the earlier stage of the Czech National Revival (1996, 92-93), diminutives are, mainly due to the character of the period, possible to observe even in the Pre-romanticism. In the end of the period of Pre-romanticism, the overuse of Rococo-styled diminutives is criticised mainly by F. L. Čelakovský (reference in: Levý 1996, 93).

3.3.3. Czech Ossianism

Czech Ossianism entered the stage of the Czech National revival as the above-mentioned desire to prove that Czech nation is a level to other nations of Western Europe. Dolanský in his work *Záhada Ossiana v Rukopisech královédvorském a zelenohorském* (1975, 8) explains that it was the Ossian's "courageous imagery" what attracted Pre-romantic Europe. The poems of Ossian (full title is "Fragments of ancient poetry, collected in the Highlands of Scotland and translated from the Gaelic or Erse language."). The success of forged Poems of Ossian (published in 1760) resulted in latter publishing of eposes Fingal (1762) and Temora (1763). The author of the Ossian's cycle, Scottish poet James Macpherson, deliberately claimed the work to be of his own but it was not long after publishing the whole Ossian's cycle when critical voices rose (Dolanský 1975, 8). Even though the Ossian's cycle was proved to be a forged document, its fame started to spread all over the Europe and entered also Russia. The

main character of the cycle is a Scottish bard Ossian, the son of Fingal. Macpherson situated Ossian's heroic deeds to the third and fourth century A.D.

The initial phase of Czech Ossianism is described in the article of Tomáš Hlobil, *August Gottlieb Meissner a český ossianismus* which was published in the first issue of the magazine *Aluze* of the volume 2006 (pp. 153-159). Hlobil claims that the very beginnings of the Czech Ossianism reach back in time as far as the end of Napoleonic wars. According to Hlobil, the essential role connected with the beginnings of Ossian's existence in the Czech context was played by aesthetics and poetics lectures of August Gottlieb Meissner who lectured at the Charles University in Prague. Besides Meissner's lectures themselves, Hlobil assigns the beginnings of spreading of Ossianism also to the notes of Josef Jungmann and Josef Liboslav Ziegler who were students of Meissner. Hlobil divides Jungmann's and Ziegler's notes into two groups. First group is connected with the relation of particular episodes and the overall structure of Fingal. Second group of notes (more important according to Hlobil) concentrates on "negating objections against aesthetics functioning as a discipline offering authors rules for art". During his lectures, Meissner pointed that it was improbable that the author of Ossian's poems was James Macpherson himself. Meissner's arguments relied mainly on the fact that Macpherson himself had not written anything else besides Ossian. Meissner believed in authenticity of Ossian's cycle even despite the fact that Macpherson had never revealed the Scottish original poems. Meissner, in his lectures, characterizes the Ossian's poems (Fingal in particular) as a "lucky combination of lyrical and epic tone" Meissner further highlights the gracefulness of the characters together with the "ardent tone, swift and beautiful course of events and richness in scenes and metaphors" (Hlobil cites Jungmann's notes from *Epopée*, pp. 173-175). By mentioning Meissner's Prague lecturing on Ossianism, Hlobil manages to give the very initial starting point for Ossianism in the Czech lands. As he mentions in his article in *Aluze* (2006, issue 1, 154-155), the interest in Ossian in the period of the Czech national revival is not possible to take for granted. Hlobil in his study proves that the essential impulse which brought the theme of Ossian to the Czech literature (before the National revival started) was August Gottlieb Meissner and his students. As far as further development of Ossian's existence in the Czech National revival is concerned, Hlobil stresses two

aspects of it. First aspect only repeats the fact that the development of the theme of Ossian enters Czech lands (due to already mentioned delay in the sequence of movements entering Czech stage) with a considerable delay. The second aspect of Czech Ossianism is according to Hlobil of a crucial nature and is related to the “tight bound” between Ossian and forged manuscripts *Rukopis královédvorský* (“found” by Václav Hanka in 1817) and *Rukopis zelenohorský* (“found” in 1817 and published in 1822). Hlobil claims that Czech perception and examination of Ossian have not been able to break the strong connection to above-mentioned forged manuscripts. Hlobil further mentions that it was Ossian’s connection to the manuscripts what caused the interest of translators and people involved in newly developing Czech literary style in the form of the verse. According to Hlobil, there existed two groups of authors and translators preferring either metrical or stress-based prosody and thus influencing the development of the Czech prosodic system.

Ossian is also the first attempt of František Palacký to “follow the path of the Czech pen craft”, as Jan Jakubec claims in his *Poznámky* [Notes] to *Básně Františka Palackého* [Poems of Palacký] (1898, 110). Palacký published his translation of Ossian in *Prvotiny pěkných umění* (1817, issue 27 and 28) and did not conceal his passion for him when he named Ossian “the heartthrob among all the poets”. As the period of Czech pre-romanticism progressed towards the year 1830 (according to Vodička, the approximate end of Pre-romanticism in the Czech lands) Palacký’s attitude changed significantly. Palacký, originally praising Ossian’s “beautiful naturalness, deep and faithful feelings, excellence of thoughts, dignity, natural beauty and fantasy” later evaluated Ossian much more critically (Jakubec 1848, 112). Jakubec claims that Palacký, due to his critical nature, found Ossian of opposite absolutely opposite features than the originally praised ones. Jakubec (1898, 113) illustrates it by citing Palacký:

“Takto soudil a psal mladík ještě ne cele 19letý ...proto také nepokračováno dále u překládání díla Macphersonova. Chorobná citlivost i něžnost, ba i uplakané hrdinství... nemohou než na krátce poutati cit a obraznost, a to jen v jejich prvním bujném rozvoji...”

[These were the opinions of a young boy before reaching his 19... it is why I decided to not continue with translating Macpherson’s work. Compulsive sensitiveness and tenderness, even maudlin bravery... cannot impress by evoked emotions and imagery

longer than for a mere while. The while which is connected to the lush development of these qualities].

To demonstrate the approach to the issue of Ossianism and translation in the specific context of the Pre-romantic period of the Czech National Revival, two samples of translations and their analyses are attached. First translation (by František Palacký) dates back as far as to 1817 and thus belongs to the High phase of the Czech Pre-romanticism (according to Vodička's treatment of the terminology). The second translation (by Josef Hollmann) was published in 1827 and thus witnessed the end of the High phase of the Czech Pre-romanticism and the Fade out phase (again according to Vodička's terminology) gaining its rule.

Analyses of the selected translations are aimed at observing theoretical aspects of translation theories and aesthetics of Czech Pre-romantic period described in this paper.

for Colma, and our souls were sad! Ullin came with his harp! he gave the song of Alpin. The voice of Alpin was pleasant: the soul of Ryno was a beam of fire! But they had rested in the narrow house; their voices had ceased in Selma: Ullin had returned, one day, from the chase, before the heroes fell. He heard their strife on the hill; their song was soft but sad! They mourned the fall of Morar, first of mortal men! His soul was like the soul of Fingal; his sword like the sword of Oscar. But he fell, and his father mourned; his sister's eyes were full of tears. Minona's eyes were full of tears, the sister of ear-borne Morar. She retired from the song of Ullin, like the moon in the west, when she foresees the shower, and hides her fair head in a cloud. I touched the harp with Ullin; the song of mourning rose!

