

UNIVERZITA PARDUBICE
FAKULTA FILOZOFICKÁ
Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky

BAKALÁŘSKÁ PRÁCE

2006

Jitka VENOSOVÁ

University of Pardubice
Faculty of Arts and Philosophy
Department of English and American Studies

**Comparison of Two Translations: The Picture of Dorian Gray
By Oscar Wilde Translated By J. W. Pimassl (1948) and J. Z.
Novák (1964)**

Bachelor Paper

Author: Jitka Venosová
Supervisor: Mgr. Irena Reimannová

2006

Univerzita Pardubice
Fakulta filozofická
Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky

**Comparison of Two Translations: The Picture of Dorian Gray
By Oscar Wilde Translated By J. W. Pimassl (1948) and J. Z.
Novák (1964)**

**Srovnání dvou překladů: Obraz Doriana Graye od Oscara
Wilda překlad J.W. Pimassl (1948) a J. Z. Novák (1964)**

Bakalářská práce

Autor: Jitka Venosová
Vedoucí: Mgr. Irena Reimannová

2006

ZADÁNÍ BAKALÁŘSKÉ PRÁCE

pro: Jitku Venosovou

obor: Anglický jazyk pro hospodářskou praxi

Název tématu: **Comparison of Two Translations: The Picture of Dorian Grey By Oscar Wilde Translated By J. W. Pimassl (1948) and J. Z. Novák (1964)**

Zásady pro vypracování:

Tato bakalářská práce bude zaměřena na analýzu překladů uměleckých děl.

První část práce bude charakterizovat umělecký styl a popíše základní překladatelské teorie a postupy.

Ve druhé části bakalářské práce studentka provede textovou analýzu překladů a zaměří se na zkoumání vlivu dobovosti a kulturního prostředí na překládaný text.

Autorka bude ve své práci využívat sekundární zdroje z oblasti stylistiky a teorie překladu a zdroje primární, tj. originální text výše uvedeného díla v anglickém jazyce a jeho překlady v jazyce českém.

Vedoucí bakalářské práce: **Mgr. Irena Reimannová** **Podpis:**

Vedoucí katedry: **Paedr. Monika Černá, Ph.D.** **Podpis:**

Datum zadání práce: **31. 3. 2005**

Prohlašuji:

Tuto práci jsem vypracovala samostatně. Veškeré literární prameny a informace, které jsme v práci využila, jsou uvedeny v seznamu použité literatury.

Byla jsem seznámena 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 poskytnuta licence o užití jinému subjektu, je Univerzita Pardubice oprávněna ode mne požadovat přiměřený příspěvek na úhradu 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 30. 6. 2006

Jitka Venosová

Abstrakt

Tato bakalářská práce se zabývá srovnáním dvou českých překladů *The Picture of Dorian Gray* od Oscara Wilda. První překlad je od J. W. Pimassla z roku 1948 a druhý od J. Z. Nováka z roku 1964. Jádrem práce je analýza těchto dvou překladů v lexikální rovině se zaměřením na vliv dobovosti a kulturního prostředí na překládaný text. Na základě odborné literatury je charakterizován umělecký styl a jeho specifické aspekty. Následuje prodiskutování základních překladatelských teorií a postupů. Další část práce je věnována analýze lexikálních ekvivalentů a zkoumání vlivu dobovosti a kulturního prostředí na překládaný text. V závěrečné části práce je shrnutí analýzy a vyvození závěrů vyplývajících z porovnání daných překladů.

Abstract

This bachelor paper deals with the analysis of two Czech translations of Oscar Wilde's novel *The Picture of Dorian Gray*. The former translation is from J. W. Pimassl (1948) and the latter from J. Z. Novák (1964). The core of this paper is analysis of these two translations at lexical level. Besides, the influence of time-period and cultural setting on the translated text is taken into account. At the beginning of this paper the term "literary style" together with its specific aspects is discussed. Then the basic theories of translation and translation processes are discussed. Next part of this paper is dedicated to comparison of two Czech translations with each other and with the original text with the focus on lexical equivalence together with the influence of time-period and culture on the translated text. Finally, the results from this analysis are summarized.

I would like to express my gratitude to Mgr. Irena Reimannová for all her advice and critical comments.

Outline

1. Introduction	1
2. Literary style	2
3. Oscar Wilde – The picture of Dorian Gray	4
4. Translation.....	6
4.1. Types of translation.....	7
4.2. Literal vs. free translation	8
4.3. Equivalent effect	9
4.4. Translation shift	11
4.5. Translation process.....	13
5. Levels of translation.....	15
5.1. Lexical level	15
5.2. Grammatical level	18
5.3. Textual level.....	18
5.4. Pragmatic level.....	18
6. Text analysis.....	20
6.1. The summary of the analysis	32
7. Conclusion	35

1. Introduction

This bachelor paper deals with comparison of two Czech translations of Oscar Wilde's novel *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, outlining certain differences between Czech lexical equivalences. The former translation is from J. W. Pimassl (1948) and the latter from J. Z. Novák (1964).

The second chapter of this paper is focused on the literary style in terms of stylistics. Firstly, there are discussed the main characteristic features of literary texts. Then, the basic division of literary texts, which comprises three main genres followed by numerous sub-genres, is discussed. Lastly, various patterning devices, which literary texts display, are mentioned.

The third chapter presents a brief survey and characterization of Oscar Wilde's writing style. In fact, the special attention is paid to stylistic features of novel *The Picture of Dorian Gray*.

The following chapter is devoted to the definition and the main principles of translation. Then, there are discussed different approaches to translation before and after the second half of the twentieth century. Next, there are provided the various methods dealing with "untranslatable" words, which can be semantic or cultural. Finally, the individual stages of translation process are discussed.

Next chapter deals with various levels of translation including lexical, grammatical, textual and pragmatic level. The special attention is paid to Czech lexical equivalences of certain English words and structures.

In the last chapter of this bachelor paper, the analysis, which consists of two Czech translations compared with each other and with the original text and where the main focus is on lexical equivalence, is provided. Besides, the influence of time-period and cultural setting on the translated text is taken into account. Then, the analysis and its results are summarized.

2. Literary style

According to Chapman's *Linguistics and Literature*, one characteristic feature of literary texts is their "fictionality" or "imagination." He states that there is an universal agreement that literary texts, even if they attempt to represent reality in some form or another, for example, including references to real places and historical events, are basically products of writer's imagination and that at least the characters and their conversations are fictitious (1973, 3).

The literary text itself functions as a message between an author and reader, where the main writer's purpose is to inform the reader about a particular fictional world or evoke certain responses or interests in him/her (Leech and Short 1994, 257).

On the other hand, texts that are normally read as non-fiction, like a newspaper report, may also include features that remind one of literature, for instance, including descriptive passages, setting, plot and rhetorical devices, such as alliteration, metaphor and the like. They also serve for the same purpose as literary texts, to evoke interest and curiosity in their readers (Leech and Short p. 153-154).

According to Skoumalová, literary texts can be divided into different categories or genres, such as prose fiction, drama and poetry. Furthermore, numerous sub-genres can be identified for each main category. Prose fiction is subdivided into: romance, novel, novella, short story and the like, where novel can be further subdivided into: historical, gothic, social, epistolary and many others. The other two main generic groups, poetry and drama, can of course also be subdivided into numerous sub-genres, such as ballad, sonnet, ode, comedy, tragedy, satire, lyric, elegy, tragicomedy, epic theatre and the like (1994, 26-27).

According to Chapman (1973), "genres are defined by certain conventions, patterning devices which texts display" (p. 5). These patterns enable us to state differences and similarities between texts. For instance, prose fiction is generally defined by the fact that it is not written in verse like poetry, for example, and that it is narrative while drama normally includes the direct presentation of a scene on stage (p. 14). In addition, such devices can be divided into two main groups, firstly, "rhetorical figures" that describe the arrangement of individual sounds, words and sentence structure, secondly, "tropes" that represent a deviation from the common or main significance of a word or phrase (semantic figures) or include specific appeals to

audience (pragmatic figures) (p. 75). Some examples of the former are, alliteration, assonance, consonance, onomatopoeia and parallelism. The latter are, for example, irony, hyperbole, metaphor, simile and puns (Jírů 2004).

According to Brislin (1976), language of literary texts, apart from the above-mentioned rhetorical figures, consists of many formal features describing, “the roles of those who participate in the discourse or about the settings in which the discourse takes place.” For instance, dialect differences are typical of such “role-related formal features” providing the information about the geographical origin, social class, age, sex, or ethnic group of speakers or authors (p. 55).

Furthermore, there can also be found a variety of levels of language usage that “reflect differences of psychological distance between participants in the communication setting.” In other words, such levels or registers of language denote a kind of language appropriate to a particular situation including, for instance, levels of formality, like frozen, formal, consultative, informal, casual, and intimate and the like. For example, one uses different vocabulary or different syntax when talking to one’s parents than one uses when talking to one’s examiner in the final oral exam (Brislin p. 56).

3. Oscar Wilde – The picture of Dorian Gray

It is said that the Aesthetic movement played a major role in Oscar Wilde's writing career. As a result, he became highly conscious of language as a material, as something that can be perceived in the same way as a painting or sculpture. According to Ojala, "Wilde was a literary artist, an artist in words" and his works, in general, are kind of compilations that consist of "well-sounding words and brilliant, well-formulated phrases," such as metaphors, parallelism, alliteration, puns and the like (1955, 254).

However, it seems that Wilde was not, in eyes of literary critics, very successful with his experiments with language. For instance, taking the opening lines of *The Picture of Dorian Gray*:

The studio was filled with the rich odour of roses, and when the light summer wind stirred amid the trees of the garden there came through the open door the heavy scent of the lilac, or the more delicate perfume of the pink-flowering thorn (Wilde 1994, 23).

According to Miller, "Oscar Wilde would defend himself by claiming that he was setting the rich and heavy atmosphere he is trying to evoke". However, despite of this lengthy description we, as the readers, learn almost nothing, because there is no direct connection with its subject (1982, 39).

Generally, Wilde revealed his attachment to aestheticism in the excessive use of words related to flora, fauna terms and artificial things, however, being merely used for decorative purposes (Ojala p. 61).

In fact, in regard to *Dorian Gray*, there can be found a few words that are employed for the purposes of symbolism to deliver some special meanings or messages. For instance, the word "rose" in the sentence "time is jealous of you, and wars against your lilies and your roses" (p. 46), suggests love, passion, beauty, purity and the like (Ojala p. 59).

