UNIVERSITY OF PARDUBICE

FACULTY OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH AND AMERICAN STUDIES

Rosten's

"O K★A★P★L★A★N! MY K★A★P★L★A★N!"

As a Challenging Literary piece

For Its Translator

Antonín Přidal

BACHELOR PAPER

AUTHOR: Dana Vondráčková

SUPERVISOR: Mrg. Irena Reimannová

2007

UNIVERZITA PARDUBICE

FAKULTA FILOZOFICKÁ

KATEDRA ANGLISTIKY A AMERIKANISTIKY

Rosten's

"O K★A★P★L★A★N! MY K★A★P★L★A★N!"

As a Challenging Literary piece

For Its Translator

Antonín Přidal

BAKALÁŘSKÁ PRÁCE

AUTOR PRÁCE: Dana Vondráčková

VEDOUCÍ PRÁCE: Mrg. Irena Reimannová

2007

ZADÁNÍ BAKALÁŘSKÉ PRÁCE

Pro: **Dana Vondráčková**

Studijní program: **Filologie**

Studijní obor: **Anglický jazyk pro hospodářskou praxi**

Název tématu: **Rosten's "O K★A★P★L★A★N! My K★A★P★L★A★N!" As a Challenging Literary Piece for Its Translator Antonín Přidal**

Zásady pro zpracování:

Tato bakalářská práce bude zaměřena na jazykovou analýzu překladu výše uvedeného uměleckého díla a bude se zabývat především otázkou vlivu kulturního prostředí na překládaný text.

První část práce bude charakterizovat umělecký styl a definovat základní překladatelské teorie a postupy, zaměří se na otázku kulturní převoditelnosti textu.

V druhé části bakalářské práce studentka provede jazykovou analýzu originálu a překladu, především se bude věnovat problematice převodu slov a gramatiky z jednoho kulturního prostředí do druhého.

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

Rozsah: 38 stran

Vedoucí práce: Mgr. Irena Reimannová

Vedoucí katedry (ústavu):   Paedr. Monika Černá, Ph.D.

Datum zadání práce: 31. 3. 2005

Termín odevzdání práce: 29. 6. 2007

Prohlašuji:

Tuto práci jsem vypracovala samostatně. Veškeré literární prameny a informace, které jsem 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 bude 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 29. 6. 2007

ABSTRAKT

Bakalářská práce je zaměřena na jazykovou analýzu překladu literárního díla se zaměřením na problematiku kulturní převoditelnosti textu. Předmětem analýzy je kniha Leo Rostena, která formou humorných příběhů popisuje příhody amerických imigrantů jež navštěvují večerní přípravnou školu pro dospělé. Jazykový rozbor porovnává anglický originál s českým překladem a upozorňuje na prvky, které jsou specifické pro daný jazyk i kulturu. Analýza se pokouší dokázat, že uvedené literární dílo nelze prostě přeložit, nýbrž převést z jednoho kulturního prostředí do jiného. Teoretická část definuje terminologii, popisuje překladatelské postupy a vysvětluje přístup k analýze. Praktická část prezentuje analýzu překladu a provádí rozbor překladatelových postupů.

CONTENTS:

APPENDIX

- Reference Summary of Expressions Related to Terms "TRANSLATE, TRANSLATION" Comparative Chart (vocabulary);

INTRODUCTION

The book of stories *O K★A★P★L★A★N! My K★A★P★L★A★N!*, by Leo Rosten is a readable and entertaining literary piece. Moreover, from the linguistic point of view, it is an exquisite object worth of analyzing, all the more when viewed as an artwork to be translated into other languages. It is a true challenge for translators since the humorousness of the book lies not in the plot or the events, nor is it based on the form in which it is presented; it is the very English language that is laughed at. The nature of the comicality is tied with the language of the main characters - the immigrants to the United States who attend the beginners' grade of the American Night Preparatory School for Adults in New York. The uneasy task to bring the book to the Czech reading public was undertaken by Antonín Přidal. The success of his translation published as *Pan Kaplan má stále třídu rád* has proved that it is comparable to the original both in the humorousness and in the brilliancy of expression.

The objective of this paper is to analyze the translation and to demonstrate that the process of translation cannot be restricted to linguistic issues but that it should consider the extra-linguistic features as well. The aim is to describe the possibilities of *cultural transposition* and to show its importance in the translation process. At first, the book will be introduced and terminology explained, including the expression *cultural transposition.* Following a description of general procedures of translation, the analysis will be presented. It will concern the comparison of the two language systems with regard to the cultures they are tied with. Levels of equivalence, respectively non-equivalence, will be evaluated in the analysis. Examples will be provided in order to demonstrate specific difficulties of translation with respect to *cultural transposition*, to show the pitfalls, and, primarily, to disclose the procedures adopted by Antonín Přidal when undertaking the translation. The analysis attempts to prove that the book is a challenge for translators.

The book provides a valuable material for an analysis of the distorted speech of the characters, which would suffice for a separate work. Due to the reasons of space, the important level of phonetics cannot be developed in the desired length and detail, and will therefore be considered to a limited, yet sufficient extent.

1. <u>**THE BOOK AND THE STRATEGY OF PŘIDAL**</u>

At first, it should be explained that the original stories about Hyman Kaplan have been published in three different books and that Přidal was not the first translator to deal with Mr. Kaplan and his language "adventures" experienced in the classes of Mr. Parkhill.

Initially, Leo Rosten wrote the first story for The New Yorker magazine. Having written another fourteen, Rosten published the fables in the collection called *The Education of H★Y★M★A★N   K★A★P★L★A★N* in 1937. The book was translated into the Czech language by Pavel Eisner being published with the title *Pan Kaplan má třídu rád* in 1946. Another twenty stories by Rosten appeared in 1959 as *The Return of H★Y★M★A★N   K★A★P★L★A★N*. However, Mr. Kaplan had not returned to the Czech readers until the third Rosten's book was published. *O   K★A★P★L★A★N! My K★A★P★L★A★N!* was intended to be a simple combination of the two preceding books but Rosten did not only write the preface to the book, yet he has re-written the old stories. The third book is then a new work, expanded and enriched, and therefore it must have accordingly been approached by its translator Antonín Přidal. The titles of the books are typed with the use of capital letters and five-pointed stars, which imitates the signature of the main character, who writes his name with crayons, decorated by green little stars. The decorated form of *O K★A★P★L★A★N! My K★A★P★L★A★N!*, is, however, rather distracting, and therefore the book is further referred to as *O Kaplan! My Kaplan!* or simply *Kaplan*.

The approach to the translation is partially evident from the text and partially disclosed in Přidal's preface to the book. He had to make the decision on how to approach the translation with respect to the former one by Eisner. As he reveals in his preface to the book, he considered to use the version of Eisner in order to keep the favorite expressions that became naturalized among the readers. However, to take apart the work and build it into a new piece would create a hybrid, as he called it.

Rejecting the early idea, Přidal decided to undertake a new translation and re-tell the stories. He was then free to change the whole concept given by his predecessor, who

"equipped" the main characters with the Czech language while leaving them in the original location, New York. Přidal could have transferred the plot to Prague or else, where the Czech-speaking characters would be situated in a natural environment. However, Přidal wanted to preserve the arrangement by Eisner because he considered his translation a "surprising, congenial" variation of the original, as he acknowledges in the preface. Using the example of Shakespeare's Hamlet who also speaks Czech in the plays translated into Czech, Přidal argues that it is a standard procedure of translation to keep the location of the original but to exchange the language. He admits that to translate an utterance that carries a message is, however, different from translating an utterance that deals with the rules of grammar and spelling as in the case of *Kaplan*.

The translation of *O Kaplan! My Kaplan!* by Antonín Přidal is therefore an original translation, which only keeps the framework of the first stories presented by Eisner.

2. **TERMINOLOGY**

Terminology is the essential issue of this analysis and therefore the pivotal word *translation* shall at first be scrutinized. In order to determine its meaning within the scope of this paper and to illustrate the need to introduce more specific expressions, *translation* is confronted with synonymic words *transfer*, *transposition* and *transplantation* as well as it is contrasted with its Czech counterpart *překlad* and the related words.

2.1. **"TRANSLATION" VS. SYNONYMS**

On the one hand, the word *translation* seems to be so deep-rooted that scarcely do the linguists and theorists replace it; on the other hand, the term is rather worn-out as well as too general, and so the use of a more explicit expression appears to be more proper. Besides these two reasons, the desire for using an unusual term when referring to the translation of *Kaplan* is supported by the idea of Skoumalová, who states that when this common expression is replaced by a synonym, it has an animating function (Kufnerová).