Ryno. The wind and the rain are past: calm is the noon of day. The clouds are divided in heaven. Over the green hills flies the inconstant sun. Red through the stony vale comes down the stream of the hill. Sweet are thy murmurs, O stream! but more sweet is the voice I hear. It is the voice of Alpin, the son of song, mourning for the dead! Bent is his head of age; red his tearful eye. Alpin, thou son of song, why alone on the silent hill? why complainest thou, as a blast in the wood; as a wave on the lonely shore?

Ullín, přistoupiv s harfou, dal nám zpěv Alpínův. Hlas Alpínův líbezný byl, duše Rynova jako paprsek ohně. Ale již jsou spočívali v doméčku ouzkém; pominul na Selmě hlas jejich. – Ullín, navrátev se jednou z lovu, přede dnem pádu hrdin, slyšel zpěv jejich na pohorku: píseň jejich líbezná, ale smutná. Toužilit' pádu Morara, prvního mezi smrtedlníky. Duše jeho, jako duše Fingalova: meč jeho - meč Oskarův. Ale on padl, a otec jeho žalostil; oči sestry jeho plny byly slz (slz) – Minoniny oči plny byly slz, sestry mocného Morara. I ustoupila před zpěvem Ullínovým, jako měsíček na západu, předzvídáje bouři, ukryje v oblak krásnou hlavu svou. Já dotýkal harfy s Ullínem; zpěv smutku začal se!

Ryno.

„Přešli vítr a déšť, ticho jest o poledni, rozehnala se oblaka na nebesích. Nad zeleným pahorkem poletuje nestálý slunce blesk. Červenavý hrčí potok dolů kamenitým oudolím. Sladký jest šum tvůj, potůčku, ale sladčejší hlásek, kterého doslýchám. Hlas to Alpína, syna zpěvů, truchlicího po mrtvých. Sehnutá-tě stářím hlava jeho; červení se oko ode slz.

Alpíne, synu zpěvů, proč samotný na
tichém pahorku? proč to kvílíš jako v lesu
větříček, jako vlnka na břehu samotném?“

This excerpt is taken from Palacký's translation of Ossian (published in 1817, in *Prvotiny pěkných umění neb Vídeňské učené Noviny*, pp. 118-119), consulted with Jakubec's edition (Palacký 1898, 81-82). Original is from Macpherson (1834, 111).

As far as the form of the translation in relation to the original text is concerned, Palacký stayed (according to Pre-romantic ideals) faithful to the structuring his text. It is obvious that he translated Macpherson's Ossian with respect to the absolute majority of all nuances of the original. In his strive to be as faithful to the original as possible, Palacký absolutely respects punctuation (e.g. use of colons, semi-colons which divide individual sentences, exclamation marks and question marks), and the use of capital letters. The only exception to treating punctuation as in the original is replacing full-stops by dashes (for evidence, consult the excerpt). Capital letters are, according to the original texts omitted after colons and semi-colons. Palacký's strive to faithfully translate the original text reflects also in the way of treating proper names. In this field Palacký's treatment of the original is not so enormously accurate as in the case of punctuation, nevertheless it still reflects Pre-romantic ideals of a translator. Proper names in the excerpt are modified to better fit Czech pronunciation. The vowel [i] in Macpherson's text was prolonged to [i:] in Palacký's translation (see names Alpín and Ullín in the excerpt). The treatment of the name "Oscar" (Oskar in Palacký's translation) shows the same approach. Palacký's translation also reveals his approach to Pre-romantic tendency to translate everything by replacing one expression by another one (the most adequate one). The excerpt shows that Palacký worships this approach but only to certain extent. While the structure of the text is preserved by one hundred percent in Palacký's translation, the word-for-word approach is not so precise but it does not mean that it is harmful to the translation. Palacký respects the word order of the original and, at the same time, he subordinates the style of his translation to the needs of the prose of the Czech National Revival for which the "high style" was important. Palacký's efforts to approach the translation in accordance with the previously mentioned are observable in the word order of the translation and Palacký's choices in the field of lexis and grammar. From the excerpt it is obvious that Palacký, in order to instil the translation a higher and poetic atmosphere, prefers the postposition of adjectives (e.g. zpěv Alpínův,

meč Oskarův, na břehu samotném) and possessive pronouns (e.g. hlas jejich, píseň jejich). For creation of the “high style” prose, another feature of poetic language is used. Palacký enriches words of vowels to increase the flow of the sentence (as described in...). Examples of such treatment are: *Slez* and *ode slz* [tears] and [from the tears]. This is a result of aesthetics of the Czech Pre-romantic period which, again in desire for the “higher style”, tries to reduce as much consonants (namely their clusters) as possible and replace them by vowels (Levý 1996, 116). The word (slz) in brackets also shows Palacký’s approach to neologisms. In accordance with the approach of Jungmann in his *Atala*, Palacký explains possibly unknown words by putting the meaning of the word into brackets inserted directly into the body of the translation. Thus, the clash between Classicistic method (explanatory notes in brackets) and Pre-romantic enriching of the Czech language is displayed.

As far as syntax is concerned, it is necessary to agree with Vodička (1948, 152) that the relation between sentences, both in the original and in the translation, is paratactic (two sentences are syntactically joined in the way that either of the two sentences is both syntactically and meaning-wise independent of the other one). Moreover, Palacký in his translation respects the content of the sentences in the original and therefore no enjambment in the Czech Ossian originates.

Palacký’s treatment of participles interferes with the word-by-word approach to translation but it does not affect the translation in a negative way. According to Jan Sedláček (in: Jedlička and Dvořák 1959, 247), some authors in the period of the Czech National Revival preferred omitting participles of the auxiliary verbs in connection to adjectives in the passive voice. A comparison of Palacký’s translation to the Sedláček’s theory shows that Palacký accepted the newly forming trend (refer to “sehnutá” in the text of the translation). Further Palacký’s treatment of participles includes replacing Macpherson’s finite verb forms “Ullin came, Ullin had returned and she foresees” by Czech participles “přistoupiv, navrátiv se and předzvídáje”. Sedláček paraphrases František Kopečný and claims that this treatment of participles and adjectives is possible to classify as elliptic participles (reference in: Jedlička and Dvořák 1959, 247). However, Palacký realises more ellipses in his translation and thus contributes to

liveliness of the translation, preventing repetition (compare “The voice of Alpin was pleasant: the soul of Ryno was a beam of fire” and “Hlas Alpínův líbezný byl, duše Rynova jako paprsek ohně.”).