In addition to Wilde's vocabulary, Miller says that "Wilde has irritating tendency to re-use vocabulary" resulting in the mechanical effect. For instance, a word "exquisite" in relation to other words, like "violin," "knowledge," "disdain," "day" and so on, is repeated within a rather few pages of *Dorian Gray*. Besides, there can be found plentiful adjectives used in the same way. In defending this style, Wilde had the following to say:

In prose correctness should always be subordinated to artistic effect and musical cadence; and any peculiarities of syntax that may occur in *Dorian Gray* are deliberately intended, and are introduced to show the value of the artistic theory in question (Miller p. 39-40).

As can be seen, the main purpose of Oscar Wilde was not to convey meaning or thought, but to achieve an artistic effect on his readers by means of a beautiful style.

Despite of emphasizing the aestheticism throughout his book, Miller points out that there are some passages when Wilde is caught being unfaithful to his claims, for example, not only did he use words to speak of beauty but also of hideous places, such as Dorian Gray's own experience with an opium-den; such lines that he much criticized in the works of other novelists (p. 40).

In conclusion, Wilde just did not wish to express himself in simple and direct terms. As a result, he used a great deal of decorative terms employed as a means of escape from just plain expressions. Miller, regardless of this, sees *The Picture of Dorian Gray* as a piece of work that "has plot and wit, but still it is intellectually and stylistically immature" (p. 41).

4. Translation

In the beginnings of translation practice, according to Nida and Taber (1969), the main focus was on the form of the source language message, however, through the following centuries the focus has shifted from the form to the response of the receptor on the condition that the reaction of the target audience to the translated message is the same as the reaction of the original receptors (p. 1). With this in mind, they have the following to say:

Translating consists in reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent of the source language message, first in terms of meaning and secondly in terms of style (1969, 12).

In addition, both the source language (henceforth SL) culture and the target language (henceforth TL) culture play an important role in translating. For this reason, Straková, in *Překládání a čeština*, states that the translation activity acts as a bridge between two different languages, cultures, time periods and destinations (1994, 13).

As has already been pointed out in the definition above, translating is about the transference of meaning of the SL text, in other words, content of the message. Thus, the main task of the translator is to “reproduce the message” of the original. However, to reproduce the message, the translator should bear in mind that “each language possesses certain distinctive characteristics which give it a special character”, for example, “word-building capacities, unique patterns of phrase order, proverbs” and the like. As a result, the translator should be prepared to make necessary grammatical or lexical changes (Nida and Taber 1969, 4).

Another important task of the translator is to reproduce the style and manner of writing that is of the same character with that of the original, for instance, poetry should be translated in TL as poetry and not as though it is prose or something else (Nida and Taber p. 13).

Furthermore, Klégr, in his *The Noun in Translation*, states that the translation can be judged in terms of adequacy that is, “the ability of the translation to convey the factual content of the source text in a satisfactory way and in suitable form,” where “suitable form” means that “the translation basically respects the specific character of the text (as regards its style, genre, structural features, etc.)” and “satisfactory” means that:

The events, circumstance, etc. described in the source text are found in the target text as well and that no essential information has been omitted and there is no danger of the source text being misunderstood or misinterpreted (1996, 31).

Additionally, he points out that there are no such criteria according to which the translation adequacy can be judged. As a matter of fact, decisions about what is or what is not relevant or essential information are purely subjective (p. 32).

4.1. Types of translation

As a result of developments in the field of technology, the term language may be assigned to every system of signs, for example, artificial language, technical codes or language of computers. Thus, it is not only possible to carry out translation from one natural language to another one, but also from natural language to artificial one (Vilikovský 2002, 24).

In his article *On Linguistic Aspects of Translation*, Roman Jakobson (1959) distinguishes three types of translation:

1. Intralingual translation, or rewording (an interpretation of verbal signs by means of other signs in the same language).
2. Interlingual translation or translation proper (an interpretation of verbal signs by means of some other language).
3. Intersemiotic translation or transmutation (an interpretation of verbal signs by means of signs of nonverbal sign system) (Bassnett-McGuire 1991, 14).

According to Jeremy Munday, Jakobson's theory is essentially based on his semiotic approach to translation according to which the translator has to recode the source text (henceforth ST) message first and then he/she has to transmit it into an equivalent message for the target culture (2001, 36).

Jakobson claims that, in the case of interlingual translation, the translator makes use of synonyms in order to get the ST message across. This means that in interlingual translations there is no full equivalence between code units. According to this theory, "translation involves two equivalent messages in two different codes" (Munday 2001, 37).

Jakobson goes on to say that from a grammatical and lexical point of view languages may differ from one another to a greater or lesser degree, but this does not mean that a translation cannot be possible, as a result, the translator may face the problem of not finding a translation equivalent. Jakobson provides a number of

examples by comparing English and Russian language structures and explains that in such cases where there is no a literal equivalent for a particular ST word or sentence, then it is up to the translator to choose the most suitable way to render it in the target text (see 4.4. below)(Munday p. 37).

4.2. Literal vs. free translation

Up until the second half of the twentieth century, there seemed to be three kinds of translation methods, “literal,” “free” and “faithful.” Going back to Cicero (106 – 43 BC) times, terms “word-for-word,” “sense-for-sense” and “free” were used instead (Munday 2001, 19).

In Roman times, “word-for-word” translation was exactly what it said, “the replacement of each individual word of the ST with its closest grammatical equivalent.” Resulting in a target text that was not likely to appear natural to the target text (henceforth TT) audience. “Sense-for-sense,” on the other hand, was understood as translation of “the sense or content of the ST.” As a result, a TT sounded normal to native TL speakers (Munday p. 20).

In the 17th century, John Dryden, whose description of translation process is said to be the most influential of that time, proposes three categories of translation:

1. metaphrase: word by word and line by line translation, which corresponds to literal translation;
2. paraphrase: translation with latitude, where the author is kept in view by the translator, so as never to be lost, but his words are not so strictly followed as his sense; this involves changing whole phrases and more or less corresponds to faithful or sense-for-sense translation;
3. imitation: forsaking both words and sense; this corresponds to free translation and is more or less adaptation (Bassnett-McGuire 1991, 60).

In fact, Dryden criticizes such translators who use metaphrase, where a translator seems “like dancing on ropes with fettered legs” and imitation, where the translator uses the ST “as a pattern to write as he supposes that author would have done, had he lived in our age and in our country.” As a result, he sees paraphrase as the only translation method that should be used and both previously mentioned methods ought to be avoided (Munday p. 25).

4.3. Equivalent effect

After centuries of circular debates over literal and free translation, translation theorist of the late twentieth century began to combine linguistic, scientific, literary, cultural history, philosophy, and anthropology studies in their works in order to define the nature of equivalence (Munday p. 35).

In a work on translation equivalence, Catford (1965) adopts a linguistic-based approach to translation and this approach is based on the linguistic work of Firth and Halliday (p. 1). In his work *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*, he defines translation as, “the replacement of textual material in one language, source language, by equivalent textual material in another language, target language” (1965, 20). He distinguishes “textual equivalence” from “formal correspondence.” The former is, “any target language text or portion of text which is observed on a particular occasion to be the equivalent of a given source language text or portion of text” (p. 27). He implements this by a process of “commutation”, whereby “a competent bilingual informant or translator” is consulted on the translation of various sentences whose ST items are changed in order to observe “what changes if any occur in the TL text as a consequence” (p.28).

The latter definition is:

Any target language category (unit, class, structure, element of structure, etc.) which can be said to occupy, as nearly as possible, the same place in the economy of the target language as the given source language category occupies in the source language (p. 27).

Here, the forms of the original words, in terms of grammar and phonetics, are retained as much as possible, even if those forms do not sound and look natural in a TL text. In addition to the definition above, Nida suggests, “footnotes can be introduced, to make the reader understand the customs, manner of thought and means of expressions of the original” (1964, 166).

However, Catford is very much criticized for his linguistic theory of translation. One of the criticisms comes from Snell-Hornby *Translation Studies*, who argues that Catford’s definition of textual equivalence is “circular,” his theory’s reliance on bilingual informants “hopelessly inadequate,” and his example sentences “isolated and even absurdly simplistic.” Furthermore, she asserts that the translation process cannot simply be reduced to a linguistic exercise, as claimed by Catford above, since there are

also other factors, such as textual, cultural and situational aspects, which should be taken into consideration when translating (1995, 19-20).

On the other hand, Nida and Taber, in their *The Theory and Practice of Translation*, are in favour of the application of “dynamic equivalence” or “functional equivalence” which they, like Catford, see in sharp opposition to the concept of “formal correspondence” (1969, 14). In addition, their work is based on scientific approach to translation, combining of work in semantics and pragmatics (Munday 2001, 38).

Dynamic equivalence is then defined as a translation principle according to which a translator seeks to translate the meaning of the original in such a way that the TL wording will have the same impact on the target audience as the original wording did upon the ST audience (Nida and Taber 1969, 24). They argue that:

Frequently, the form of the original text is changed; but as long as the change follows the rules of back transformation in the SL, of contextual consistency in the transfer, and of transformation in the receptor language, the message is preserved and the translation is faithful (1969, 202).

As can be seen from the above, the focus is upon preservation of the meaning, rather than the form of the original. The translator will read a sentence or other unit of thought, try to understand it as well as possible, and then write that thought in the target language.

For instance, taking Nida’s example from Bible translation, where the phrase “Lamb of God” would be rendered into “Seal of God” for the Eskimos because the lamb does not symbolize innocence in their culture. In this case, a formal equivalence does not mean anything in a different culture, so the dynamic equivalence is necessary (Snell-Hornby 1995, 19).

Koller (1989), on the other hand, describes five different types of equivalence at various levels. His theory is established on the basis of:

1. Denotative or referential equivalence - the SL and TL words supposedly referring to the same thing in the real world.

According to Koller, this above-mentioned type of equivalence can be always achievable though it may require sacrificing other qualities of the text, such as readability, connotative or formal value and so on.

2. Connotative equivalence - the SL and TL words triggering the same or similar associations in the minds of native speakers of the two languages.

3. Text-normative equivalence - the SL and TL words being used in the same or similar contexts in their respective languages.
4. Pragmatic or communicative equivalence - the SL and TL words having the same effect on their respective readers.

In addition, pragmatic equivalence is in principle the same as Nida's dynamic equivalence.

5. Formal equivalence - the SL and TL words having similar orthographic or phonological features, such as stylistic features, syntax, metaphor and puns.

This is sometimes referred to as "expressive equivalence" and is not to be confused with Nida's term (p. 100-104).

