

Univerzita Karlova v Praze

Filozofická fakulta

Ústav anglického jazyka a didaktiky

Diplomová práce

Bc. Zuzana Slabyhoudová

Canterburské povídky v českém překladu Františka

Vrby: lingvistická analýza

The Canterbury Tales as translated into Czech by František Vrba:

a linguistic analysis

Praha 2013

Vedoucí práce: doc. PhDr. Jan Čermák, CSc.

Prohlášení:

Prohlašuji, že jsem diplomovou práci vypracovala samostatně, že jsem řádně citovala všechny použité prameny a literaturu a že práce nebyla využita v rámci jiného vysokoškolského studia či k získání jiného nebo stejného titulu.

V Praze, dne 3. ledna 2014

.....

Jméno a příjmení

Poděkování

Za cenné rady, odborné vedení a trpělivost při zpracování diplomové práce
děkuji vedoucímu diplomové práce doc. PhDr. J. Čermákovi, CSc.

Klíčová slova

Canterburské povídky, František Vrba, Geoffrey Chaucer, lingvistická analýza, překlad

Keywords

a linguistic analysis, a translation, František Vrba, Geoffrey Chaucer, *The Canterbury Tales*

Abstrakt

Diplomová práce předkládá filologickou analýzu českého překladu Chaucerových Canterbury povídek od Františka Vrby. Práce se skládá ze tří hlavních částí: Teoretická část, Hypotéza a metodologie a Praktická část. Analýza se týká lexikálních, syntaktických, stylistických, metrických a kulturních aspektů jazyka. Analýza se soustředí na Povídku rytířovu, Povídku mlynářovu, Povídku kněze jeptišek a Povídku ženy z Bathu, jelikož adekvátně reprezentují stylistickou variabilitu, propojení žánrů a strukturní shody a odlišnosti v Canterbury povídkách. Cílem této práce je zanalyzovat a zhodnotit kvalitu Vrbova překladu do češtiny.

Abstract

The diploma thesis offers a philological analysis of František Vrba's translation into Czech of *The Canterbury Tales* by Geoffrey Chaucer. The paper is composed of three major parts: "Theoretical background", "Hypothesis and Method", and "Analysis". The analysis addresses matters of lexical, syntactic, stylistic, metrical and cultural nature. The analysis focuses on *The Knight's Tale*, *The Miller's Tale*, *The Nun's Priest's Tale* and *The Wife of Bath's Tale* as convenient manifestations of stylistic variation, cross-generic links and structural correspondences and contrasts in *The Canterbury Tales*. The aim of this thesis is to analyze and evaluate the quality of František Vrba's Czech translation.

List of abbreviations

PKJ – Povídka kněze jeptišek

PM – Povídka mlynářova

PR – Povídka rytířova

PŽB – Povídka ženy z Bathu

The CT – The Canterbury Tales

The KT – The Knight's Tale

The MT – The Miller's Tale

The NPT – The Nun's Priest's Tale

The WBP – The Wife of Bath's Prologue

The WBT – The Wife of Bath's Tale

List of Tables

Table 1: The present tense, indicative mood	20
Table 2: Preterite forms	20

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Theoretical Background	3
2.1. <u>Geoffrey Chaucer: The Story of His Life</u>	3
2.2. <u>Chaucer's Works</u>	6
2.3. <u>The Canterbury Tales</u>	7
2.4. <u>The Language of Chaucer</u>	13
2.4.1. Prosody.....	13
2.4.2. Grammar	16
2.4.3. Vocabulary, registers, dialects	23
2.4.4. Style	26
2.4.5. An opposing perspective on Chaucer's uniqueness	28
2.5. <u>František Vrba – A Brief Survey</u>	30
3. Hypothesis and Method	31
3.1. <u>Methodological Approach</u>	31
3.2. <u>Hypothesis</u>	34
4. Analysis	36
4.1. <u>The Knight's Tale</u>	36
4.1.1. Summary and Plot.....	36
4.1.2. Differences Between the Original and the Translation	38
4.1.2.1. Category 1	38
4.1.2.2. Category 2	39
4.1.2.3. Category 3	43

4.1.2.4. Metre and Rhyme	44
4.1.2.5. Conclusion	45
4.2. <u><i>The Miller's Tale</i></u>	46
4.2.1. Summary and Plot	46
4.2.2. Differences Between the Original and the Translation	49
4.2.2.1. Category 1	49
4.2.2.2. Category 2	50
4.2.2.3. Category 3	53
4.2.2.4. Metre and Rhyme	54
4.2.2.5. Links Between <i>The KT</i> and <i>The MT</i>	54
4.2.2.6. Conclusion	55
4.3. <u><i>The Wife of Bath's Tale</i></u>	56
4.3.1. Summary and Plot	56
4.3.2. Differences Between the Original and the Translation	58
4.3.2.1. Category 1	58
4.3.2.2. Category 1/2	59
4.3.2.3. Category 2	60
4.3.2.4. Category 3	64
4.3.2.5. Conclusion	64
4.4. <u><i>The Nun's Priest's Tale</i></u>	65
4.4.1. Summary and Plot	65
4.4.2. Differences Between the Original and the Translation	68
4.4.2.1. Category 1	69
4.4.2.2. Category 1/2	69

4.4.2.3. Category 2	69
4.4.2.4. Category 3	72
4.4.2.5. Metre and Rhyme	72
4.4.2.6. Links Between <i>The WBT</i> and <i>The NPT</i>	72
4.4.2.7. Conclusion	73
5. Conclusion	74
References	77
Résumé	79
Appendix	85
<i>The Knight's Tale</i>	85
<i>The Miller's Tale</i>	95
<i>The Wife of Bath's Tale</i>	99
<i>The Nun's Priest's Tale</i>	105

1. Introduction

The diploma thesis *The Canterbury Tales as Translated into Czech by František Vrba: A Linguistic Analysis* offers a philological analysis of František Vrba's Czech translation of *The Canterbury Tales* by Geoffrey Chaucer. The work is based on the last edition of Vrba's translation from the year 1970. The key reason for choosing the latest translation was that it maximally reflects contemporary language. The previous editions are not used for comparison because of the limited space for the analysis. The paper consists of three major parts: "Theoretical background", "Hypothesis and Method", and "Analysis". The "Theoretical background" outlines Geoffrey Chaucer's life, literary works and language, as well as the origins of *The Canterbury Tales* (*The CT*) itself and František Vrba's brief biography. The second major part, "Hypothesis and Method", presents the hypothesis and chosen methodological approach which is based on three fundamental categories of mistakes: *Incomprehension of the original text*, *Mistranslation*, and *Linguistic violation of the target language*.

The third and the most important part is analytical. The analysis addresses matters of lexical, syntactic, stylistic, metrical and cultural nature. In terms of textual material, it focuses on *The Knight's Tale* (*The KT*), *The Miller's Tale* (*The MT*), *The Nun's Priest's Tale* (*The NPT*) and *The Wife of Bath's Tale* (*The WBT*) as they represent convenient manifestations of stylistic variation, structural correspondences and contrasts, and cross-generic links in *The CT*. The aim of this thesis is to analyse and evaluate the quality and effectiveness of František Vrba's Czech translation, and whether he is able to differentiate between various styles of the original. As regards expected results, the diploma thesis is supposed to

illustrate a high level of concordance between *The KT*, *The MT*, *The NPT*, *The WBT* and their translations.

2. Theoretical Background

2.1. Geoffrey Chaucer: The Story of His Life

Geoffrey Chaucer is a remarkable figure of English literary history. His life is a story of a boy from a middle-class home who ended up as a distant relative to King Henry IV and the “first [English] poet in the high culture of Europe“ (Coghill 7). He lived in ambivalent times which loved learning and founding of new colleges but which, on the other hand, suffered from plague, poverty, rebellion, war, political murder, heresy and schism. Chaucer, who was called “rhetor“ (“a good poet“) by Lydgate and many others, was born in London around the year 1340 or a little later¹. Owing to the fact that he was a relatively well-known person with a career of a courtier, we can find plenty of information about his life.

Chaucer probably attended St. Paul’s Almonry Grammar School, where he learned Latin and French, and later he most likely studied at Westminster School. As a young man, he became a page in the royal household of Elisabeth, Countess of Ulster, who was the wife of Lionel, third son of Edward III and later Duke of Clarence (Crow and Leland in Benson xiii). The first known reference to Geoffrey Chaucer, dated April 1357, was discovered in her household books. He learned many practical things during the service, especially courtesy (seen as a feature of noble manners and education), which was a significant aspect of life in any royal household. It influenced also Chaucer and his work: “Of all our poets, Geoffrey Chaucer is the most courteous to those who read or listen to him“ (Coghill 22).

¹ The latest possible date of his birth is estimated to be 1345.

When we read *The CT*, we can perceive Chaucer's graceful attitude to his readership. For example, he clearly states that he has no intention of offending anyone. He was ready to mock almost anything but never courtesy, which was a great ideal of the Middle Ages.

In 1359, Chaucer was sent to the Hundred Year's War but he was almost immediately imprisoned. Fortunately, he was not held in captivity for a long time because on 1 March 1360, the King paid sixteen pounds as a ransom and Chaucer was released (Crow and Leland in Benson xiii). He married Phillipa de Roet in 1366 and went into service with Blanche, Duchess of Lancaster, first wife of John of Gaunt, in 1369 (Coghill 29). John of Gaunt became the poet's friend and patron, and later even his brother-in-law, when he – after becoming a widower – married Phillipa de Roet's sister. Chaucer gradually built a career as a man of affairs: in the year 1370, he was something between a King's Messenger and a royal nuncio to France (Coghill 29). He travelled extensively; especially his missions to Italy in 1372 and 1378 had a great influence on his literary work. Furthermore, he may have met Francis Petrarch, one of the most famous living poets of Chaucer's time, although there is no direct evidence for that (Crow and Leland in Benson xv).

Chaucer was promoted during his travels; he now (i.e. in 1374) held the position of Comptroller of the Customs and Subsidies of Wools, Skins and Tanned Hides in London. He was becoming a fairly affluent person: he was granted various respectable offices, such as the Comptroller of Petty Customs (in 1382) or a Justice of the Peace (in 1385), and he sat in Parliament at Westminster as the Knight of the Shire for Kent in October 1386 (Coghill 33). However, by the

turn of fortune's wheel or rather because his patron John of Gaunt was out of the country, Chaucer was deprived of his offices in the same year (1386). The following year – or at least it is believed to be in the year 1387 – his wife died. It was during that hapless time when the poet started to write his masterpiece, *The Canterbury Tales*.

On 12 July 1389, Chaucer was appointed Clerk of the King's Works by King Richard, which means that he was in charge of construction and repairing of royal residences and other holdings of the king, for instance The Tower of London or Westminster Palace (Crow and Leland in Benson xx). His task was also to organize tournament events, which is reflected in the description of tournament preparations in *The KT*. Chaucer left the post in 1391 but still received a pension from the king. When John of Gaunt's son ascended the throne as King Henry IV in 1399, Chaucer was again rewarded with a pension (Crow and Leland in Benson xxi).

The last mention of a living Chaucer is dated on 5 June 1400, when he accepted a pay check with money from the King, but there are no life records hereafter (Crow and Leland in Benson xxii). He died on 25 October 1400 and was buried in Westminster Abbey. The date may not be correct since his tomb may have been erected as late as 1555, i.e. a long time after his death, but no other date is known (Crow and Leland in Benson xxii). Regarding Chaucer's burial in Westminster Abbey, Coghill offers a very interesting comment: "[...] it is not known why. St. Margaret's, Westminster, was his parish church, and that would have been his natural resting-place; perhaps they put him in the Abbey because he had been Clerk of the Works, or perhaps he slipped in by some oversight [...]. It

was anyhow not Chaucer's fame as a poet that made him Head of the Poets' Corner; it was not until the late 16th century that a corner in the Abbey began to belong to the poets" (34).

2.2. Chaucer's Works

Geoffrey Chaucer, who can be characterized as a love-poet and a teller of tales, started his literary career as an author of translations. His first translation was the *Roman de la Rose*, which is a medieval French poem with courtly subject matter. He adopted this aristocratic and French philosophy of love and transferred it together with a French way of poetry to the English environment (Coghill 28).

The earliest of Chaucer's major poems is an elegy *The Book of the Duchess*. It is a slow dream poem, which was written to commemorate the death of Blanche, Duchess of Lancaster, John of Gaunt's wife. Although the dating of her decease slightly varies – she died either in 1369 (Coghill 29), or on 12 September 1368 (Crow and Leland in Benson xv) – it seems safe to assume that *The Book of the Duchess* was composed sometime between the years 1369 and 1370². It is imagined as a love-story with John of Gaunt as the main character singing a lament for his dead lady. The relationship between the Duke and his wife is depicted as if they were courtly lovers, although they had been married for ten years: their ordinary Christian marriage is described with all the conventions of idealized courtly love, in which we can recognize the above-mentioned influence of French poetry (Coghill 36).

² Benson suggests 1368-72 (Benson xxv).

Other Chaucer's works include *The House of Fame* (written in between his travels to Italy, i.e. 1378-80, and influenced by the *Divine Comedy*), *The Parliament of Fowls* (1380-82), *The Legend of Good Women* (written 1385-86), and *Troilus & Criseyde* (1382-86). Unfortunately, some Chaucer's works have been lost in the course of time (Benson xxii). In *Troilus & Criseyde*, Chaucer's perspective is changed from the lightness of courtly love to a more serious tone; furthermore, it is the first tragedy in English (Coghill 63).

Chaucer had a tendency to reflect literature which he was currently reading. He gladly quoted his favourite authors, especially Latin classics such as Ovid, Vergil and Boethius, but also French writers (inspired by the *Roman de la Rose*), and Italian authorities: Dante and Petrarch. He knew Boccaccio's poems, or at least two of them – *Il Filostrato* and the *Teseida* – because he reshaped them into *Troilus & Criseyde* and *The KT*, respectively (Coghill 32).

Geoffrey Chaucer is certainly best known for *The CT*, which is discussed in a separate section. His poems have an important position within the literature of the Middle Ages, along with other significant works, for instance *Piers Plowman*, or *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*.

2.3. *The Canterbury Tales*

Chaucer began to write his masterpiece in the late 1380s – or more precisely in 1386-87 (Coghill 34) – and occupied himself with it at least until the late 1390s but most probably until his death. It remained his work in progress, thus it was never completed. However, some scholars, for example Ralph W.

Baldwin, believe that the integrity of the work is as it stands because the narrative frame is basically finished. John Norton-Smith and other authorities even claim that *The CT* “was intended to be an imperfect work“ (Benson 797), which would suggest that Chaucer meant to leave it this way. Nevertheless, it seems improbable since not every pilgrim is given a chance to tell a story and a few tales are not finished.

The CT is a collection of mutually interconnected stories united by its narrative framework. The idea of pilgrimage forming a frame could come to Chaucer from different sources: Boccaccio’s *Decameron* is the most supported one but although very likely, it is not proven in any way. There are other possible sources, such as Juan Ruiz’s *Libro del buen amor* (Benson 795). An analogy can also be found with the *Novelle* of Giovanni Sercambi, in which Sercambi is a narrator and the leader of a group of travellers. The tales are set into a pilgrimage-like journey frame, i.e. into the same frame as *The CT*, but the work was written after 1400 (Benson 796), which means that it could not be Chaucer’s inspiration – it merely shows that this kind of framework was quite popular. Chaucer may have developed the idea from everyday life since pilgrimages were common in his time.

In spite of the non-originality of the frame, *The CT* is still exceptional in that it does not contain any moral pattern unlike other works of this kind. However, the pilgrimage of *The CT* is usually perceived rather as a metaphor which gave Chaucer an opportunity to join people of various age, social status, occupation, temperament, etc., who would otherwise not have met. The date of

this imaginary pilgrimage is estimated to be the year 1387 but the author maybe did not have any particular date in mind (Benson 796).

There are eighty-two different manuscripts of *The CT* and six early prints, which theoretically have a manuscript status as well. There have naturally been more copies – we can find various allusions in other texts – but they were lost in the course of time. The Ellesmere and the Hengwrt Manuscripts are considered to be “superior“ to the rest of the manuscripts. Hengwrt is probably the oldest surviving manuscript and Ellesmere is called “the most beautiful of the extant manuscripts“ (Cooper 7). Both of them come from London, they are carefully written and of a very early date, which means that they originated shortly after Chaucer’s death. These facts are of great importance because scribes copying the text were not given a chance to alter it extensively, thus we can examine texts which are close to the original. Interestingly enough, the Ellesmere and the Hengwrt Manuscripts were written by the same scribe, who was identified as Adam Pynkhurst, London scrivener (Horobin 46). Nevertheless, their spelling sometimes vary, which shows that it was not relevant for the scribe. He most probably regarded the forms equivalent and felt no preference for either of them.

Modern editions are of course modified in many respects – for instance, thorn (Þ, þ) is replaced by *th*, abbreviated forms are expanded, modern punctuation is added, etc. When we intend to analyse *The CT*, there are basically two options: we can either choose one of the manuscripts (most likely Hengwrt or Ellesmere), or we can use an “artificial“ version of *The CT*. Since scribal copyists ruined the original metre and text after so many revisions (they sometimes mixed it with other poems), the more recent manuscript version of *The CT* we read, the

more deviated it is from Chaucer's original. Thus the standard editions do not correspond with any of the surviving manuscripts. The editions are an effort of many scholars to recreate the original text but this is a complicated task with no certainty of authenticity – it may be even impossible (Burnley 5). The diploma thesis is based on *The Riverside Chaucer*, which is a hybrid of the Ellesmere and the Hengwrt Manuscripts (Benson 1120); nonetheless, David Burnley, for instance, works with Hengwrt because he believes that it is closer to Chaucer's real language than any "artificial" version (Burnley 8).