Translation refers to both the activity and the result of the process of translation. Based on the simplified widespread perception, *translation* (as a noun) is a version of the original text or discourse in another language. By definition, it is "an act, process, or instance of translating; a rendering from one language into another" as well as "a change to a different substance, form, or appearance", the synonym of which is "conversion" (Webster). In other words:

> What is generally understood as translation involves the rendering of a source language text into the target language so as to ensure that (1) the surface meaning of the two will be approximately similar and (2) the structures of the source language will be preserved as closely as possible but not so closely that the target language structures will be seriously distorted. (Bassnett)

Unfortunately, neither of the statements implies that there exist many different types of translations; not event the dictionary entry does make further distinctions by referring to for example literary translation. Compared to the English *translation*, its Czech semantic counterpart *překlad* (Fronek) is defined in the explanatory dictionary *Slovník spisovné češtiny* by a reference to two types of translations: "doslovný překlad"

('literal translation') next to "strojový překlad" ('computer-assisted translation') (Mejstřík).

Based on the above given explanation, the two counterparts *translation ~ překlad* and the related verbs *translate ~ překládat* are hereinafter considered general terms that refer to the result of or the activity that aims at expressing the original text in another language. (The original text is further referred to as the source text (ST), being expressed by the means of the source language (SL); hence the language variant be the target text (TT), the language of which is the target language (TL)). As long as the expression *translation* is the subject in question, it remains printed in italics.

In her book *Překládání a čeština*, Kufnerová devotes a whole chapter to the conception of the word *překlad* (~ *translation*) where she points out that the Czech language disposes of many synonymic expressions, for instance *převod*, *přeložení* or *interpretace*. Looking for corresponding terms in English, a number of related expressions was scrutinized. Many of them have been used by the linguists and lexicographers but rather as supportive words that help to define or explain the act of translation. Neither of the terms, unfortunately, can already be considered as established and determined on its own in terms of the theory of treanslation. Therefore, from the complete list of the terms that were considered, which can be found in the Appendix, three most suitable expressions have been evaluated with regard to their current frequency of use within the works on translation, with respect to their etymology, original meaning and function, as well as the common perspective. Placing the chosen terms *transfer*, *transposition* and *transplantation* into the context of linguistics is also based on the analysis of the methods adopted by Přidal when undertaking the translation of *Kaplan*.

Transfer was evaluated as the most suitable expression to refer to the Czech version of *Kaplan* instead of *translation* primarily for the reason of its denotative and connotative meaning. "To transfer" means "to convey from one person, place or situation to another" (Webster), and in the context of translating it suggests that a shift applied in the process. Since Přidal changed the topic of the book by replacing the study

of the English for the Czech grammar, he did not undertake a simple *translation*. Another reason for choosing *transfer* was that it is recognized as the counterpart of the Czech *převod*, *přesun*, which has been used in a similar sense. The book *Pan Kaplan má stále třídu rád* is therefore considered a *transfer* of *O Kaplan! My Kaplan!*.

Another word that was scrutinized was the verb *transpose* and the derived form ***transposition***. According to the Webster's dictionary, "to transpose" is a synonym of "to translate", being explained as "to render into another language, style, or manner of expression". Surprisingly, the result of this action, *transposition*, is not linguistically marked in the dictionary in contrast to the Czech term *transpozice*, which is explained as a change of the order of letters in spelling or the transfer of a lexical unit from one category into another (Mejstřík). Herein, translational *transposition* is understood as a process of translating that involves deviation of the TT from the ST.

Transplantation should then be considered the highest level of *transposition*, for it implies a most attentive approach. The verb *transplant* also refers to relocation; by definition it means "to remove from one place or context and settle or introduce elsewhere". In terms of translation, it represents the ability to introduce something in another context, which involves the knowledge of both the source and the target environment. Thus, *to transplant* and the derived noun *transplantation* should be considered hyponyms of *transposition*; they are used on the level of individual operations and procedures of translation.

Within a hierarchy, the three selected words would be expressed in the following sequence:

1. Transfer – representing the target text that is a version of the original with a major shift or exchange (for example in the concept of the book).

2. Transposition – representing a process of translation that involves replacement of words or particular features of the text by equivalents of different levels.

3. Transplantation – being the highest level of transposition that deals with the replacement of a specific detail including its connotative meaning.

2.2. <u>**CULTURAL TRANSPOSITION AND TRANSPLANTATION**</u>

Having explained the meaning of the words *transposition* and *transplantation,* and having provided the essential information on the book as well as the translating issues involved, two related terms can be introduced: *cultural transposition* and *cultural transplantation.*

Knittlová explains that the term ***cultural transposition*** has been used by many authors (naming S.Harvey and I. Higgins) as a superior expression to different degrees and grades of deviation from literal translation, to which the translators turn in order to transfer the contents of the source text into the context of the target culture. Knittlová recognizes "cultural transposition" on the level of language systems; she further explains that what is being replaced are the language-specific features of the ST by the TL-specific ones (Knittlová). It is obvious that in the case *Kaplan*, the deviation of the TT from the ST was inevitable. For instance, the described mistakes made by the students are bound to the English grammar and could not have been translated - they must have been exchanged for similar mistakes that are typical for students of the Czech grammar.

Besides the language-specific features of the ST, culture-bound details are of great importance in translation and they deserve delicate handling as well. Mona Baker explains that the SL words may express a culture-specific concept that is totally unknown in the target culture, giving an example of religious belief, social custom, or even a type of food. *Cultural transplantation* is then a most adequate term to describe the operation "involving the replacement of source-cultural details mentioned in the ST with cultural details drawn from the target culture in the TT" (Knittlová). If the stories about Hyman Kaplan were a simple excursion into the class of grown-up students, they could be easily re-told by the translator in the TL. However, not only does the narrative take the readers into the world of languages, but also among various cultures. To name one of the easier culture-specific details that Přidal had to deal with, *marshmallow* can be mentioned. The fluffy American candy was exchanged for the Czech chocolate with a rum filling recognized as *pralinka*. The *transplantability* of the culture-bound details is often embarrassed by the manner in which it is presented; if introduced in direct

speech of the characters (students), the spelling of the word in question is incorrect in order to reflect the mispronunciation, which leads to comicality. Therefore *de Peelgrims* (meaning the Pilgrims) is transplanted by *první vystěhováci do ciziny*, and *Sandy Claws* (Santa Claus) becomes *fousatý děduláš*.

To achieve the same impact on the TT readers, the translator of *Kaplan* had to take the advantage of both the *cultural transposition* and *cultural transplantation*. As the analysis proves, Přidal executed it sensitively, demonstrating his awareness of the context as well as the knowledge of the two language systems.

3. **THE THEORY AND PROCEDURES OF TRANSLATION**

The theory of translation has developed in the 19th century. However, the linguistic approach, in contrast to the traditional literary-esthetical interest taken by that time, was introduced as late as in the second half of 20th century. Within the years, the literary and linguistic approaches have established the core of the theory of translation, which is now recognized as a separate discipline; in some respect it can be considered a cross-sectional discipline for it involves analyses of distant methodologies. Among the main approaches that are considered in translation, as listed by Kufnerová, belong: communication, semiotic, psychology and cultural anthropology (Kufnerová).

One of the attempts of the theory of translation is to describe the translation procedures. The theorists have introduced various characteristics but since translation is such a complex process, as implied above, to generalize the procedures is impracticable. Nevertheless, the findings remain a source of instructions or recommendations to be considered or further developed.

3.1. **TRADITIONAL PROCEDURES OF TRANSLATION**

The traditional procedures of translation developed together with the linguistic approach to translation. The procedures correspond to the early "narrow sense" of the theory of translation that focused mainly on linguistics. The stress was laid on meaning because the idea was that the units of the ST shall convey the same meaning in the TT (regardless of their function in the text). The traditional procedures of renowned linguists have been well arranged by Dagmar Knittlová in her book *K teorii i praxi překladu*, on which the following paragraph is utterly based.

Seven essential procedures, recognized for example by the linguist A. Poldauf, include (in order of the most simple to the most difficult): 1. Transcription (including transliteration), 2. Calque, 3. Substitution, 4. Transposition, 5. Modulation, 6. Equivalence and 7. Adaptation. The hierarchy established by G. Vázques-Ayora is extensive by one while four of his eight techniques are identical with the aforementioned, yet listed in a different sequence: 1. Transposition, 2. Modulation, 3. Equivalence, 4. Adaptation, 5. Amplification, 6. Explicating, 7. Omission, and 8.