Based on the theory of texts and Pierce's categories, Neubert (1967) proposes that translation equivalence must be considered a semiotic category that consists of three components, such as:

1. syntactic (the relation between signs themselves)
2. semantic (the relationship between signs and what they stand for)
3. pragmatic (the relationship between signs, what they stand for, and those who use them) (Vilikovský 2002, 39)

These components are arranged in a hierarchical relationship, where semantic equivalence takes priority over syntactic equivalence, and pragmatic equivalence conditions and modifies both the other elements. Frequently, this semiotic-based approach is applied when the TL equivalence cannot be found, often as a result of cultural or time period differences. Thus, for example, the Czech polite formulae "Dobrou chut" or other formal formulae or obscenities can only be rendered pragmatically in English by substituting expressions with the similar function as the original ones (Vilikovský p. 39).

4.4. Translation shift

From Neubert's theory can be seen that the translator may find words or utterances in the SL text for which there is no substitute in the TL. According to Catford, those can be of a semantic and cultural nature, known as "linguistic untranslatability," like neologisms, aphorisms, calques, institutional and standardized terms, and other forms of interference and "cultural untranslatability," like idioms, sayings, proverbs, jokes, puns and the like (Bassnett-McGuire 1991, 32).

According to Anton Popovič (1975), when dealing with “untranslatable” words the activity involved is called “the shift of expression concept”. Moreover, he recognizes four of these shifts, such as:

1. Constitutive shift – an inevitable shift that takes place in the translation as a consequence of differences between the two languages, the two poetics and the two styles or original and translation.
2. Individual shift – such shifts are prompted by the stylistic propensities and the subjective idiolect of the individual translator.
3. Thematic shift – substitution of cultural aspects, expressions, idioms of SL by features of TL.
4. Negative shift – as a result of misinterpretation of the original (Vilikovský 2002, 44).

In fact, a more detailed work on translation shifts comes from Canadian authors Vinay and Darbelnet. Their interest is in linguistic differences between two languages, differences that constitute areas where translation is impossible. For this reason, they propose two general translation strategies, such as “direct” and “oblique translation,” which are synonyms for terms “literal” and “free” (see 4.2. above). Those strategies comprise seven procedures, of which “direct translation” covers three (Munday 2001, 56-58):

1. Borrowing: the SL word is transferred directly to the TL in order to fill a semantic gap in the TL or to add local colour (*pétanque*, *armagnac* and *bastide* in a tourist brochure about south west France, for instance).
2. Calque: this is “a special kind of borrowing” where the SL expression or structure is transferred in a literal translation.
3. Literal translation: this is “word-for-word” translation described as being most common between languages of the same family and culture.

In regard to the third translation procedure, the translator may judge it to be “unacceptable” because, for instance, it gives another meaning, has no meaning, is structurally impossible and does not have a target-language correspondence but not at the same language level. As a result, the strategy of “oblique translation” must be used instead. This comprises remaining four procedures:

4. Transposition: this is a change of one part of speech for another without changing the sense, for instance, a verb in SL can be transferred to TL as a noun.

5. Modulation: this changes the semantics and point of view of the SL, for instance, substitution of abstract word for concrete one (*brown paper* : *balící papír*; the example is taken from Knittlová 1995, 9) or cause word for effect one and the like.
6. Equivalence: referring to cases where languages describe the same situation by different stylistic or structural means. Equivalence is particularly useful in translating idioms and proverbs.

In addition, the use of equivalence in the restricted sense as mentioned above should not be confused with the one discussed in part 4.3. of this bachelor paper.

7. Adaptation: this involves changing the cultural reference when a situation in the source culture does not exist in the target culture. For instance, the cultural connotation of a reference in an English text to the game of cricket might be best translated into French by a reference to the Tour de France.

4.5. Translation process

Considering the work of translators involved, Nida and Taber in their work mentioned above, establish a model of the translation process that consists of three stages, such as “analysis of SL text, transfer, restructuring it to receptor language” (1969, 33).

According to P. Newmark, the first stage involves reading of a SL text that serves for understanding its content and context, author’s purpose in order to avoid misinterpretation of the ST message (2003, 11).

According to Wills, apart from the previously mentioned aspects, the translator should search for the intention of the text. As he explains, “this represents the SL writer’s attitude to the subject matter.” Here, the translator asks himself, for example, what does the author intend with his/her text; does he/she want to describe, inform or motivate; is it his/her intention to deceive, persuade, influence; does he/she want to make someone read between the lines (1982, 119).

Finally, the translator should attempt to characterize the “readership” of original by asking himself, for example, whether it is a specific group of recipients, variable specter of readers or just one reader; what is his/her education, class, age, sex; is the reader “informed or ignorant, layman or expert;” “where would the text be found” and the like (Newmark 1982, 20).

In regard to the last two translation processes, according to Ludskanov, the activity performed is called a “semiotic transformation,” defined as, “the replacement of the

signs encoding a message by signs of another code, preserving invariant information with respect to a given system of reference.” For instance, in case of transference of the word “yes” the invariant information is “affirmation” (Bassnett-McGuire 1991, 18).

Furthermore, based on Saussure’s theory, the signs mentioned in the definition above consist of two parts: “the signifier and the signified,” where the former is, “the function and value of the object in its cultural context or the mental image of the physical sound that you make when you say, for example, *butter*” while the latter is, “a mental concept or representation of the object *butter* in the real world” (Bassnett-McGuire p. 18).

However, considering Sapir’s statement that:

No two languages are ever sufficiently similar to be considered as representing the same social reality. The worlds in which different societies live are distinct worlds, not merely the same world with different labels attached (Bassnett-McGuire 1991, 13).

For this reason, in different languages the semantic areas of corresponding words are not identical. Thus, the choice of the right word in the receptor language in order to translate a word in the SL text depends on the context. For instance, the word “butter” in Italian cultural context signifies the product used for cooking, whilst in Britain is used only for spreading on bread and for the cooking is actually used “margarine” (Bassnett-McGuire p. 19).

5. Levels of translation

5.1. Lexical level

The following information is taken from Knittlová *K teorii i praxi překladau* (2003), unless otherwise noted.

According to Knittlová, when looking for the notion of equivalence at lexical level, the following situation can occur:

1. Equivalence exists:
 - a) a total or absolute, especially in meaning and stylistics,
 - b) a partial equivalent,
 - c) there are more equivalents

2. Equivalence does not exist:
 - a) an indirect expression, a calque or a loanword should be used instead,
 - b) an equivalent of the situation should be used (p. 19-20).

The absolute or total equivalents consist of basic units of word fond, particularly substantives that refer to, for example, a name of a living being, a thing, a place or an idea. In other words, lexis virtually having denotative meaning, for example, *eye : oko, window : okno, roof : střecha, tree : strom*. Also verbs having a number of senses may be included here on the condition that they have only one meaning due to grammatical or lexical, situational or pragmatic context. These verbs refer in particular to actions or activities, such as *eat : jíst, laugh : smát se* or a state of being or change of state, such as *be : být, sleep : spat, sit : sedět*, perception and the senses, such as *see : vidět, hear : slyšet, listen : poslouchat* and so on. Descriptive adjectives also belong to this category expressing, for instance, state, quality, size, colour, like *black : černý, long : dlouhý, full : plný, wet : mokrý*. Furthermore, adverbs of place have direct equivalent, like *he was at home : byl doma, drive/go home : jet/jít domů* (p. 33-35).

According to Mathesius (1961), an English naming unit that consists of the following components: “the semantic nucleus” that is the basic meaning of the word, “the associations attached to the word” and “emotional colouring” has, in comparison with Czech, a wider range and more general content. As a result, English often uses more words to express what can be expressed with fewer words in Czech (p. 17).

When comparing English and Czech words in regard to their content, it can be said, “the idea of a thing expressed by the English word does not correspond in all its features

to the idea expressed by the corresponding Czech word” (Mathesius p.17). Resulting in, as Knittlová states, “formal,” “denotative,” “connotative” and “pragmatic” differences between the Czech and English language, which can occur in combination (Knittlová p. 35).

The formal differences consist of “multi-word structures contra one-word structures.” For instance, the phrase “the poor man” is translated into Czech as a single word “chudák.” Also English uses more than one word to express negative or positive state of mind, like *old man : děda*. For this reason, the meaning of pre-modifier “old” is both denotative and connotative. Furthermore, a phrase consisting of three words, like “in a little bitty while,” where two pre-modifiers are used and one of them with adjectival suffix, can be rendered into Czech as a single word with an added diminutive suffix “za chvíličku, chvílinku, chvílilinku.” The same it is with English phrasal verbs that can be translated into Czech as one word, like *get up : vstát, pick up : zvednout* and so on. Naturally, the meaning of a multi-word structure is more explicit than the meaning of a single word, for example, *half-bread Indian : napůl Indián, square tile : kachlik*. There is another formal difference between these two languages, where English nominal phrases are rendered into the Czech language as prepositional, for instance, *club discussion : debata v klubu* (p. 36-39).

Denotative differences, as mentioned above, include the specification, generalization and semantic congruity. In regard to specification, a ST expression is transferred to TL by a hyponym that is an expression whose literal meaning, in comparison with its corresponding ST expression, is narrower and more specific (p. 41). This situation usually occurs when translating English verbs into Czech due to the fact that English is a nominal language and Czech is verbal. As Knittlová points out that English verbs of movements, such as “go, come, arrive, leave” and so on, in comparison with Czech, do not include the semantic element, expressing the means of movements. Besides, the Czech verbs are richer in the aspect, so English verb “go” can mean in Czech “jít/jet” or “chodit/jezdit” (p. 42). Generally, according to Knittlová, Czech equivalents of the most frequent English verb groups are semantically richer and more specific. In regard to Czech verbs of movement, it is typical to have added an element implying a means of transport, for communicative verbs, on the other hand, is typical to have an element implying information of the form and the content of the message and

verbs of perception and mental state need an element of activity and time specification. In other words, Czech verbs include more information or the information involved is explicitly expressed that is, on the other hand, expressed only implicitly in English (p. 51).

Generalization is, on the other hand, an activity comprising the substitution of a ST expression for a TL hyperonym that is an expression whose literal meaning, in comparison to its corresponding ST expression, is wider and less specific (p. 42). However, the occurrence of generalization in translation is not as frequent as above-mentioned specification. It is usually used when translating substantives, for instance, *storebread : chleba, chestnut : kaštan* (p.53)

The remaining cases of semantic shifts that neither belong to the above-mentioned specification nor generalization, are included into the category called semantic congruity, where expressions of ST are substituted for a TL co-hyponym that is a lexical unit with analogical function, for instance, *on my mother's knee : na klíně mé mámy* (p. 53-54).

Connotation differences can be of two kinds: “expressive” the use of emotional coloured words and “stylistic” (p. 55). In regard to expressive connotation, English emotionally neutral words can be substituted for Czech words that have diminutive suffix added to them, for instance, *star : hvězdička, daughter : dcerka*. However, diminutive suffix does not only have to express a positive state, but also an irony, for instance, *that type of language : řečičky* (p. 58–59) . Other words that are said to be emotionally coloured are, for instance, interjections, words used for addressing people, vulgarisms and intensifiers (p. 63, 65).