Regarding the content and subject matter organisation of *The CT*, Chaucer had written some of the tales (for example *The KT*) before he started to create *The CT* itself. Harry Bailly's (the Host leading the group of pilgrims) initial plan was that everyone should tell two tales on the way to Canterbury, to the shrine of Saint Thomas Becket, and two tales on the way back. Thirty travellers multiplied by four equals 120 stories. In reality, there are 24 tales plus the *General Prologue* and *Chaucer's Retraction*. The question concerning the assignment of some tales is frequently discussed: Chaucer evidently made certain changes in the arrangement and matching of the tales with respective characters. The order is also a major issue of *The CT*: "Speculation about their proper sequence is based on the assumption that Chaucer left his work unfinished, the apparent fact that he made changes in plan and arrangement as he worked [...]" (Benson 796). The most commonly used order is that of the Ellesmere Manuscript as it is probably the one most resembling the order intended by Chaucer (Benson 1121). Aside of other proposed arrangements, W. W. Skeat established another order in his edition

of Chaucer's works. The contrast between the Fragments of the Ellesmere order and the Groups of Skeat's version is the following:

Fragment I: *The General Prologue, The KT, The MT, The Reeve's Tale, The Cook's Tale*

Fragment II: *The Man of Law's Tale*

Fragment III: *The Wife of Bath's Tale, The Friar's Tale, The Summoner's Tale*

Fragment IV: *The Clerk's Tale, The Merchant's Tale*

Fragment V: *Squire's Tale, Franklin's Tale*

Fragment VI: *Physician's Tale, Pardoner's Tale*

Fragment VII: *Shipman's Tale, Prioress's Tale, The Tale of Sir Thopas, The Tale of Melibee, Monk's Tale, Nun's Priest's Tale*

Fragment VIII: *Second Nun's Tale, Canon's Yeoman's Tale*

Fragment IX: *Manciple's Tale*

Fragment X: *Parson's Tale, Chaucer's Retraction*

Group A: *The General Prologue, The KT, The MT, The Reeve's Tale, The Cook's Tale*

Group B: *The Man of Law's Tale, Shipman's Tale, Prioress's Tale, The Tale of Sir Thopas, The Tale of Melibee, Monk's Tale, Nun's Priest's Tale*

Group C: *Physician's Tale, Pardoner's Tale*

Group D: *The Wife of Bath's Tale, The Friar's Tale, The Summoner's Tale*

Group E: *The Clerk's Tale, The Merchant's Tale*

Group F: *Squire's Tale, Franklin's Tale*

Group G: *Second Nun's Tale, Canon's Yeoman's Tale*

Group H: *Manciple's Tale*

Group I: *Parson's Tale*, *Chaucer's Retraction*

The CT differs from other works of medieval time in many aspects. As already mentioned above, it lacks any moral framework. Harry Bailly's effort to create a natural order of storytelling is ruined by the Miller and his rudeness, which shows that conventions will not probably be followed by the characters. Furthermore, it is composed of extremely heterogeneous structures: not only with respect to the characters, whose individuality is reflected in their tales, but also with respect to style, language, themes, motifs, and ideas (the first two points will be discussed in the following chapter). Helen Cooper describes the wide range of topics in *The CT*: "[...] questions about Fortune and Providence; the suffering of the innocent; what men or women most desire; the choices they make, and the *entente* behind those choices; the nature of friendship, love, the good ruler, and good living" (17). The role of women in marriage, one of the key topics of *The CT*, is a component of a more complex theme of sexual love and the role of women in the world. Sources for the subject matter are numerous: almost every tale contains at least a small allusion to the Bible (some parts are filled with them – especially *The WBP*, *The MT*, *The NPT*, and others). A classical work such as Ovid's *Metamorphoses* could be Chaucer's inspiration as well (Cooper 9); the same applies to Dante's *Divine Comedy*, which influenced for example *The KT* or *The NPT*. The philosophical text *Consolation of Philosophy* of Boethius, translated by Chaucer, is the next source among many others – an exhaustive list would be very extensive.

The CT was translated into Czech three times. The first translation made by Vilém Mathesius was published in 1927 and entitled *Výbor z Canterburských povídek*. The second translation was made by František Vrba; it was first published in 1941 and then republished in 1953, 1956, and 1970. The third and the latest version was translated by Hana Skoumalová in 1976 and it was also republished in 1985. Her text was a translation of a prosaic adaptation for children (Macura 377). The diploma thesis is based on the last edition of František Vrba's translation from the year 1970, which also contains Vrba's comments and explanatory notes.

2.4. The Language of Chaucer

2.4.1. Prosody

Verse in English poetry of the 14th century was represented by two distinct traditions which were usually not used simultaneously. The first one – Germanic tradition – was inherited from Old English times. It was based on a certain number of stressed syllables in each line of verse (usually from two to four) which were linked by alliteration of initial sounds, i.e. no rhyming at the end of the lines. The second tradition appeared in English in the 12th century and came from French and Latin poetry. It was formed by a specific number of syllables in a line and by rhyming of final sounds at the end of the lines. The latter was frequently employed before the 14th century, usually with eight syllables (i.e. four stresses/beats) but the span was actually rather from seven to ten syllables, and

arranged in rhyming couplets. Geoffrey Chaucer used it in his early poems, *The Book of the Duchess* and *The House of Fame* (Davis in Benson xxxix).

However, he soon abandoned it and began to employ quite uncommon five beats in a line, which the poet probably discovered in a French decasyllabic line or in an eleven-syllable line of Italian verse. Chaucer used it in seven-line stanzas (later called “rime royal“) in *The Parliament of Fowls* and *Troilus and Criseyde*. “His greatest contribution to the technique of English verse was the arrangement of this five-stress line in rhyming couplets, which he adopted in *The Legend of Good Women* and most of *The Canterbury Tales*. No earlier model for this has been found [...]“ (Davis in Benson xxxix). It is apparent that Chaucer knew also the alliterative verse since it appears in certain passages of his works (such as the tournament scene of *The KT*; see *The KT*’s analysis) but it was not important for the structure of his verse. Nevertheless, Chaucer is the first poet in English who employed the alliteration for special effects and not as “a literary medium or a set of formulae“ (Cooper 90), i.e. it is not a primary tool for building his verse.

The state of English in Chaucer’s time gave him a great opportunity to play with the language. Numerous spelling variants, words with alternative pronunciation, and final unstressed syllables were some of the available advantages which Chaucer was capable to utilise. The final unstressed syllables contained *-e* which could be pronounced as a neutral vowel or was not pronounced at all: this fact had an influence on a number of (light) syllables in a word and consequently on the metre as well. The *-e* was generally pronounced but it often remained silent in short unstressed words (for instance *hadde*, or *hire*), and it was elided when the following word started with a vowel or *h*. Furthermore,

Chaucer was familiar with other creative strategies of adjusting the metre – switching between verb tenses (this topic will be discussed in the grammar section), using oaths as metrical fillers (*pardee, benedicitee*), or shifting of stress as needed (this was enabled by certain inconsistencies in pronunciation, found especially in words recently borrowed from French).

A regular rhythm arises when light and stressed syllables are repeated in periodic intervals. Chaucer commonly began with a light syllable and continued with regular succession of stressed and unstressed syllables. In combination with Chaucer's five-stress lines, it follows that he used iambic pentameter. However, the first light syllable can sometimes be omitted (such line is then called "headless"), light and stressed syllables are frequently switched, or there can be an extra unstressed syllable (Davis in Benson xl).

Finally, it is necessary to briefly mention Christopher Cannon's viewpoint concerning Chaucer's contribution to English metre. Cannon believes that it is doubtful whether Chaucer had a real influence on the tradition of English metre, since the final inflectional *-e* in poetry was already archaic and it started to disappear altogether after 1400 due to the progressive change in morphology which made Modern English out of Middle English. After the loss of final *-e*, the structure of pentameter was felt to be artificial and collapsed. Poets returned to four-stress native patterns (Cannon 46), which would suggest that Chaucer's contribution to English verse was not long-lasting.

2.4.2. Grammar

Middle English nouns are fairly similar to Modern English nouns. Their inflexional endings were added to a base form and they were inflected for number and genitive case. Other cases as well as gender of Old English nouns more or less disappeared – we can only find a dative inflexional *-e* in prepositional idioms on rare occasions (Burnley 11). The most common inflexional ending was *-es/-s* expressing both plural and genitive. It could also be written as *-ys*, *-is*, or *-z* (*-z* was used with some words of French origin). A plural ending *-en* was frequent in the South and in Kent but it did not usually occur in London English, Chaucer's dialect. However, he regularly used *-en* plural in several fixed expressions, such as *eyen* (*eyes*), *brethren*, and *children*. Furthermore, the plural number could be signalled by a vowel change in the stem (*feet*, *teeth*, etc.) and by a zero plural form (*deer*, *sheep*, etc.; French words ending in *-s*; words denoting measure of time and space qualified by numerals – *foot*, *myle*, *pound*, *winter*, *yeer*, etc.) as in Modern English (Davis in Benson xxx).

Beside *-es/-s*, the genitive case could be represented by *-an* (for example *lady*, *herte*), or by a zero ending (some Classical names and names ending in *-s*; nouns of relation ending in *-r*: *fader*, *brother*, *suster*, etc.) (Davis in Benson xxxi). Possession could also be formed by periphrastic means, i.e. by the *of*-construction. If the genitive appeared in a noun phrase, it sometimes behaved slightly differently than in Modern English: “When a noun in the genitive is qualified by a phrase, whether with *of* or in apposition, the word on which the genitive depends follows it immediately and the phrase comes after, as *the king Priamus sone of*

Troye“ (Davis in Benson xxxiv), which would be today’s *King Priam of Troy’s son*.

Adjectives of Old English times were heavily inflected for gender, number and case and were in concord with nouns. In the Middle English period, adjectives partially lost their inflection but two kinds were still distinguished: weak and strong. The weak declension, also called “definite“, was largely represented by *-e* ending. It was used in vocative phrases and when the adjective was preceded by a definite article, a demonstrative, or a noun (or an adjective) in the genitive case. Nevertheless, this applied only to monosyllabic adjectives ending in a consonant. If disyllabic ones had been combined with *-e*, it would have destroyed the rhythm of the verse; whereas trisyllabic adjectives usually had an ending (Davis in Benson xxxi). Some adjectives of French origin took *-s* as a plural ending.

Comparative and superlative forms of adjectives were almost the same as in Modern English (weak adjectives sometimes had *-re*, *-este*); irregular forms of comparison were again very similar (*bettre*, *beste*, etc.) (Davis in Benson *ibid.*). However, there is a significant contrast between Modern English adjectives and those of Middle English. The latter could function as a noun in singular with no difficulties (for example *an impossible*); contemporary converted adjectives can express only a plural meaning (such as *the poor*). In conclusion, the adjectives of Chaucer’s English were commonly – but not always – marked for plurality and definiteness by *-e*. Although he was quite conservative regarding the final *-e*, some endings are missing in his works for no reason – it reflects a general trend of the disappearing of the final *-e* under the influence of the North (Burnley 14).

In general, the system of personal and possessive pronouns in Middle English resembled the modern set of pronouns except for some rather minor changes: *I* was sometimes written as *ich*; we could find *hit/hyt* for the neuter nominative and accusative singular besides familiar *it*; possessive *myn* and *thyn* had a plural ending *-e* and they lost the *-n* when the following noun began with a consonant other than *h*; *his* was used instead of *its* as the possessive of neuter; the third person plural *they*, which was of Scandinavian origin, had the possessive *hire/here* and the objective *hem* (Davis in Benson xxxii). There was of course a dialectal variation.

Probably the most significant feature of Middle English personal pronouns was the differentiation in number of the second person, which was later lost. The choice between the second person singular *thou/thow* (with the objective form *thee*) and the plural *ye* (with the objective form *you/yow*) was made based on the relative status of speakers (social usage): *thou* started to be applied in addressing people of equal or lower status, and *ye* became the polite form of address for people of higher status. Nevertheless, the distinction was employed in a polite society (a courtly gentleman addressed his lady *ye*) but for example in fabliaux, the characters did not follow these rules (Burnley 18). Furthermore, emotions could influence the selection – *thou* expressed closeness and intimacy but also contempt or anger. The second person nominative *thou* often appeared suffixed to a verb with assimilation of the consonant (*artow, wiltow*).

A reflexive function was represented either by the objective case, or by compounds with *self, selve(n)* as in Modern English (Davis in Benson xxxii). The plural of demonstrative *this* was *these*, and *that* had a plural form *tho; thilke*

(*the plus ilke*) meant “the same“. “The demonstrative *this* is used idiomatically to draw attention to a character in a narrative [...]“ (Davis in Benson xxxiv) – it usually appeared in front of a proper name, suggesting familiarity of the narrator with the character and adding vividness³. The repertoire of relative pronouns which could refer both to a person and a thing was the following: *that, which, which that, the which (that)*. *Who* in the nominative case was not used as a relative, only as an interrogative with a reference to persons. On the other hand, the possessive *whos* and the objective *whom* were frequently used as relatives (Davis in Benson xxxii). Indefinite pronouns included *a man, he, people, you, we, they, one* (Burnley 34).

A typical ending of an infinitive was *-en*, or *-e* with some exceptions (monosyllabic verbs having a long vowel or a diphthong in the stem eliminated *-e*, such as *go(o)n, seyn*). Chaucer employed either a plain infinitive, or a to-infinitive, or an infinitive preceded by *for to*. The last mentioned variant was quite rare in London English, it is thus possible that Chaucer used it because of the metre (Burnley 29). All regular verbs were conjugated in the present tense as follows: singular – the first person *-e*, the second person *-est*, and the third person *-eth*; plural *-e(n)*. Some verbs with the stem ending in a dental consonant could drop the vowel of the third person singular *-eth* and assimilate the consonant to that of the stem, which resulted in a monosyllabic word ending in *-t* (*rit* instead of *rideth*) – the reason was a metrical convenience (Davis in Benson xxxii). For a better illustration, the following chart demonstrates the system of endings of the present tense indicative:

³ Examples can be found in the analytical part.

	Middle English	Modern English
Infinitive	(to, for to) love(n)	(to) love
Singular	loue	love
	louest	love
	loveth	loves
Plural	loue(n)	love

Table 1: The present tense, indicative mood

There were two kinds of verbs distinguished in the past tense: weak and strong. Weak verbs outnumbered strong ones (newly borrowed verbs usually followed a weak pattern), but strong verbs were more common, i.e. more frequent in usage. In the past tense, strong verbs changed their stem vowel and attached *-e* in the second person singular. Weak verbs added stem endings containing *-d* or *-t* to the infinitive (*-t* after a voiceless consonant), and their personal endings in singular were *-e* for the first and the third person and *-est* for the second person (*-d(e)*, *-t(e)* could form also a past participle). All of them had *-en* in plural (Davis in Benson xxxiii). Table 2 illustrates the preterite forms of weak and strong verbs (extracted from Horobin 109):

	Weak	Strong
Singular	louede	bounde
	louedest	bounde
	louede	bounde

Plural	louede(n)	bounde(n)
---------------	-----------	-----------

Table 2: Preterite forms

The future tense was expressed by means of the present tense in combination with certain adverbs, or by a periphrasis using *shal/wol* and the infinitive. *Shal* and *wol* could represent not only a simple future; they also carried a modal meaning: *shal* (with the past tense *sholde*) – “compulsion“, “obligation“, “inexorability“, and “owe“; *wol* (with the past tense *wolde*) – “volition“, “desire“, “intention“, or “wish“ (Burnley 42). The perfect and pluperfect of intransitive verbs were formed rather with *be* as an auxiliary than with modern *have*. Progressive forms were rare and a simple tense was used instead (Davis in Benson xxxvii).

It is necessary to mention two aspects of Chaucer’s verb tenses: first, his employment of preterite, perfect and pluperfect would often be considered ungrammatical according to the rules of Modern English (Burnley 48); second, he was sometimes inconsistent in the application of tenses, which allowed him to conform to the metre (Burnley 49) – a different verb form could change the structure and the rhythm of a particular line. A typical feature of Chaucer’s storytelling is that the present tense was used to refer to past events – this is called the “Historic Present“ (Burnley 51). Its purpose was to add immediacy and vividness to a narration.

There was no special passive inflexion of the verb but the “passive meaning“ was expressed by the verb *to be* and a past participle (Burnley 34). Concerning the mood of verbs, the indicative was already mentioned. The

imperative lacked an ending in singular, *-eth* appeared in plural (Davis in Benson xxxiii); in the second person, *ye* was usually accompanied by *-eth*, *thou* more likely without an ending (Burnley 33). The subjunctive, carrying meanings such as wish, imperative of the first person plural, concession, or hypothetical condition (in subordinate clauses), had in the singular *-e* and in the plural *-e(n)* in the present, while in the past, the endings remained the same but the stem vowel of the plural indicative was used (Davis in Benson xxxiii). Impersonal constructions could be formed with a missing subject or with *it* as a formal subject empty of reference (Burnley 36). The present participle and the gerund ended in *-ing/-inge*, and the past participle could contain a prefix *i-/y-* (Davis in Benson xxxiii).

Negation in Middle English worked in a different way than in Modern English: double negatives were nothing uncommon. Multiple negation was used as a reinforcement, to add intensity, and it was a feature of high style (Burnley 60). The elementary negative adverb was *ne* and it usually preceded the verb but it could also be incorporated in the verb form. It was often supported by another negative, most frequently *nat* or *nought*, which followed the verb. These additional negatives sometimes appeared without *ne* and exceptionally even preceded the verb (Davis in Benson xxxviii). Dropping of the *ne* particle was associated with a colloquial usage (Horobin 120). The scope of negation may become a problem for contemporary readers and it can cause misunderstandings, mainly when only one negative particle is present. We can find contracted negative forms of lexical verbs, such as “not to be“ – *I nam, thou nart, he nys, he nas, it nere*; “not to have“ – *he nath, he nadde*; “not to wish“ (“will not“) – *thow*

nilt, he nyl, he nolde; “not to know“ – *nost(ow), he niste, he not* (Burnley 65). There were also negative idioms: *It is no nay* (“there can be no denial“), *I nam but deed* (“I shall not be other than dead“, meaning “death is inescapable“), etc. (Burnley 73). Regarding interrogation, the most productive pattern in Middle English was an inversion of a subject and a verb (Davis in Benson xxxviii).