Compensation. In contrast to the two approaches that are rather close to one another, the nine procedures by the theorist J. L. Malone show a different standpoint: 1. Equivalence, 2. Substitution, 3. Divergence, 4. Convergence, 5. Amplification, 6. Reduction, 7. Diffusion, 8. Condensation, and 9. Re-ordering (Knittlová).

Having provided explanation to the above stated procedures and techniques, it can be inferred that none of the three schemes is concerned with translatability of the whole text but rather with a specific individual problem on the level of linguistic equivalence. This fact demonstrates the former focus of translation.

3.2. <u>**RECENT PROCEDURES OF TRANSLATION**</u>

The contemporary techniques of translation do not contradict the traditional ones but they include them. The new perspective of translation builds on the linguistic approach and branches off to a large extent. The shift or, more accurately, development in the attitude can be demonstrated by the statement by S. Bassnett who declares that "it is pointless … to argue for a definitive translation, since translation is intimately tied up with the context in which it is made" (Bassnett).

Although the idea of considering the translation process in a wider perspective became principal in the 20th century, it can also be found in some of the early theories. As long ago as in the year 1540, Etienne Dolet presented a summary of translation principles that reach beyond the mere linguistic attitude. These five rules are quoted by O. Krijtová (Krij 35) who justly claims them valid even today. The fundamentals of Dolet's theory are:

1. The translator must perfectly understand the content and the intention of the author he translates.
2. The translator shall perfectly master the source language as well as the target language.
3. The translator shall avoid the tendency to translate word for word by reason that it ruins the sense of the original and spoils the beauty of its expression.
4. The translator shall use forms commonly used in spoken language.

5. By the choice of words and word order, the translator shall create a comprehensive general impression in a relevant „tone“.

In particular, the last principle contains an indication of a later approach to translation represented for instance by the belief of the contemporary translator S. Bassnett: „… translation can only be made by taking into account both the process of creating it and its function in a given context“ (Bassnett).

The modern "broad" view of the translation process takes into account the extra-linguistic factors; in other words, it prefers the object of literary translation be neither purely esthetical nor linguistic but an integration of both approaches while taking account of other relevant factors. The factors to be considered by translators shall serve the intention to introduce the literary work in another language and in the context of another literature and even culture at the same time. The primary view of translation focuses on the text as a whole and subsequently on the smaller units of the text, respectively particular problems of translation. Knittlová speaks of an "integral translation" that is not a matter of isolated words or sentences but of a translation as a text located in a particular situation as an integral part of a cultural background. She further refers to M. Snell-Hornby who has elaborated the scheme of progress from a general "macro" to a specific "micro" level (Knittlová).

The *macro-concept*, in words of Knittlová, focuses on the cultural background, location of the text within the history and place, the type and function of the text, as well as the relation of the author to the addressee. In terms of translation procedures, to classify the text within the given framework is the primary, *strategic decision*.

Following that, the *detail decisions* are realized, which have been classified as the *micro-concept*; it attends to the individualities, grammatical structures and their lexical content, which forms the final target text (Knittlová).

The example of the recent procedures of translation is clear from the decision making process by Přidal.. He took the *strategic decision* to preserve the location of the plot according to his predecessor and not to deviate from the translation of Eisner in the

general characteristics and nature of the book. On the contrary, the *detail decisions* (classified as the *micro approach*) were not to be based on the former translation; Přidal decided to execute a new translation of the re-written stories regardless of fragments that could have been conserved. These particular decisions are analyzed in the relevant chapters on equivalence; the essential procedures (transformation, stylization and compensation) are introduced next to deformation in chapter 7 on Pragmatic equivalence, which explores language-creative operations.

4. **EQUIVALENCE, NON-EQUIVALENCE**

The work of a translator is nothing but a constant search for equivalents when attempting to express the source text by the means of the target language. The problem of equivalence in translation is fundamental but it is not feasible to set the limits of what can be considered equal or to determine where the line of non-equivalence can be drawn. Similarly, the controversy of translatability and untranslatability remains an open question that will probably never be satisfactorily answered. Regardless of the opinions that translation is impossible, translations are being undertaken, reviews and analyses of translations are still being written.

Equivalence is a notorious term but is difficult to define it in order to provide an undisputed explanation in the context of linguistics. While mathematics recognizes but one "kind" of equivalency, which is the logical one, linguistics accepts countless equivalencies. In terms of mathematics, if "two plus three equals five", it does not equal "six" or "twenty"; however, in linguistics, if "nice" is equal to "beautiful" it does not mean that it is not equal to "handsome"; it can even be equal to "polite, good-looking", or even "pěkný", "krásný", "milý". Although the linguists speak of equivalence, they avoid to use the symbol "=" (commonly recognized as "equal") but prefer the "~" and "≈" symbols which mean "approximate", or "nearly equal". The reason is that in contrast to mathematics, the linguistic or translational equivalency cannot be proved; it is based on perception, the sense of language, subjective feelings, and many other factors that can hardly be physically demonstrated.

When comparing two units, whether those are two words or two language systems, the objective is not to discover if they are equal or not but to what extent they are equal. Susan Bassnett believes that:

> Equivalence in translation… should not be approached as a search for sameness, since sameness can not even exist between two TL versions of the same text, let alone between the SL and the TL version. (Bassnett)

In general, equivalence is then evaluated in levels, being a spectrum of similarity, approximation, or resemblance. Depending on the number of various approaches,

equivalence has been divided into groups and types, some of which are rather similar and some entirely different.

4.1. <u>**APPROACHES TO EQUIVALENCE**</u>

This chapter introduces several perspectives from which equivalence can be viewed, in order to allow comparison with the approach of Knittlová, whose classification of equivalence has been used for the analysis of *Kaplan*.

Susan Bassnett provided an overview of approaches to equivalence in *Translation Studies*, two of which are worth of mentioning. Eugene Nida distinguishes formal and dynamic equivalence. Formal equivalence focuses attention on the message itself, in both form and content, while dynamic equivalence is based on the principle of equivalent effect - the relationship between the receiver and the message should aim at being the same as the one between the original receivers and the SL message. Quite a different point of view is taken by A. Neubert, who claims that equivalence must be considered a semiotic category, comprising a syntactic, semantic and pragmatic component.

A practical approach is seen in the attitude of V. Straková; she differentiates dictionary equivalence (between lexical units) from textual equivalence which spans from collocations and phrases to whole texts (Kufnerová).

A complex approach to equivalence that covers apparently all levels is presented by Mona Baker. Her book *In Other Words* classifies equivalence into five major groups: 1. Equivalence at word level, which is represented by lexical equivalence. 2. Equivalence above word level includes collocation, idioms and fixed expressions. 3. Grammatical equivalence concerns grammatical categories. 4. Textual equivalence deals with thematic and information structures as well as cohesion. 5. Pragmatic equivalence is represented by coherence (Baker). A very similar stratification is created by Dagmar Knittlová, only with the difference that the equivalence at word level is merged with equivalence above word level into one group - lexical equivalence.

Apparently, classifications of equivalence can be created in accordance with the particular perspective and the given criteria. Neither does a universal evaluation exist, nor has any of the existing ones become generally recognized. The approach of Knittlová seems to be developed into the sufficient extent that it could have been adopted as the concept of the analysis of *Kaplan*, being supplemented by selected findings of other theorists and linguists.

4.2. <u>**LEVELS OF EQUIVALENCE ACCORDING TO KNITTLOVÁ**</u>

The four main groups of examining equivalence established by Knittlová are based not on different perspectives but on the scope. The basic, but not the narrowest view evaluates translation at the level of lexical equivalence. This level includes denotative and connotative meaning of words as well as collocations and idioms, the latter of which Knittlová does not mention. The second is the level of grammatical equivalence, which investigates the differences of the language systems of the ST and the TT. The third level is textual equivalence, which evaluates cohesion and coherence of the text. (This topic is, however, excluded from the analysis for it is rather distant from the aim of this paper that focuses on cultural transposition). The last, fourth level is pragmatic equivalence; it examines whether the translator understood the source text in order to embed it in the context of the target language and culture; this involves the transposition of language-specific and culture-specific features, the use of another (third) language within the text, as well as distorted speech.

As it was mentioned in the introduction, the level of phonetics plays an important role in this analysis and if it were to be analyzed to the extent that the book provides a source for, a separate level of phonetic equivalence would have to be established. Phonetic level is therefore covered in pragmatic equivalence in connection with distorted speech, or noted as a supplement of the particular issue of lexical or grammatical level.