In regard to stylistic connotation, English emotionally neutral words can be rendered into Czech as expressive, colloquial, colloquial expressive, commonly Czech, commonly expressive Czech, dialects and professionalisms. For instance, *posture : figura* (ironic meaning), *father : máma, cry : brek, work : fuška*. On the other hand, English informal words can be rendered into Czech, like neutral *dorm : pokoj*, expressive *grandpa : děda*, colloquial *daddy : táta*, colloquial expressive *hang around the house : trčet doma*, slang *buddy : kámoš* and the like. Additionally, English dialect words can be rendered into Czech, like neutral *aim : chtít*, colloquial *pappy : táta*,

colloquial expressive *purty* : *bezvadný/povedený* and commonly expressive Czech *pow'ful* : *móc dobrý* (p. 77-80).

Pragmatic differences are the last differences at lexical level between those two languages. As a result, the translator may be induced, for instance, include some additional information, like *Wyoming* : *stát Wyoming*, omit some information, like *Eastern college talk* : *hovory o škole*, use substitution by analogy that is, substitution of source experience for target one or vice versa, like *about two inches* : *maximálně půl decimetru* or to use an explanatory paraphrase, like *Windsor tie* : *mašle pod bradou* (p. 82 - 84).

5.2. Grammatical level

Here, the focus is on the diversity of grammatical categories across languages. Baker, in her *In Other Words*, notes that grammatical rules may vary across languages and this may cause some problems in terms of finding a direct correspondence in the TL (1992, 83). These differences may induce the translator either to add or to omit information in the TT because of the lack of particular grammatical devices in the TL (p.86).

Amongst these grammatical devices that may cause problems in translation Knittlová focuses on number, tense and aspects, voice, person and gender (2003, 92-95).

5.3. Textual level

Here, the focus is on the textual equivalence between a SL text and a TL text in terms of thematic and information structure, cohesion and coherence. In this case, there are also notable differences between languages and it is for the translator to decide either to adapt the text to principles of the TL or to maintain special characteristics of the SL. His/her decision may depend on three main factors, such as the target audience, the purpose of the translation and the text type (Knittlová 2003, 96).

5.4. Pragmatic level

At this level, the translator deals with the pragmatic equivalence that involves “implicatures” during the translation process. Here, the meaning is observed in terms of

how it is being conveyed and manipulated by its users in a communicative situation (Baker 1992, 217).

Implicature is not about what is explicitly said but what is implied. Therefore, the translator needs to work out implied meanings in translation in order to get the ST message across (Baker p. 227).

The role of the translator is to create the author's intention in another culture in a way that enables the TT reader to understand it clearly. For instance, he should recognize the irony and insult in the form of address and the like. Overall, the translator should distinguish either the aspects used in the ST are "language-specific" or "culture-specific" (Knittlová 2003, 104).

6. Text analysis

In the following analysis are compared Czech translations of *The Picture of Dorian Gray* by Oscar Wilde with the focus on lexical equivalence. The former translation is from J. W. Pimassl (1948) and the latter from J. Z. Novák (1964). As the whole book is a quite extensive piece of work, the original text and both translations are analysed only at lexical level with focus on the influence of time-period and cultural setting on the translated text. After that, the whole analysis is summarized.

In addition, the analysis with its results and the following summary are influenced by the author's subjective point of view.

Wilde: The studio was filled with the rich odour of roses, and when the light summer wind stirred amidst the trees of the garden, there came through the open door the heavy scent of the lilac, or the more delicate perfume of the pink-flowering thorn (p. 7).

Pimassl: Studio bylo plno silné vůně růží, a když lehký letní vánek provanul stromy v zahradě, vnikla dovnitř otevřenými dveřmi těžká vůně šeříků nebo jemnější vůně růžového hlohu (p. 15)

Novák: Ateliér byl plný syté vůně růží, a když se mezi stromy v zahradě pohnul lehounký letní vánek, zavanul otevřenými dveřmi těžký pach šeříku nebo jemnější parfém růžově kvetoucího hlohu (p. 9).

Here, Pimassl uses a loanword that resembles the external form of the original, however, its literal meaning differs from the original. Novák, by contrast, substitutes the original word for its Czech equivalent that refers to the workroom of an artist. The interesting thing is that Pimassl suddenly substitutes the original word "studio" (p. 126) for the word "atelier" (p. 116) and continues to use it up until the end of his translation.

In addition, there can be seen a slight spelling difference between Novák's and Pimassl's equivalent (*ateliér* : *atelier*) and that is a short "e" in the middle of Pimassl's equivalent. However, there are other equivalents in Pimassl's translation with the same spelling difference, for instance, "salon" (p. 22), "graciosním" (p. 31), "nervosně" (p. 57), "prosy" (p. 65) and "extase" (p. 95).

In regard to the rest of this paragraph, it can be seen that Wilde avoided repeating the word "odour" by including its synonyms instead, like "scent" and "delicate." In fact, only Novák preserves this style by using synonyms for the word "vůně."

Wilde: the divan (p. 7)
Pimassl: pohovky (p. 15)
Novák: divanu (p. 9)

Here, Pimassl's equivalence, in comparison with the original word, differs in association attached to it. Novak preserves the literal meaning of the original by substituting it for the word of a foreign origin that a TT reader may not have difficulty to recognize. Nevertheless, Pimassl switches to the word "divan" (p. 29) as a substitution for the original word "divan" (p. 23), because he starts to use the word "pohovka" on page forty-three as the equivalent to the original word "sofa" (p. 39). Then he continues using the word "divan" for the rest of his translation.

There are other cases, similar to the one previously mentioned, where Pimassl substitutes the original word "daisis" (p. 11) for a botanical term "chudobky" (p. 19) instead of much more familiar word "sedmikrásky" as Novák does (p. 13) and continues to use this word up until page fifty-six, where he employs the word "sedmikrásky" instead; or he substitutes the original word "waiter" (p. 86) for a word "sluha" (p. 83) and then on page ninety he begins to use the word "číšník" as the substitution for the original word "waiter" (p. 93) instead.

Wilde: languidly (p. 8, 41)
Pimassl: unyle (p. 16, 45)
Novák: ospale (p. 10, 43)

Here, both equivalents differ from each other in their meanings. Pimassl uses an archaic word referring to a person who reacts to something in a sad way. Novák, on the other hand, employs the word "ospale," referring to an action performed without energy or spirit, in fact, indicating the state in which Lord Henry was at the time of a conversation between him and Basil Hallward (Wilde p. 8).

In addition, there are other partial equivalents in both translations that differ from each other in their meanings and only one of them is, in terms of meaning, the closest to the original, for instance: *extraordinary fellow* (Wilde p. 11) : *vyjíměčný chlapík* (Pimassl p. 18) : *prapodivný člověk* (Novák p. 13). Here, Novák, in comparison with Pimassl, employs a pre-modifier with a negative meaning instead of positive as indicated in the original. Another example, *dowagers* (p. 12) : *vdovami* (p. 20) : *matrónami* (p. 14). Here, according to *Příruční slovník jazyka českého (part II)*, Novák

uses a word with different meaning to the original expressing an old, noble, respectable woman or a spinster but not a wealthy woman whose husband is dead as indicate in the original (1957, 747). *Newspaper* (p. 14) : *novinách* (p. 21) : *plátcích* (p. 15), in this case, according to the above mentioned dictionary (*part IV*), Novák employs a word that refers to a paper containing valueless and unimportant news (p. 298). *Boyhood* (p. 26) : *chlapectvím* (p. 32) : *jinoštvím* (p. 28), here, the original word refers to the time of Dorian Gray being a boy. In fact, according to the dictionary (*part I*), only Pimassl's equivalent expresses the same thing as the original and that is a male child between 7 and 14 years of age (p. 1045). Novák's equivalent, on the other hand, expresses a male child between 14 and 21 years of age (p. 1225). *Boyhood* (p. 27) : *mládí* (p. 33) : *dětství* (p. 28), here, Pimassl uses a word indicating that Dorian Gray is already an old man and that his boyhood was a long time ago. Pimassl ignores the fact that Dorian Gray is nearly 18 years old (Wilde p. 90). *A story of it* (p. 43) : *báji* (p. 46) : *anekdotu* (p. 44), here, the original word refers back to the sentence, "The Queen used to ask me about the English noble who was always quarrelling with the cabmen about their fares" (Wilde p. 43). As can be seen, only Novák's equivalent is, in terms of meaning, the closest to the original, because, according to the dictionary (*part I*), the word "anekdota" refers to a short, interesting or amusing story, especially a true one (1957, 30). Thus, this word can be used to refer back to the original above-mentioned sentence. On the other hand, the word "báje" refers to a story handed down from one generation to another or to a story about some heroes, ghosts, people, events and so on, but probably not true (1957, 67). *The arm-chair* (p. 55, 75) : *pohovka* (p. 56, 75) : *lenoška* (p. 55, 75), as can be seen, Pimassl uses equivalent indicating different type of furniture than the original. The interesting thing is that Pimassl uses a word "lenoška" (p. 71) for the original word "arm-chair" (p. 72) and then, as illustrated above, for this original word (p. 75), he uses the word "pohovka" (p. 75) again. *The cab* (p. 94) : *vůz* (p. 90) : *drožka* (p. 93), here, the difference between these two Czech equivalences is in associations attached to them. According to the above-mentioned dictionary (*part VIII*), Pimassl uses a word referring to a four-wheeled vehicle used mostly for carrying loads (1957, 1262). *The sofa* (p. 101) : *lenošku* (p. 96) : *pohovku* (p. 100), as can be seen, Pimassl uses equivalent indicating different type of furniture than the original. *The blinds* (p. 104) : *žaluzie* (p. 99) : *záclony* (p. 103), in this case, it is Novák who uses equivalent indicating

different type of thing than the original. *Tapestries* (p. 105) : *tapetami* (p. 99) : *gobelíny* (p. 103), here, Pimassl uses equivalent indicating different type of thing used on walls than the original. According to the above-mentioned dictionary (*part I*), the word “gobelíny” refers to a piece of cloth into which a picture of design has been sewn or woven and hung on a wall for decoration or used to cover, for instance, the seats of chairs (1957, 795). *Telegraphed* (p. 125) : *zatelefonoval* (p. 115) : *zatelegrafoval* (p. 122), as can be seen, Pimassl uses, in comparison with the original, a verb denoting different action, because, according to the above-mentioned dictionary (*part VI*), the original verb indicates that a message is send by telegraph that is a system using either wires and electricity or radio in order to send messages (1957, 150). On the other hand, the verb used by Pimassl indicates that a message is send by means of the telephone that is an instrument for speaking to someone from a distance (p. 150).