Adverbs were most commonly created by adding *-e* to adjectives (*faire, faste*); these forms shared the way of comparison with their source. Another option was suffixation by *-ly* or *-liche* (*playnly, rudeliche*) – in this case, the comparison employed periphrastic means *moore* and *moost* (Davis in Benson xxxi). There were some irregular adverbs as in Modern English (*wel, yvele, muchel*). Adverbs could also come into existence by converting nouns into adverbs using an *-es* ending: *moste nedes* – “necessarily“ (Burnley 12).

To conclude the grammar section with a very brief comment regarding syntax, Middle English word order was more flexible than the present-day one – a verb could easily appear at the end of a sentence (Horobin 124). Furthermore, syntax in poetry is usually subordinate to metre and rhyme, which means that the word order can be determined by them (for instance, a particular word is shifted to the end of a line because of rhyme). As a result, the word order in *The CT* rather reflects tendencies in the poetry of Chaucer’s time (or Chaucer’s own poetry) than tendencies of Middle English syntax in general.

2.4.3. Vocabulary, registers, dialects

After the Norman Conquest, English was not a primary language of written records (Davis in Benson xxv). English revived after the 12th century but

between the years 1100 – 1500, which implies that in Chaucer’s time as well, it was rather a large quantity of dialects without any standard. As Burnley puts it, “Chaucer’s language is, above all, a variety of ME of a kind used in London in the late 14th century [...]“ (xiii). London English itself was a “mixed dialect“; it contained features of other dialects which mingled with it not only because of the geographical centrality of London, but also because London was a centre of culture, government, business, education, etc., and during the 14th century, people from the whole country were heading to London to find a job (Burnley 111). In the 15th century, London brought forth Chancery Standard. Chaucer’s English and Chancery Standard were both formalisations of the language of London, thus they were more or less similar in type (Burnley 10). There can be found a variety of dialects in *The CT*, such as a particularly distinct northern dialect in *The Reeve’s Tale*, used for comic purposes.

An important feature of Chaucer’s language and London English in general was their specific composition of vocabulary. Among words of English origin, there were words from French, Latin and Norse. We can find relatively new words from Norse in Chaucer’s texts, such as *dreme*, *callen*, and *werre* (Burnley 148). French and Latin, the language of the Church and scholars, were a part of linguistic options available for Englishmen – they were used for centuries in an appropriate context (Burnley 104). English borrowed from French in two waves: in the first wave, immediately after the Norman Conquest, important words related to government and law came into English; in the second wave, which culminated around the year 1400, words were not restricted to any specific field – they were terms concerning culture, art, food, fashion, learning,

etc. (Horobin 41). English was considered to be a language of peasants; on the other hand, French was a noble language of aristocracy which implied certain stylistic values and association whenever it was used (Burnley 104). In Chaucer's time, French still had a prestigious status but it was on the decline: it was a language of legal cases, administration, parliamentary business, technical matters, etc., which became ossified and formulaic outside the court (Burnley 106).

Although over a half of Chaucer's vocabulary was of a Romance origin, this fact has no information value because there was a large amount of words of French origin which were borrowed earlier and which were not felt as foreign any more – the dynamism of London English caused that they were treated as its natural component (Burnley 135). What often appeared to play a more important role was a degree of familiarity, frequency and register rather than etymological origins. Chaucer and his contemporaries perceived that a division of vocabulary was based on stylistic and socially-motivated factors – this perspective resembles modern registers (Burnley 159). Burnley regards “termes“ as a crucial constituent of Chaucer's vocabulary. He defines them as “special forms and expressions of language which are associated with technical discussion“ (156). Nevertheless, less institutionalised or technical areas of lexis could have their “termes“ as well. There were, for example, “loves termes“: a variety of them can be found in *The MT* – *lemman, hony-comb, my faire bryd, my sweete cynamome, sweete bryd, my deerelyng* (Burnley 169); or “cherles termes“ (churls' speech) – bold, rude, plain, etc. expressions (Burnley 183).

The “termes“ themselves are not so extraordinary but Chaucer’s employment of them is. He was aware of the fact that if the “termes“ were used outside their typical context, they could convey an extra meaning, such as irony (for example when technical terms were used in fabliaux). Horobin mentions that Chaucer was the first poet who used legal terms in other than legal environment (89). It is necessary to emphasize that there are many words which are part of the contemporary common core and we do not perceive them as technical but which were “termes“ for Chaucer – for instance, *ascendent* was an astronomical term, or *consequence* and *suggestioun* usually appeared only in a philosophical context (Burnley 159). Burnley believes that Chaucer’s ability to use words in other than their primary sense is a sign of his competence: “If he can truly be called the Father of English Poetry, it is clearly not for his employment of French themes and poetic forms, but more justly for his discovery and exploitation of a newly developed potential in the English language“ (176).

2.4.4. Style

We can identify not three (as in the classical division), but two distinct styles in Chaucer’s texts: high and low style (Burnley 186). They were represented by *courtly* and *plain speech* respectively. The *courtly speech* symbolized the ideals of courtliness and it was typical for its eloquence, elaboration of syntax, use of figurative language, knowledge of “termes“, and high proportion of words of Latin and French origin (Burnley 198). On the other hand, the *plain speech* included no eloquence or learning, there was simple syntax and limited vocabulary, no proper “termes“, and it often contained an indecent

reference to topics which should not be mentioned by a noble person (Burnley *ibid.*). However, the *courtly speech* was not associated with a specific individual and his social status – a person of lower rank could also use *courtly speech* to show politeness and courtesy; it was rather a linguistic register dependent on a situation (Horobin 172).

There were certain groups of words which could indicate a style. Generally speaking, words of French and Latin origin usually denoted a high style and English or Norse words rather a lower style but this was not true in absolute terms. Some French names which were used by the peasantry were lacking elevation, such as *Robyn*, *Perkyn*, *Alisoun*, *Jankyn* etc., and they became typical names of fabliau characters (Burnley 140) – cf. *Alisoun* in *The MT* or *Jankyn* in *The WBP*. *Tretys*, *fetys*, *coy*, *gent* and others are words of French origin which used to appear in a courtly context, but they fell into a socially-ironic usage and again became typical words of fabliaux (Burnley 142) – for instance, *fetys* (“elegant, shapely, handsome, neat“) and its adverb *fetisly* were used to describe Nicholas’s room in *The MT*. On the other hand, some words of Norse origin were a part of elevated style: *sparth* (“battle-axe“), *ransake*, *gap*, *big*, *hap* (“random chance in contradistinction to destiny or fortune“), *hauen*, etc. (Burnley 153). Furthermore, there were terms which could refer to the same extralinguistic reality but which were characteristic for a specific style: *wenche* could never appear in a romance and *lady* in a low-style story (Cooper 23).

Various stylistic levels in *The CT* are not distinguished by the density of rhetorical figures as much as by a selection of these figures, vocabulary and imagery – even fabliaux narrated by unlearned churls can be a stylistic and

rhetorical masterpiece. Tales in a higher style use a different range of tropes: they employ especially figures which draw our attention to methods and processes of narration, such as rhetorical question, apostrophes, and other kinds of comments concerning the structure and events of a text (Cooper 23). The style is also reflected in a selected range of imagery and similitude since in the high style, the images are frequently of exotic, symbolic or exalted character (supernatural creatures – angels, noble animals – lions, etc.). By contrast, the low style (for example fabliaux) contains ordinary, domestic, subhuman creatures (no angels; animals – ducks, mice, etc.) and a local setting (Cooper *ibid.*). Regarding vocabulary, as already noted above, a high-style vocabulary includes higher proportion of Romance-derived words, which are often polysyllabic; a low-style vocabulary consists of mostly Germanic words and it rather focuses on facts and physical objects than on abstract ideas.

2.4.5. An opposing perspective on Chaucer's uniqueness

Numerous works about Chaucer praise his originality and many of them are used in this diploma thesis. To quote here at least one, I have chosen *The Riverside Chaucer*: “In some respects, especially in the technique of verse, he was a great innovator [...]“ (xxvi). The author further appreciates Chaucer's style and his elegant language (*ibid.*). However, Christopher Cannon believes that Geoffrey Chaucer did not invent anything new, that his English is generally “traditional“ but he himself did not start any tradition (Cannon 9) and that his English does not underlie standard English, i.e. standard English is not based on Chaucer's language (Cannon 15). Cannon's viewpoint concerning Chaucer's contribution to

English metre was already offered in the Prosody section. Furthermore, Cannon also rejects claims that Chaucer's vocabulary admirably grew during his career, or that his novelty was based on using foreign sources of words. The latter is elaborated in the following paragraph.

Chaucer is considered to be most innovative in adopting Romance forms but Cannon disagrees. He presents Mersand's study in which Mersand states that Chaucer "introduced about 1,180 Romance words into the English vocabulary" (Cannon 56). This number is misleading since Mersand simply checked *The Oxford English Dictionary* for Chaucer's Romance words and every time when Chaucer's word was of an oldest occurrence, Mersand labelled it as Chaucer's invention (Cannon 57). It is logical that many of the 1,180 words could have been used long before Chaucer in spoken language or in texts which have been lost. Borrowing of new words was a common technique of literary language of that time – it was a general practice which Chaucer only employed, not invented (Cannon 65). Middle English of the 14th century contained words of Romance origin from earlier times (as noted in the Vocabulary section), which were considered a natural part of English – a fundamental feature of Middle English was that it borrowed from Latin and French in an attempt to become equal to them. "On the whole then, lexical invention constituted Chaucer's English because lexical invention constituted Middle English literary culture" (Cannon 90).

2.5. František Vrba – A Brief Survey

František Vrba was born on 30 May 1920 in Prague and died on 21 December 1985 also in Prague. He was a translator of works from English, French, German and Russian, and a literary, theatre and film critic. Vrba attended a grammar school in Prague and after his graduation in 1939, he started to study at the Faculty of Medicine but transferred to the Faculty of Arts after World War II. In 1940-41, he was an editor of a publishing house named *Družstevní práce*. Vrba was imprisoned in concentration camps Dachau and Buchenwald between the years 1944 and 1945. During 1946–50, he worked as a Czechoslovak cultural attaché in the USA. He became an editor of *Literární noviny* in 1956 and remained in his office until the year 1964. In 1968–69, he was a vice-chairman of *Svaz československých spisovatelů*. His son, Tomáš Vrba (born in 1947), translates English texts, and his daughter, Helena Beguivinová (born in 1951), translates French texts.

Vrba continuously translated from 1941, thus the list of his translations is quite impressive. It contains famous English authors, such as William Shakespeare – *Comedy of Errors*; J. R. R. Tolkien – *The Hobbit or There and Back Again*; Oscar Wilde – *The Balad of Reading Gaol*; or works of Isaac Asimov, Charles Dickens, Ernest Hemingway and many others. The translations from French and German include Moliere's or J.-P. Sartre's works, or Friedrich Schiller's *Die Braut von Messina*. The full list can be found online at <http://www.obecprekladatelu.cz/ftp/DUP/V/VrbaFrantisek.htm>.

3. Hypothesis and Method

3.1. Methodological Approach

Generally speaking, there are three fundamental categories of mistakes which can appear when we translate a text from a source language to a target language:

1. Incomprehension of the original text
2. Mistranslation
3. Linguistic violation of the target language

The first category, *Incomprehension of the original text*, can sometimes be subjective and it can be complicated to determine whether František Vrba truly did not understand, or whether he was aware of the meaning and simply opted for a particular solution in spite of its unsuitability. Therefore it should be noted that Category 1 contains examples in which the incomprehension of the original text is of high probability, not a complete certainty. The incomprehension can be lexical, syntactic, stylistic, or cultural (realia).

Category 2, *Mistranslation*, stands for occurrences which are understood by the translator but they are not translated correctly. The reasons may be various, such as an effort to meet the metre and the rhyme. This category is very broad and includes numerous subcategories:

- a) Semantic shifts
- b) Loose translation
- c) Additions and deletions
- d) Omission of features characteristic for the original text

The individual examples can then address matters of lexical, syntactic, stylistic and cultural nature. The subcategory *Semantic shifts* includes various semantic changes which occur between the original and the translation (especially on a lexical level), such as an addition of expressivity. The subcategory *Loose translation* appears when the original text is not followed precisely and the resulting translation is rather similar to the original than its accurate reflection, which means that Vrba usually translates the meaning of the original text, not individual words. *Loose translation* can also manifest itself on a syntactic level when sentence types are not observed (for example, when a rhetorical question is translated as a declarative sentence). The subcategory *Additions and deletions* is quite self-explanatory – any lexical material (i.e. words, phrases, sentences, etc.) which is deleted or added during the process of translation falls into this subcategory. Naturally, only the additions and deletions of lexical material which cause a change or a loss of meaning are taken into consideration. The last subcategory, *Omission of features characteristic for the original text*, contains Vrba's omission of features which frequently appear in the original and can be considered characteristic for it, such as the "Historic Present", the demonstrative *this* used in front of a proper name, syntactic inversions, the word *allas*, etc.

The third category, *Linguistic violation of the target language*, is represented by mistakes which are intelligible to the reader, as the original text is obviously correctly decoded by the translator, but the translation violates rules of the target language. As an outcome, the resulting translation can be, for instance, too literal, be based on using an unsuitable preposition or valency of a verb, or of

a word order pattern that is unnatural for Czech. Category 3 emerges especially from lexical and syntactic levels of analysis.

The analysis of metrical arrangement and rhyme is discussed separately, aside from the categories, since it is related rather to the structure of the text than to the content and it cannot be designated as a mistake as such. However, the metre and the rhyme, which are characteristic features of poetry, also influence the content considering the fact that they have an impact on the choice of words or expressions. It is most probable that in many cases there are better Czech equivalents to certain English words of the original text but Vrba chooses a particular translation because of the metre and the rhyme, which means that there is more limited range of lexical choices in comparison to prose. The same applies to syntax and its rules, which are less strict in poetry than in prose. For example, a postposition of an attribute is more frequent in poetry and it is acceptable even in situations where it would sound unnatural in prose.

If necessary, the meaning of Czech words will be searched in *Slovník spisovného jazyka českého* (<http://ssjc.ujc.cas.cz/>) and English expressions will be checked in *A Glossary for the Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* (<http://sites.fas.harvard.edu/~chaucer/glossar.htm>), or in the *Middle English Dictionary* (<http://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/med/structure.html>). Citations of the original will be referred to with the number of the corresponding Fragment and the line. Since the translated text was not published with numbered lines, it was necessary to number them for the purpose of easier orientation in the text. Citations of the translation will be referred to with the respective abbreviation of the corresponding tale and the number of line of the corresponding tale.

3.2. Hypothesis

As already mentioned in the section *Theoretical Background*, the diploma thesis is based on the last edition of František Vrba's translation from the year 1970. It was preceded by three other editions. Therefore it seems safe to assume that the last version is the most accurate one – it follows that there should be a minimum of mistakes. Especially instances of Category 1 and Category 3 should be eliminated since Vrba had an opportunity to correct them. As he gained experience as a translator, his ability to understand the original text grew⁴, thus it is expected that Category 1 will be represented by a minority of mistakes; the same applies to Category 3.

Furthermore, poetry is more tolerant of neologisms and it can, above all, break (not only) linguistic rules⁵. As a result, it is probable that there will be only a limited number of examples which noticeably violate linguistic rules of Czech (i.e. examples of Category 3). On the other hand, Category 2 is very broad in its definition and it includes numerous subcategories – the nature of this category suggests that it will be the largest of the categories and that it will significantly outnumber the remaining categories. Especially the subcategory *Semantic shifts* is expected to be prominent. On the whole, it is assumed that the vast majority of occurrences will concern individual words or phrases and that larger units, such as sentences, will be influenced only occasionally.

However, it should be noted that the previous editions are not used for comparison because of the limited space for the analysis – the diploma thesis is

⁴ However, this is only a conjecture. Unfortunately, I could not rely on information and assistance of František Vrba's family in an effort to study the background of the translation.

⁵ Cf. Geoffrey N. Leech - *A Linguistic Guide to English Poetry*.

based only on the last edition and the hypothesis is derived purely from the character of the categories. A preservation of the meaning of the text as a whole is expected to be Vrba's primary goal, which implies that František Vrba's translation is believed to be a successful and high-quality work.

4. Analysis

4.1. *The Knight's Tale*

4.1.1. Summary and Plot

Geoffrey Chaucer wrote *The KT* before *The CT* itself, probably in the early 1380s. Benson mentions that the line 884 is perceived as an allusion to the arrival of Queen Anne in England on 18 December 1381 but it is not certain (826). The question remains whether Chaucer somehow modified the tale to fit it in the framework of *The CT* since no distinct prologue is present. The division into four parts can be found only in the Ellesmere Manuscript; Hengwrt contains an introduction (ending in the line 892) and then three major parts (Cooper 62). *The KT* is a free adaptation of Boccaccio's *Il Teseida delle nozze d'Emelia* (*The Story of Theseus concerning the Nuptials of Emily*), which was written around 1339-41 (Benson 826). The philosophical component is influenced by *The Consolation of Philosophy* of Boethius from the 6th century, Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and many others (Cooper 65, 71).

The KT is a chivalric romance of a philosophical complexion which includes elements of realism and contemporary courtly practices (Benson 827). Cooper defines romances as "substantial narratives about high-born people, set far away or long ago (or both); their plots are concerned with love or chivalry, or both; the vast majority have happy endings [...]" (63) – the happy ending of *The KT* is to the detriment of Arcite's life, thus the tale also incorporates features of a tragedy. There is usually no deeper, inner meaning but *The KT* is characterized by philosophical reflections about fate, fortune, mortal life and divine order of the

universe – Providence is seen as the ruling principle. The Knight and the characters of his tale are rather chivalric idealizations than realistic individuals. “The finest figure of courtesy in *The CT* is the Knight. [...] Chaucer’s Knight is the embodiment of a whole way of life [...]; for it is the first image of the idea of a gentleman, in the language that has given that idea to the world“ (Coghill 26).