Palacký's choice of lexical expressions to depict the landscape and moods of the characters are selected carefully with respect to Pre-romantic tendencies. Description of the nature in the excerpt is very colourful and evocative. Moreover, the character of the excerpt highlights the reason why Pre-romanticism is sometimes titled as Sentimentalism. The excerpt depicts a gloomy atmosphere, woeful events and melancholic feelings (“Přešli vítr a déšť, ticho jest o poledni, rozehnala se oblaka na nebesích. Nad zeleným pahorkem poletuje nestálý slunce blesk, Ale on padl, a otec jeho žalostil and Sehnutá-tě stářím hlava jeho; červení se oko ode sléz”).

As the second analysis of translation of Macpherson's Ossian is related to the later time interval of development of Pre-romanticism and Romanticism in the Czech lands, after the analysis of Palacký's translation the description of this interval, named by Vodička as the Fade out phase of the Czech Pre-romanticism.

3.4. The Fade-out phase of the Czech Pre-romanticism

Vodička (1948, 335-348) introduces reasons why Pre-romanticism vanishes from Czech literature and the National Revival and says: “*Každý nový směr literární vzniká z touhy vyřešit problémy, jež vyplývají z aktuální krise, do jaké se dostala literatuře předcházejícího období.*” [Every literary movement arises from the current issues resulting from the crisis of the previous movement], (Vodička 1948, 335). Pre-romantic movement is thus no exception to this rule. Pre-romantic prose and translation were accepted very positively in the beginning but with the development of the movement critical feedback started to appear. Vodička claims that it is not possible to look for the reasons of decline of Pre-romanticism only in the movement itself but also in the reading audience. The beginning of the 19th century in the Czech lands was characteristic by the increased level of interest in supporting the Czech language to grow in quality and support Czech self-awareness, culture and literature by this way. As the first three decades of the 19th century passed, authors and translators realized that

the “high style” of prose they had created, is comprehensible only to a narrow group of educated and linguistically oriented people. Pathos and poetic character of works however stayed incomprehensible to the wider reading audience. Vodička (1948, 336) blames both generations of the Czech National Revival for it. “Wider reading audience”, according to Vodička consisted of two groups of people. First group was the group of “common people” who, due to the level of their education were not able to “decipher” the texts of the prose of the “higher style”. The second group of people to who was the Pre-romantic prose inaccessible was the educated Czech nobility. The nobility, however received a high level of education, was not due to enormous fixation on the German language background able to read the texts written in complicated Pre-romantic style (even though reading simpler texts caused them no difficulties). According to Vodička (1948, 337), it is František Palacký, who strives most for the higher level of comprehensibility of Czech prose. Vodička further claims that the problem of incomprehensibility was recognisable in the whole category of belles lettres and former advocates of the “higher style” during the course of time changed their opinion and started to prevent the standard language from becoming negatively affected by Pre-romantic style (Vodička 1948, 338). Authors and translators involved in enriching Czech language of new expressions and theories suddenly changed their approach and started to prefer Classicistic and humanistic treatment of the language as an effort to “stabilize and preserve” the language. Pre-romantic approaches were regarded as something, the purpose of what was only to enhance the aesthetic, lexical and stylistic features of the Czech language. Together with Palacký, it was also Jungmann, who was engaged in “stabilizing” efforts.

Vodička (1948, 339) claims that prose of the Czech Pre-romanticism was not supposed to develop in the way it used to during first three decades of the 19th century. Vodička in particular mentions the “poetisation of lexis” which had to be stopped or, at least practised in a different manner. The main problem with poetic lexis in prose was the use of archaic terms, Old Czech and Slavonic lexis or stylisation. Vodička appreciates the function of this approach in the forged manuscripts *Rukopis královédvorský* and *Rukopis zelenohorský* but finds it unacceptable in works of “folk” character where it has a nature of a meretricious mode. Other stylistic devices such as pathos of changed word

order or phonetic devices with dramatizing effect are according to Vodička in the same situation (Vodička 1948, 339). Czech prose of the beginning of the thirties of the 19th century required naturalness. This requirement was voiced not only by Palacký but also by younger authors of prose such as Josef Kajetán Tyl. Tyl's attitude to the ideals of Pre-romantic prose is obvious from his question: "*Je-li již v tom kus zdravé přirozenosti?*" [Does this really contain any trace of naturalness?], (reference in: Vodička 1948, 341). Tyl, in his effort to make the Czech prose more natural refuses participles, pathos, ancientry and purism as products of the period of the "first large turmoil" in literature (reference in: Vodička 1948, 343). Vodička agrees with Tyl that it was the continual repetition of these stereotyped qualities which made Czech reading audience perceive Pre-romantic prose as "artificial and lifeless formalism".

As stated by Vodička (1948, 346-347), there are several impulses for the development of a prose different from the Pre-romantic one. First impulse comes from reconstruction of the links between literary works and reality. Pre-romantic world was characteristic for its idiosyncrasies and connection with mystic and unusual nature. The intentions of newly forming prose were not to destroy these ideals but to add the feeling of reality and probability to them. The reality of nature and surroundings in the newly forming prose relies on the connection with up-to-datedness (e.g. national and social situation of the society, the personality of a poet himself/herself or a human being in general). As Pre-romanticism declined and gradually changed into Romanticism, the efforts to depict the nature and history as phenomena absolutely disconnected from the present situation vanished and were replaced by viewing the nature and history interfere with the present time by the means of a poet-narrator (e.g. K. H. Mácha's approach) or a human destiny.

The time span of the gradual change of Pre-romanticism to Romanticism is the period when Josef Hollmann's translation of Macpherson's *Ossian* and F.L. Čelakovský's translation of Scott's *The Lady of the Lake* were published.

The following excerpt is a part of Hollmann's translation of *Ossian*, a part named *Darthula* (Macpherson 1827, 221-222). Original from: Macpherson (1834, 144)

DAUGHTER of heaven, fair art thou! the silence of thy face is pleasant! Thou comest forth in loveliness. The stars attend thy blue course in the east. The clouds rejoice in thy presence, O moon! They brighten their dark-brown sides. Who is like thee in heaven, light of the silent night? The stars are ashamed in thy presence. They turn away their sparkling eyes. Whither dost thou retire from thy course when the darkness of thy countenance grows? Hast thou thy hall, like Ossian? Dwellest thou in the shadow of grief? Have thy sisters fallen from heaven? Are they who rejoiced with thee, at night, no more? Yes! they have fallen, fair light! and thou dost often retire to mourn. But thou thyself shalt fail one night, and leave thy blue path in heaven. The stars will then lift up their heads: they, who were ashamed in thy presence, will rejoice. Thou art now clothed