Wilde: dear fellow (p. 8)
Pimassl: milý brachu (p. 16)
Novák: kamaráde (p. 10)

Here, Pimassl employs a familiar form of addressing with a positive pre-modifier. Novák, on the other hand, uses a neutral word.

There are other forms of addressing involved in both Czech translations, for instance, *lad* (Wilde p. 17) : *jinocha* (Pimassl p. 24) : *hochu* (Novák p. 19), *lad* (p. 22, 25) : *jinocha* (p. 28, 31) : *chlapec* (p. 24, 35), in the last case, although the original word “lad” refers to Dorian Gray, who is, as already mentioned above, nearly 18 years old, Novák uses, according to dictionary (*part I*), a word referring to a male between 7 – 14 years of age (1957, 1045). Resulting in an inappropriate form of addressing.

Wilde: When I leave town now I never tell my people where I am going (p. 10).
Pimassl: Když teď opouštím město, nikdy neříkám svým lidem, kam jdu (p. 18).
Novák: Když odjíždím z města, nikdy neřeknu svým příbuzným, kam mám namířeno (p. 12).

Here, Pimassl uses the equivalents, consisting of a possessive pronoun followed by an abstract noun, with the narrowest sense to the original words. However, we, as the readers, do not learn who are the people that the speaker refers to. Novak, on the other hand, substitutes the original abstract noun for a concrete one instead. This process is called “modulation.”

Wilde: deception (p. 10)
Pimassl: podvádět (p. 18)
Novák: šalby (p. 12)

As can be seen, Novák uses a word that may not be easily recognized by its TT readers even if it is of Czech origin.

Actually, there are more of these words in both Czech translations. These words can either be colloquial, archaic, terms or expressive, like *dragon-fly* (Wilde p. 12) : *vážka* (Pimassl p. 20) : *šídlo* (Novák p. 14), *articulate* (p. 26) : *článkovaná* (p. 32) : *nemluvila zřetelně* (p. 28), *dry-goods* (p. 48) : *střížní zboží* (p. 50) : *konfekce* (p. 48), *commit* (p. 63) : *nepáší* (p. 64) : *nepáchají* (p. 63), *sullenly* (p. 80) : *posupně* (p. 79) : *nevraživě* (p. 80), *reticence* (p. 136) : *zámlky* (p. 125) : *nesdílnost* (p. 133), *to miss* (p. 143) : *pohřeší* (p. 131) : *už tu není* (p. 140), *macaroni* (p. 165) : *tatrmanem* (p. 149) : *švihákem* (p. 161), *the bag* (p. 184) : *tlumok* (p. 164) : *brašnu* (p. 178), *in the hansom* (p. 212) : *ve fiakru* (p. 186) : *v kočáru* (p. 205) and *neckties* (p. 249) : *nákrčníky* (p. 218) : *vázanky* (p. 241).

Wilde: crisis (p. 13)
Pimassl: krise (p. 20)
Novák: krize (p. 15)

Here, both translators use the same loanword that is adapted, in terms of spelling and pronunciation, from a foreign language to the Czech language. There is, however, a slight spelling difference between these two equivalences owing to the different time periods between them. Pimassl's equivalent contains "s", whereas Novák's equivalent "z".

In addition, looking at the whole Pimassl' translation, there is a high occurrence of loanwords including the above mentioned spelling deviation, for instance, "civilisovaný" (p. 20), "metafisice" (p. 23), "impuls" (p. 31), "graciosním" (p. 31), "analysoval" (p. 46), "simpatisují" (p. 52), "improvisace" (p. 54), "demoralisující" (p. 55), "nervosně" (p. 57), "iluse" (p. 57), "konversace" (p. 60), "sensace" (p. 60), "poesie" (p. 68), "pompésní" (p. 90), "extase" (p. 96), "fantasie" (p. 103), "risika" (p. 125), "realisace" (p. 136), "symbolisovat" (p. 138), "moralisovat" (p. 219), "inserátem" (p. 215).

Now looking at Novák's translation, there can also be found a few loanwords, however, spelled with the letter "z", for instance, "civilizovaný" (p. 14), "metafyzice" (p. 18), "improvizace" (p. 52) and the like.

Wilde: theory (p. 51)

Pimassl: theorie (p. 53)

Novák: teorie (p. 52)

As can be seen, there is another obvious spelling difference between these two Czech equivalences. It seems that Pimassl's equivalent includes an implantation of a foreign element "th", assuming that this element is borrowed from Greek language. *Pravidla českého pravopisu* (1948) shows that these words are not assimilated phonetically to Czech language yet.

In addition, there are other examples of such words in Pimassl's translation, like "lethargie" (p. 61), "ethika" (p. 105), "teatrální" (p. 93), "pathosem" (p. 138), "theologové" (p. 192) and "pathetická" (p. 117).

On the other hand, Novák's equivalences, such as "teatrální" (p. 97), "etika" (p. 111), "patosem" (p. 150), "teologové" (p. 211) and "patetická" (p. 124) are spelled without the letter "h" owing to assimilation of these loanwords both in terms of spelling and pronunciation to the Czech language. Assuming this assimilation occurred during the time of creation of the former translation.

Looking at Pimassl's translation from the point of view of a contemporary reader, there is another example of a spelling oddity found in the word "skizzuji" (p. 24) that is the equivalent of the original word "sketch" (p. 17). Novák, by contrast, uses the same word "skicují" (p. 18) as Pimassl, however, spelled, in regard to a contemporary reader, in much more familiar way.

Generally, Pimassl uses a huge number of loanwords with Czech spelling as substitutions for the original words. Novák, by contrast, uses in most cases words of Czech origin, however, there can also be found a few loanwords in his translation. For instance, *vulgar* (Wilde p. 8) : *vulgární* (Pimassl p. 16) : *lidové* (Novák p. 10), *with gigantic tiaras* (p. 13) : *s ohromnými tiarami* (p. 21) : *s gigantickými členkami* (p. 15), *indifferent* (p. 15) : *indiferentní* (p. 22) : *lhostejný* (p. 17), *subtle* (p. 17) : *subtilní* (p. 25) : *pronikavý* (p. 19), *graceful* (p. 25) : *graciósní* (p. 31) : *ladné* (p. 27), *impulse* (p. 25) : *impuls* (p. 31) : *pud* (p. 27), *triumphs* (p. 30) : *triumf* (p. 35) : *vítězství* (p. 31), *insult* (p.

42) : *insultoval* (p. 46) : *urazil* (p. 43), *analysed* (p. 46) : *analysoval* (p. 49) : *rozebral* (p. 47), *cosmopolitan* (p. 57) : *kosmopolitické* (p. 58) : *světové* (p. 57), *loyalty* (p. 60) : *loyálnost* (p. 61) : *stálost* (p. 60), *lethargy* (p. 60) : *lethargie* (p. 61) : *otupělost* (p. 60), *philistine* (p. 68) : *filištín* (p. 68) : *šosák* (p. 67), *trivial* (p. 68) : *triviální* (p. 69) : *všední* (p. 68), *vivisecting* (p. 68) : *vivisekci* (p. 69) : *pitvat* (p. 68), *sum* (p. 72) : *suma* (p. 72) : *částka* (p. 72), *imaginary* (p. 77) : *imaginární* (p. 76) : *pomyslný* (p. 77), *young dandy* (p. 79) : *mladý dandy* (p. 77) : *mladý švihák* (p. 79), *standard* (p. 92) : *standard* (p. 88) : *měřítka* (p. 91), *privilege* (p. 92) : *privilegiem* (p. 89) : *výsadou* (p. 91), *declaimed* (p. 98) : *pronesena* (p. 93) : *deklamovala* (p. 97), *manager* (p. 98) : *manager* (p. 94) : *ředitel* (p. 97), *reviews* (p. 191) : *revue* (p. 170) : *časopisech* (p. 186) and *stagnate* (p. 240) : *stagnaci* (p. 211) : *zakrňují* (p. 232).

Wilde: cheroot (p. 41)
Pimassl: cheroot (p. 44)
Novák: tlustý krátký doutník (p. 42)

According to *Příruční slovník jazyka českého* (1935 - 1957) or *Slovník cizích slov* (1996), there is no sign of the word “cheroot” in the Czech language. Pimassl transfers this cultural specific word, in terms of spelling and pronunciation, directly to the TT language. This translation method is called “borrowing.” However, resulting in the word that a TT reader may not understand.

In addition, there are other words, the same as the one mentioned above, and even one preposition included in Pimassl’s translation, where their external form either resembles the original or they are slightly modified according to rules of grammar and phonetics of the Czech language, for instance, *Erskin of Treadley* (Wilde p. 47, 49) : *Erskine of Treadley* (Pimassl p. 50, 51), *in a hansom* (p. 94) : *v hansonu* (p. 90), *the little brougham* (p. 94) : *malého broughamu* (p. 90), *cupids* (p. 105) : *cupidy* (p. 99), *sovereign* (p. 211) : *sovereign* (p. 186), *Union Jack* (p. 207) : *Union Jack* (p. 183) and *at garden-party* (p. 225) : *na garden-party* (p. 198).

Novák, on the other hand, tries to find words that are equivalent to the above-mentioned original words and sometimes using translation method called “calque,” where the original words are transferred in a literal translation, for example, “Erskine z Treadley” (p. 48), “drožkou” (p. 93), “malého kočáru” (p. 93), “amorky” (p. 104), “zlatku” (p. 204), “britskou vlajku” (p. 201) and “na zahradní slavnosti” (p. 218).

In addition, it should be mentioned here that Pimassl uses footnotes in order to make the TT readers understand the original poem written in French (p. 167). Novák, on the other hand, neither translates the original poem nor uses footnotes (p. 183). As a result, those who are not familiar with French language cannot obviously understand this poem in Novák's translation.

Wilde: a stockbroker (p. 12)
Pimassl: obchodník s cennými papíry (p. 20)
Novák: burzián (p. 14)

As can be seen, Novák, in comparison with Pimassl, uses an informal word in order to substitute the original for a single word. In addition, there is another informal word in Novák's translation used in the same way, such as *patent-leather boot* (Wilde p. 16) : *lakové botky* (Pimassl p. 23) : *lakýrky* (Novák p. 18).

Wilde: an ass of himself (p. 23)
Pimassl: ze sebe blázna (p. 23)
Novák: ze sebe hovado (p. 17)

Here, Novák uses a vulgarism as the substitution for the original vulgar expression. Pimassl, by contrast, employs a euphemism.