The KT is a representative of a high style: the narrator employs rhetorical questions; he comments on the structure of the story and addresses the audience; there are noble animals used as similes, such as a tiger or a lion; there is syntactic parallelism, which is a repetition of identical syntactic structures causing a certain effect on a reader (Cooper 90); etc. Nevertheless, features of a low style can be found as well – for example, a straightforward statement in *The sowe freten the child right in the cradel* (I 2019) – *v kolébce děti, žrané od sviní* (PR 1161), a crow in I 2692, or a cuckoo and a hare (low style animals) in I 1810.

The tale reveals a story of two cousins, Arcite and Palamon, who are imprisoned by Theseus. They see Emelye in the courtyard from their cell in the tower and they both fall in love with her, which causes them to despise each other. After some years, Arcite is released from the prison through the intercession of his friend and then returns to Athens in disguise and enters service in Emelye’s household. Palamon eventually escapes the prison as well. Arcite and Palamon accidentally meet in a grove and they begin to fight. An unexpected arrival of Theseus changes the situation: Theseus sentences them to gather one hundred men and fight a tournament, the winner of which will marry Emelye. Before the tournament, Palamon prays to Venus to make Emelye his wife, Arcite prays to Mars for victory, and Emelye prays to Diana to stay unmarried or, if inevitable, to

marry the one who really loves her. Arcite wins the battle but he subsequently falls off his horse and is fatally wounded. On the deathbed, Arcite tells Emelye to marry Palamon as he would be a good husband. At the end of the tale, Palamon marries Emelye, therefore all prayers are fulfilled. However, the plot itself is not as important as the above-mentioned philosophical perspective: despite the fact that the cousins are basically equal, one of them dies and the second one ends happily married.

4.1.2. Differences Between the Original and the Translation

First, it is important to note that it was necessary to add a category, Category 1/2, since it is sometimes not evident whether a particular occurrence is Category 1 or Category 2. For instance, Vrba does not translate *by my pan* in *Love is a gretter lawe, by my pan, / Than may be yeve to any erthely man* (I 1165-6) – *Ta zákonem je sama od věků / silnějším, než dal člověk člověku* (PR 307-8). The phrase *by my pan* expresses swearing and it is difficult to decide whether he does not understand it or only omits it.

4.1.2.1. Category 1

Category 1, based on Vrba's incomprehension of the original, is more extensive than Category 3 but still significantly smaller than Category 2. Vrba most commonly translates incorrectly individual words or phrases, but sometimes misinterprets a whole sentence: *Kan hem therfore as muche thank as me* (I 1808), meaning "Owes them as much gratitude for this as she owes me", is translated as

o nic než já jim není vděčnější (PR 950). The lack of understanding of individual words can cause minimal damage, for example when *jealous strokes* (I 2634), i.e. “fervent, vigorous strokes“, is translated as *žárlivé rány* (PR 1776), or it can devastate the meaning of a whole sentence: *My lookyng is the fader of pestilence* (I 2469), with the sense “my (astrological) aspect is the cause of pestilence“, results in *a pohledem svým rozpoutávám mor* (PR 1611). Furthermore, there are minor grammatical slips, such as when *som* (I 2119), which denotes singular – “a certain one“ (DiMarco in Benson 837), is translated as plural *někteří* (PR 1261).

4.1.2.2. Category 2

In conformity with the previously mentioned assumptions, the second category of mistakes is the most extensive category. Concerning the subcategory *Additions and deletions*, Vrba sometimes omits phrases or whole lines of the original, such as the line 2060 in *And after was she maad the loode-sterre. / Thus was it peynted; I kan sey yow no ferre. / Hir sone is eek a sterre, as men may see* (I 2059-61) – *načež se stala hvězdou polární. / A její syn se též stal hvězdou s ní, / jak bylo vidět na obraze tom* (PR 1201-3). Furthermore, Vrba adds some words which have no counterpart in the original text: *Whan that this worthy duc, this Theseus, / Hath Creon slayn and wonne Thebes thus* (I 1001-2) – *Když Théseus, tak mocně rozhorlen, / Kreonta zabil a vzal Théby v plen* (PR 143-4). Nevertheless, additions and deletions are not very frequent in *The KT*.

On the other hand, the subcategory *Omission of features characteristic for the original text* is more prominent here. Vrba most frequently ignores the

“Historic Present“, the demonstrative *this* used to draw attention to a character, and syntactic inversions. The employment of the Historic Present is an important – and characteristic – feature of *The KT*. Its functions (to actualise events, to add vividness, to present ideas outside time, to express strong emotions, etc.) are lost because Vrba translates it as the past tense in most cases, even when the present tense of the original is reinforced by *now*: *How greet a sorwe suffreth now Arcite!* (I 1219) – *Jak strašným žalem Arcita byl jat!* (PR 361). However, there are rare passages of the translation in which we can find a mixture of present and preterite, such as I 1673-1682/PR 815-824, or *That al the orient laugheth of the light, / And with his stremes dryeth in the greves* (I 1494-5) – *až celý východ světlem rozesmál, / a jeho žárem rosa v houští schne* (PR 636-7). Furthermore, there is an isolated instance of the past tense in the original and the present in the translation, probably caused by the rhyme: *With eyen rede, and of a man he eet* (I 2048) – *krvavých zraků, mrtvolu an hltá* (PR 1190).

This in front of a proper name, expressing familiarity of the narrator towards a character, is also systematically omitted, although it is sometimes partially compensated by *tady*: *Lo heere this Arcite and this Palamoun* (I 1791) – *Hle, Palamon a tady Arcita* (PR 933). As already mentioned in the section “The Language of Chaucer“, syntax in poetry is usually subordinate to metre and rhyme. In *The KT*, syntactic inversions of the original are rarely reflected in the translation and even when they are, it seems to be only a coincidence created by Vrba’s effort to meet the metre and the rhyme, for example in *Ful many a riche contree hadde he wonne* (I 864) – *Bohatou získal nejednu si zem* (PR 6). The object of the original text is transposed to a frontal position and the subject is

inserted between the auxiliary and the verb; the translation only moves the attribute of the object to a frontal position.

The subcategory *Loose translation* is not very significant in *The KT*. Regarding sentence types, they are generally but not strictly observed. A rhetorical question can be translated as a declarative sentence or vice versa: *And ther he lyveth in joye and in honour / Terme of his lyf; what nedeth wordes mo?* (I 1028-9) – *A v radosti pak žil a ve slávě / celý svůj věk, co dál bych povídal.* (PR 170-1); *What! Verray fool, thynk wel that love is free* (I 1606) – *Což, blázne, lásku kdo kdy upoutal?* (PR 748).

From the point of view of *Semantic shifts*, there are numerous changes and semantic shifts on the level of individual words (or phrases), which is in fact the most widespread type of variation between the original and the translation. For example, expressivity is added in a Czech word *vyšňorit*⁶: *She was arisen and al redy dight*, i.e. prepared (I 1041) – *se vyšňorila před úsvitem dne* (PR 182); or an oxymoron *my sweete foo* (I 2780) is lost in the translation, i.e. is translated as *má láska* (PR 1922). In general, these modifications do not seem to change the meaning of larger units, thus they do not have any devastating impact on the text as a whole.

“Termes“ – a characteristic feature of Chaucer’s vocabulary – do not appear in the Czech text. The lines I 1209-10 illustrate it sufficiently: *This was the forward, pleynty for t’endite, / Bitwixen Theseus and hym Arcite*. The legitimacy of the agreement between Theseus and Arcite is expressed by legal style and words of legal English, *forward* and *hym*, which indicate accuracy and

6

<http://ssjc.ujc.cas.cz/search.php?hledej=Hledat&heslo=vy%C5%A1%C5%88o%C5%99it&sti=E MPTY&where=hesla&hsubstr=no>

effort to avoid misunderstanding (Burnley 24). The corresponding lines of the translation lack elaboration and legality of the original: *Abych řek rovnou: Byla dohoda, / již s knížetem si smluvil vévoda* (PR 351-2). In addition, *s knížetem si smluvil vévoda* gives the impression that the contract is between Theseus and Perotheus, not Arcite. It is difficult to decide whether Vrba was aware of legal and other terms used by Chaucer or not but this type of departure would probably belong to Category 1; it is mentioned here simply because *s knížetem si smluvil vévoda* is an instance of Category 2.

Besides “termes”, a frequently repeated word *allas* is not translated in many cases (I 2362 – PR 1504, I 2390 – PR 1532, etc.) but when it appears in the translation, *běda (mi)* is usually used. This is clearly an example of Category 2 because Vrba obviously knows the meaning, only decides not to translate it. The same strategy is applied to narrator’s comments. The Knight often uses the first person singular to comment on the structure of narration (*as I yow tolde*, I 2097), or the second person plural for addressing the audience (*ye may heere*, I 2296). Both kinds of remarks are commonly omitted in the translation, which causes a loss of awareness of the narrator’s and audience’s presence. On the other hand, it does not interrupt the flow of narration. On the whole, the Czech text is denser and more compact – in the original, there are passages which are written in brackets and seem to be more loosely connected to the rest of the story but the translation does not mirror this: (*For wommen, as to speken in comune, / Thei folwen alle the favour of Fortune*) (I 2681-2) – *vždyť všeobecně platí pro ženy, / že jdou vždy tam, kam přízeň štěstěny* (PR 1823-4); cf. DiMarco in Benson 839.

Mistakes concerning realia in *The KT* are instances of Category 2 since Vrba clearly understands them but works with them differently. First, he sometimes gives preference to an explanatory description rather than using a specific term/name: *Heere in this temple of the goddesse Clemence* (I 928) – *Zde před tím chrámem božstva Slitování* (PR 70); or he uses a semantic equivalent *Now highte I Philostrate, nocht worth a myte*⁷ (I 1558) – *nejsem ted' nic, jsem pouhý Filostrat* (PR 700). Both examples are not regarded as mistakes because no meaning is lost. Second, there are numerous mistakes in the form of ancient names and place names: *Perotheus* (I 1191) is translated as *Peirithous* (PR 333), although the correct Czech form is *Peirithoos* (Svoboda 459); the same applies to *Egeus – Aegeus* (I 2838 – PR 1980) with the correct form *Aigeus* (Svoboda 40), and many others. The meaning is not lost but the forms are incorrect (not codified in Czech), which means that these examples rather belong to Category 3. The third kind of variation is represented by the following line: *And lik a griphon looked he aboute* (I 2133) – *měl pohled jako okřídlený lev* (PR 1275). A griphon (a griffin) is not exactly *okřídlený lev*, but *gryf* (Svoboda 219), a mythological creature which is partially a lion and partially an eagle. As a result, certain parts of the meaning are lost.

4.1.2.3. Category 3

As expected, Category 3 is not very large. Mistakes of this kind usually occur when Vrba either follows the original text too strictly or uses an ungrammatical structure. The latter can be found for instance in *Have ye so greet*

⁷ a myte = a small Flemish coin of little value

envye / Of myn honour, that thus compleyne and crye? (I 907-8) – Či závidíte mi / mé pocty nářkem svým a slzami? (PR 49-50), in which the verb *závidět* is unnaturally connected with the instrumental case; or in *Lord, to whom Fortune hath yiven / Victorie, and as a conqueror to lyven (I 915-6) – Pane, tobě osud dal, / k vítězství abys žil a dobýval (PR 57-8)*, which is probably a result of contamination of verbs *žít* and *být stvořen k*. The overly faithful translation appears in phrases such as *That frothen whit as foom for ire wood (I 1659) – ...až pěnou stříkal hněv (PR 801)*. Category 3 can also manifest itself on the level of vocabulary: *chivalrye (I 2106)* is translated as *rytířování*⁸ (PR 1248), which can be regarded as Vrba's poeticism.

4.1.2.4. Metre and Rhyme

Both the original and the translation are arranged in rhyming couplets. Lines predominantly contain ten syllables but frequently also eleven and occasionally even more syllables (the English text utilises the opportunity of final *-e*). The original uses iambic pentameter relatively regularly (*He rolleth under foot as dooth a bal, I 2614*), although there are numerous lines in which stressed and unstressed syllables are switched or usually an unstressed word is stressed, which is an acceptable deviation from the metrical norm. However, to fit iambic pentameter to the Czech translation is more problematic because many stressed words become unstressed or vice versa, and words with more than two syllables

⁸ No evidence of this expression can be found in the lexicographic sources:

http://ssjc.ujc.cas.cz/search.php?hledej=Hledat&heslo=ryt%C3%AD%C5%99ov%C3%A1n%C3%AD&sti=EMPTY&where=full_text

are assigned two stresses as a result of iambic pentameter. We can find an example right in the second line: *žil vévoda kdys jménem Théseus* (PR 2), where a lexical verb will be unstressed and words *vévoda* and *Théseus* will have two stresses (unusual in Czech) if we apply iambic pentameter regularly. On the other hand, *A s těmi slovy zazněl šípů chřest* (PR 1500) is an instance of perfect iambic pentameter.

Frequently discussed alliteration of the tournament scene (I 2601-16) is not considerably reflected in the translation. Only two lines contain noticeable alliteration: *Pod prudkou ranou praskla přílbice* (PR 1751) and *Povedla / se prudká rána; sok spad ze sedla* (PR 1757-8). The tournament scene is also characteristic of parallel structures, which Vrba more or less preserves. Furthermore, highly predictable rhymes are a typical feature of romances (Burnley 129). In *The KT*, words *wille* and *fille/fulfille* rhyme with each other for several times but they are always translated differently and they do not usually appear in the rhyme: for example, *With long swerd and with mace fighteth youre fille. / Gooth now youre wey; this is the lordes wille* (I 2559-60) – *Mlatem a mečem běžte potýkat se! / A ted' svou cestou! Tak si přeje vládce!* (PR 1701-2); or *For Goddes sake, to letten of his wille, / Ther as a beest may al his lust fulfille* (I 1317-18) – *a v bázni boží rvát se s touhami, / jež každé zvíře ukojiti smí* (PR 459-60).

4.1.2.5. Conclusion

Through force of circumstances, it was necessary to add a new category in the analysis, Category 1/2, because it is sometimes not obvious whether a particular occurrence is Category 1 or Category 2. In general, Vrba's *Povídka*

rytířova is a very good translation. The majority of mistakes are subtle semantic changes, which naturally occur as a result of necessity to conform to the metre and rhyme. Vrba seems to understand the text very well, which is also proved by the limited size of Category 1 – it is approximately ten times smaller than Category 2. Category 3 is even more limited: it is about half the size of Category 1. The most prominent subcategories of Category 2 are *Semantic shifts* (for example, expressivity is added to a neutral word), and *Omission of features characteristic for the original text* (most frequently the “Historic Present“, the demonstrative *this*, and syntactic inversions). “Termes“ are also omitted, but they are most probably instances of Category 1. Larger units are influenced only occasionally. Concerning the metre, the original uses iambic pentameter quite regularly, but the Czech translation is less regular.

4.2. *The Miller's Tale*

4.2.1. Summary and Plot

No certain date of origin of *The MT* is known and no direct source for the story is acknowledged, although Cooper suggests a Flemish fabliau called the *Dits van Heilen van Beersele* (96). “Its [the tale’s] three principal motifs – the man who is made to fear a prophesied second flood, the misdirected kiss, and the branding with a hot iron – are widely distributed in medieval and modern anecdotes, occurring both individually and in combination“ (Benson 842). Chaucer may have found an inspiration in a French fabliau or through an oral

form. *The MT* is often termed a “cherles tale“ – a story told by a churl (i.e. Robin the Miller) in a churlish style. It is a fabliau, which is “a brief comic tale in verse, usually scurrilous and often scatological or obscene“ (Benson 7), and it “is set in the contemporary everyday world, not the far away and long ago; its characters are bourgeois, peasants, or clerks, not aristocrats [...]“ (Cooper 95). The local setting manifests itself for instance in the moment when an old superstitious carpenter, living in Osney, invokes a local Osney saint, St. Frideswide (I 3449), who does not appear anywhere else in *The CT* (Coghill 55); or in the use of St. Neot (I 3771), St. Thomas of Kent (I 3291, 3425, 3461), or in other details from contemporary Oxford.

Fabliaux further deal with common human functions or activities, such as sex or excretion, which are – together with the whole characteristic of fabliaux – in a direct contrast to idealized love of romance and romances in general. In fact, fabliaux often parody the courtly literature, especially in an ironic use of the language of elegant love (Benson 843). In fabliaux, there is rather an animal copulation than a love-making. A love-triangle is a frequent topic and cunning is perceived as a desirable quality (Cooper 95) which is usually used against old husbands trying to guard their unfaithful young wives. The story of fabliaux tends to be simple, straightforward and with only one plot. Nevertheless, Chaucer does not follow this tendency and he employs a more complicated structure.

The style of *The MT* is a mixture of both styles but a low style prevails (Horobin 141). There are no narrator’s comments concerning the composition of the story and only one rhetorical question in I 3747-9; the syntax is simple with little subordination and a large amount of direct speech, which causes a swift

narrative pace, and the vocabulary includes many Germanic words. There are basic words for basic concepts, such as *ers*, *swyve* (“to copulate with”), and *fart*. No noble animals or plants appear as similes but rather low ones – *lycorys* (I 3207), or *calf* (I 3260). Switching between the present and past tense marks colloquial speech (Horobin 8) and the themes of *The MT* are also low. On the other hand, there are euphemisms typical for a high style: *nether ye* (a euphemism for a bottom), or *queynte*, which is a pun for “cunt” (Horobin 141).

To summarise the plot, *The MT* is a story of a carpenter named John who lives in Oxford with his beautiful and much younger wife, Alison. John rents a room to a poor student, Nicholas. When John is away, Nicholas convinces Alison to have sex with him. Absolon, a local parish clerk, also tries to win Alison’s sexual favours but she rejects him. Nicholas wishes to spend a whole night with her, thus he convinces John that God is about to send a great flood and that they could save themselves by hanging three large tubs from the ceiling and hiding in them. When the water rises, they would cut the ropes and float away. John believes him, climbs into his tub and Nicholas and Alison secretly spend the night together. In the meantime, Absolon appears in front of a window and asks Alison for a kiss. In the darkness, she sticks her bottom out of the window and Absolon kisses her there. Absolon leaves enraged and borrows a piece of red-hot iron from a blacksmith. As he returns, he asks for another kiss, intending to burn Alison. This time Nicholas presents his own backside and Absolon burns him. Nicholas cries for water; his screaming awakens John who thinks that the Second Flood has come and cuts off his tub, falling to the floor and breaking his arm.