Dcero oblohy, což ty krásna jsi!
 Libé je ticho na líci tvé,
 Ana kráčíš ve spanilosti.
 Hvězdice od východu
 Zprovázej tě na dráze blankytné;
 Oblaka jásají ve tvé, ó luno,
 přítomnosti;
 Tebou zjasňují černosivé kraje své;
 Kdož ti roven na obloze,
 Ty světlo noci pustotiché?
 Hvězdy se zastyzují před tebou,
 Odvracejí od tebe své jiskřivé zraky.
 Kamže ustupuješ z dráhy své,
 Kdy se ti šerota po líci rozetře?
 Mášli kobku svou jako Ossian?
 Bydlíšli ve stínu hoře?
 Zda sestry tvé spadaly s oblohy?
 Zda jich není více,
 Jenže s tebou se těšivaly z noci
 Ano spadaly, ty světlo krásné
 A ty často se vracíš smutnět po nich!
 I ty zmizneš v některé noci,
 A Opustíš blankytnou na obloze dráhu!
 Pak hvězdy pozdvihnou hlavy své,
 Stydivše se před tebou,
 A v radosti zajásají

The different treatment of translation, when compared to the translation of Palacký, is recognizable in Hollmann's use of different structure of the text (both from Macpherson and from Palacký). Hollmann's translation is structured into lines (each of which starts with a capital letter) which in loose manner follow the structure of the original text. As far as punctuation is concerned, the approach of Hollmann shows lower level of respecting Pre-romantic ideals of the absolutely faithful translation. The distribution of punctuation is the same as in the original text but the symbols do not correspond to the ones in the original. This is the result of Hollmann's loose treatment of Pre-romantic word-for word approach. By dividing it into separate lines, Hollmann instilled his translation the atmosphere of poetry. The poetic atmosphere of the translation is also underlined by the frequent use of use of long vowel e (e.g. líci tvé, dráze blankytné, kraje své, pustotiché, dráhy své and others) at the end of several lines. Hollmann also

tries to keep Macpherson's attitude to the poetic character of the work. Thus even alliteration appears in the Czech translation ("light of the silent night" translated by Hollmann as "Ty světlo noci pustotiché"). Hollmann's word-for-word approach to translation is not so absolute as the one of Palacký. In the first line, for example, Hollmann puts more stress on the exclamatory character of the sentence whereas the sentence in the original texts is rather of indicative character. Further, Hollmann does not follow the word order also in the sentence where The Moon is addressed ("Oblaka jásají ve tvé, ó luno, přítomnosti") and places the addressing of The Moon in the middle of the sentence, which helps to establish a pathetic style of the sentence. Another example showing that Hollmann tried to translate more freely than Palacký is the sentence "Are they who rejoiced with thee, at night, no more?". Palacký translated it by inverting the sequence of sentences ("Zda jich není více, Jenže s tebou se těšivaly z noci?"). This "non-observance" of Pre-romantic ideals, again, does not harm Hollmann's translation in any way. Except from the above-mentioned examples, Hollmann respects Pre-romantic ideals, even though his faithfulness to the original (in Pre-romantic point of view) is influenced by an approach significantly different than the one of Palacký. As far as word-for-word translation in relation to lexis is concerned, Hollmann for instance succeeds in expressing the beauty and majesty of The Moon by translating original's "loveliness" as "spanilost" [charm, beauty]. The word "spanilost" suits better Pre-romantic aesthetics as it depicts someone or something majestic or dignified.

However the excerpt contains an example of the participle ("Stydivše se"), as far as the use of participles is concerned; Hollmann does not incline to this tendency. On the contrary, the tendency which is respected by Hollmann is the postposition of adjectives (in the excerpt e.g. "dráze blankytné, noci pustotiché") and possessive pronouns (e.g. "líci tvé, kraje své") in his translation. However Hollmann's translation does not feature the overuse of postposition.

Hollmann's fulfilment of Pre-romantic aesthetics needs is obvious from addressing The Moon ("Luna" in the translation). The Moon is addressed as something unique and special. Moreover, Either Macpherson or Hollmann in the translation assign The Moon

(“Luna”) a status of a living woman (“Daughter of heaven, Dcera oblohy”) and thus involve her in Pre-romantic sentimentality by noticing that it is not for ever that she will shine on the sky.

The third demonstration of Pre-romantic approaches to translation in the period of the Czech National Revival uses the excerpt from the Čelakovský’s translation of Walter Scott’s poem “The Lady of the Lake”. Čelakovský’s *Panna Jezerní* [The Lady of the Lake] was published in 1829 and shows how Čelakovský, under the influence of Pre-romantism, together with the specific linguistic situation of the Czech language (almost no potential for versed poetry) faced the difficult task of translation. Levý, in his analysis (1996, 133) of another excerpt from Čelakovský’s *Panna Jezerní* shows that Scott’s poem is both syntactically and verse-wise divided into couplets. Čelakovský in his translation respects these couplets and this is why he divides the text of *Panna Jezerní* into coordinated units or into coordinated complex sentences which are divided into halves. Levý, by his analysis also confirms Pre-romantic tendencies to prefer postposition of adjectives and verbs. Moreover, Levý classifies Čelakovský’s approach as inclining to Classicism in the aspect of the “ease to follow” the text. This aspect, according to Levý, is related to restraint in the use of Pre-romantic flowery language full of features which J.K. Tyl in the ČČM magazine in 1846 classified as “*nepřirozené nadutí, olověné vlečení a kroucení*” [unnatural pompousness and heavy distortion of the language], (reference in: Vodička 1948, 341). For Levý’s excerpt (canto V), consult the appendices (4). This paper’s analysis uses the fifth part of the first canto of the poem (Scott 1825, 14-15) and its translation (Scott 1828, 176).

V.

**The noble Stag was pausing now,
Upon the mountain’s southern brow,
Where broad extended, far beneath,
The varied realms of fair Menteith.
With anxious eye he wander’d o’er
Mountain and meadow, moss and moor,
And ponder’d refuge from his toil,
By far Lochard or Aberfoyle.**

**But nearer was the copse-wood gray,
That waved and wept on Loch-Achray,
And mingled with the pine-trees blue
On the bold cliffs of Ben-venue.
Fresh vigour with the hope return’d,
With flying foot the heath he spurn’d,
Held westward with unwearied race,
And left behind the panting chase.**

Staví se konečně spanilý jelen na temenu polední hory, ku které přiléhá kvetoucí panství rozlehlého Menteitu. Bázlivým okem probíhá vůkol pahorky, louky, močály a bažiny, rozmýšleje či v podálném Lochardě, či v Aberfayle odvaha jeho přítulku nalezne. Bližší však jsou šeré borky, jež se schvívají a pláčí nad jezerem Achrayským, sousedující s pomodralými sosnami na kolmém ouskalí Benvenuském. Naděje nová osvěžuje jeho síly; uletující nohou tepe padrtiny, a neunaveným poskokem na západ se chýle zůstavuje za sebou uhnané lovce.