The classification by Knittlová, presented in her book *K teorii i praxi překladu*, was used for organizing of the following chapters on equivalence. The examples, which are taken from the analyzed texts *O Kaplan! My Kaplan!* and its transfer *Pan Kaplan má*

stále třídu rád, are written in the standard language, except where the phonetic level or distorted speech is in question (than the original spelling is retained).

5. __LEXICAL EQUIVALENCE__

The theory presented in this chapter is based on Knittlová, who claims that three situations occur when searching for an equivalent: the TL disposes of a corresponding counterpart of the SL; there exist counterparts that correspond partially; or no counterparts exist, which is called non-equivalence.

5.1. __CORRESPONDING COUNTERPARTS__

It is a limited group of expressions, the common feature of which is that they are mainly related to reality surrounding us, having denotative meaning. These expressions can be nouns referring to close objects or extra-linguistic facts: *chalk ~ křída; second ~ vteřina;* verbs of action: *dance ~ tančit;* adjectives referring to objective characteristic: *blue ~ modrý.* Sometimes a poly-semantic word can be specified by context, such as *desk ~ katedra* (denoting professor's desk)*; to dust ~ vyprášit* (in connection with trousers); *give ~ ustoupit* (in *'give an inch ~ ustoupit o píď'*).

5.2. __PARTIAL COUNTERPARTS__

Partial counterparts form the largest group since English and Czech are distinct (not only typologically). Knittlová recognizes four types of partial differences: formal, denotative, connotative, and pragmatic, while formal equivalence overlaps or is included in the other types.

5.2.1. __FORMAL DIFFERENCES__

Formal differences can be easily found where one-word expression on the one side has a two-word counterpart on the other. Being an analytic language, English disposes of more analytic, multiple-word expressions, and is therefore more explicit than Czech, for example *cleared his throat ~ odkašlal si.* However, a reverse relation also exists, for instance *one-paragraph composition ~ práce v rozsahu jednoho odstavce.*

5.2.2. DENOTATIVE DIFFERENCES

Diverse level of specificity that is expressed in the texts results in denotative differences; the SL expression can be either more specific or less specific than in the TL counterpart, however, it refers to the same matter or it has the same function in the text, and so the information conveyed by the translation remains unchanged. The difference in the level of specificity in the ST is therefore inevitably adjusted mostly by either specification or generalization of the lexical unit in the TT.

Specification is most frequently related to English verbs by reason that they are usually general in contrast to Czech verbs, which convey the essential meaning in sentences. For instance, the primary meaning of *come* expresses motion together with direction. In the sentence *"Oy!" came the diphthong of total despair* ~ *"Joj! zazněl zoufalý sten naplno* , the TT verb requires to be specified by manner and grammatical aspect (perfect) in the TT.

The opposite of specification is **generalization**, which often affects nouns. Translation by a more general expression (superordinate), according to M. Baker, works equally well in most, if not all, languages, since the hierarchical structure of semantic fields is not language-specific; for example *butterscotch ~ plněná tyčinka.*

Contiguity, also called "semantic cohesion", is another form of expressing denotative differences. Among those belongs the **antonymic change**, represented by the use of a negated antonym. **Vector change** then denotes a change in the attitude. An extraordinary combination of these two processes appears in the book: *he had not registered until six weeks after the fall session had begun ~ Do školy se zapsal téměř dva měsíce po zahájení výuky.* Another type of contiguity in translation is for example **replacement of a part by a whole**: *he stepped back up the curb ~ vystoupil znovu na chodník.*

5.2.3. CONNOTATIVE DIFFERENCES

These differences are challenged by translators in order to preserve the appropriate level of connotations that the text or individual lexical units invoke. The

subdivision of these differences separates expressive connotations from the stylistic ones.

Expressive connotations represent translation procedures that involve emotionally marked equivalents. English expresses emotionality, rather analytically by combination of a neutral lexical unit with a modifying unit that carries the emotive meaning. Such an emotive attitude can even be intensified by graduation - by morphological adjustment: *long walk ~ dlouhatánská vycházka.* The ST expressions that are emotionally neutral are often translated by emotive Czech counterparts in the diminutive form *little boy ~ capartík*. However, diminutives do not always express emotive attitude; they can refer to items (in the general contexts) that are smaller than usual, for example *a star* (denoting an asterisk) cannot be translated but as ‚hvězdička‘.

Translation of **salutations**, which express the attitude of the speaker, should aim at connoting the same expressiveness in the TT (Knittlová). Přidal sometimes even stresses expressiveness, for example in *hello ~ těbůh; and* even a greater stress is apparent when distorted form is used: *dear ~ vysokostěný* (instead of ‚vážený‘). High emotive connotations are evoked by **interjections**; they are used more frequently in English and to Czech they are mainly translated by particles or other elements of contact: *now, class ~ vidíte, třído; er~ ehm.*

Special care is required when translating **sacred expressions** since their emotive attribute is highly subjective. The overall tone of the utterance or text should be preserved and so the same lexical unit may be translated in different ways: *God bless her memory ~ Pánbůh jí dej věčnou slávu; God's almighty! ~ Pane na nebi!* These types of expressions appear in the text frequently in a distorted form, which requires transposition: *omigod* (standing for *oh my God*) *~ pánenanepi* (Pane na nebi), similarly *omigott ~ majnkot.* Often such a deformation creates a shift in meaning that is humorous and should therefore be accordingly approached by the translator. Přidal succeeded many times; one of his precious cultural transplantations is found in the passage (presented as direct speech) when a student sneezes and his colleague reacts by saying *God blast you* instead of *God bless you.* Přidal managed to deform the Czech

counterpart, which would normally be translated as *pozdrav Pánbůh,* in a similarly comical way: *potrefpámbu.* Foreign-language sacred expressions also appear in the text, such as: a*leha ha-shalom ~ alejchem šolom*; as well as exclamations *bodzhe moi* translated as *góspodi*, or (distorted) *meine Gott ~ majn got.*

Sacred expressions are closely related to another group of connotative expressions – **intensifiers**, which prevail in spoken utterances. Their denotative meaning and expressiveness is often weakened due to the frequency of use (Knittlová). Many subgroups of intensifiers can be distinguished. When repetition is used, the effect is even stronger, as in: *so long – so very long – ago*. In this case, the author adds more stress in the phrase by inserting pauses, which Přidal achieved by creating a contrast: *docela nedávno, a přece tak dávno, dávno.* Translation by omission of the intensifier can also apply, for instance when the expressivity is inappropriately strong, such as *infernal marbles.*

Expressiveness is also strengthened by **similes**, and although the images can differ in the ST and the TT, their impact can be the same, for example *bounce around like marbles ~ skákat cik cak.*

Stylistic Connotations, next to expressive connotations, are related to stratification of vocabulary according to stylistic parameters or characteristics. The choice of the corresponding expression is influenced by the sense, taste and experience of the translator.

> Accuracy is no doubt an important aim in translation, but it is also important to bear in mind that the use of common target-language patterns which are familiar to the target reader plays an important role in keeping the communication channels open. (Baker)

The analysis of *O Kaplan! My Kaplan!* neutral lexical units of the ST are often translated by various stylistically marked equivalents (according to Mejstřík). For instance *dirt ~ brajgl* (expressive); *furor ~ furóre* (old-fashioned); *drenched ~ zbrocen* (bookish); *esoteric ~ záhadný* (expressive); *stroke ~ infarkt myokardu* (medical); *stalwart ~ borec* (expressive).

On the contrary, the expressions of the ST that are labeled as *informal* (Summers) are only rarely translated by a neutral counterpart, for example *obtuse* (formal) ~ *špatně.*

Sometimes, it can hardly be revealed for what reason the item of the ST was replaced by the particular counterpart. For example, when analyzing the question *How old is your papa?,* it can only be supposed why Přidal translated it as *Jak starý je pan otec?*, using a formal noun instead of a colloquial or informal expression. The reason may be found in dictionaries. While in the "American" dictionary *Webster's Universal Encyclopedic dictionary* (commonly called *Webster)*, the word *papa* is labeled as "chiefly British", being a synonym of *father* , the "British" dictionary, *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*, labels *papa* as "old-fashioned" (Summers). It seems to be a likely reason why Přidal applied such a counterpart; else it could have only been due to resemblance of *papa* with Czech *papá*, which is similarly marked as old-fashioned in the Czech dictionary (Mejstřík). Nevertheless, the formal expression has no disturbing function within the context.