4.2.2. Differences Between the Original and the Translation

4.2.2.1. Category 1

The core of Category 1 consists of two problems: “termes” and the word *sely*. The passage describing Nicholas’ knowledge of astrology (I 3193-8) contains technical terms, such as *conclusiouns*, *interrogaciouns*, and *houres* (astrological hours), but the translation (PM 85-90) does not reflect it – the passage is in fact quite loosely translated⁹. Furthermore, the Miller uses a legal term *protestacioun* in his Prologue, trying to prove in formal (legal) manner that he is not responsible for what he says (Horobin 90). However, it is not mirrored in the translation: *But first I make a protestacioun* (I 3137) – *Však říkám napřed na námitky něčí* (PM 29).

The second difficulty, the word *sely*, extends over the whole tale. *Sely* is typically associated with the carpenter but its sense has changed in the course of time. The present-day meaning is *hloupý* or *pošetilý* but the sense of Chaucer’s time is “innocent, simple, hapless“ (there are also other meanings, cf. Gray in Benson 846). In most cases, Vrba translates *sely* in the modern sense, which means as *tupý* (I 3404 – PM 296), *bláhový* (I 3423 – PM 315), *hlupák* (I 3509 – PM 401), *hloupý* (I 3601 – PM 493), or *nekňuba* (I 3614 – PM 506). On the other hand, he once translates it as *chudák* (I 3744 – PM 636), which corresponds with the meaning “hapless“, but it seems to be rather a coincidence. We can occasionally find isolated instances of Vrba’s incomprehension of the original, for example in *And doun gooth al; he foond neither to selle, / Ne breed ne ale, til he cam to the celle* (I 3821-22) – *A bum! A slít! Chléb s pivem lítly spolu, / až na*

⁹ The passage is cited in the Appendix.

práh dopad se vším všudy dolů (PM 713-14). The meaning of Chaucer's sentence is "He did not stop to sell bread or ale on the way", i.e. he wasted no time; Vrba's translation is too literal.

4.2.2.2. Category 2

Equally as in *The KT*, Category 2 is the largest category. Numerous facts are shared with the analysis of *The KT*. Syntactic inversion, although slightly less frequent in *The MT* than in *The KT*, is also not reflected in the translation: *A chambre hadde he in that hostelrye* (I 3203) – *V tom domě bydlel v malém pokojíku* (PM 95). As well as in *The KT*, the subcategory *Loose translation* manifests itself mainly on a syntactic level – the only rhetorical question of the original is translated as an exclamation: *Who rubbeth now, who froteth now his lippes / With dust, with sond, with straw, woth clooth, with chippes* (I 3747-8) – *Jak si ted' prachem, pískem drh, dřel pysky, / jak slámu bral a látku, ba i třísky* (PM 639-40). On the other hand, Vrba adds rhetorical questions which are not in the original text: *I wol bileve wel that I am noon* (I 3162) – *věřím, že nejsem; proč se trápit, nač?* (PM 54). *The MT* contains a large amount of direct speech which is, in some cases, translated as the narrator's speech, for example in: *And swoor, "By armes, and by blood and bones"* (I 3125) – *a při krvi a kostech Páně klel* (PM 17).

The same as in *The KT*'s analysis applies to *Omission of features characteristic for the original text* in *The MT*, i.e. primarily to the employment of the Historic Present and the demonstrative *this* in front of a proper name, which means that they are predominantly not translated, although both features are less

widespread in *The MT*. The immediacy and comic effect expressed by the Historic Present are then suppressed: *This sely carpenter bigynneth quake* (I 3614) – *Ten nekňuba se všecek rozklepal* (PM 506). However, *this* is sometimes translated as *náš* (in contrast to *The KT*): *This Absolon, that jolif was and gay* (I 3339) – *Náš Absolón, ten mladík zářící* (PM 231).

Allas is again a very common word in *The MT* but it is not often translated. If it is translated, *ach* is usually used (I 3488 – PM 381, I 3714 – PM 606, etc.); cf. *běda* in *The KT*. In general, the lexicon of *The MT* is characteristic of colloquial and expressive words, both in the original and the Czech text, such as informal *to gabbe* (“to talk nonsense, or indiscreetly“, Horobin 140) and expressive *klábosení* (I 3510 – PM 402), or formulaic/ironic *poure scoler* (cf. Gray in Benson 843) compared to *student* (I 3190 – PM 82). However, English colloquial expressions are not always translated as Czech colloquialisms and vice versa, which means that there are sometimes colloquial words in the translation which have no source in the original text. For instance, the colloquialism *študium* in: *Was turned for to lerne astrologye* (I 3192) – *spíš ku astrologickým študiům* (PM 84). Nevertheless, Vrba’s effort to preserve the overall informal nature of the vocabulary is undeniable.

Furthermore, the local setting as a feature of low style is only partially maintained in place names and names of saints – some of them are simply omitted, as in *Whil that hir housbonde was at Oseneye* (I 3274) – *když její manžel odjel na den pryč* (PM 166). Vrba probably believed that *Osney* is not known by Czech readers. He assimilates the names of the characters and saints whenever it is possible: *Alison* – *Alena*, *John* – *Jan*, *Nicholas* – *Mikuláš*, *Seint Thomas of Kent*

(I 3291) – *svatý Tomáš* (PM 183); but he sometimes keeps the original form because of the lack of equivalents in Czech: *Seinte Frydeswyde* (I 3449) – *svatá Frideswida* (PM 340).

There are naturally numerous minor semantic changes on the level of individual words, which are unavoidable because of the limited range of choices (limits are given by metre, rhyme, style, etc.) but they do not affect the text in general. For example, *harlotrye* (glossed as “ribaldry“) is not the same as *lumpárny*¹⁰: *Lat be thy lewed dronken harlotrye* (I 3145) – *Těch lumpáren tvých opilých je dost* (PM 37); the difference does not seem to be important. On the other hand, words such as *hende*, *deerne love*, or *joly* are more significant since they are characteristic for *The MT*. The word *hende*, which originally meant “gentle, polite, courteous“, underwent a semantic change and the meaning shifted to “knowing“ in the sense of “skill and knowledge of the external forms of courtliness“ (Burnley 139). It can also be seen as polysemous with the appropriate meaning determined by genre. In the original text, it is used as a fixed epithet for Nicholas but it is not translated in the majority of the cases. If it appears in the Czech text, *chytrý* (PM 91) or *milý* (PM 293) are used. *Deerne love* is also not translated, only once as *láska* (PM 170). *Joly*, associated with Absolon, is frequently omitted as well; however, we can find, for instance, *čacký* (I 3348 – PM 240). Love terms are usually translated very loosely: *sweete leef* (I 3792) – *růžička* (PM 684); and sometimes even omitted. Moreover, although Vrba removes a malapropism *Nowelis flood*¹¹ (I 3818 – PM 710), he preserves the

¹⁰

http://ssjc.ujc.cas.cz/search.php?heslo=lump%C3%A1rna&sti=34727&where=full_text&hsubstr=no

¹¹ Cf. Horobin 130.

malapropism *astromye*¹² which he translates as *hvězdoprava* (PM 343) – the correct form is *hvězdopravectví*¹³: *This man is falle, with his astromye* (I 3451) – *Ten mladík strnul při své hvězdopravě* (PM 343).

Chaucer's text uses the opportunity to differentiate between the second person singular *thou* and the plural form *ye*. Although Vrba has the same opportunity in Czech, he does not employ it. The Czech polite form of address is used only once in *The Miller's Prologue: Now telleth ye, sir Monk, if that ye konne, / Somwhat to quite with the Knyghtes tale* (I 3118-9) – *Vy, pane mnichu, vyprávějte dál / a stejnou mincí zkuste zaplatiti!* (PM 10-11). In the tale itself, no *ye* is translated as the Czech polite form of address (for example, I 3287 – PM 179, I 3701 – PM 593, I 3768-71 – PM 660-3). As a consequence, functions expressed by *ye* are lost, such as the ridiculousness of Absolon when he tries to behave as a courtly lover and thus uses *ye* in his courtly speech¹⁴ to address Alison: *What do ye, honey-comb, sweete Alisoun* (I 3698) – *Co děláš, ty má sladká, medová?* (PM 590).

4.2.2.3. Category 3

Category 3 is very small and consists of a few examples, mostly of morphological character. For instance, *cetewale* is translated as *valerián* (I 3207 – PM 99), but the correct form is of feminine gender, i.e. *valeriána*¹⁵. Moreover, Vrba makes some mistakes in prepositions: *Z pasu jí visel pěkný míšek z kůže* (PM

¹² Cf. Burnley 144; Gray in Benson 846.

¹³

http://ssjc.ujc.cas.cz/search.php?heslo=hv%C4%9Bzdopravectv%C3%AD&sti=20699&where=full_text&hsubstr=no

¹⁴ Cf. Horobin 102.

¹⁵ http://ssjc.ujc.cas.cz/search.php?heslo=valeri%C3%A1n&sti=101851&where=full_text

142) – *u pasu* would be definitely more natural in Czech; *A z chladné strany popad za ocel* (PM 677) – the preposition *za* is superfluous since the valency of the verb *popadnout* is “popadnout něco (za něco)” and *ocel* is a direct object in this case.

4.2.2.4. Metre and Rhyme

Concerning the metre and the rhyme, the same as in *The KT*'s analysis applies to *The MT*. The original text seems to be more regular in using the iambic pentameter and both are also arranged in rhyming couplets. There are no highly predictable rhymes or alliteration as in *The KT* but we can find here what Cooper calls “the exploitation of incongruity” (107) – two words which are in a stark contrast to each other appear in the rhyming couplet together, such as *kisse* and *pisse* in I 3797-8. This feature is lost in translation since Vrba translates it as *dáš – Mikuláš* (PM 689-90). Theoretically, it could be perceived as an instance of Category 1.

4.2.2.5. Links Between *The KT* and *The MT*

Finally, there is a line of *The MT* identical with a line in *The KT* but they are translated differently. It is rather impossible to decide, whether Vrba knew it or not:

The KT: Now with his love, now in his colde grave / Allone, withouten any compaignye (I 2778-9) – *Dnes vřelý cit a zítra hrob a chlad, / kde společníci je nám jenom tma* (PR 1920-1).

The MT: A chambre hadde he in that hostelrye / Allone, withouten any compaignye (I 3203-4) – V tom domě bydlel v malém pokojíku / sám pro sebe a neměl společníků (PM 95-6).

4.2.2.6. Conclusion

The analysis of *The MT* is very similar to that of *The KT*. Category 2 is the largest category – it is approximately twelve times larger than Category 1, which is represented here mainly by “termes” and the word *sely*. “Termes“ are not usually reflected in the translation and the word *sely* is translated in its modern sense. Category 1/2 contains two instances of minor significance. Category 3 is only third the size of Category 1 and contains a few examples mostly of morphological character. The most noticeable subcategories of Category 2 are *Semantic shifts* and *Omission of features characteristic for the original text*. The overall informal nature of the vocabulary of *The MT* is well preserved in the translation. Unlike Chaucer, Vrba does not seize the opportunity to differentiate between the second person singular and the plural form, and usually uses the second person singular. The analysis of metre and rhyme is essentially identical with the analysis of metre and rhyme in *The KT*.

4.3. *The Wife of Bath's Tale*

4.3.1. Summary and Plot

Alison of Bath is one of the most noticeable figures of *The CT*: “[...] the most strikingly described character in the *Prologue* is that of The Wife of Bath“ (Coghill 51). She is a complicated person who often contradicts herself (she explains these contradictions by horoscopy – III 609-13). For instance, she speaks highly of virginity (“Virginitee is greet perfeccion” – III 105) but she condemns celibacy. The Wife of Bath is a central character of what Coghill calls “the Great Sex War of *The CT*”, in which the major question is “Who is to have the mastery in marriage, husband, or wife?“ (44). She believes that women should have sovereignty over men, and especially her *Prologue* is supposed to advise women how to do that. Fragment III, beginning with *The WBT*, is considered to be a starting point for a “Marriage Group“: *The WBT* provokes other pilgrims’ responses – one of them is also *The NPT*.

The date of origin of *The Wife of Bath's Prologue (WBP)* is not certain but it is estimated at the early to mid-1390s, i.e. before 1395-96 (Benson 864). *The WBT* was probably written at the same time. However, most scholars claim that the tale which is now *The Shipman's Tale* is the original *WBT* – they believe so because her current tale is stylistically too different from *The WBP*, although they match from the point of view of subject matter and Alison's opinions concerning marriage and female dominance (Cooper 139). The most distinct sources of Alison's quotations in *The WBP* are St. Jerome's *Epistola adversus Jovinianum*, other “celibate“ writings and antifeminist literature (Coghill 43). The personality of the Wife of Bath is predominantly derived from *La Vieille* and secondarily

from Le Jaloux, characters of the *Roman de la Rose*. A direct source for *The WBT* is not known but the final theme – “the disenchantment [...] connected with the theme of sovereignty“ – comes probably from Ireland, Middle English romances, or Gower’s *Confessio Amantis* (Benson 872).

The WBP is a mixture of different genres: it resembles a literary confession (Benson 11); it is partially a fabliau (Benson 7) and a mock sermon (Benson 865). *The WBT* is usually classified as a romance but Cooper mentions that it can also be described as a folktale, or even a fairy-tale (156). The style of *The WBP* is very personal, assertive, colloquial, and full of first-person pronouns, digressions, questions and addressing the audience. The colloquiality can be identified, for example, in the dropping of *ne* particle in negatives (III 20), in the usage of expressions such as *lo, fy*, or *A ha!* (Horobin 141), or in curses – “Jhesu shorte thy lyf” (III 365). On the other hand, there are elevated parts in which we can find learned terms, polysyllabic words of French origin, rhetorical questions and euphemisms: *quoniam, bele chose, nether purs, harneys, sely instrument, or thynges smale* (Horobin *ibid.*). The style of *The WBT* is less conversational; particularly when a loathly lady, one of the main characters, speaks about *gentillesse*, the style is high with a more complex rhetoric.

Concerning the plot, *The WBT* is a story of a Knight from King Arthur’s times who rapes a young woman. The Knight is sentenced to death by King Arthur but the Queen asks her husband to allow her to pass judgment upon the Knight. The Queen tells the Knight he will be spared his life if he can discover what women most desire and gives him a year and a day to return with an answer. Everywhere the knight goes, he asks women’s opinion, but he receives many

different answers: fame, wealth, clothes, sexual pleasure, flattery, or freedom. When the time comes to return to the Court, he still lacks the answer. In the woods, he sees twenty four maidens dancing and singing but when he approaches, they disappear and there can be found only an old hag. The Knight explains the problem to her. She promises to give him the answer if he grants any favour she might ask of him in return and the Knight agrees. When they arrive at the court, he replies to the Queen that women most desire to rule their husbands, which is unanimously agreed to be true by the present ladies. The Knight is free but the old hag publicly requests a marriage with him as a reward and he eventually agrees. On their wedding night, the Knight is repulsed by her, thus she reminds him that her looks can also be an advantage. She asks him what he would prefer – an old ugly hag who is loyal, true and humble, or a beautiful and potentially unfaithful wife. The Knight says that the choice is hers: when she has won power over him, she asks him to kiss her and promises beauty and fidelity. The Knight is astonished to find that the old hag has turned into a lovely young woman.

4.3.2. Differences Between the Original and the Translation

4.3.2.1. Category 1

On the level of individual categories, the analysis of *The WBP* and *The WBT* is quantitatively very similar to the analyses of *The KT* and *The MT*, which means that Category 1 and Category 3 are in noticeable minority in proportion to Category 2. Category 1 and Category 3 contain only several examples, which is in a direct contrast with dozens of instances of Category 2. Within Category 1, Vrba

usually misinterprets individual words, such as in *Thus seistow, olde barel-ful of lyes* (III 302) – *to pořád meleš, starý sude lží!* (PŽB 308). The word *lyes* means “lees (dregs)“, i.e. a sediment of wine, not “lies“ – the similarity of form evidently caused a misinterpretation. In other cases, Vrba fails to notice a figurative meaning: *But yet I hadde alwey a coltes tooth* (III 602) – *hřiběcí chrup jsem si však podržela* (PŽB 608). *Coltes tooth* is glossed as “youthful tastes, desires“. To be accurate, Vrba is aware of its figurative meaning because he describes *hřiběcí chrup* as a sign of lecherousness (Chaucer 410), but “lecherousness“ and “youthful tastes, desires“ do not mean absolutely the same. Furthermore, Vrba sometimes translates a word in its modern sense and overlooks older senses: *Al were it that myne auncestres were rude* (III 1172) – *Třebaže hrubí byli snad mí předci* (PŽB 1178). The meaning of *rude* in this sentence is “humble“ but the Czech word *hrubý* does not denote the meaning “prostý, obyčejný“¹⁶.

4.3.2.2. Category 1/2

Category 1/2 incorporates instances such as *Thou liknest it also to wilde fyr* (III 373) – *anebo také k výhni rozpoutané* (PŽB 379). *Wilde fyr* is glossed as “Greek fire, an inflammable mixture, used in warfare“. In Czech, the term “řecký oheň“ is used (Svoboda 532) – Vrba probably understands the expression and decides to translate it loosely but we cannot be certain. The same observations apply for example to *Who peyntede the leon, tel me who?*¹⁷ (III 692) – *Kdo namaloval čerta na stěně?* (PŽB 698). Nevertheless, Vrba’s solution causes a change of meaning. The original text comments on the fact that a perspective is

¹⁶ http://ssjc.ujc.cas.cz/search.php?heslo=hrub%C3%BD&sti=20193&where=full_text

¹⁷ See Hilary in Benson 871.

in its nature subjective; the translation evokes a meaning “strašit, přivolávat neštěstí“.