The analysis of the fifth canto proves Levý's theory right. As far as the first two couplets of the original are concerned, Čelakovský joined them in one complex sentence. The other three four-lined parts of the poem are treated in the same way in the translation. From the contrastive point of view, Čelakovský's approach to translation of Scott's poem is absolutely inversed to the approach of Josef Hollmann's translation of Macpherson's Ossian. Whereas Hollmann strived to translate Macpherson's prose by structuring it into separated lines, Čelakovský uses different approach and organizes Scott's verses into what Levý names "rhythmical prose" (1996, 132). However, Čelakovský did not translate Scott's work only by the means of prose. Some parts of it are translated in verse as well. The display of Čelakovský's approach is excerpted from the final sequence of canto's VI twentieth part (Scott 1825, 280) and Scott (1828, 176).

—Just then a flash of lightning came,	Tu blesk se po mracích rozlívá;
It tinged the waves and strand with flame;—	A břeh a jezero ohněm splývá;
I mark'd Duncraggan's widow'd dame,	Vidím vdovu
Behind an oak I saw her stand,	Dunkragganovu
A naked dirk gleam'd in her hand :—	Na pobřeží v té době teskné,
It darken'd,—but amid the moan	Nahá se jí dýka v ruce leskne
Of waves I heard a dying groan ;—	Opět se zatmělo, z vln klokotání
Another flash !—the spearman floats	Vyniká násilné smrti stenání;
A weltering corse beside the boats,	Nový blesk vody osvěcuje, -
And the stern matron o'er him stood,	Již mrtvola podle lodi pluje,
Her hand and dagger streaming blood.	A mstitelkyně nade hlavou
	V pěsti drží braň krvavou.

As depicted in the excerpt the Pre-romantic faithfulness to the original is respected only as far as the content of particular couplets is concerned. Čelakovský, in order to create rhyme in the Czech language, was forced to shift the content from one rhyme to another or to create a slightly different background to the story (compare: “Behind an oak I saw her stand” with the Czech “Na pobřeží v té době teskné” [On the coast in wistful times]). After this verse, Scott uses an enjambment of “Of waves” belonging to the previous line to the following line. Čelakovský in his translation manages to keep the content of the verse on one line and moreover, by the use of “Opět se zatmělo” suggests the atmosphere of the storm (i.e. continuous contrast of darkness and the light) more successfully than Scott does. Scott’s suggestion of a heavy storm is realized by the following verse (“Another flash...”). Further, Scott manages to “identify” the victim of the murder in the same verse but Čelakovský’s translation gives the description of the overall atmosphere instead. The last couplet from the excerpt shows signs of the faithful translation (however the translation is not faithful to the absolute Pre-romantic extent). Even though Čelakovský did not respect the absolute faithfulness to the original, it has no harming effects on the translation. Not observing the Pre-romantic need for the highest possible level of faithfulness is thus a necessary approach when the translation is supposed to be in verses.

Concerning Levý’s thesis about Čelakovský’s inclination to postposition of adjectives and verbs in the translation, it is proved right even in the versed parts of *Panna Jezerní* (“Blesk se po mracích rozlívá, době teskné, v ruce leskne” etc.). In accordance with Pre-romantic theory of “higher style” language, Čelakovský translates Scott’s finite verb forms (he) “held” and (he) “left” by participles (“na západ se chýle, zůstává za sebou”). Čelakovský however stays faithful to Pre-romantic aesthetic sense of imagery and mysticism, which is depicted on both “prosaic” and “poetic” excerpt of his translation (description of the landscape where the stag is being hunted and description of the dark sea repeatedly enlightened by the flash together with the “murder scene”). Another field where Čelakovský respects the ideals of Pre-romanticism are proper names. Čelakovský does not replace them by their Czech equivalents or even absolutely different names but works with the names from the English original. The only change

Čelakovský does to the names of characters is the replacement of certain consonants to provide Czech spelling (e.g. change of English “Duncarggan” to Czech “Dunkarggan”).

Hollmann’s translation of Ossian and Čelakovský’s translation of the Lady of the Lake belong to the time period which is characteristic for handing its rule over translation theories, literature and aesthetics to Romanticists and, later on, representatives of post-National Revival period. Translation theories thus begin to feature more Classicistic approaches which form the cornerstone for the following development of Romanticism and, after the National Revival, the development of translation and literature around authors and translators from magazines Ruch and Lumír.

4. Conclusion

Czech theories of translation in general faced a difficult task in the period of the National Revival. Not only were they supposed to develop the humanistic theories into more mature ones but also aimed at enrichment of the lexical and stylistic layers of the Czech language. Translation theories which followed the humanistic ones were the Classicistic, Pre-romantic and Romantic ones. Whereas Classicism was the leading movement before the turn of the 18th and 19th century, Pre-romanticism and Romanticism ruled translation theories in the first three decades of the 19th century (Pre-romanticism) and in later years (Romanticism). Values of Classicism as far as translation theories are concerned consisted in approaching translation as “refining” the original text and “competing” with the author of the original in the form of the literary work. Classicistic approach to translation often lay in putting explanatory notes either directly in the text or after the translation. Later, Pre romantic and romantic translators focused on faithfulness of the translation instead. They worshipped original works as art which is necessary to be translated word-by-word due to transmitting all the unique features of individuality in every its piece from one language to another. After it, Romantic tendencies were involved in making translations more available for “common” people. Due to the specific relation of the Czech development of literary movements to their development in the Western Europe (every literary movement of the turn of the 18th and 19th century entered Czech lands with delay), the period of the development of the Czech language in the Czech National revival was influenced by Classicism which was slowly fading out, Pre-romanticism and the first romantic

tendencies almost at once. It influenced also the range of translators who treated the theories. As the above-mentioned literary movements and their influence on translation changed one for another in approximately forty years which was not enough for the natural change of their representatives, the first three decades of the 19th century are also typical for combination of approaches in case of individual translators (e.g. Jungmann). The leading movement in the second phase of the Czech National Revival is the movement of Pre-romanticism. Pre-romanticists and their approach to translation and literature met best the needs of development of the Czech language towards a higher style, which emerged after the long time of the decline of Czech language and national self-awareness. Features that were supposed to elevate Czech language (neologisms, compounds, postposition of sentence elements, using participles instead of subordinated clauses, experiments with word order, flowery language, translation either by poetry or by prose) and aesthetic features (pathos, rich and colourful imagery, sentimental and sad mood) were observed in the translations of James Macpherson's and Walter Scott's works. Analysed Czech translations by František Palacký, Josef Hollmann and František Ladislav Čelakovský show all aspects of Pre-romantic linguistics and aesthetics described in the theoretical part of the paper and thus follow the tendencies which were typical for the first three decades of the 19th century.