In addition, there are other either vulgarisms, pejorative or offensive appellations involved in both Czech translations, such as *ringlets* (Wilde p. 59) : *pačesy* (Pimassl p. 61) : *vlasy* (Novák p. 60), *carts* (p. 104) : *vozy* (p. 98) : *káry* (p. 102), *dowdy* (p. 116) : *hrozná coura* (p. 108) : *přestane o sebe dbát* (p. 114) and *negroes* (p. 155) : *negři* (p. 140) : *černoši* (p. 151).

Wilde: evening coat (p. 12)
Pimassl: večerní kabátek (p. 20)
Novák: frak (p. 14)

Here, Pimassl uses a "literal" translation. He replaces each individual word of the original multi-word structure with its closest lexical equivalent, resulting in TT multi-word structure whose literal meaning is wider and less specific than that of the original. Novák, on the other hand, uses a TL hyponym "frak" whose literal meaning, in comparison with the original, is narrower and more specific.

In addition, there are other cases of literal translation in Pimassl's translation, like *my dear old Basil* (Wilde p. 17) : *můj milý starý Basile* (Pimassl p. 22) : *můj milý zlatý*

Basile (Novák p. 22), *the finest portrait* (p. 32) : *nejjemnější portrét* (p. 37) : *nejdokonalejší portrét* (p. 34), *an English blue-book* (p. 41) : *v anglické modré knize* (p. 45) : *v anglické diplomatické korespondenci* (p. 42), *parrot-tulips* (p. 55) : *papouščích tulipánů* (p. 56) : *pestrobarevnými tulipány* (p. 55) *and negroes* (p. 155) : *negři* (p. 140) : *černoši* (p. 151).

Wilde: in the East End (p. 20, 50)
Pimassl: v East Endu (p. 27, 52, 53)
Novák: ve čtvrtích chudiny (p. 22, 50), periférie (p. 51)

As can be seen, the original word has no equivalent in Czech. Thus, Novák uses an explanatory paraphrase in order to describe a place found in another country to its TT readers. Pimassl, on the other hand, uses the translation method called “borrowing,” where the original expression is transferred directly to the TT language and changed according to Czech orthographic conventions.

Besides, there can be found other either explanatory paraphrases or borrowings in both Czech translations, such as *tussore-silk curtains* (Wilde p. 7) : *záclony z tussorského hedvábí* (Pimassl p. 15) : *záclony z hrubého indického hedvábí* (Novák p. 9), *to lionise me* (p. 14) : *udělat ze mne hrdinu dne* (p. 21) : *ze mne udělá zlatý hřeb večera* (p. 15), *Midland counties* (p. 40) : *v Midlandu* (p. 44) : *ve vnitroanglických hrabstvích* (p. 41), *subaltern* (p. 42) : *subalterní* (p. 45) : *s nizoučkou šarží* (p. 43), *at the Athenaeum* (p. 53) : *do Athenea* (p. 56) : *ve vědecké společnosti* (p. 54) and *Debrett* (p. 206) : *Debretta* (p. 182) : *Debrettův almanach šlechty* (p. 200).

Wilde: the moon (p. 29)
Pimassl: měsíc (p. 35)
Novák: luna (p. 31)

As can be seen, Novák includes a poetic expression into his translation. In addition, there is another poetic word “laňka” (p. 96) in Novák’s translation, as the substitution for the original word “fawn” (p. 96).

Wilde: June (p. 30)
Pimassl: květen (p. 36)
Novák: červen (p. 32)

Although there can be found an absolute equivalent of the original in the TL, like the one found in Novák's translation, Pimassl uses word that is the equivalent of an English word "May."

Besides, there can be found more original words being rendered into both Czech translations by expressions whose literal meaning is different than the original, for instance, *Mrs. Vandeleur* (Wilde p. 50) : *pan Vandeleur* (Pimassl p. 53) : *paní Vandeleurová* (Novák p. 51), here, Pimassl substitutes the English abbreviation "Mrs." that is a polite title given to a female adult for the title "pan" that is given to a Czech male adult. *Tuesday* (p. 52) : *středa* (p. 55) : *úterý* (p. 53), in this case, Pimassl uses an incorrect equivalent for the original name of the second day of the week. *Tuesday* (p. 67) : *středa* (p. 67) : *čtvrtek* (p. 67), here, both translators use incorrect equivalences for the original name of the second day of the week. *Patches* (p. 165) : *licousy* (p. 149) : *muškami* (p. 161), here, both translators employ incorrect equivalents of the original, because the original word refers to a piece of material sewn on to cover a hole and not, as indicated in Pimassl's translation, to the hair grown on the side of a man's face or, as in Novák's translation, to the hair on the upper lip of a man. *White-whiskered* (p. 203) : *licousy* (p. 179) : *licousy* (p. 197), in this case, the original word refers to a man's moustache or beard and not to the hair grown on the side of a man's face as indicated in both Czech translations. In addition, according to *Anglicko-Český a Česko-Anglický slovník*, the word "licousy" is the equivalent of an English word "side whiskers" (1999, 585).

Wilde: at Spa (p. 42)
Pimassl: ve Spa (p. 46)
Novák: v lázních Spa (p. 41)

In this case, Pimassl uses the translation method called "borrowing," where the original expression is transferred directly to the TT language. Novák, on the other hand, includes additional information in order to describe what kind of place the word "Spa" refers to.

There are more place names included in both Czech translations treated the same ways as mentioned above, for instance, *at the Bristol* (Wilde p. 86) : *v Bristolu* (Pimassl p. 83) : *v hotelu Bristol* (Novák p. 85), *to the Park* (p. 75) : *do Parku* (p. 74) : *do Hyde Parku* (p. 75) and *in the Piazza* (p. 104) : *na Piazzze* (p. 98) : *na náměstí Piazza* (p. 103).

Wilde: collieries (p. 40)
Pimassl: dolů (p. 44)
Novák: uhelných dolů (p. 41)

In this case, Pimassl leaves out a piece of information, resulting in the TT expression whose literal meaning is wider and less specific than that of the original. Novák, on the other hand, substitutes the original one-word structure for a multi-word equivalence. As a result, he provides the whole information of the original.

Besides, there are other structures either complete, partial or left out completely, for instance, *Louis Quatorze clock* (Wilde p. 55) : *hodiny z doby Ludvíka Čtrnáctého* (Pimassl p. 57) : Ø (Novák p. 55), *greasy ringlets* (p. 59) : *namaštěné pačesy* (p. 61) : *mastné, kudrnaté vlasy* (p. 60) and *in a rut* (p. 213) : *o kolej* (p. 187) : *o vyjeté koleje* (p. 206).

Wilde: foolish (p. 10)
Pimassl: bláhový (p. 18)
Novák: blázen (p. 12)

In this case, Pimassl, in comparison with Novák, uses a euphemism as the substitution for the original pejorative word.

In addition, there are other euphemisms involved either in Pimassl's or Novák's translation, such as *to a truculent and red-faced old gentleman* (Wilde p. 14) : *k barbarskému starému pánovi s červenou tváří* (Pimassl p. 21) : *k sveřepému červenolícímu starému pánovi* (Novák p. 16), *mutilation of the savage* (p. 25) : *mrzačení otroků* (p. 31) : *potlačení přirozenosti divochů* (p. 27), *bullied* (p. 40) : *utlačoval* (p. 44) : *tyranizoval* (p. 42) and *wretched* (p. 172) : *ztroskotanec* (p. 154) : *nešťastný* (p. 168).

Wilde: uncle George (p. 41 - 44)
Pimassl: strýčku Jiří (p. 44 - 47)
Novák: strýčku (p. 42 - 45)

As can be seen, Pimassl translates the personal name into the TT language by using its Czech equivalent. Novák, on the other hand, avoids using the name "George" in his translation and substitutes only the original word "uncle" for the direct equivalent.

Besides, there are other names included in both Czech translations either used as borrowings with English spelling or slightly changed according to Czech grammatical

conventions or substituted for Czech equivalents. For instance, *Victoria* (Wilde p. 56) : *Viktorie* (Pimassl p. 57) : *Victoria* (Novák p. 56), *Victor* (p. 109) : *Viktor* (p. 102) : *Victor* (p. 107), *Jim* (p. 75) : *Jim* (p. 78) : *Jim* (p. 80), *Sibyl* (p. 76) : *Sibyl* (p. 74) : *Sibyl* (p. 80), *Francis* (p. 185) : *Františku* (p. 164) : *Francisi* (p. 179), *Marguerite de Navarre* (p. 204) : *Marguerita de Navarre* (p. 180) : *Markéta Navarrská* (p. 198), *Adolphe* (p. 203) : *Adolfa* (p. 179) : *Adolfa* (p. 197) and the like.

Furthermore, the original names of the streets, roads and square are transferred directly to both Czech translations, for instance, *Jermyn Street* (Wilde p. 109) : *Jermyn Street* (Pimassl p. 102) : *Jermyn Street* (Novák p. 108), *Euston Road* (p. 77) : *Euston Road* (p. 76) : *Euston Road* (p. 82), *Grosvenor Square* (p. 169) : *Grosvenor Square* (p. 152) : *Grosvenor Square* (p. 165), *Bond Street* (p. 210) : *Bond Street* (p. 186) : *Bond Street* (p. 204) and the like.

Wilde: to Royalties, and people with Stars and Garters (p. 13)

Pimassl: ke královským hodnostářům, k lidem s hvězdami a řády (p. 21)

Novák: k výsostem a k rytířům podvazkových a jiných řádů (p. 15)

As can be seen, Pimassl substitutes the original word “Garters” for the word “řády” changing the meaning of the whole original phrase. Novák, on the other hand, substitutes the original word for its Czech equivalent preserving the meaning of the whole original phrase.

In addition, there are other multi-word structures in both Czech translations, where some words are not the equivalents of the original words, resulting in a change in the meaning of the whole structure, for instance, *struck a light on a dainty silver case* (Wilde p. 20) : *vzal si cigaretu z drahého stříbrného pouzdra* (Pimassl p. 26) : *rozškrtl zápalku o úhlednou stříbrnou krabičku* (Novák p. 21), *the common hill flowers* (p. 30) : *obyčejné horské květiny* (p. 36) : *obyčejná kvítka na stráních* (p. 32) and *helping himself to some quail* (p. 48) : *napomáhaje ženským jazykům* (p. 51) : *vzal si kousek křepelky* (p. 48).

Wilde: Only England could have produced him, and he always said that the country is going to the dogs (p. 41)

Pimassl: Jedině Anglie ho mohla zplodit a stále říkal, že Anglie jde ve psí (p. 44)

Novák: Mohla ho zplodit jenom Anglie a on o své vlasti stále říkal, že to s ní jde z kopce (p. 42)

As can be seen, Pimassl translates this English idiom by using literal method of translation, where the individual words of the original are rendered into TT language with the use of their Czech equivalents, resulting in not preserving the meaning of the original and in the utterance that cannot certainly be understood by its TT readers. Novák, by contrast, replaces the original idiom with the Czech saying whose meaning is similar to the original.