4.3.2.3. Category 2

Category 2 is, as already mentioned, distinctively larger than other categories (even larger than Categories 1, 1/2 and 3 combined). Several tendencies which are present in *The KT* and *The MT* can also be found in *The WBP* and *The WBT*, such as no employment of the Historic Present in the translation: *The queene thanketh the kyng with al hir myght* (III 899) – *Dík vzdala králi horoucími slovy* (PŽB 905); no reflection of syntactic inversions: *Deceite, wepyng, spynnyng God hath yive / To wommen kyndely, whil that they may lyve* (III 401-2) – *pro celý život Bůh nám štědře vdych / slzy a lest a chutě do pletich* (PŽB 407-8); the analysis of metre and rhyme is basically identical; etc. However, these features do not play an important role in the analysis of *The WBP* and *The WBT* since there are more frequent features which are characteristic of *The WBP* and *The WBT* and are rather secondary in *The KT* and *The MT*. These are various *Additions and deletions*, and especially *Loose translation* – both subcategories constitute a significant component of Category 2.

Deletions include individual words and expressions as well as larger units, such as whole lines and sentences. The words and phrases which are commonly omitted are the following: a) the Wife of Bath's swearing (interjections *benedicitee, pardee, by my fey, by my trouthe*), for example *What rowne ye with oure mayde? Benedicite!* (III 241) – *Co s děvečkou sis tuhle šuškal asi?* (PŽB 247); b) invoking of God: *And so I dide ful often, God it woot, / That made his*

face often reed and hoot (III 539-40) – *To často šlo tak daleko, že pán by / se málem zalkl pod přívalem hanby* (PŽB 545-6); c) reporting clauses (especially *quod she*), for instance “*Bifore the court thanne preye I thee, sir knyght,*“ / *Quod she, “that thou me take unto thy wyf* (III 1054-5) – *Rytíři, žádám, celý soud to slyší, / aby sis vzal mě hnedka za svou choť* (PŽB 1060-1). Whole lines are not omitted in the sense that they would simply be missing (contrary to the omission of individual words) – any line deletion is always accompanied by an addition, which means that there is rather a substitution (i.e. the number of lines does not change). However, these substitutions do not usually disrupt the meaning of the translation, as can be observed in “*Thou standest yet,*“ *quod she, “in swich array / That of thy lyf yet hastow no suretee*“ (III 902-3) – *Napořád ještě v sázce je tvůj vaz / a napůl mrtev, napůl živ jsi ted’* (PŽB 908-9). The meaning of the two original lines is expressed by the line 908 in PŽB; the line 909 is additional and it says basically the same once again.

The subcategory *Loose translation* is very noticeable in this analysis – the previous analyses contain only an insignificant amount of occurrences. It is logical that *Loose translation* manifests itself on a higher than a lexical level of analysis, which implies that it is not a matter of individual words and phrases but rather whole lines and sentences. In the majority of the cases, the meaning of the original is preserved, thus nothing is in fact lost. Numerous examples include *Thus shulde ye speke and bere hem wrong on honde* (III 226) – *Co chcete dostat, vynuťte si směle* (PŽB 232); or *I ne owe hem nat a word that it nys quit* (III 425) – *že chytrá žena muži zrak vždy vytře!* (PŽB 431). It is sometimes complicated to decide whether a particular instance belongs to the subcategory *Additions and*

deletions, or *Loose translation*: *That feele I on my ribbes al by rewe, / And evere shal unto myn endyng day* (III 506-7) – *Ubohý hřbet můj, tak byl často ztýrán, / že modřiny mi sotva mizely* (PŽB 512-3). Loose translations related to the semantic content go hand in hand with syntactically loose translations, which means that sentence types are not observed as carefully as in the previous tales: *What helpith it of me to enquere or spyen?* (III 316) – *Však uvidíš! A nepomůže ani / tvé hlídání a tvoje špehování!* (PŽB 321-2); or *But what! He may nat do al as hym liketh.* (III 914) – *Ale co dělat? Což měl na vybranou?* (PŽB 920).

Regarding the vocabulary of *The WBT*, there naturally appear various semantic shifts in the meaning of individual words but they are not considered significant unless there is a recurring tendency. Vrba tends to translate neutral English expressions as colloquial or expressive, which is an attempt to compensate for the Wife of Bath's personal and conversational style, and which results in an overall informal vocabulary of *The WBT* and especially *The WBP*. However, it applies also vice versa – English colloquial expressions are sometimes translated as neutral Czech words; a relevant factor is the overall character of the vocabulary. To illustrate, neutral words and their expressive counterparts are underlined: *Now wherwith sholde he make his paiement, / If he ne used his sely instrument?* (III 131-2) – *A čím by dluh byl jinak zaplacen, / ten požehnaný nemít inštrument?*¹⁸ (PŽB 137-8); *Thanne seistow that it is a tormentrie* (III 251) – *to zase řňukal*¹⁹ *bys jí za zády* (PŽB 257). In some cases, the original and the translation match in expressivity: the infantile *ba*²⁰ is

¹⁸ <http://ssjc.ujc.cas.cz/search.php?heslo=instrument&sti=22584&where=hesla>

¹⁹ <http://ssjc.ujc.cas.cz/search.php?heslo=f%C5%88ukat&sti=15895&where=hesla>

²⁰ Cf. Hilary in Benson 869.

translated as *pusa* in *Com neer, my spouse, lat me ba thy cheke!* (III 433) – *pojď, mužíčku můj, pojď, a dám ti pusu*²¹! (PŽB 439).

“Termes“ are not so noticeable as in the previous analyses and it does not seem that Vrba focuses on them. The well-known *bele chose* is translated rather loosely but the meaning is essentially preserved: *For if I wolde selle my bele chose* (III 447) – *Být jedna z těch, co krásu prodat běží* (PŽB 453); *Whan that he wolde han my bele chose* (III 510) – *kdykoli toužil dostat moji čičku*²² (PŽB 516). The term *quoniam* is left in the original form but the meaning is clear and easily deducible from the context: *And trewely, as myne housbondes tolde me, / I hadde the beste quoniam myghte be* (III 607-8) – *a všichni muži říkali, že mám / jak z hedvábí tu svoji quoniam* (PŽB 613-4).

Realia are usually translated without difficulties, although sometimes omitted, as in *But if I telle tales two or thre / Of freres er I come to Sidynborne* (III 846-7) – *když nepovím vám cestou o fráterech / dvě či tři historky...* (PŽB 852-3), and sometimes misspelled (cf. Category 3). Furthermore, Vrba translates names of characters (*Alisoun – Alenka, Jankyn – Jeník*), which brings us to characters' interaction and forms of address. Chaucer skilfully employs the polite form of address when necessary and switches between *thou* and *ye* are quite common. Nevertheless, Vrba does not often translate them with the corresponding Czech forms, although Czech commonly uses a T–V distinction. In general, Vrba ignores these switches and uses the second person singular form in almost every case, for example *Tel me what that ye seken, by youre fey!* (III 1002) – *Řekni mi*

²¹ <http://ssjc.ujc.cas.cz/search.php?heslo=pusa&sti=73527&where=hesla>

²² *Čička* is an expressive, diminutive word for *a cat*:

http://ssjc.ujc.cas.cz/search.php?hledej=Hledat&heslo=%C4%8Di%C4%8Dka&sti=EMPTY&where=full_text&hsubstr=no

ale pravdu, co tu chceš (PŽB 1008). The translation sometimes matches the original as in *Do, dame, telle forth youre tale, and that is best* (III 853) – *Nu, dámo, mluvte, tak se nejlíp stane* (PŽB 859). Occasionally, there is the polite form of address in the translation but the second person singular form in the original: *Nay, thou shalt drynken of another tonne* (III 170) – *Z jiného ještě ochutnáte sudu* (PŽB 176).

4.3.2.4. Category 3

Category 3 includes a few occurrences – most of them are related to realia and their correct spelling in Czech. For example, the correct form is *Déianeira* (Svoboda 134), not *Dejanira: Of Hercules and his Dianyre* (III 725) – *jak Herkules pro Dejaniru, ženu* (PŽB 731). Furthermore, in *For which he often tymes wolde preche, / And me of olde Romayn geestes teche* (III 641-2) – *Kázal mi proto, četl v jednom karé / z jedné své knihy římské bajky staré* (PŽB 647-8), the word *karé* has no direct source in the original text, thus it is partially an addition (Category 2) but it does not fit to the translation either, i.e. it does not fit to Czech as used in this sentence. None of its meanings²³ makes sense here. The meaning “úprkem, honem“ could be perhaps acceptable but it seems to be primarily connected with verbs of motion.

4.3.2.5. Conclusion

To conclude, the analysis of *The WBP* and *The WBT* is quantitatively very similar to the analyses of *The KT* and *The MT* on the level of individual

²³ http://ssjc.ujc.cas.cz/search.php?hledej=Hledat&heslo=kar%C3%A9&sti=EMPTY&where=full_text

categories, i.e. Category 1 and Category 3 are in noticeable minority in comparison to Category 2 (the same applies to Category 1/2). Within Category 1, Vrba usually misinterprets individual words. Concerning Category 2, several features of the previous analyses can be also found in *The WBP* and *The WBT*, such as no employment of the Historic Present or no reflection of syntactic inversions in the translation. However, these tendencies are not primary in this analysis. The most noticeable fact is that *The WBT* differs from *The KT* and *The MT* in the extent of subcategories *Additions and deletions* and especially *Loose translation* since they constitute a significant component of the whole analysis. The subcategory *Loose translation* manifests itself not only on a semantic level but also on a syntactic level, which means that sentence types are not observed as carefully as in the previous tales. The majority of occurrences in Category 3 is related to realia and their correct spelling in Czech. The analysis of metre and rhyme does not differ from the analyses of *The KT* and *The MT*.

4.4. *The Nun's Priest's Tale*

4.4.1. Summary and Plot

The NPT was written late in comparison to other tales discussed in this work (probably as one of the latest of *The CT*) – that can be assumed because there are many shared themes and allusions to other stories (Cooper 340). No exact date is known, although there are various theories. It is possible to find a reference to the Peasants' Revolt of 1381 in the text (Benson 935) but several

years clearly passed after that event since Chaucer was able to joke about it. The story of *The NPT* is inspired by the fable “Del cok e del gupil“ by Marie de France, by the corresponding episode by Pierre de Saint Cloud in Branch II of the *Roman de Renart*, and perhaps by the corresponding episode in Branch VI of *Renart le Contrefait* (Benson 936). Furthermore, Cooper suggests the encyclopaedic handbook for preachers *Summa praedicatorum* by John Bromyard as one of the sources for the plot, and Robert Holcot as a source of knowledge for the main theme of *The NPT*, i.e. dreams (344). Allusions to the *Poetria nova* (a rhetorical textbook) of Geoffrey of Vinsauf appear in the tale as a parody (Cooper 22). There are also very numerous quotations of the Bible and significant authorities, for example Cato.

The NPT is a beast-fable, characteristic of an exemplary relationship between animals and humans, and containing a moral. The beast-fable was an ambivalent genre of the Middle Ages: its simplicity allowed to express an elementary instruction but it could also include sophisticated rhetoric (Cooper 341). At the same time, it is a mock-heroic tragedy (Cooper *ibid.*; Benson 18) – lamentations of hens resemble moaning of women in tragedies, a philosophical debate about the meaning of dreams is belittled by laxatives, a cock and a hen, i.e. low animals, address each other *you* as courtly lovers, the cock is compared to a noble lion (VII 3179), etc. Furthermore, the mixture of romance and tragedy is reflected in a reversal of Fortune at the moment of the fox’s triumph. Two main themes – a punishment of pride, which is typical for an exemplum or a fable, and a deceived trickster, frequently appearing in beast-fables – constitute only a conventional framework since the story itself occupies approximately 60 lines

but the topic concerning dreams extends over 280 lines (Čermák 234)²⁴. The latter part contains exempla, anecdotes, literary allusions and various moralities; it is perceived as a parody of the excesses of rhetoric and the cock is usually interpreted as a preacher.

The combination of different styles and themes in *The NPT* mirrors the overall heterogeneity of *The CT*; Cooper even calls it “*The CT* in miniature” (352). We can find here a plain unelaborated style in an exemplum in VII 3064-3109 which is based on a simple, predominantly co-ordinate syntax and which is preceded by *Heere may men seen that dremes been to drede* (VII 3063), the phrasing used by preachers (Burnley 98). On the other hand, there are many features of the high style: apostrophes (*O destinee, O Venus, O woful hennes*), rhetorical questions (VII 3346), parallel syntax (VII 3339-40), etc.

The main character of *The NPT* is a rooster named Chauntecleer, who lives in a yard of a poor widow with seven hens, his paramours. One morning, Chauntecleer has a bad dream about a creature which tries to seize him and murder him. Pertelote, Chauntecleer’s beloved hen, mocks him, telling him that he is a coward. She then argues that dreams are meaningless visions, caused simply by indigestion. Chauntecleer disagrees and tells Pertelote stories which illustrate his perspective that we should beware of dreams. However, he eventually forgets his dream and stops talking about the prophecy. After some time, a fox breaks through the hedges into the yard. Chauntecleer notices the fox and wants to flee but the fox claims to be his friend. The fox also says that he has known Chauntecleer’s father, who had an excellent singing voice and always

²⁴ For further reading concerning the motif of dreams in the Middle Ages see “Osvobozený sen pozdního středověku: případ opeřeného spáče” by Jan Čermák.

stretched his neck and stood on his tiptoes before singing. The fox then asks whether Chauntecleer could sing like his father and Chauntecleer stands on his tiptoes, stretches his neck, closes his eyes, and begins to sing. The fox immediately grasps him by the throat and runs to the wood with him. The widow, her two daughters and many others, hearing the cry of the hens, run after the fox. Chauntecleer manages to speak to the fox and encourages him to proudly tell his pursuers that he is going to eat his victim. As the fox opens his mouth to agree, the rooster flies away. The fox tries to capture him again but Chauntecleer is now more careful. At the end, both the fox and the cock draw their own lesson (keeping one's mouth shut or one's eyes open), which shows that moral readings can be subjective.

4.4.2. Differences Between the Original and the Translation

With respect to the fact that *The NPT* is considerably shorter than *The KT*, *The MT* and *The WBP/The WBT*, it is more complicated to detect any tendencies characteristic of *The NPT*. There can be found the same features as in the previous analyses, which are obviously typical for Vrba's translation in general, such as no employment of the present tense of the original: *Certes this dreem, which ye han met to-nyght, / Cometh of the greete superfluytee* (VII 2926-7) – *A tak i to, co vám se dneska snilo, / zajisté mělo za příčinu vzniku* (PKJ 160-1); or no reflection of syntactic inversions *No wyn ne drank she, neither whit ne reed* (VII 2842) – *nepila vína, červená ni bílá* (PKJ 76).

4.4.2.1. Category 1

Category 1 is very limited – it includes incomprehension of legal terms and a single occurrence of lexical incomprehension: *As kan the hooly doctour Augustyn* (VII 3241) – *tak jako svatý doktor Augustinus* (PKJ 475). The word *doctour* is glossed as “teacher (doctor of the church)“, which Vrba most probably does not know. Legal terms giving an impression that the cock is a target of an assassin are used here as a mockery but the translation does not reflect it: *By heigh ymaginacioun forncast* (VII 3217) – *zchytralým plánem řídě svoje spády* (PKJ 451).

4.4.2.2. Category 1/2

Category 1/2 includes a few examples of minor importance, for instance *For she was, as it were, a maner deye* (VII 2846) – *a tak si žila ve své chýši chudé* (PKJ 80), which is translated loosely possibly because Vrba does not understand the word *deye*, “a dairywoman“, but it cannot be certain.

4.4.2.3. Category 2

Regarding Category 2, the subcategory *Additions and deletions* is more similar to *The KT* and *The MT* than to *The WBP/The WBT*, which means that it operates on the level of individual words and phrases but whole lines are not usually deleted. Frequently omitted expressions are the following: a) reporting clauses: *“In alle haste com to me!“ he sayde.* (VII 3007) – *A pospěš, než se stane věc ta děsná!* (PKJ 241); b) the demonstrative *this* in front of a proper name, which belongs to the subcategory *Omission of features characteristic for the*

original text: *This Chauntecleer his wynges gan to bete* (VII 3322) – *Kokrháč nato počal křídly tlouci* (PKJ 556); however, *this* is sometimes translated as *náš*, which is a feature of *The MT* (cf. *The KT*): *This Chauntecleer stood hye upon his toos* (VII 3331) – *Náš Kokrháč si stoup na prstů špičky* (PKJ 565); c) the word *allas*, which is surprisingly abundant considering the length of the tale: *Seyde, “Gentil sire, allas, wher wol ye gon?”* (VII 3284) – a „*Kampak račte,*“ *říká,* „*vzácný pane?*“ (PKJ 518); nevertheless, in some cases, it is translated as *běda* and as *ach* in other cases, which creates a mixture of *The KT* and *The MT*; d) the word *daun*: *Looke of Egipthe the kyng, daun Pharao* (VII 3133) – *Hle, faraóna, krále egyptského* (PKJ 367); e) discourse markers (especially *lo*) and comments addressed to the audience: *But herkneth! To that o man fil a greet mervaille* (VII 3076) – *Jednomu z nich však div se přihodí tu* (PKJ 310).

The subcategory *Loose translation* is not very large in *The NPT*. It includes only a few examples, such as *Reed eek of Joseph, and ther shul ye see* (VII 3130) – *Co o Josefu říká historie?* (PKJ 364). This instance illustrates also the fact that sentence types are not always observed but this kind of departure is rather rare in *The NPT*. Another example is *What sholde I moore unto this tale sayn?* (VII 3046) – *Podotknout k tomu více lze už stěží* (PKJ 280).