Résumé

Práce se zabývá teoriemi překladu, které se utvářely na našem území v době českého Národního obrození, s důrazem na teorie překladu a estetické ideály českého předromantismu. Ve své úvodní části se práce zabývá prvními komplexnějšími úvahami o teorii překladu, které mají počátek v období středověku a s ním spojeným husitským hnutím. V této době je překlad spojen především s náboženstvím a náboženskou literaturou, která zde existuje především v kulturním kontextu západní Evropy a dělí se na dvě oblasti, kanonickou (šířenou písemnou formou a mezi vzdělanější vrstvy) a světskou (šířenou ústně mezi „obyčejné lidi“). V těchto prvopočátcích českých překladatelských teorií bylo hlavním zájmem překladatelů pouze převést náboženské texty z jednoho jazyka do druhého tak, aby byl přeložený text relevantní publiku, které jej dostane k dispozici. Nebylo tak výjimkou svévolné vynechávání například celých pasáží originálního textu. Rozvinutější teorie překladu postavená na lingvistických základech je záležitostí období pozdějšího, období humanismu. V tomto období byly oblasti kanonické a světské literatury k překladu obohaceny o oblast třetí, která kombinovala jejich vlastnosti, což spolu s vynálezem knihtisku vyústilo v šíření překladů náboženské literatury v písemné podobě mezi co nejširší základnu čtenářů. Překladatelé v tomto období tak dostávají nepřehledné množství možností, jak čelit problematice překladu. Humanistické teorie překladu se pokouší zjistit, zda je čeština vhodná k překladu z latiny stejně, jako ostatní cizí jazyky. Charakter práce humanistických překladatelů je možno označit jako adaptační, neboť při snaze o přiblížení textu širším masám publika docházelo například k vulgarizaci textu, nebo nahrazování jednoslovných výrazů výrazy delšími (za účelem co nejpřesnějšího vystižení originálu). V období renesance, které následovalo po humanismu, se překladatelé zaměřili na teorie, podle kterých by bylo možno překládat poezii. Jejich snahy však často končily pouze převodem s naznačeným rýmem a bez přítomnosti verše, často v nestejně dlouhých řádcích. Situace českých překladatelských teorií se nezlepšila ani v období baroka, kdy český národ upadl po porážce českých stavů na Bílé hoře do Habsburského područí. To mělo za následek emigraci početné skupiny potencionálních čtenářů českých překladů. Ke stagnaci českých překladatelských teorií a vydávání překladů vůbec, přispěl nemalou měrou také fakt, že mnoho Čechů přijalo za svůj první jazyk němčinu.

Téměř dvě a půl století kontinuálního úpadku českého jazyka a české kultury všeobecně vyústila v situaci, kdy se začaly intenzivněji objevovat požadavky na znovuoobnovení pozice českého jazyka a české kultury. České Národní obrození, jehož stručnou charakteristiku podává druhá kapitola této práce je snahou o oživení českého jazyka na úkor velmi rozšířeného jazyka německého. V období Národního obrození se také opět začínají objevovat propracovanější překladatelské teorie, které nyní čelí dvojímu úkolu. Teorie překladu v Národním obrození se věnují jak řešení otázek problému překladu, tak řešení otázek vlivu překladů a jejich lexikální, morfologické a stylistické složky na nově oživovaný český jazyk. Po stručné charakteristice Českého národního obrození poskytuje druhá kapitola této práce charakteristiku prvních teorií, které se v této době účastnily na formování českého překladu a jazyka obecně. Těmito teoriemi jsou teorie klasicistické, které navazují na teorie renesance. Oproti renesančním teoriím překladu však klasicistický přístup klade větší důraz na působení překladatele jako takového. Klasicistický překlad se tak stává dílem, které se svoji předlohou soupeří v kvalitě a podstatný požadavek je „vylepšení“ originálu. Klasicistické teorie překladu obohacují český jazyk o četné neologizmy, které jsou vysvětleny buď formou závorek přímo v textu, nebo až v sekci vysvětlivek za dílem. Požadavek doslovnosti se z důvodů výše zmíněného „soupeření“ s autorem originálu o kvalitnější dílo v klasicistických teoriích překladu nevyskytuje. Naopak, překladatelé vyznávají princip kompenzace, který jim umožňoval vzhledem k originálu pracovat s velkou mírou samostatnosti a svobody. Požadavek doslovnosti překladu přichází do atmosféry českého Národního obrození až po přelomu století, se směrem zvaným předromantismus. České předromantické teorie překladu, včetně impulsů, které způsobily jejich nástup na českou scénu a nahrazení klasicistického přístupu k překladu, jsou detailně popsány v následující kapitole práce. Třetí kapitola se věnuje překladatelským teoriím českého předromantismu, jeho fázím a vlivům na překladatelskou tvorbu jednotlivých autorů, jmenovitě Josefa Jungmanna, Františka Palackého, Josefa Hollmanna a Františka Ladislava Čelakovského. Předromantismus, jeho teorie překladu a estetika vstupují na scénu českého Národního obrození ovlivněny kulturním děním v západní Evropě, které má před kulturním děním českým předstih zhruba půl století. A tak když v západní Evropě již vládne překladu a literatuře čistě romantické tendence, dochází u nás k situaci, kdy má sice hlavní slovo předromantismus, ale v jeho počáteční fázi je ještě patrný vliv klasicistických teorií.

České předromantické teorie překladu se tedy začaly uplatňovat již v prvním desetiletí devatenáctého století, kdy Josef Jungmann publikoval překlad díla francouzského autora René Chateaubrianda, nazvaný *Atala, aneb láska dvou divochů na poušti*. Jungmann k překladu přistoupil velice inovativním stylem, čímž v podstatě podnítil snahy svých následovníků o neustálé zdokonalování a „přebušování“ slovní zásoby, morfologie a stylistických prostředků českého jazyka. Jungmannův přínos tkvěl hlavně v používání lexikálních jednotek do té doby češtině takřka neznámých a přeorganizování typické struktury věty se slovesem na konci. Jungmann dokázal uspořádat slovosled větných celků ve svém překladu Ataly tak, že slovesným tvarem jich končilo jen naprosté minimum. Předromantické teorie překladu a estetika si zachovaly vliv na tvorbu překladatelů po následujících dvacet let, během kterých rušily většinu teorií klasicistických a nastolovaly postupy zcela nové. Zásadním požadavkem předromantických teorií překladu bylo poznání individuálních a neopakovatelných vlastností originálního díla, či vlastností typických pro zemi jeho původu a její kulturu. Tímto předromantismus prakticky vyrušil klasicistický požadavek velmi volného překladu a místo něj nastoluje požadavek doslovnosti, jenž má poznání individualit a specialit předlohy umožnit. Poznání individuálních rysů originálu však nebylo jediným impulsem k proniknutí předromantismu do českých překladatelských teorií. Dalším impulsem byly tendence, které vyplývaly z vývoje předromantismu v kulturách západní Evropy. Předromantismus tak do překladů a literatury vnesl požadavek po dokonalých prostředcích k vyjádření obraznosti (např. fonetických), požadavek zakončení věty jinak, než slovesným tvarem (jak naznačil Jungmann v překladu Ataly), dále například požadavky na zobrazení přírody, která měla být zobrazena nejen jako prosté dějové pozadí. Neodmyslitelnou součástí předromantické estetiky byl také požadavek na vysokou míru emotivnosti v díle, která přecházela místy až v později kritizovaný sentimentalismus a „sladkobolnost“. Předromantismus také poskytl českému překladu možnost obohatit český jazyk o stylistické a lexikální vrstvy příznačné pro vyšší styl vyjadřování. Směrem, který byl vytyčen těmito požadavky a poprvé prozkoumán Jungmannovým překladem Ataly, se ve vrcholné fázi českého předromantismu vydali další překladatelé a autoři literárních děl. Vrcholná fáze českého předromantismu umožnila aplikovat výše zmíněné požadavky na styl a slovní zásobu jak v teoriích překladu, tak v původní tvorbě. Překladatelské teorie byly aplikovány na českém