Connotations are subjective; the translator aims at finding a counterpart with regard to the connotative meaning, however, the decision can hardly be universal. To show ambiguity on the level of language systems, the following example is presented. (The whole phrase is mentioned in order to allow for the needed connotation). *Mr. Parkhill took a fresh stick of a chalk to write the passage on the board in large, <u>crystal-clear</u> letters …~ Profesor Parkhill vzal zbrusu novou křídu a <u>křišťálově čistými</u> písmeny napsal na tabuli…* In English, *crystal-clear* means "very clearly stated and easy to understand" (Summers). Although the collocation with neither *write* nor *letters* is usual, it evokes rather a common connotation. On the contrary, when used in its denotative meaning in the TT, the connotation seems rather strange and "foreign". The Czech transposition could have either stemmed from a similar transferred meaning, for example *nad slunce jasnější*, or used a standard expression, such as *úhledný.* After all, every reader takes a different perspective and what may seem unacceptable to one person; the other may consider it an interesting or refreshing detail.

5.2.4. PRAGMATIC DIFFERENCES

As it has already been explained, the modern theory of translation prefers functional translation to the bare linguistic one. Bassnett declares that the translator must:

> Consider the range of TL phrases available, having regard to the presentation of class, status, age, sex of the speaker, his relationship to the listeners and the context of their meeting in the SL. (Bassnett)

The desire to bring the ST-specific item to the TT reader may necessitate **addition of information** (Knittlová). This procedures applies primarily with unknown names to which a general classifier is added, such as *Pocahontas ~ indiánská princezna Pokahontas*.

When a lengthy explanation would be required in order to explain the meaning in the TT, translators opt for **omission.** Mona Baker argues that in fact it does no harm to omit translating a word or expression in some contexts (Baker). In this procedure, the specifying item is omitted, substituted by a more general one. To give a few examples: *Macy's ~ „nóbl" obchod; as high as the Empire State Building ~ vysokánský jako mrakodrapy.*

The advantage of omission was taken by Přidal when he avoided translating the expression *English language* that is used in the ST to refer to the tongue that is studied by the immigrants. For the reason that English is replaced by Czech in the TT, yet the location of the plot remains New York, Přidal did not want to draw attention to this rather strange contrast by the expressive use of *Czech language*, and therefore he often opted for omission: *Is that English or Chinese? ~ To je čínsky, nebo jak?*

Substitution by analogue fact or experience is a most common strategy. It can be put on the same level as "cultural substitution", a term used by M. Baker, because it mainly affects the replacement culture-specific items. Among the most common strategies of analogy belong the conversion of measuring units and ordinary facts: *five miles ~ 10 km; fifteen minutes ~ čtvrthodina*; and the replacement of figures that refer to undefined quantity or approximate quantity commonly used in the SL, such as *a dozen ~ asi deset; any of the thirty-odd members ~ kdokoli z třicítky žáků; months ago ~ už*

dávno. It cannot be disclosed for sure whether it is a mistake in the book or if it was a purpose, but the time reference in the ST *8:40 p.m.* was not simply converted from the 12-hour form to the 24-hour form (which would give *20.40*), but it appears in the TT as *19.40.* It may be a subject of transposition as well; the time refers to a break in the class and so the translator may have felt that such a late evening class would raise questions with the Czech readers.

Adjustment of the ST information to the target culture conventions includes the transfer of interjecting exclamations and onomatopoeic interjections, such as *Hoorah! ~ Huráá!; Cheers! ~ Živijó!; Phooey! ~ Fuj!; Kachoo! ~ Hepčí!; Shah! ~ Pšša!.* A small number of them did not require any intervention: *Mmh.* Somewhere, deformation of speech was used: *Aha! ~ Acha!*

5.3. <u>**ZERO EQUIVALENTS**</u>

Non-equivalence is tied with the above-mentioned pragmatic differences to some extent. The attempt to translate a phrase or lexical unit of the ST that does not have its counterpart in the TT leads to creating the equivalent, which can also be by the means of substitution, additional explanation or generalization. The strategies for dealing with the problem of zero equivalents can also include modification, adaptation, creating calques, using loan words, or even omission. Zero equivalents usually involve proper names, geographical names and terms, and therefore this issue is significant in Rosten's book. Přidal had to deal with names in every chapter; the standard ones are mentioned within this article while the non-standard names where the so much used distorted spelling applied are discussed separately in the chapter about language-creative operations.

The method of **borrowing** is usually used when transposing names; the form (spelling) of the expression is not changed in any way and that is also why the confrontation of the counterparts can use the symbol of equivalence in the record: *George Washington = George Washington, New York = New York, Olga Tarnova = Olga Tarnova.* The same name is, however, not used in the same form consistently throughout the TT. Sometimes the adapted Czech form is used with respect to common practice: *George Washington = George Washington* but *George the Third ~ Jiří III.*

This approach is in line with the argument by Straková, who explains that translation of names should be undertaken with regard to the degree of frequency, level of its "domestication" and adoption (Kuf 172).

By **modification** or **adaptation** translators "domesticate" the ST item, such as *Clara ~ Klára; Rose ~ Róza; Danzig ~ Gdaňsk.* **Omission** can apply where the information is not relevant in the text, for example in: *I had to visit my sister in Patchoque ~ Musel jsem navštívit sestru.* **Generalization** is achieved when the non-equivalent item is replaced by a counterpart that conveys a general meaning, for example *clutching one lapel in the manner of Daniel Webster ~ po způsobu slavných rétorů sevřel v hrsti klopu svého saka.*

6. **GRAMMATICAL EQUIVALENCE**

Grammatical equivalence deals with differences between the language systems of the ST and the TT. Mona Baker contrasts grammatical choices to lexical choices. The latter are largely optional while the former are largely obligatory (Baker). As she further sums up, the reason is that grammatical choice is drawn from a closed set of options, which rules out other choices from the same system by default.

In this chapter, grammatical equivalence is not analyzed on the general level. The problems of translating from English to Czech have been described in plenty works by linguists, translators and theorists, and the analysis of *Kaplan* would hardly introduce a new rule or approach. The aim of this chapter is to consider the creativity of Antonín Přidal when dealing with such grammatical problems that represent the plot in the stories. The three selected examples are presented in the misspelled form – in the way the book describes the troubles encountered by the students learning the English, respectively Czech language. Where appropriate, a brief introduction of the situation is provided. For the sake of comprehensibility, quoted examples can be arranged in columns, left being the ST, right being the TT.

6.1. **NOUNS**

The students were practicing "opposites", creating the following pairs:

1	*milk – cream*	*mlíko – šlehačka*
2	*life – debt*	*život – smrď*
3	*dismay – next June*	*hlavní – pohlavní*

In the first pairs, the TT keeps the denotative meaning of the ST. In the second pair, the opposites stem from the denotative meaning *death ~ smrt*, creating new words by deformation. The last pairs are completely different. The pun in the ST considers the aspect of pronunciation: *dismay* (meaning ‚zděšení‘) is understood as *this may* by the student; therefore the opposite is *next June.* In the TT the pun concerns word formation by derivation with a shift in meanings (back translated to English: ‘major – sexual’). The aspect of pronunciation is compensated in the TT by the use of a non-standard form in the first pair.

6.2. **GENDER**

"The word 'stamp'–for putting on mail. Isn't that masculine?" ... (Mrs. Shimmelfarb had obviously equated "mail" with "male").

"Slovo ‚ondatra' – to zvíže. Je to muský rod?"... (Paní Shimmelfarbovou patrně zmátla slabika 'on' na počátku slova).

Přidal did not use the semantic equivalent of *stamp* (‚razítko') in order preserve the topic of gender; he created analogical situation by including the pronoun *on* which denotes masculine.

6.3. **HOMONYMS**

In the chapter where the students come across homonyms, the translator could neither translate the original pairs nor pick a random pair of homonyms. To minimize deviation of the TT from the ST, Přidal had to consider the situations that rise from the homonyms as described in the original. With one pair, he succeeded to keep relation between the key words:

BARK – BARK

"The spelling is identical. But the first 'bark' means the covering of a tree or a branch… whereas the second is the sound made by a dog."
"Bow-wow!" came from Mr.Matsoukas.
"Now it's a school for 'animals'?!" wailed Miss Ziev.

RUM –RUM

„Písmena se do jednoho shodují. Ale první 'rum' znamená rozpadle zdivo na zbořeništi nebo na rumovišti…kdežto druhý ‚rum' je alkoholický nápoj."
„Vrťan!" dal se slyšet pan Matsukas.
„Sme ve škole, né v hospodinci!" pokárala ho slečna Zievová.