6.1. The summary of the analysis

First noticeable differences between certain Czech lexical equivalences of the originals are in spelling. For instance, *atelier* (Pimassl p. 116) : *ateliér* (Novák p. 123), *krise* (p. 20) : *krize* (p. 15), *theorie* (p. 53) : *teorie* (p. 52), *skizzují* (p. 24) : *skicují* (p. 18). These spelling differences may be due to different time periods between these two Czech translations.

Pimassl, in comparison with Novák, employs words in his translation whose literal meaning refer to something different than the literal meaning of the original words. For instance, *the arm-chair* (Wilde p. 55, 75) : *pohovka* (Pimassl p. 56, 75), *tapestries* (p. 105) : *tapetami* (p. 99) and the like. In addition, Novák also uses words having different literal meaning than the original words, however, not as frequently as Pimassl uses them.

Both translators use words that may not be easily recognized by their TT readers even if they are of Czech origin, like *šídlo* (Novák p. 14), *střížní zboží* (Pimassl p. 50), *nepáší* (Pimassl p. 64), *posupně* (Pimassl p. 79) and the like.

There are some cases, when Pimassl transfers cultural specific words, in terms of spelling and pronunciation, directly to the TT language by using translation method called “borrowing.” However, resulting in the words that the TT readers may not understand. Novák, on the other hand, tries to find words that are equivalent to the original words and sometimes using translation method called “calque,” where the original words are transferred in a literal translation, for instance, *at garden-party* (Wilde p. 225) : *na garden-party* (Pimassl p. 198) : *na zahradní slavnosti* (Novák p. 218) and so on.

Generally, Pimassl uses a huge number of loanwords with Czech spelling as substitutions for the original words. Novák, by contrast, uses mostly words of Czech origin, however, there can also be found a few loanwords in his translation.

In most cases Pimassl uses a “literal” translation, where he replaces each individual word of the original with its closest lexical equivalent, resulting in TT expressions or structures whose literal meaning is wider and less specific than that of the original. Novák, on the other hand, uses TL hyponyms whose literal meaning, in comparison with the original, is narrower and more specific.

In cases where there is no equivalent for the original word in the Czech language, Novák uses explanatory paraphrases. Pimassl, on the other hand, uses the translation method called “borrowing,” where the original expressions or structures are transferred directly to the TT language and slightly changed according to the Czech orthographic conventions, for instance, *in the East End* (Wilde p. 20) : *v East Endu* (Pimassl p. 27) : *ve čtvrtích chudiny* (Novák p. 22) and the like.

Although there can be found absolute equivalents of the originals both translators in some cases use expressions of structures with literal meaning different from the original, for instance, *Tuesday* (Wilde p. 52) : *středa* (Pimassl p. 55) : *úterý* (Novák p. 53) and so on.

Generally, Pimassl translates the personal names into the TT language by using their Czech equivalents. Novák, on the other hand, leaves them out completely or transfers them directly to the TL by either preserving or slightly changing the original spelling according to Czech grammatical conventions.

Pimassl often uses the translation method called “borrowing,” where the original expression is transferred directly to the TT language. Novák, on the other hand, includes additional information in order to describe a particular thing or place to the TT readers. For instance, *at the Bristol* (Wilde p. 86) : *v Bristolu* (Pimassl p. 83) : *v hotelu Bristol* (Novák p. 85) and the like.

In conclusion, as can be seen from the results of the analysis, Pimassl’s translation may be considered inadequate. There are too many mistakes and some of them can be considered basic mistakes. This mistakes may be due to the fact that this translation was done before the second half of the twentieth century, where were used just two translation methods “literal” and “free” and in case of cultural or semantic specific

words found in ST, there was no other way than to choose between those two translation methods.

On the other hand, Novák's translation also includes a few either minor or major mistakes, however, not as many as found in Pimassl's translation. This may be due to the fact that his translation was done after the second half of the twentieth translation, where various methods dealing with "untranslatable" words appeared. As a result, his translation sounds more natural.

7. Conclusion

This bachelor paper deals with comparison of two Czech translations of Oscar Wilde's novel *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, outlining certain differences between Czech lexical equivalences together with the focus on the influence of time-period and cultural setting on the translated text. The former translation is from J. W. Pimassl (1948) and the latter from J. Z. Novák (1964).

The second part of this paper is devoted to the stylistic analysis of literary texts, where attention is paid to four points: the definition of the term "fictionality," the main purpose of literary texts, division of literary texts in terms of genres and division of patterning devices. Generally, literary texts, even if they refer to real places or historical events, are ultimately products of writer's imagination and at least the characters and their conversations are fictitious. They are created in order to inform the reader about a particular fictional world or evoke certain responses or interests in him/her. Furthermore, these texts can be divided into different categories or genres and numerous sub-genres that consist of rhetorical figures, tropes, formal features and registers.

The third part concerns Oscar Wilde's writing style with the special focus on stylistic features of his novel *The Picture of Dorian Gray*. It is said that his works are kind of compilations consisting of "well-sounding words and brilliant, well-formulated phrases." However, Wilde was not, in eyes of literary critics, very successful with his experiments with language owing to his irritating tendency to re-use vocabulary and the excessive use of decorative terms with no direct connection with their subject.

Next part is focused on four points: the definition of translation together with the main principles of translation, various types of translation methods used before and after the second half of the twentieth century, several procedures dealing with "untranslatable" words and translation process. It is shown that translation is an activity comprising the transference of meaning and style from a SL text into a TL. There are three types of translation, such as "intralingual" (within the same language), "interlingual" (between two languages) and "intersemiotic" (translating from one natural language system into technical codes). Up until the second half of the twentieth century, there are two main translation methods, such as "literal" or "word-for-word" and "free" or "sense-for-sense." After the second half of the twentieth century, translation began to adopt linguistic, scientific, literary, cultural, historical based

approach to translation in order to define the nature of equivalence. The various types of equivalences are introduced and discussed, for instance, dynamic or functional equivalence vs. formal equivalence. Furthermore, there can be words or utterances in the SL text for which there is no substitute in the TL. For this reason, there are provided several translation procedures dealing with them. Lastly, Nida and Taber's model of the translation process is introduced that consists of three stages, where the first stage serves for understanding ST content and context, intention of the ST and the like. The last two stages deal with the transference of signs from one language system into another.

The following chapter deals with various levels of translation, including lexical, grammatical, textual and pragmatic level. The special attention is paid to lexical equivalence. It is said that when looking for the notion of equivalence at lexical level, the following situation can occur: there can be absolute, partial, zero or more equivalents.

The last chapter deals with the analysis of two Czech translations compared with each other and with the original text, where the main focus is on lexical equivalence. Besides, the influence of time-period and cultural setting on the translated text is taken into account. The analysis is followed by the summary of its results, where it is shown that Pimassl's translation is inadequate, because it includes too many either major or minor mistakes. Novák's translation, by contrast, may be considered better translation, however, not adequate, because it also includes some either major or minor mistakes, however, still fewer mistakes than found in Pimassl's translation.

Résumé

Tato bakalářská práce se zabývá srovnáním dvou překladů anglického originálu knihy Oscara Wilda - *The Picture of Dorian Gray*. První překlad pochází z roku 1948 a je od J. W. Pimassla a druhý překlad je od J. Z. Nováka z roku 1964. Jádrem práce je analýza těchto dvou překladů v lexikální rovině se zaměřením na vliv dobovosti a kulturního prostředí na překládaný text.

Bakalářská práce je rozdělena na část teoretickou a praktickou. První kapitola teoretické části je úvodní, kde je uveden cíl a obsah práce.

V kapitole druhé je na základě odborné literatury charakterizován umělecký styl a jeho specifické aspekty. Literární díla jsou charakteristická tím, že postavy, místa, události v nich obsažené jsou buď z části nebo zcela smyšlené. Hlavní roly zde hraje fantazie, kterou chce autor díla upoutat pozornost čtenáře. Dále, literární díla mají za úkol informovat čtenáře a vzbudit v nich emoce a zájem. Literární díla mohou být rozdělena podle různých žánrů: na prózu, drama a poezii, které pak mohou být dále rozděleny na několik dalších žánrů tzv. pod-žánrů. Volba jazykových prostředků při tvorbě literárního díla je rozmanitější než u jiných stylů. Vyskytují se v něm metafory, aliterace, expresivně zabarvený slovník, slovní hříčky, neobvyklá slovní spojení apod.

V další kapitole se práce zabývá stylem Oscara Wilda, zejména pak jazykovými prostředky obsažené v románu *The Picture of Dorian Gray*. Oscar Wilde ve svých dílech hojně využívá metafor, aliterací, slovních hříček, intelektuálních konverzací, filozofická moudra apod. Samotný román byl kritiky odsouzen pro velké množství slov, které mají v knize jen dekorativní funkci a velké množství nic neříkajících vět.

Následuje prodiskutování základních překladatelských teorií a postupů. Tato kapitola je rozdělena do několika částí. Autorka nejprve uvádí definici překladu a hlavní principy překladu například, na co by se měl překladatel při překladu zaměřit, co by mělo být při překladu zachováno, což je styl a hlavní myšlenka původního textu. V další kapitole jsou rozlišeny tři typy překladu: „intralingvální“ (vnitrojazykový), „interlingvální“ (mezijazykový), čili vlastní překlad a „intersemiotický“ (transmutace). Následující podkapitola je zaměřena na překladatelské metody od vzniku prvních překladů až do druhé poloviny dvacátého století. Jsou zde uvedeny dvě metody a to: „doslovný“ překlad a „volný“ překlad, o několik let později se místo nich používá termínu jako „slovo za slovo“ a „smysl za smysl.“ Cituje zde především dílo

Introducing Translation Studies od Jeremyho Mundaye. V následující části se dostáváme k pojmu ekvivalence. Autorka uvádí čtyři hlavní představitele zabývající se tímto pojmem. Mezi ně především patří: Catford, jehož práce, která je lingvisticky orientována, se zabývá „formální korespondencí“ a „textovou ekvivalencí.“ V jeho práci zachází tak daleko, že podle Snell-Hornby se jeho závěry nemohly trvale uplatnit. Dále je to Eugene A. Nida, který rozlišuje ekvivalenci „formální,“ což je doslovný překlad a „dynamickou,“ což je volný, ale funkčně odpovídající překlad, kterou pak ilustruje na příkladu. Následně je uveden Neubert, který přistupuje k problému ekvivalence z hlediska semiotického a posledním představitelem je Koller, který rozlišuje podle různých úrovní pět typů ekvivalence. V další podkapitole autorka popisuje strategie, které se zabývají lexikálními jednotkami, které se nekryjí, nebo vůbec nemají protějšek v druhém jazyce. Dochází k tomu především v důsledku kulturních a lingvistických rozdílů mezi oběma jazyky. Anton Popovič uvádí, že v určitých případech je překladatel přinucen se odchýlit od originálu, dochází přitom k tzv. posunům. Touto problematikou se detailněji zabývají kanadští autoři Vinay and Darbelnet, kteří popisují sedm základních postupů, jimiž se řeší nedostatek přímého ekvivalentu v CJ. V poslední části se autorka zabývá překladatelským postupem.