As in the previous analyses, one of the most common semantic shifts is the addition of expressivity, i.e. English neutral expressions are translated as colloquial or expressive Czech words: *Ye been so scarlet reed aboute youre yen* (VII 3161) – *na šarlat kolem vašich očiček*²⁵ (PKJ 395). Furthermore, Vrba translates the names of characters to make them sound more natural in Czech:

²⁵

http://ssjc.ujc.cas.cz/search.php?heslo=0%C4%8Di%C4%8Dko&sti=47537&where=full_text&hs_ubstr=no

Chauntecleer – Kokrháč, Malle – Micka (VII 3161 – PKJ 64), *daun Russell the fox – Ferina lišák* (VII 3334 – PKJ 568), but some of them are kept in their original form: *Talbot and Gerland – Garland i Talbot* (VII 3383 – PKJ 617). As already mentioned, Chauntecleer and Pertelote address each other *ye* as courtly lovers, which is correctly translated by Vrba: *What eyleth you, to grone in this manere?* (VII 2890) – *Co se vám stalo, že tak naříkáte?* (PKJ 124). Nevertheless, the Host's changing attitude towards the Nun's Priest, which can be observed in *The Prologue* and *The Epilogue of The NPT*, is not reflected in the translation, since both are translated as the polite plural form: *Be blithe, though thou ryde upon a jade. / What thogh thyn hors be bothe foul and lene?* (VII 2812-3) – *A netrapte se, i když harcujete / na hnusné herce, samá kost a kůže!* (PKJ 46-7); *Now, sire, faire falle yow for youre tale!* (VII 3460) – *Žehnej vám za tu historku Bůh v nebi!* (PKJ 694).

Realia are represented mainly by names of cited scholars and authors. The well-known remark about Jack Straw is preserved (and glossed by Vrba) but the exophoric *he*, denoting a familiarity, i.e. “that fellow“ (Burnley 25), is omitted: *Certes, he Jakke Straw and his meynee / Ne made nevere shoutes half so shrille* (VII 3394-5) – *že ani Jack Straw se svou chasou celou / tak pronikavě nekřičeli sami* (PKJ 628-9). As in the previous analyses, “termes“ are not translated as any particular terms but as rather neutral words: *By nature he knew ech ascencioun / Of the equynoxial in thilke toun* (VII 2855-6) – *vždyť v celém okolí znal od náture, / jak slunce stoupá a zas klesá shůry* (PKJ 89-90).

4.4.2.4. Category 3

Concerning Category 3, there can be found a few minor mistakes related to the correctness of Czech forms, such as Vrba's *Pyrrhus* as opposed to the correct form *Pyrrhos* (Svoboda 515): ...*and Pirrus with his streite swerd* (VII 3357) – *ani když hrozný Pyrrhus ve výpadu* (PKJ 591); or *Kartágina* with the appropriate form *Kartágo* (Svoboda 288) in *And that the Romayns hadde brend Cartage* (VII 3365) – *když Kartáginu sžehly římské voje* (PKJ 600).

4.4.2.5. Metre and Rhyme

The analysis of metre and rhyme does not differ from the previous analyses regarding this topic. The original and the translation are arranged in rhyming couplets and both use the iambic pentameter (more or less regularly). There can be found an occasional alliteration²⁶ but the translation does not reflect it (the two successive *k* in PKJ 108 seem to be rather a coincidence): *That trewely she hath the herte in hoold / Of Chauntecleer, loken in every lith* (VII 2874-5) – *že Kokrháči každou žilkou háral / cit lásky k ní a do morku svých kostí...* (PKJ 108-9); *Men dreme alday of owles and of apes, / And of many a maze therwithal* (VII 3092-3) – *lidem se denně o opicích zdává, / či o sovách, vše jako ve fantase* (PKJ 326-7).

4.4.2.6. Links Between *The WBT* and *The NPT*

Finally, there is a line which is identical with a line in *The WBT*, except for the personal pronouns *he/she*, but Vrba translates each line absolutely differently,

²⁶ Cf. Cooper 354, Burnley 98.

as is the case with the two equivalent lines in *The KT* and *The MT*, which would suggest that he is not aware of it:

The WBT: “Nay, thanne,“ quod she, “I shrewe us bothe two!“ (III 1062) – „To radši peklo!“ odsekla mu na to (PŽB 1068).

The NPT: “Nay thanne,“ quod he, “I shrewe us bothe two.“ (VII 3426) – „To tak!“ děl kohout. „Ať jsme oba kleti...“ (PKJ 660).

4.4.2.7. Conclusion

Category 1, Category 1/2 and Category 3 in *The NPT* are very limited, which is probably given by the length of the tale. Category 2 is essentially similar to Category 2 in *The KT* and *The MT*, more than to that of *The WBP/The WBT*. It implies that the subcategory *Loose translation* is not very large and that the subcategory *Additions and deletions* operates on the level of individual words and phrases but whole lines are not usually deleted. As in the previous analyses, one of the most common semantic shifts is the addition of expressivity. No uniquely characteristic tendencies were identified. The analysis of metre and rhyme is identical with the analyses of the previous tales.

5. Conclusion

The aim of the diploma thesis *The Canterbury Tales as Translated into Czech by František Vrba: A Linguistic Analysis* is to offer a philological analysis of František Vrba's translation of Geoffrey Chaucer's *The Canterbury Tales* and to analyse the efficiency of the translation. The thesis includes three major parts: "Theoretical background", "Hypothesis and Method", and "Analysis". The chosen methodological approach is based on three fundamental categories of mistakes which can appear between the original text and the translation: Category 1 – *Incomprehension of the original text*, Category 2 – *Mistranslation*, and Category 3 – *Linguistic violation of the target language*. Category 2 is further divided into subcategories: *Semantic shifts*, *Loose translation*, *Additions and deletions*, *Omission of features characteristic for the original text*.

The hypothesis establishes the assumption that since the paper uses the last of four editions of Vrba's translation, the number of mistakes is supposed to be minimal, especially in Category 1 and Category 3. Category 2 is very broad in its definition thus it is expected to be the largest of the categories. The analysis addresses matters of lexical, syntactic, stylistic, metrical and cultural nature and it focuses on *The KT*, *The MT*, *The NPT* and *The WBP/The WBT*.

Expected results in fact match the actual result: Category 3 and Category 1 are in noticeable minority in proportion to Category 2. Category 3 is the smallest of the categories – on the average, it contains only a few examples. Category 1 is approximately twice the size of Category 3 in all the analyses and Category 1/2 is usually as large as Category 1. Category 2 considerably outnumbered all remaining categories combined – roughly speaking, Category 2 is at least ten times larger

than Category 1. These are general tendencies which appear in each of the analysed tales – on the level of categories, they do not differ distinctively. However, on the level of subcategories of Category 2, there is a variation. The subcategories *Semantic shifts* and *Omission of features characteristic for the original text* (such as the Historic Present, or the demonstrative *this*) are more or less evenly distributed in all the tales, although the second subcategory is more evident in *The KT*, but the most noticeable difference is in the extent of the subcategories *Loose translation* and *Additions and deletions*: they are more frequent in *The WBP/The WBT* than in other tales.

There is also a very remarkable distinction in the translation of the word *allas*, which tends to be translated as *běda* in *The KT*, as *ach* in *The MT*, and as a mixture of *běda* and *ach* in *The NPT*²⁷, which implies that Vrba's translation of *allas* is probably associated with a specific style (*běda* with the high style and *ach* with the low style). The same applies to the demonstrative *this* which tends to be translated as *náš* in the low style and rather omitted in the high style.

Category 1 is most commonly represented by incomprehension of individual words or phrases such as “termes” but sometimes also by incomprehension of whole sentences. The majority of examples of Category 2 are subtle semantic changes on the level of individual words and phrases, which usually occur as the result of an effort to conform to the metre and rhyme; for instance, a neutral English word is translated as an informal Czech word. Mistakes of Category 3 commonly occur when Vrba either follows the original text too strictly or employs an incorrect spelling of Czech forms concerning realia or uses

²⁷ In *The WBP/The WBT*, *allas* is not as frequent as in other tales, thus it is not mentioned in the analysis.

an ungrammatical structure (for example, an unsuitable preposition or valency of a verb) but these instances are quite easily decodable.

Regarding the analyses of metre and rhyme, they are almost identical: the original and the translation are arranged in rhyming couplets and both use the iambic pentameter more or less regularly (to fit iambic pentameter to the Czech translation is more complicated). Alliteration of the tournament scene in *The KT* and occasional alliteration in *The NPT* are not considerably reflected in the translation.

On the whole, the majority of occurrences concerns individual words or phrases, which means that larger units such as sentences are influenced less frequently (*The WBP/The WBT* is an exception – because of loose translations and various additions and deletions, larger units are affected). Vrba obviously understands the text very well, which is also supported by the limited size of Category 1, and a preservation of meaning of the text as a whole seems to be Vrba's primary goal. This goal appears to be achieved. As a result, František Vrba's text is believed to be a successful and unquestionably well-executed translation with a high level of concordance between *The KT*, *The MT*, *The NPT*, *The WBP/The WBT* and their Czech counterparts.

References

- Benson, L. D. (ed) (1987) *The Riverside Chaucer*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 3rd ed.
- Burnley, D. (1983) *A Guide to Chaucer's Language*. Palgrave.
- Cannon, Ch. (1998) *The Making of Chaucer's English. A Study of Words*. Cambridge Studies Cambridge University Press 39.
- Coghill, N. (1956) *Geoffrey Chaucer*. British Writers and Their Work No. 1. University of Nebraska Press: Lincoln.
- Cooper, H. (1989) *The Canterbury Tales*. Oxford Guides to Chaucer, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Čermák, J. (2008) „Osvobozený sen pozdního středověku: případ opeřeného spáče“. In: Starý, Jiří – Hrdlička, Josef (eds.), *Spánek a sny. Svět archaických kultur III*. Herrmann a synové, Praha, pp. 227-241.
- Chaucer, G. (1970) *Canterburské povídky*. Překlad František Vrba. SNKLHU, Praha, 2., přepracované a rozšířené vydání.
- Horobin, S. (2007) *Chaucer's Language*. Palgrave: MacMillan.
- <http://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/med/structure.html> (accessed: 29 November 2013)
- <http://sites.fas.harvard.edu/~chaucer/glossar.htm> (accessed: 29 November 2013)
- <http://ssjc.ujc.cas.cz/> (accessed: 29 November 2013)
- http://www.obecprekladatelu.cz/_ftp/DUP/V/VrbaFrantisek.htm (accessed: 16 November 2013)
- Leech, G. (1973) *A Linguistic Guide to English Poetry*. London: Longman Group Ltd.
- Macura, V. (1988) *Slovník světových literárních děl I*. Praha: Odeon.

Svoboda, L. et al. (1974) *Encyklopedie antiky*. Praha: Academia.

Résumé

Diplomová práce na téma „Canterburské povídky v českém překladu Františka Vrby: lingvistická analýza“ se zabývá porovnáním českého překladu Canterburských povídek od Františka Vrby a jeho anglické předlohy od Geoffreyho Chaucera. Práce sestává ze tří základních součástí: Teoretická část, Hypotéza a metodologie a Praktická část. Účelem Teoretické části je nastínit především pozadí originálního textu a životní příběh samotného autora. Tato část obsahuje Chaucerův životopis, představení Canterburských povídek a dalších děl Geoffreyho Chaucera, podkapitulu „Chaucerův jazyk“ a stručnou biografii Františka Vrby. Podkapitola týkající se Chaucerova jazyka podrobně popisuje rozličné aspekty dobové angličtiny, jako jsou prozodie, gramatika, slovní zásoba, dialekty a styl. V závěru této podkapitoly je uveden kontrastní názor Christophera Cannona na jedinečnost Geoffreyho Chaucera a jeho jazyka.

Druhá část s názvem Hypotéza a metodologie předkládá zvolený metodologický postup a z něj vyplývající hypotézu. Metodologie je založena na třech základních kategoriích: Kategorie 1 – Neporozumění originálu, Kategorie 2 – Nesprávný překlad, Kategorie 3 – Nedodržení lingvistických pravidel cílového jazyka, tj. češtiny. V některých případech Kategorie 1 však není možné s jistotou tvrdit, že František Vrba textu neporozuměl, tudíž výskyty spadající do této kategorie jsou považovány za pouze pravděpodobné neporozumění originálu. Neporozumění může být lexikálního, syntaktického, stylistického, nebo kulturního charakteru.

Kategorie 2 reprezentuje ty příklady, které vznikají nepřesným překladem, přestože Vrba zcela zjevně originálu porozuměl. Mezi důvody pro nepřesný

překlad patří kupříkladu snaha vyhovět rýmu či metru. Kategorie 2 je dále rozdělena do následujících podkategorií: a) sémantické posuny (např. přidání expresivity k neutrálnímu anglickému slovu), b) volný překlad, c) dodatky a výmazy (přidání/odebrání lexikálního materiálu), d) vynechání rysů typických pro původní text (např. vynechání historického prezentu, ukazovacího zájmena *this* před vlastním jménem, nebo syntaktické inverze). Podkategorie „volný překlad“ zahrnuje případy, kdy bychom český text označili za spíše významově podobný originálu než za jeho přesný překlad. Dále tato podkategorie obsahuje případy syntakticky volného překladu, tj. nedodržení větných typů.

Do Kategorie 3 („Nedodržení lingvistických pravidel cílového jazyka“) náleží porušení pravidel češtiny. Výsledkem mohou být nevhodně použité předložky, nesprávná valence slovesa, či nepřirozený slovosled. Dále do této kategorie spadá použití nesprávného (tj. nekodifikovaného) tvaru reálií v českém jazyce. Tyto chyby neplynou z překladatelova neporozumění originálu, ale mohou způsobit neporozumění na straně čtenáře. Kategorie 3 se projevuje především na lexikální a syntaktické úrovni.

Kategorie chyb nejsou aplikovány na analýzu rýmu a metra, neboť rým a metrum se vztahují k výstavbě textu a ne k jeho obsahu, přestože mohou ovlivňovat i obsah, jelikož mají dopad na výběr slov. V případě nutnosti byl význam českých slov vyhledáván online ve *Slovníku spisovného jazyka českého* (<http://ssjc.ujc.cas.cz/>) a anglické výrazy ve slovníku Chaucerova jazyka na <http://sites.fas.harvard.edu/~chaucer/glossar.htm>, případně v *Middle English Dictionary* (<http://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/med/structure.html>).

Následná hypotéza vychází z faktu, že diplomová práce je založena na posledním ze čtyř vydání Vrbova překladu, z čehož vyplývá, že by v překladu mělo být minimum chyb, jelikož měl František Vrba možnost je opravit. Přestože použité vydání nebylo porovnáváno s předchozími vydáními, je zde předpoklad, že hypotéza se projeví na kvantitativním poměru tří zmíněných kategorií, tj. že Kategorie 1 a Kategorie 3 budou zastoupeny v minimálním rozsahu v porovnání s Kategorií 2. Již z definice je patrné, že Kategorie 2 je ve své podstatě širší než Kategorie 1 a Kategorie 3, tudíž je předpokládáno, že bude obsahovat nejvyšší podíl výskytů (především v podkategorii „sémantické posuny“). Mimoto je poezie tolerantnější nejen k novotvarům, ale i k porušování lingvistických pravidel, proto je pravděpodobné, že bude možné nalézt jen omezené množství příkladů, které znatelně porušují pravidla českého jazyka (Kategorie 3). Dále je hypotéza založena na domněnce, že ve většině případů se chyby v překladu projeví na úrovni jednotlivých slov a frází a že větší celky (např. věty) budou zasaženy minimálně. Zachování významu textu jako celku by mělo být Vrbovým primárním cílem. Účelem této práce je zanalyzovat, jestli bylo tohoto cíle dosaženo, a zhodnotit kvalitu Vrbova překladu do češtiny.

Třetí část diplomové práce je praktická. Analýza se soustředí na Povídku rytířovu, Povídku mlynářovu, Povídku kněze jeptišek a Povídku ženy z Bathu, jelikož adekvátně reprezentují stylistickou variabilitu, propojení žánrů a strukturní shody a odlišnosti v Canterburských povídkách. Každá z analýz daných povídek obsahuje dvě části – teoretickou, ve které je povídka v krátkosti představena (tj. jsou uvedeny její zdroje, pravděpodobná doba vzniku, styl, obsah a případná jazyková specifika), a praktickou, ve které je prezentována samotná analýza

překladu. V této části bylo nutno vytvořit doplňkovou kategorii, Kategorii 1/2, neboť v některých případech nebylo možné rozhodnout, zda určitý příklad spadá do Kategorie 1 či do Kategorie 2.

V souladu s hypotézou bylo možné v analýze PR nalézt nejvíce výskytů v Kategorii 2. Kategorie 1 je přibližně desetkrát menší než Kategorie 2 a Kategorie 3 má dokonce poloviční rozsah než Kategorie 1, což potvrzuje Vrbovu schopnost porozumět originálu a vytvářet kvalitní český text. Do Kategorie 1 spadají například „termes“ (technické termíny), které většinou nebývají nijak reflektovány ve Vrbově překladu. Z Kategorie 2 jsou nejvíce zastoupeny podkategorie „sémantické posuny“ a „vynechání rysů typických pro původní text“. Mezi tyto typické rysy patří především vynechání historického prézentu a ukazovacího zájmena *this* před vlastním jménem. V reáliích Vrba chybí jen výjimečně a většina chyb z této oblasti se týká správnosti české formy, tj. ortografie. Větší celky jsou změnami v překladu ovlivněny jen příležitostně. Analýza metra a rýmu v PR ukázala, že překlad i originál jsou uspořádány v dvojverších se sdruženým rýmem a používají jambický pentametr, který se zdá být pravidelnější v anglickém textu. Aliterace originálu se pouze ojediněle odráží v překladu.

Poměr kategorií i podkategorií v analýze PM je kvantitativně velmi podobný analýze PR. Kategorie 1 je přibližně dvanáctkrát menší než Kategorie 2. Kategorie 1 je reprezentována především technickými termíny, které Vrba nepřekládá, a slovem *selly*, se kterým Vrba chybně pracuje v jeho novodobém významu. Kategorie 1/2 je tvořena dvěma nepřilíš význačnými příklady. Kategorie 3 je pouze třetinové velikosti Kategorie 1 a obsahuje příklady nevhodně

použitých předložek či nesprávných morfologických tvarů. Nejrozsáhlejší kategorií v analýze PM je Kategorie 2. Stejně jako v PR jsou nejdominantnější podkategorie „sémantické posuny“ a „vynechání rysů typických pro původní text“. Vrba správně dodržuje celkově neformální až hovorový charakter slovní zásoby v PM. Na druhou stranu však nevyužívá možnosti rozlišit mezi tykáním a vykáním, které se hojně vyskytuje v originálním textu. Analýza metra a rýmu je v zásadě shodná s analýzou metra a rýmu v PR.