In the ST, the verb *bark* is linked with the interjection *bow-wow* that imitates the sound made by a dog, and with the remark of the other character that mentions *animals*. In the TT, this relation is expressed by the noun *rum*, linked with *vrťan* (in correct spelling ‚frťan', denoting a drink, back translated as *shot*), and further linked with the noun *hospodinec* (a word formed by blending *hospoda* and *hostinec*, denoting a pub or tavern). This is another example of Přidal's capability of transplantation.

7. **PRAGMATIC EQUIVALENCE**

The modern approach of the theory of translation, which views the translation process in a broad perspective, taking into account the function of the text besides the linguistic aspect, evaluates equivalence also on the pragmatic level. Knittlová speaks of "anchoring" of the TT within the specific situational and experiential context of the TL community. She points out that disrespect to the conventions may lead to misinterpretation of the text by the reader (Knittlová).

Culture-specific and language-specific details are encountered by translators both on the lexical level, as it has already been demonstrated, and on the higher level of the language style where language-creativity occurs. The use of a non-standard language, slang, dialects, etc. in the ST should not get lost in translation – all shall be reflected in the TT in some way. The book *O Kaplan! My Kaplan!*, being based on a non-standard language, was a great opportunity for Antonín Přidal for utilization the most of his creativity when transforming the distorted utterances of the immigrants from English to Czech.

This chapter presents the analysis of the language-creative operations applied by Přidal in *Pan Kaplan má stále třídu rád.* For the reason that the procedures are considerably intertwined and combined, it is difficult to categorize them. The classification in which they are presented below is inspired by Zlata Kufnerová and her book *Překládání a čeština* where she organizes the chapters by both the particular procedures and by the topics to which various procedures are related.

7.1. **TRANSFORMATION**

According to Kufnerová, **transformation** is the most common procedure of literary translation. She defines it as the essential selection of linguistic units that satisfy the request of both content and formality, but which is not restricted to dictionary counterparts. A certain level of creativity is involved in transformation; the translator is free to form variations of the lexical units. Kufnerová explains that creativity applies mainly in translation of poetry, whose form is tied with rhythm, euphony or structure. Examples can be found in *Kaplan* as well, although sporadically because the process of

deformation (see below) prevails. Transformation was used, for example, in the situation when a student presented an antonym of *height* as *lowth;* Přidal created the antonym of *výška* by a new formation *nížka.* Similarly, to provide counterparts to pairs of words that represent the students' logic in word creation, he looked for lexical units that can be transformed in the way that resembles such an improper logic. For instance, the student's deduction that if a feminine of *host* is *hostess*, the feminine of *ghost* must be *ghostess*, was transferred into the pairs *kupec – kupcová, tupec – tupcová.*

7.2. **STYLIZATION AND COMPENSATION**

Stylization applies on a higher level when the translator decides about the distribution of lexical units. According to Kufnerová, stylization usually follows transformation; at first the translator transforms the lexical units on the particular level (selecting morphological, syntactic or lexical items) and then decides on their frequency of use within the TT. This process often involves **compensation** – the same means of the same quality that are included within the ST can be used elsewhere within the TT. To give a simple and explicit example, a triplet of words that appear in one sentence of the ST can be taken: *Mr. Kaplan believed that modern cities consist of* <u>streets</u>, *boulevards, revenues.* The mistake of the student who confused *revenues* with 'avenues' is presented in the TT as mistake tied with another of the three words: *Pan Kaplan byl přesvědčen, že moderním velkoměstem vedou ulice, avenue a budvary* ‚bulváry'.

7.3. **DEFORMATION**

Deformation of the standard language applies when distorted items of the ST are to be transferred into the TT. Kufnerová distinguishes four types of deformation: spelling, sound, morphological, and lexical deformation (Kufnerová). This analysis considers the first two types in one collective subclass of phonetic deformation, for they are closely related.

7.3.1. PHONETIC DEFORMATION

Phonetic deformation of the standard language is used when pronunciation is to be expressed by the text. **Spelling deformation**, based on Kufnerová, is used to reflect pronunciation of words in an improper way that resembles either colloquial or uneducated speech. Examples can be found both texts; they are listed separately, since the ST items do not have their direct counterparts in the TT (compensation applies): *fife* 'five'; *som* 'some'; *houze* 'house'; *polityka* ‚politika‘, *zhůru* ‚vzhůru‘, *šecko* ‚všecko‘ *deme* ‚jdeme‘; *meno* ‚jméno‘; *dyš* ‚když‘.

Sound deformation, as Kufnerová defines it, applies when insufficient knowledge of the language is presented, including a baby talk; for instance *počebuju* ‚potřebuju‘; *nežikam* ‚neříkám‘. The exchange of voiced and voiceless consonants is often used, for example: *jop* 'job'; *de kit* 'the kid'; *nejlepčí* ‚nejlepší‘. Many exmaples can be found in the texts, to give some more: *voild* 'world', *Hindyans* 'Indians', *spik nethcherel* 'speak natural'; *potočte* ‚pootočte‘; *mochla* ‚mohla‘,

Sometimes, the mispronounced word conveys a different meaning, such as *batter* 'better', *fillings* 'feelings', *odder* 'other', *chicken* 'kitchen'; similarly *časný* ‚šťastný‘, *pačes* ‚pařez‘, *žampión* ‚šampión‘.

Without knowing the context, some distortions are difficult to "decode". The unaccustomed phonetic spelling causes confusion, for instance: *ufcawws* 'of course'; *horyjendální* ‚orientální‘. A specific form of phonetic deformation appears in a situation when a student responses with her mouth full of taffy: *zln mb thnks ~ zln mb dkuji*.

Although this paper cannot analyze the rules that Přidal had established in the process of transferring *Kaplan* with the use of deformation, one rule cannot remain unnoticed. The translator attempted to stay consistent in the way of distortion of the characters' speach – the idiosyncratic features of the utterances in the ST were transformed into similar characteristic items of the TT. To some extent, Rosten created speech "profiles" of the character, establishing a "typology" of deformation of speech.

The imperfect pronunciation of the immigrants is characterized by elements that

reflect their mother tongue, or that are typical for a particular group of non-native speakers. One student is for example characterized by the use of sibilants. Substitution is often used in order to concentrate the feature of the utterance of the ST in the TT:

Zat could be ze most zuccezzful lezzon   *Zákva, to zi muzim zapízat!*

zis zemester.

 'That could be the most successful   ‚Sakra, to si musím zapsat.'

lesson this semester.'

Exceptionally, substitution can be avoided: *Zelma broke the sipper on her zkirt ~ Zilva pokasila sip na zukni* 'Thelma broke the zipper on her skirt ~ Silva pokazila zip na sukni'.

Some other speakers (mainly of Italian or Spanish origin) are characterized by the tendency to add vowels before, after, and even in between words:

Is only da one Amerigo Vespucci! Is   *Je jenom<u>o</u> jedno Amerigo Vespucci!*

no<u>a</u> one lak – befor<u>a</u>, behind<u>a</u>!   *Neni žadn<u>o</u> druh<u>o</u> – přetto ani potto!*

'Is only the one Amerigo Vespucci! Is   ‚Je jenom jeden Amerigo Vespucci!

no one alike – before, behind.'   Není žádný druhý – před tím ani

       potom.'

The above-mentioned examples give a very brief insight into the issue of phonetics that is involved in the translation process of *Kaplan*. This topic is worth of an individual analysis and cannot, unfortunately, be further explored in this paper.

7.3.2. MORPHOLOGICAL DEFORMATION

In general, the deformation affects various parts of the speech. The following examples mention only either the ST or the TT item, for the counterparts are not subject to the same deformation.

NOUNS - improper **declination**: *Den Kolumbusa* ‚Kolumba'; *slyšim tady čmeláci* ‚čmeláky'; as well as their **number**: *udělat strakatou kalhotu* ‚udělat strakaté kalhoty'; and **gender**: *ten dítě by řek* ‚to dítě by řeklo'.

VERBS – improper **conjugation**: *těkuji vás* ‚děkuji vám‘; **mood**: *neomdlejte* ‚neomdlévejte‘; **tense**: *you'll gonna make* 'you're gonna make; *spoluprácnout* ‚začít spolupracovat‘.

PRONOUNS: *já tolik stydím* ‚já se tolik stydím‘; *all mine life* 'all my life'.