Pátá kapitola čerpá především z díla *K teorii i praxi překladu* od Dagmar Knittlové, kde se autorka věnuje různými úrovněmi překladu a to lexikální, gramatickou, textovou a pragmatickou úrovní. Autorka se především soustředí na ekvivalenci na rovině lexikální, kde mohou nastat při hledání nejvhodnějšího ekvivalentu tyto případy: ekvivalent existuje a je buď úplný nebo-li absolutní, částečný nebo existuje více ekvivalentů. Může nastat druhá varianta a to ta, že ekvivalent neexistuje. V tomto případě má překladatel na výběr ze sedmy základních postupů od kanadských autorů. Autorka dále uvádí příklady úplných, částečných a nulových českých ekvivalentů anglických kontextově zapojených lexikálních i výpovědních jednotek.

Kapitolou šestou začíná praktická část, kde autorka provádí analýzu, která se skládá ze srovnání dvou českých překladů anglického originálu knihy Oscara Wilda - *The Picture of Dorian Gray*. První překlad pochází z roku 1948 a je od J. W. Pimassla a druhý překlad je od J. Z. Nováka z roku 1964. Samotná analýza je zaměřena na tyto dva překlady v lexikální rovině se zaměřením na vliv dobovosti a kulturního prostředí na překládaný text. Autorka zde poukazuje na ten fakt, že analýza a závěry z ní

vyplývající jsou ovlivněny jejím subjektivním postojem k problematice. Po analýze následuje shrnutí a vyvození závěrů vyplývajících z porovnání daných překladů.

Bibliography

Baker, Mona. 1992. *In Other Words: A coursebook on translation*. London - New York: Routledge.

Bassnett-McGuire, Susan. 1991. *Translation Studies*. London: Methuen.

Brislin, Richard W. 1976. *Translation: Applications and Research*. New York: Gardner Press.

Catford, J. C. 1965. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation: An essay in applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fronek, Josef. 1999. *Anglicko český a česko anglický slovník*. Praha: nakladatelství Leda

Chapman, Raymond. 1973. *Linguistics and Literature: An introduction to literary stylistics*. London: Edward Arnold.

Jírů, Martina. 2004. *Jazykové prostředky v uměleckém stylu* [online]. Český Krumlov: Gymnázium [cited 8th June 2006]. Available from World Wide Web: <<http://www.gymck.cz/~jiru/mat-cj17.htm>>

Klégr, Aleš. 1996. *The Noun in Translation: A Czech-English Contrastive Study*. Prague: Charles University Press.

Knittlová, Dagmar. 1995. *Teorie překladu*. Olomouc: Nakladatelství Univerzity Palackého.

Knittlová, Dagmar. 2003. *K teorii i praxi překladu*. Olomouc: Nakladatelství Univerzity Palackého.

Koller, W. 1989. *Equivalence in translation theory*. Translated by A. Chesterman. Helsinki: Finn Lectura.

Kufnerová, Z., M. Poláčková, J. Povejšil, Z. Skoumalová, a V. Straková. 1994. *Překládání a čeština*. Praha: H&H.

Leech, Geoffrey N., and Michael H. Short. 1994. *Style in fiction: A linguistic introduction to English fictional prose*. London: Longman Harlow.

Mathesius, Vilém J. 1961. *Obsahový rozbor současné angličtiny na základě obecně lingvistickém*. Praha: ČSAV.

Miller, Robert Keith. 1982. *Oscar Wilde*. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing co.

Munday, Jeremy. 2001. *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and applications*. London: Routledge.

Newmark, Peter. 1982. *Approaches to Translation*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Newmark, Peter. 2003. *A Textbook on Translation*. London: Pearson education limited.

Nida, Eugene A., and Charles R. Taber. 1969. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Nida, Eugene A. 1964. *Toward a Science of Translating*. Leide: E. J. Brill.

Ojala, Aatos. 1955. *Aestheticism and Oscar Wilde: Literary style*. Helsinki: suomalaisen tiedekat.

Pravidla českého pravopisu s abecedním seznamem slov a tvarů. 1948. Praha: ČAVM (Česká akademie věd a umění).

Příruční slovník jazyka českého (díl I – VIII). 1935 – 1957. Praha: Státní nakladatelství: ČAVM.

Slovník cizích slov. 1996. Praha: Encyklopedický dům.

Snell-Hornby, Mary. 1995. *Translation Studies: An integrated approach*. Amsterdam - Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

The Picture of Dorian Gray. [online, cited 20th June 2006]. Available from World Wide Web: <<http://sparknotes.com/lit/doriangray/summary.html>>

Vilikovský, Ján. *Překlad jako tvorba*. 2002. Překlad Emil Charous. Praha: Nakladatelství Ivo Železný.

Wilde, Oscar. 1994. *The Picture of Dorian Gray*. London: Penguin Group.

Wilde, Oscar. *Obraz Dorian Graye*. 1964. Překlad J. Z. Novák. Praha: Mladá fronta.

Wilde, Oscar. *Obraz Dorian Graye*. 1948. Překlad J. W. Pimassl. Praha: Nakladatelství Rudolfa Kmocha.

Wilss, Wolfram. 1982. *The Science of Translation: Problems and Methods*. Tübingen: Müller + Bass.

Appendix 1

The summary of novel “The Picture of Dorian Gray”

In the stately London home of his aunt, Lady Brandon, the well-known artist Basil Hallward meets Dorian Gray. Dorian is a cultured, wealthy, and impossibly beautiful young man who immediately captures Basil’s artistic imagination. Dorian sits for several portraits, and Basil often depicts him as an ancient Greek hero or a mythological figure. When the novel opens, the artist is completing his first portrait of Dorian as he truly is, but, as he admits to his friend Lord Henry Wotton, the painting disappoints him because it reveals too much of his feeling for his subject. Lord Henry, a famous wit who enjoys scandalizing his friends by celebrating youth, beauty, and the selfish pursuit of pleasure, disagrees, claiming that the portrait is Basil’s masterpiece. Dorian arrives at the studio, and Basil reluctantly introduces him to Lord Henry, who he fears will have a damaging influence on the impressionable, young Dorian.

Basil’s fears are well founded; before the end of their first conversation, Lord Henry upsets Dorian with a speech about the transient nature of beauty and youth. Worried that these, his most impressive characteristics, are fading day by day, Dorian curses his portrait, which he believes will one day remind him of the beauty he will have lost. In a fit of distress, he pledges his soul if only the painting could bear the burden of age and infamy, allowing him to stay forever young. In an attempt to appease Dorian, Basil gives him the portrait.

Over the next few weeks, Lord Henry’s influence over Dorian grows stronger. The youth becomes a disciple of the “new Hedonism” and proposes to live a life dedicated to the pursuit of pleasure. He falls in love with Sibyl Vane, a young actress who performs in a theatre in London’s slums. He adores her acting; she, in turn, refers to him as “Prince Charming” and refuses to heed the warnings of her brother, James Vane, that Dorian is no good for her. Overcome by her emotions for Dorian, Sibyl decides that she can no longer act, wondering how she can pretend to love on the stage now that she has experienced the real thing. Dorian, who loves Sibyl *because* of her ability to act, cruelly breaks his engagement with her. After doing so, he returns home to notice that his face in Basil’s portrait of him has changed: it now sneers. Frightened that his wish for his likeness in the painting to bear the ill effects of his behaviour has come true and that his

sins will be recorded on the canvas, he resolves to make amends with Sibyl the next day. The following afternoon, however, Lord Henry brings news that Sibyl has killed herself. At Lord Henry's urging, Dorian decides to consider her death a sort of artistic triumph—she personified tragedy—and to put the matter behind him. Meanwhile, Dorian hides his portrait in a remote upper room of his house, where no one other than he can watch its transformation.

Lord Henry gives Dorian a book that describes the wicked exploits of a nineteenth-century Frenchman; it becomes Dorian's bible as he sinks ever deeper into a life of sin and corruption. He lives a life devoted to garnering new experiences and sensations with no regard for conventional standards of morality or the consequences of his actions. Eighteen years pass. Dorian's reputation suffers in circles of polite London society, where rumours spread regarding his scandalous exploits. His peers nevertheless continue to accept him because he remains young and beautiful. The figure in the painting, however, grows increasingly wizened and hideous. On a dark, foggy night, Basil Hallward arrives at Dorian's home to confront him about the rumours that plague his reputation. The two argue, and Dorian eventually offers Basil a look at his (Dorian's) soul. He shows Basil the now-hideous portrait, and Hallward, horrified, begs him to repent. Dorian claims it is too late for penance and kills Basil in a fit of rage.

In order to dispose of the body, Dorian employs the help of an estranged friend, a doctor, whom he blackmails. The night after the murder, Dorian makes his way to an opium den, where he encounters James Vane, who attempts to avenge Sibyl's death. Dorian escapes to his country estate. While entertaining guests, he notices James Vane peering in through a window, and he becomes wracked by fear and guilt. When a hunting party accidentally shoots and kills Vane, Dorian feels safe again. He resolves to amend his life but cannot muster the courage to confess his crimes, and the painting now reveals his supposed desire to repent for what it is—hypocrisy. In a fury, Dorian picks up the knife he used to stab Basil Hallward and attempts to destroy the painting. There is a crash, and his servants enter to find the portrait, unharmed, showing Dorian Gray as a beautiful young man. On the floor lies the body of their master—an old man, horribly wrinkled and disfigured, with a knife plunged into his heart (www.sparknotes.com).

ÚDAJE PRO KNIHOVNICKOU DATABÁZI

Název práce	Comparison of Two Translations: The Picture of Dorian Gray By Oscar Wilde Translated By J. W. Pimassl (1948) and J. Z. Novák (1964)
Autor práce	Jitka Venosová
Obor	Anglický jazyk pro hospodářskou praxi
Rok obhajoby	2006
Vedoucí práce	Mgr. Irena Reimannová
Anotace	Práce je zaměřena na analýzu dvou uměleckých překladů. V teoretické části je charakterizován umělecký styl a překlad.
Klíčová slova	Dorian Gray – Oscar Wilde – překlady – srovnání – umělecký styl – analýza překladů