ztvárnění díla skotského autora Jamese Macphersona, jehož Ossian (zprvu uváděný jako dílo pocházejícího z doby kolem třetího až čtvrtého století našeho letopočtu, později prokázán jako falzum) zaujal překladatele právě vrcholného českého předromantismu. Směr, kterým se ubírala vlastní tvorba autorů je dán stylem Rukopisu královédvorského a zelenohorského, které byly rovněž považovány za pravé historické dokumenty popisující středověké hrdinské boje rytířů (ekvivalent k Macphersonovu Ossianovi). Velmi důležitým zástupcem českých předromantických teorií překladu se tak po J. Jungmannovi stává František Palacký, který r. 1817 vydal překlad Ossiana. Analýza vybrané části Palackého překladu ukazuje, že autor překladu postupuje v souladu s ideály českých předromantických teorií, včetně teorie, která z důvodu nedostatečně vyvinutých možností pro překlad poezie rovněž poezií, doporučuje překládat poezii prózou. Závěrečná část třetí kapitoly popisuje stav českých předromantických teorií překladu v období postupného slábnutí předromantismu. Situace v českém Národním obrození spěla postupem dvacátých let zpět k pozvolné preferenci klasicističtější vnímaných přístupů k překladu. Někteří překladatelé totiž považovali předromantický jazyk překladatelské i vlastní tvorby za příliš šroubovaný, archaický, těžkopádný, umělý a neadekvátní z hlediska přístupnosti lingvisticky neorientovanému čtenářskému obecenstvu. Právě v této době vycházejí další dva překlady, jejichž vzorky analyzuje tato práce. Roku 1827 vychází překlad Macphersonova Ossiana přeložený Josefem Hollmannem a o dva roky později, roku 1829 Čelakovského překlad Panna Jezerní (Walter Scott – The Lady of the Lake). Analýza vzorků těchto překladů opět prokazuje, že jak Hollmann tak Čelakovský se při překladu drželi předromantických teorií s důrazem na mystiku, obraznost, emotivnost, sentimentalitu a snahu o poetické a vznešené vyznění textu, ke kterému použili adekvátních prostředků jako členění textu, snaha o rytmický přednes a dokonce i překlad poezie poezií. Čtvrtá kapitola práce je věnována shrnutí výsledků analýzy a stanovení míry, do jaké se výše zmínění překladatelé drželi předromantických překladatelských postupů, které měly za úkol povznést a obohatit lexikální a stylistické prostředky českého jazyka v Národním obrození před tím, než do vývoje překladatelských teorií plně zasáhne další literární směr, romantismus.

Appendices

1.

“*Pozatmělá slova*” [obscure words] (in: Levý 1996, 102) in the first edition of Jungmann’s translation of Chateaubriand’s *Atala* contained words such as:

rozlehlou (valnou, obširnou)

zálivu (zátoky, sinus)

lianami (pletivem, proutím...)

ústí (ústí, ostium, Mündung, vpád řeky do moře)

ohromný (náramný, grandis)

sloupení (sloupení, mnoho sloupů pohromadě, colonade)

lekna (byliny – *Nymphaea lutea*. Michaux)

plemenáčkové (flamant, pták z Bahama)

blankyt (blankyt, modrá nebes barva)

trubače (zrostlina americká)

tulipy (liriodendron, tulipifera, Willd)

ústupu (ústup, recessus, skrýš)

na haluzích (větví)

karibů (způsob losů v Kanadě)

posměváčkové (drozdi dlouhoocasí, moqueurs)

květníků (florides)

čižební (k čižbě, tj. k vábení ptáků se hodící)

poklid (pokoj)

divochy (divokými člověky)

šakta (tj. hlas libozvučný)

milenkem (milenek, tolik co milenec, miláček)

pospolitost (tovaryšstvo lidu)

dcěř (dcera)

sachemů (starců, rádců)

žonglérově (kněží indiánští)

2. Classicistic approach to the treatment of the verb forms (Vodička 1948, 80).

- I. *Zdeněk z Zásniku s svými tovaryši*. V Praze 1799 (pp. 2-23).
- II. Prokop Šedivý: *Mnislav a Světivina*, 1794 (počítáno podle vydání u Fr. Bergra 1847; úvod, 1. a 2. kapit. a část 3. kapit.).
- III. J. Javůrek: Překlady Fénelonovy knihy *Příběhové Telemacha, syna Ulyssova*, II, 1797. Kniha 24.
- IV. *Básně o čarodějnicích*, 1794. (Počítáno podle vydání Ad. Weniga ve Vybraných pracích V. M. Kramera, 1909, pp. 76-88).

	Počet zkoumaných větných celků	Počet případů, v nichž je na konci věty:		Počet slovesných zakončení:	
		sloveso urč.	infinitiv	absolutně	v procentech
I.	200	160	14	174	87%
II.	200	125	27	152	76%
III.	200	119	29	148	74%
IV.	134	113	5	118	88%

Vodička analysed the part of Atala titled *Jednání (Le Drame)* with **233** sentences.

Only **16** sentences (**6,86%**) are ended with a finite verb form and **four** sentences are ended with a base form.

3.

Václav Hanka and his translation of *Slovo o pluku Igorově* (published in Praha 1821, pp. 5-7). The passage is excerpted from Levý (1996, 127-128)

O Bojane, soloviju starago vremeni! Aby ty sija pluky uščekotal, skača, slaviju, po myslenu drevu, letaja umom pod oblaky, slivaja slavy oba poly sego vremeni, rišča v tropu Trojanju čres polja na gory. Pěti bylo pěšň Igorevi, toho vnuku.

A vнадem, bratie, na svoji brъzyja komoni, do pozrim sinego Donu. Spala knajzu um pochoti, i žalost' jemu znamenie zastupi iskusiti Donu velikago. Chošču bo, - reče – kopie prilomiti konec polja Poloveckago s vami, rusici; chošču glavu svoju priložiti, a ljubo ispiti šelomom Donu.

O Bojane, slavíče starého věku! Aby tyto pluky uštěhotal, skáče slavíkem po myslném dřevu, létaj umem pod oblaky; svívaje slávy obapolně toho času, trče v stopu Trojanovu přes pole a hory. Pěti bylo píseň Igorovi, toho vnuku.