PREPOSITIONS *musím do vé cé* ‚musím na vé cé‘; *plenty time* 'plenty of time'.

ADJECTIVES vs. **ADVERBS**: *explained it perfect* 'perfectly'.

7.3.3.   LEXICAL DEFORMATION

Lexical deformation includes **neologisms**; these new formations supplement absent lexemes in the language (Kufnerová). In *Kaplan* they are presented in the utterances of the characters, demonstrating their poor knowledge of the language, and showing what logic the non-native speakers use to derive new words, for example: *naroděniště* ‚místo narození‘; *samosébně* ‚samosebou (resembling samozřejmě)‘; *zjantarověla* ‚získala barvu jantaru‘.

To create such neologisms intentionally requires a good knowledge of the language as well as some experience in this field. Přidal searched for inspiration in the speech of both his children and foreign friends, as he admits in the acknowledgments.

7.4.   IDIOMS AND FIXED EXPRESSIONS

Idioms and fixed expressions are defined by M. Baker as frozen patterns of language that allow little or no variation in form. In addition, idioms often carry meanings that cannot be deduced from their individual components (Baker). The approach of the translator is therefore individual. As far as idioms are concerned, the process of creating of counterparts should, again, be called *transfer*, not *translation*, for it concerns substitution.

> Substitution is made not on the basis of the linguistic elements in the phrase, nor on the basis of a corresponding or similar image contained in the phrase, but on the function of the idiom. The SL phrase is replaced by a TL phrase that serves the same purpose in the TL culture (Bassnett).

Fixed expressions, also referred to as "phraseology" (Kufnerová), are usually comprehensible. They are mostly translated by the use of similar collocating expressions that are common in the TT, for instance *win hosannas ~ sklidit ovace; he hit upon the fact ~ svitlo mu; it had come ~ a bylo to tady.*

The reasons why the translator decides for the particular solution are often wondered about, especially when a possible translation lied ready to hand but was not used. The reason may be that the original phrase is slightly modified, incomplete or else affected. If an existing equivalent were used, it would leave a strange and unnatural impression. The following example demonstrates such a situation:

"I just wonder how one can– " The bell summoned them back to their duties before Mr. Parkhill could conclude, "–teach old dogs new tricks."	*„Jen si nejsem jist, nakolik lze –" zvonění jim konzultaci přetrhlo, než stačil dopovědět: „–naučit stará vrata nově vrzat."*

Přidal opted for substitution rather than adaptation of the existing equivalent ‚starého psa novým kouskům nenaučíš'.

In *Kaplan*, fixed expressions are mainly used in a distorted form. To add expressivity of the ST, Přidal sometimes preferred to substitute even where a literal translation would be possible: *she will have a heart attack ~ lepne ji pepka* ‚klepne ji pepka'. To convey or even stress humorousness, deformation was essential. Such as in the formula of courtesy *I am glad I mat you ~ poděšení bylo na mé straně.*

Idioms, in contrast to fixed expressions, are not transparent in meaning and their substitution by analogical idiom depends on how close they are and what meaning they convey. Substitution by a similar idiom is possible if the TL recognizes it, for instance *to grab by the horns ~ popadnout [příležitost] za rohy.* Substitution of a part applies when the idiom of the ST conveys the same meaning in the TT, yet it is expressed by different means, for example *he did not wear his heart on his sleeve ~ nenosíval srdce na dlani.*

Idioms also appear in the distorted form in *Kaplan.* In such instances, Přidal adopted the process of deformation, translating by a fixed expression: *he is nots ~ on je požahanej* 'he is nuts ~ on je pošahanej'.

Similes are a type of fixed expression as well. They can be both substituted by analogy and translated. Translating them may have an animating function and it can enrich the text, such as: *There are as many exceptions to the rule in English as there were thieves in Baghdad! ~ V mluvnici je tolik výjimek co v Bagdádu zlodějů!*

7.5. <u>**FOREIGN LANGUAGE WITHIN THE TEXT**</u>

When the source text contains another language (that is different from the target language), Kufnerová speaks about a translation problem that she calls "third language in the text" (Kufnerová). In connection with *Kaplan*, however, the numeral third seems improper when a number of "third" languages appear in the text; the more general expression "foreign" is appropriate.

The criterion for dealing with a foreign language in the ST is, according to Knittlová, primarily functional. She claims that where used with the purpose of creating an atmosphere, such as in greetings, it should be kept in the original form. This applies also to expressions whose meaning can easily be inferred from the context (Knittlová).

The plenty of words, phrases or even sentences written in a foreign language that are included in the analyzed texts can be grouped into two subclasses: 1. Latin or French, which is used either in the narrative or in the direct speech of professor Parkhill; 2. other languages, which are included in the utterances of the students-immigrants. The approach to any of the foreign language items is individual; the translator considers the difference in perception of the ST readers and the TT readers. What may be comprehensible for Americans, who often come across with Spanish, may rarely be understood by Russian-equipped Czechs, and vice versa.

Often is the foreign language item followed by the domestic language variant, such as *Où sont les fleurs d'antan? Where were the Blooms of yesteryear?* The TT then

keeps the foreign language and translates, or substitutes, the SL part: *Où sont les fleurs d'antan? Kdeže loňské květy jsou?.*

Foreign language of the ST can be omitted while substituted by an explanation. This process was adopted by Přidal when handling *bête noir*, which denotes a thing that is strongly avoided. He transferred the sentence *the very bête noir of English is the skulking multitude of Exceptions to the Rule!* into a metaphorical counterpart *plíživé množství výjimek z pravidla je fatálním monstrem strašícím na hradbách gramatiky.* Similarly *Doce ut discas! Teach that you may learn. ~ Doce ut discas! Uč, aby ses učil sám!*

Substitution appears in *Mr. Kaplan was simply sui generis* ('of a special kind') ~ *byl to prostě samorost*. Among the items that are preserved in the foreign-language form belongs nodding, for example Russian *da, da*, Spanish *sí*, or German *ja*. Exclamations, such as *Bene!*, are usually preserved as well.

7.6. __TRANSLATION OF TITLES__

In some respect, titles keep a privileged position in translation for they are given much of attention (M. Jovanovic, quoted in Kufnerová 2003). The title of the book *O K٭A٭P٭L٭A٭N! My K٭A٭P٭L٭A٭N!* is metaphoric. It is a reflection of Walt Whitman's poem *O Captain/! My Captain!* dedicated to Abraham Lincoln, however, the intention of Leo Rosten was not likely to panegyrize Mr. Kaplan, the diligent yet troublesome student. The exclamations resemble rather a sigh, implying a scent of resignation that Přidal could have transferred into *Ach Kaplane, můj Kaplane!*, by which the link with Whitman's poem would have been affected. The translator obviously prioritized to keep the relation of these re-written stories with the first book *The Education of H٭Y٭M٭A٭N K٭A٭P٭L٭A٭N* that was published in Czechoslovakia as *Pan Kaplan má třídu rád* (with no graphic "decoration"). The former title by Eisner (back translated as *Mr. Kaplan likes the class*) was expanded to *Pan Kaplan má stále třídu rád* (where the added word *stále* means *still*). Such an approach seems appropriate for it implies that the book is based on the first stories while introducing something new. Unfortunately, the five-pointed stars still remain omitted in the renovated title by Přidal, although he could have afforded to use them. Their

connotative meaning would have stimulated memory of the first readers who had already become acquainted with Mr. Kaplan, and it would have the same effect on the new readers, who wonder about the strange graphics in a similar way as the original-reading public.

In the titles of chapters, however, the little stars are preserved in the TT as well. Where the name of Mr. Kaplan appears in the decorated form *H⋆Y⋆M⋆A⋆N K⋆A⋆P⋆L⋆A⋆N*, the target text mirrors it by the use of asterisks *H∗Y∗M∗A∗N K∗A∗P∗L∗A∗N*. In terms of translation, the little stars are connotative – wherever interlaid in a word that is printed in capital letters, a reference to the main character is implied. Such a graphic form of the ST is used for the TT counterpart, such as in the chapter title *The Prodigal S⋆O⋆N ~ Marnotratný S∗Y∗N*; or *The G⋆O⋆O⋆D Samaritan ~ M∗I∗L∗O∗S∗R∗D∗N∗Ý samaritán*.

On the one hand, the majority of the chapter titles of *Kaplan* did not require a special treatment but could have been simply translated, for example *The Substitute ~ Suplent; Mr. K⋆A⋆P⋆L⋆A⋆N Slashes the Gordian Knot ~ Pan K∗A∗P∗L∗A∗N roztíná gordický uzel; Mr. Parkhill's Birthday ~ Narozeniny pana profesora.* However, a few titles deserved an individual approach that results in such a quality transposition that Přidal could offer. On chapter, for instance, is called *The Fifty Moods of Mr. Parkhill*, where the key word *moods* can refer to the state of mind of the professor, or the linguistic term concerned with verb forms. To keep the ambiguity of the title, Přidal created the counterpart *Padesátka profesora Parkhilla*, which allows for two interpretations; the readers infer that Mr. Parkhill is fifty-years-old (or celebrating his fiftieth birthday) until they learn that it refers to fifty examples of verb tenses and moods that Mr. Parkhill presents to the class. Another chapter title that mentions a linguistic term is *Mr. K⋆A⋆P⋆L⋆A⋆N Slays the Superlative.* In this case, the translator used a fixed expression in the TL to achieve even a more effective combination of connotative and denotative meaning of the key word, creating the title *Vražda třetího stupně.*

7.7. <u>**PROPER NAMES AND TRANSLATION**</u>

In the chapter on terminology it has been demonstrated why the book *Pan Kaplan má stále třídu rád* should not be referred to as the *translation* but *transfer* of *O Kaplan! My Kaplan!* It implies that the same reason affects proper names for they are generally *transferred* into the target language; if they were translated, *professor Parkhill* would turn into *profesor Parkkopec* or *Kopecparků*, *Mr. Bloom* would become *pan Květ* or *Kvítko.*

Proper names can be transferred by the standard procedures described above in chapter 5.3. on zero equivalents. For the number of names that appear in the distorted form in the ST, **deformation** had to be applied by Přidal. This language-creative operation is individual, solely based on the translator's experience and taste. Many examples can be taken from the book, a great deal of which involves other translating procedures as well. For instance, **substitution** was opted for when transferring the title of Shakespeare's play 'Romeo and Juliet', which, in words of Mr. Kaplan, sounds as *A Room in Joliet.* Přidal decided to replace it with a deformed title of another play by Shakespeare and so he turned ‚Zkrocení zlé ženy' into *Zhroucení zlé ženy.* Such comicality could hardly be achieved by a distortion of ‚Romeo a Julie'.

Another *cultural transplantation* on the level of deformation can be found in the passage where a student gives a speech in which he names five presidents of the United States: George Washington, James Madison, Theodor E. Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, and Abraham Lincoln. Presented in the direct speech, the names are spelled in the way that imitates improper pronunciation of the speaker: *Judge Vashington ~ Čoč Fošinton, James Medicine ~ Džem Médisyn, Ted E. Roosevelt ~ Ted E. Rózvald, Voodenrow Vilson ~ Futro Vilzón, Abram Lincohen ~ Ej Bí Linkón.* Not only did Přidal transfer the mispronunciation into the appropriate Czech form; he also managed to compensate the two names that acquired a meaning by the corruption, *Judge* and *Medicine,* by creating meaningful counterparts in the TT, also by deformation: *Džem, Futro,* and one more: *Médisyn.*

<u>RESUMÉ</u>

The paper presented the analysis of the English book *O K★A ★P ★L ★A ★N! My K★A ★P ★L ★A ★N!* by Leo Rosten in comparison with its Czech translation *Pan Kaplan má stále třídu rád* undertaken by *Antonín Přidal*. The aim was to analyze the texts not only from the linguistic point of view, but also from the larger perspective that takes into account extra-linguistic features. *Cultural transposition* was the object of the analysis, focusing on the possibilities of transfer of the specific cultural-bound items from the source text into the target.

At first, the topic of the book was presented to introduce the subject and the strategy of the translator. It was demonstrated that the translation of *Kaplan* is of a special kind for it goes beyond the pure linguistic approach. Therefore, a more explicit term than *translation* was searched for and the expression *transfer* evaluated as the most appropriate term to refer to the Czech version of the book. The essential terminology to be used within the paper was established, giving explanation of the words *transposition* and *transplantation* that are tied with *cultural transplantation* and *cultural transposition.*

The theory of translation was the briefly described. It was showed how the procedures of translation reflect the general approach of the theory of the time. While the traditional procedures focus on linguistics, which corresponds to the former, purely linguistic interest in translation, the contemporary procedures reflect the macro-view of the modern approach of the theory of translation. It was demonstrated the modern approach was taken by Přidal.

The topic of equivalence and non-equivalence was then elaborated, providing comparison of different approached so equivalence at first. The comparison allowed to explain the reasons for adopting the method of Knittlová, who evaluates equivalence in four levels with regard to need to the extra-linguistic features.

The analysis was then carried out, presenting the examples from both texts, organizing the topics according to Knittlová. At first, lexical equivalence was analyzed, comparing the texts on the level of lexis while grouping the examples into subclasses, according to the differences in denotative meaning, connotative meaning, considering also formal and pragmatic differences.

Grammatical equivalence was also analyzed, focusing on such differences that were of the subject of question in the stories. Textual equivalence, as another level considered by Knittlová, was not analysed since it is rather distant from the aim of the paper, which is *cultural transposition.*

Pragmatic equivalence was explored to a large extent, for it is represented by the extra-linguistic aspects of translation that are culture-specific, such as idioms and distorted speech of immigrants.

The analysis proved that the original text contains a great number of both language-specific and culture-bound items, that is cannot be considered a simple *translation* but a *transfer.* It also demonstrated, how complex are the procedures of translation that are involved in *Kaplan*, which made the book a true challenge for Antonín Přidal.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baker, Mona. <u>In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation.</u> London: Routledge, 2001.

Bassnett, Susan. <u>Translation Studies.</u> London: Routledge, 1991.

Dušková, Libuše., a kol. <u>Mluvnice současné angličtiny na pozadí češtiny.</u> Praha:
    Academia, 2003.

Fronek, Josef. <u>Anglicko-český, česko anglický slovník.</u> Voznice: Leda, 2001.

Knittlová, Dagmar. <u>K teorii i praxi překladu.</u> Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého, 2003.

Krijtová, Olga. <u>Pozvání k překladatelské praxi: Kapitoly o překládání beletrie.</u> Praha:
    Univerzita Karlova, 2000.

Kufnerová, Zlata., Milena Poláčková, Jaromír Povejšil, Zdena Skoumalová, and Vlasta
    Straková. <u>Překládání a čeština.</u> Jinočany: H & H, 2003.

Lotko, Edvard. <u>Slovník lingvistických termínů pro filology.</u> Olomouc: Univerzita
    Palackého, 1999.

Mejstřík, Vladimír, a kol. <u>Slovník spisovné češtiny pro školu a veřejnost.</u> Praha:
    Academia, 2006.

N. A. <u>Webster's Universal Encyclopedic Dictionary.</u> USA: Barnes & Noble, 2002.

Petráčková, Věra., Jiří Kraus, a kol. <u>Akademický slovník cizích slov.</u> Praha: Academia,
    2001.

Summers, Della. <u>Longman dictionary of contemporary English.</u> Essex: Pearson
    Education Ltd., 2003.

ÚDAJE PRO KNIHOVNICKOU DATABÁZI

Název práce	Rosten's O Kaplan! My Kaplan! As a Challenging Literary Piece for Its Translator Antonín Přidal
Autor práce	Dana Vondráčková
Obor	Anglický jazyk pro hospodářskou praxi
Rok obhajoby	2007
Vedoucí práce	Mgr. Irena Reimannová
Anotace	Bakalářská práce je zaměřena na jazykovou analýzu překladu literárního díla se zaměřením na problematiku kulturní převoditelnosti textu. Předmětem analýzy je kniha Leo Rostena, která formou humorných příběhů popisuje příhody amerických imigrantů jež navštěvují večerní přípravnou školu pro dospělé. Jazykový rozbor porovnává anglický originál s českým překladem a upozorňuje na prvky, které jsou specifické pro daný jazyk i kulturu. Analýza se pokouší dokázat, že uvedené literární dílo nelze prostě přeložit, nýbrž převést z jednoho kulturního prostředí do jiného. Teoretická část definuje terminologii, popisuje překladatelské postupy a vysvětluje přístup k analýze. Praktická část prezentuje analýzu překladu a provádí rozbor překladatelových postupů.
Klíčová slova	Jazyková analýza -- překladatelství -- lingvistika -- porovnání překladu a originálu -- kulturní převoditelnost Linguistic analysis -- translation -- linguistics -- comparison of original and translation -- cultural transposition -- cultural transplantation