A vsednem, bratří, na svoje rychlé komoně, ať pozříme silného Donu. Spala knížeti mysl žádost, i žalost jemu znamení zastoupila, zkusiti Donu velikého. Chciť já, řekl, kopí přilomiti konec pole Poloveckého s vámi, Rusici, chci hlavu svou přiložiti nebo vypíti přilbicí Donu.

4.

Comparison of the Polish translation (by Karol z Kalinówki) of Scott's The lady of the Lake to the Czech translation by František Ladislav Čelakovský. Levý (1996, 132-133).

The Lady of the Lake (canto V, 29)

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 bal 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 heard was moved;
As if behind some bier beloved,
With trailing arm and drooping head,
The Douglas up the hill he led,
And at the Castle's battled verge,
With sighs resign'd his honour'd charged.

Translation by Karol z Kalinówki:

Szalenstwo tłumu łagodzie się łzami, jak burza ściekająca deszczem. Podnosząc ręce i oczy modlą się o błogosławieństwo tej głowie co tak szlachetnie dla kraju się poświęca. Starce z kończyn życia wielbia uśmierziciela wojny domowej; matki ukazują niemowlętom wodza, który ojców zachował. Twarde nawet żołnierskie serca wzruszone: jakby za jaką ukochaną trumną z przewróconym orem ze spuszczonego grołu prowadzi Duglasa i z westchnieniem oddają go straży zamkowej.

Translation by František Ladislav Čelakovský

Jako chmúra v pršky, tak tu rozlícenost lidu se v slzy rozplývá. Ruce a oči obracející k nebi vzývají o požehnání na hlavu ctihodnou, jenž výše své vlastní pokládá krev národu, pro nějž jediné dýše. Kmetové na srázu života blahoslaví hrdinu, jenž udusil v pýři domácí válku, matky vyzdvihující děti ukazují na zachovatele jejich otců, on se v oběť vydává a vítězí nad záštím a bezprávím; i otrlé srdce vojákův želem se hnulo: jak by za rakví milého vůdce s nachýlenou tváří a zbraní provázejí do vrchu Douglasu, a ne bez lítosti v zámecké bráně vypouštějí z dozoru čestného vězně.

Information sources:

DOLANSKÝ, Julius. *Záhada Ossiana v Rukopisech královédvorském a zelenohorském*. 1. vyd. Praha: Academia, 1975. 200 p.

HLOBIL, Tomáš. August Gottlieb Meißner a český ossianismus. *Aluze. Revue pro literaturu, filozofii a jiné*. 2006, roč. 10, č. 1, pp. 153-159. ISSN 1212-5547

JUNGMANN, Josef. *Historie literatury české : Saustavný přehled spisů českých s krátkou historií národu, osvědčení a jazyka*. 2. vyd. Praha: České museum, 1849. 771 p.

LEVÝ, Jiří. *Umění překladu*. 2. dopl. vyd. Praha : Panorama, 1983. 396 p.

LEVÝ, Jiří. *České teorie překladu*. 2. vyd. Praha: Ivo Železný, 1996. 2 sv. (273, 323 p.). ISBN 80-237-1735-9.

MACPHERSON, James. *Ossianovy básně dlé přeloženj anglického Jak. Macphersona*. Josef Hollmann. Praha: Josefa Fetterlová z Wildenbrunu, 1827. 276 p.

MACPHERSON, James. The poems of Ossian, [online]. Leipsic: Ernest Fleischer, 1834. p. 111. [cited 2009-15-06]. Available at WWW:
<<http://books.google.com/books?id=0k4AAAAAcAAJ&pg=PP9&dq=ossian+1834&lr=>>.

MACPHERSON, James. The poems of Ossian, [online]. Leipsic: Ernest Fleischer, 1834. p. 144. [cited 2009-15-06]. Available at WWW:
<<http://books.google.com/books?id=0k4AAAAAcAAJ&pg=PP9&dq=ossian+1834&lr=>>.

MÁNEK, Bohuslav. *První české překlady Byronovy poezie*. 1. vyd. Praha: Karolinum, 1990. 149 p. ISSN 0567-8269.

PALACKÝ, František, Ladislav. Ossián, přeložený z Englického od Františka Palackého. *Prvotiny pěkných umění neb Wiedeňské učené Noviny*. 13.4.1817, č. 27, pp. 118-119.

PALACKÝ, František, Ladislav. *Básně Františka Palackého. Z rukopisné pozůstalosti vydal, úvodem a poznámkami opatřil Jan Jakubec*. Praha: Bursík a Kohout, 1898. 113 p.

RAK, Jiří. Obecné souvislosti českého národního obrození. In BĚLINA, Pavel, et al. *Dějiny země Koruny české*. 5. vyd. Praha: Paseka, 1998. pp. 60-64. ISBN 80-7185-164-7.

SCOTT, Walter. *Panna gezernj : Báseň w šesti zpěwjch Waltera Skotta*. František Ladislav Čelakovský. 1. vyd. Praha: Jan H. Pospjžil, 1928. 188 p.

SCOTT, Walter. The Lady of the Lake, a poem, [online]. Edinburgh: Archibald Constable and Co., 1825. pp. 14-15. [cited 2009-15-06]. Available at WWW: <<http://books.google.com/books?id=8dkIAAAAQAAJ&printsec=frontcover&dq=lady+of+the+lake&lr=>>>.

SCOTT, Walter. The Lady of the Lake, a poem, [online]. Edinburgh: Archibald Constable and Co., 1825. p. 280. [cited 2009-15-06]. Available at WWW: <<http://books.google.com/books?id=8dkIAAAAQAAJ&printsec=frontcover&dq=lady+of+the+lake&lr=>>>.

SEDLÁČEK, Jan. O jmenných polovětných vazbách v obrozenské umělecké próze. In JEDLIČKA, Alois, DVOŘÁK, Karel. *Studie o jazyce a literatuře Národního obrození*. 1. vyd. Praha: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství, n. p., 1959. pp. 247-261.

VESELÝ, Jindřich. Český překlad od středověku do národního obrození. In HRALA, Milan. *Kapitoly z dějin českého překladu*. 1. vyd. Praha: Karolinum, 2002. pp. 11-29. ISBN 80-246-0386-1.

VODIČKA, Felix. *Počátky krásné prózy novočeské : Příspěvek k literárním dějinám doby Jungmannovy*. Jinočany: H+H, 1948. 366 p. ISBN 80-85787-62-8.

VODIČKA, Felix. Tendence k jednotnému literárnímu směru, Preromantismus (sentimentalismus), Vztahy k jiným literaturám. In Československá akademie věd. *Dějiny české literatury*. Praha: Československá akademie věd, 1960. pp. 165-171.

VODIČKA, Felix. Požadavek „básnické prózy“. In Československá akademie věd. *Dějiny české literatury*. Praha: Československá akademie věd, 1960, pp. 208-209.

ZÁVODSKÝ, Artur. *František Ladislav Čelakovský*. 1. vyd. Praha: Melantrich, 1982. 648 p.