Na úrovni jednotlivých kategorií se analýza PŽB příliš neliší od analýz PR a PM, což znamená, že Kategorie 1 a Kategorie 3 jsou ve výrazné menšině v porovnání s Kategorií 2. Celkově jsou kvantitativní poměry mezi Kategoriemi 1, 1/2, 2 a 3 přibližně konstantní. V čem se ale analýza PŽB liší od předchozích analýz, je rozsah podkategorií Kategorie 2 – v PŽB jsou velmi výrazné podkategorie „volný překlad“ a „dodatky a výmazy“. Podkategorie „volný překlad“ je hojně zastoupena i syntakticky volným překladem, z čehož vyplývá, že větné typy byly v překladu PŽB relativně často nedodrženy. Mezi výrazy, které jsou často vynechány (tj. spadají do podkategorie „dodatky a výmazy“), patří například klení ženy z Bathu, dovolávání se Boha či uvozovací věty. Kategorie 1 a Kategorie 1/2 obsahují chyby především na lexikální úrovni. Většina výskytů Kategorie 3 se týká správnosti použitého tvaru reálií v českém jazyce. Analýza metra a rýmu je opět velmi podobná předchozím analýzám.

Analýza PKJ je svým charakterem velmi podobná analýzám PR a PM a neobsahuje žádné specifické tendence. Kategorie 1 a Kategorie 3 jsou rozsahem velmi malé, což je pravděpodobně dáno tím, že PKJ je nejkratší povídkou z daného vzorku. Jak již bylo zmíněno, Kategorie 2 se podobá spíše Kategorii 2

v PR a PM než Kategorii 2 v PŽB, z čehož vyplývá, že podkategorie „volný překlad“ a „dodatky a výmazy“ jsou méně výrazné než podkategorie „sémantické posuny“ a „vynechání rysů typických pro původní text“. Dále podkategorie „dodatky a výmazy“ operuje převážně na úrovni jednotlivých slov a větší celky (například řádky) obvykle vymazány nebývají. Běžným sémantickým posunem je přidání expresivity k neutrálnímu slovu. Mezi typické rysy originálu, které jsou často vynechány, patří kupříkladu použití ukazovacího zájmena *this* před vlastním jménem. Analýza metra a rýmu se nijak výrazně neliší od analýz metra a rýmu ve zbylých povídkách.

Celkově je Kategorie 3 vždy nejmenší ze všech kategorií – v průměru obsahuje pouze několik příkladů. Kategorie 1 je přibližně dvakrát větší než Kategorie 3 a Kategorie 1/2 je většinou stejného rozsahu jako Kategorie 1. V celé analýze byla Kategorie 2 nejméně desetkrát větší než Kategorie 1 (například u PM dokonce dvanáctkrát větší), z čehož vyplývá, že předpokládané výsledky odpovídají těm skutečným. Většina chyb se týká jednotlivých slov a slovních spojení – větší celky (například věty) jsou ovlivněny spíše ojediněle. Výjimku tvoří PŽB, ve které jsou hojně zasaženy i větší celky v rámci podkategorií „volný překlad“ a „dodatky a výmazy“. Je evidentní, že František Vrba rozumí originálnímu textu velmi dobře, což je dosvědčeno i omezeným rozsahem Kategorie 1. Zachování významu textu jako celku je zjevně Vrbovým primárním cílem a tohoto cíle se zdá být dosaženo. Byla potvrzena shoda mezi PR, PM, PŽB, PKJ a jejich předlohami, tudíž je možné považovat Vrbův český text *Canterburských povídek* za úspěšný a hodnotný překlad Chaucerova anglického originálu.

Appendix

The Appendix contains 200 representative examples. The number of instances for each tale is determined by its length. In case that a particular example is related to an individual expression, the appropriate expression is underlined; otherwise it is concerned with a whole line/sentence. Every instance includes a brief description of the mistake involved unless the mistake is self-evident or described in detail in the diploma thesis itself.

The Knight's Tale

Category 1

1. *Tempest* can be used metaphorically as “the excitement of the Athenians“ (DiMarco in Benson 829): *And of the tempest at hir hoom-comynge* (I 884) – *i o bouři, když byli na cestě* (PR 26)
2. *Gan espye* – “saw“ (preterite): *And with that word Arcite gan espye* (I 1112) – *Tu Arcita se běžel podívat* (PR 254)
3. “Termes“ – legal English: *This was the forward, pleynly for t’endite, / Bitwixen Theseus and hym Arcite* (I 1209-10) – *Abych řek rovnou: Byla dohoda, / již s knížetem si smluvil vévoda* (PR 351-2)
4. “Termes“ – legal English: *And eek therto he is a prisoner / Perpetuelly, noght oonly for a yer* (I 1457-8) – *A ke všemu byl ještě uvězněn / až do smrti, a ne snad na rok jen* (PR 599-600)
5. “Owes them as much gratitude for this as she owes me“: *Kan hem therfore as muche thank as me* (I 1808) – *o nic než já jim není vděčnější* (PR 950)

6. *Citole* – “kithara“ (Svoboda 295): *A citole in hir right hand hadde she* (I 1959) – *Citeru měla v drobné pravici* (PR 1101)
7. *Som* denotes singular: *Som wol ben armed in an haubergeoun* (I 2119) – *Některí krunýř k zbroji vzali si* (PR 1261)
8. *Saturnus the colde* – “Saturn the hostile“: *Til that the pale Saturnus the colde* (I 2443) – *až Saturn pobledlý a studený* (PR 1585)
9. “My (astrological) aspect is the cause of pestilence“: *My lookyng is the fader of pestilence* (I 2469) – *a pohledem svým rozpoutávám mor* (PR 1611)
10. *Jelous strokes* – “fervent, vigorous strokes“: *The jelous strokes on hir helmes byte* (I 2634) – *Žárlivé rány vřely na přilbách* (PR 1776)

Category 1/2

11. *And rente adoun bothe wall and sparre and rafter* (I 990) – *val dvojí pobořiv i ohradu* (PR 132)
12. *Tresse* – “wound about her head“ (DiMarco in Benson 830): *Hir yelow heer was broyded in a tresse* (I 1049) – *a plavé vlasy zapletla si v cop* (PR 191)
13. *By my pan* not translated: *Love is a gretter lawe, by my pan, / Than may be yeve to any erthely man* (I 1165-6) – *Ta zákonem je sama od věků / silnějším, než dal člověk člověku* (PR 307-8)
14. *His slepy yerde in hond je bar uprichte* (I 1387) – *Měl uspavačnou berlu v pravici* (PR 529)
15. *Busk* – “woods“: *The careyne in the busk, with throte ycorve* (I 2013) – *mršinu v křoví, zkrvavělý chřtán* (PR 1155)

16. *Sarge* – “serž“ (cf. DiMarco in Benson 839) omitted: *Hanged with clooth of gold, and nat with sarge (I 2568) – kde zlaté fábory jim vlály vstříc (PR 1710)*
17. *Chiere* – “face, facial expression; mood“: *With baner whyt and hardy chiere and face (I 2586) – s praporcem bílým, s odhodlanou duší (PR 1728)*
18. *Lymes* – “limbs“: *Fermacies of herbes, and eek save / They dronken, for they wolde hir lymes have (I 2713-4) – dryáky, drogy, šalvěj dali pít / felčari v snaze život zachránit (PR 1855-6)*

Category 2

Semantic shifts

19. *What with his wysdom and his chivalrie (I 865) – tak chrabrostí a válečnickou lstí (PR 7)*
20. “*What folk been ye, that at myn hom-comynge / Perturben so my feste with criynge?*“ / *Quod Theseus...* (I 905-7) – „*Kdo jste? Proč slávu, se kterou se vracím, / rušíte pláčem, touhle lamentací?*“ / *křik Théseus...* (PR 47-9)
21. *That it was routhe (i.e. pity) for to seen and heere (I 914) – že zřít a slyšet bylo ji až strach (PR 56)*
22. *With Creon, which that was of Thebes kyng (I 986) – Kreonta, toho zlého hrúzovládce (PR 128)*
23. Addition of expressivity: *She was arisen and al redy dight, i.e. prepared (I 1041) – se vyšňorila před úsvitem dne (PR 182)*

24. *Slider* (“slippery“) can denote an abstract sense “zrádný“; *neschůdný* is a physical quality: *And to a dronke man the wey is slider* (I 1264) – *a každá cesta je mu neschůdná* (PR 406)
25. *Hewe* – “hue, color; complexion“: *His hewe falow and pale as asshen colde* (I 1364) – *tvář pobledlou jak popel vychladlý* (PR 506)
26. *And bryngen harneys* (i.e. armour) *right ynough for thee* (I 1613) – *a taky tobě dojdu pro zbraně* (PR 755)
27. *Launde* – “clearing“: *And whan this duc was come unto the launde* (I 1696) – *Tu, když tak zajel hluboko v ten háj* (PR 838)
28. *And ye shul bothe anon unto me swere / That nevere mo ye shal my contree dere* (i.e. harm) (I 1821-2) – *Jen potvrďte mi oba přísahou, / že nezačnete nikdy s vládou mou / boj ani válku...* (PR 963-5)
29. *Foolhardynesse* – “recklessness, rashness“: *Plesaunce and Hope, Desir, Foolhardynesse* (I 1925) – *naději, touhu, ples i běsnění* (PR 1067)
30. *Folye* – “lechery“: *Ne yet the folye of kyng Salomon* (I 1942) – *i Šalamoun, ten láskou zpitý král* (PR 1084)
31. *Shepne* – “stable“: *The shepne brennynge with the blake smoke* (I 2000) – *z hořících stodol černý, čpavý dým* (PR 1142)
32. *A wrethe of gold, arm-greet, of huge wighte* (I 2145) – *a těžkou zlatou korunu měl na ní* (PR 1287)
33. *Brūna* – “a white horse“: *Upon a steede bay* (i.e. reddish-brown) *trapped in steel* (I 2157) – *Jel na brůně, jež byla kryta plátem* (PR 1299)
34. *As doon thise wete brondes in hir brennynge* (I 2338) – *jako když v ohni hoří čerstvý kmen* (PR 1480)

35. *Astoned* – “astonished“: *For which this Emelye astoned was* (I 2361) – *Tu Emílie v moci záhadné* (PR 1503)
36. *Testeres, and trappures* – “horse armours“: *The sheeldes brighte, testeres, and trappures* (I 2499) – *skvoucí se štíty, přilby, čabraky* (PR 1641)
37. An oxymoron is lost in the translation: *Fare wel, my sweete foo, myn Emelye* (I 2780) – *Sbohem, má lásko, Emílie má* (PR 1922)
38. *Divinistre* – “theologian“: *Therefore I stynte; I nam no divinistre* (I 2811) – *i zmlkám o tom, nejsem z mystiků* (PR 1953)
39. *Po čase* is too vague (it can be days, weeks, etc.): *By processe and by lengthe of certeyn yeres* (I 2967) – *Tak doba šla a šla a po čase* (PR 2109)
40. *Hath stablissed in this wretched world adoun* (I 2995) – *...na té zemi, co je k nám tak krutá* (PR 2137)

Loose translation

41. A rhetorical question translated as a declarative sentence: *And ther he lyveth in joye and in honour / Terme of his lyf; what nedeth wordes mo?* (I 1028-9) – *A v radosti pak žil a ve slávě / celý svůj věk, co dál bych povídal.* (PR 170-1)
42. A rhetorical question translated as a declarative sentence: *What sholde I al day of his wo endite?* (I 1380) – *Nač měl bych nad tím trávit celý den.* (PR 519)
43. An imperative sentence translated as a rhetorical question: *What! Verray fool, thynk wel that love is free* (I 1606) – *Což, blázne, lásku kdo kdy upoutal?* (PR 748)

44. *And lik a griphon looked he aboute* (I 2133) – *měl pohled jako okřídlený lev*
(PR 1275)

Additions and deletions

45. *Tak mocně rozhorlen* added: *Whan that this worthy duc, this Theseus, / Hath
Creon slayn and wonne Thebes thus* (I 1001-2) – *Když Théseus, tak mocně
rozhorlen, / Kreonta zabil a vzal Théby v plen* (PR 143-4)
46. *Quod he* deleted: *“O deere cosyn Palamon,“ quod he* (I 1234) –
Ó bratranče můj, drahý Palamone (PR 376)
47. *Za svítání* added: *Have heer my trouthe; tomorwe I wol nat faille, / Withoute
wityng of any oother wight* (I 1610-1) – *Slyš moje slovo: Zítro za svítání /
sem přijdu ve zbroji – sám, zcela sám* (PR 752-3)
48. *Co zkázu ohlašuje* added: *The barbour, and the bocher, and the smyth, /
That forgeth sharpe swerdes on his styth* (I 2025-6) – *felčar a řezník
s kovářem, jenž kuje / meč přeostřý, co zkázu ohlašuje* (PR 1167-8)
49. The line 2060 omitted: *And after was she maad the loode-sterre. / Thus was
it peynted; I kan sey yow no ferre. / Hir sone is eek a sterre, as men may see*
(I 2059-61) – *načež se stala hvězdou polární. / A její syn se též stal hvězdou
s ní, / jak bylo vidět na obraze tom* (PR 1201-3).
50. Narrator's comments omitted: *That everich sholde an hundred knyghtes
brynge / The bataille to darreyne, as I yow tolde* (I 2096-7) – *kdy každý
z nich měl přivést do Athén / sto pomocníků pro to velké klání* (PR 1238-9)

51. *Jsi mohl zřít added: This Theseus, this duc, this worthy knyght, / Whan he had broght hem into his citee (I 2190-1) – A Thésea pak, ctného vévodu, / jsi mohl zřít, jak vítal všechny hosty (PR 1332-3)*
52. *Narrator's comments omitted: Unto Dyane she spak as ye may heere (I 2296) – se obrátila takto k Dianě (PR 1438)*
53. *(For wommen, as to speken in comune, / Thei folwen alle the favour of Fortune) (I 2681-2) – vždyť všeobecně platí pro ženy, / že jdou vždy tam, kam přízeň štěstěny (PR 1823-4)*

Omission of features characteristic for the original text

54. *Syntactic inversion: Ful many a riche contree hadde he wonne (I 864) – Bohatou získal nejednu si zem (PR 6)*
55. *Syntactic inversion: But al that thyng I moot as now forbere (i.e.forgo) (I 885) – leč musím raději šetřit větami (PR 27)*
56. *Syntactic inversion: Til they the reynes of his brydel henten (i.e. siezed) (I 904) – než zachytly se za otěže koní (PR 46)*
57. *Syntactic inversion: Nat greveth us youre glorie and youre honour (I 917) – Tvá sláva, pocty netíží nás, ne (PR 59)*
58. *The Historic Present: And hem conforteth in ful good entente (I 958) – a utěšoval nářek lkajících (PR 100)*
59. *The Historic Present: His baner he displayeth, and forth rood (I 966) – svou válečnou dal vztyčit korouhev (PR 108)*
60. *The Historic Present: And forth he rit (i.e. rides); ther is namoore to telle (I 974) – a spěchal pryč. Co měl bych dodávat? (PR 116)*

61. *This* in front of a proper name: *Whan that this worthy duc, this Theseus, / Hath Creon slayn and wonne Thebes thus* (I 1001-2) – *Když Théseus, tak mocně rozhorlen, / Kreonta zabil a vzal Théby v plen* (PR 143-4)
62. The Historic Present: *He took his hoost, and hoom he rit* (i.e. rides) *anon* (I 1026) – *k domovu bral se, a s ním jeho voj* (PR 168)
63. *This* in front of a proper name: *This Palamon and his felawe Arcite* (I 1031) – *byl sevřen Palamon a jeho druh* (PR 174)
64. The Historic Present: *How greet a sorwe suffreth now Arcite!* (I 1219) – *Jak strašným žalem Arcita byl jat!* (PR 361)
65. *Him* in front of a proper name: *And Venus sleeth me on that oother syde / For jalousie and fere of hym Arcite* (I 1333) – *A Venuše mě jistě zavraždí / mou žárlivostí, strachem z Arcity* (PR 474-5)
66. *This* in front of a proper name: *For, shortly for to seyn, this Palamoun / Perpetuelly is dampned to prisoun* (I 1341) – *Co já tu říkám, říkám stručně jen. / Palamon v žalář věčně odsouzen* (PR 483-4)
67. The Historic Present: *And thus he fleeth as faste as evere he may* (I 1475) – *Palamon tedy prchal ze všech sil* (PR 617)
68. The Historic Present: *That al the orient laugheth of the light, / And with his stremes dryeth in the greves* (I 1494-5) – *až celý východ světlem rozesmál, / a jeho žárem rosa v houští schne* (PR 636-7)
69. *This* in front of a proper name: *And in the grove, at tyme and place yset, / This Arcite and this Palamon ben met* (I 1635-6) – *a v háji tom se ve smluvený čas / Arcita s Palamonem sešli zas* (PR 777-8)

70. *This* in front of a proper name: *Lo heere this Arcite and this Palamoun* (I 1791) – *Hle, Palamon a tady Arcita* (PR 933).
71. *With eyen rede, and of a man he eet* (I 2048) – *krvavých zraků, mrtvolu an hltá* (PR 1190)
72. *Allas* is translated as *běda mi: Allas! I ne have no langage to telle* (I 2227) – *Ach běda mi! Což někdo slova zná* (PR 1369)
73. *Allas* is not translated: *And seyde: “What amounteth this, allas?”* (I 2362) – *jen šeptala si: „Jak to dopadne?”* (PR 1504)
74. *Allas* is not translated: *And foond thee liggynge (i.e. lying) by his wyf, allas!* (I 2390) – *s ní, se svou ženou záletnou, tě chyt* (PR 1532)
75. *This* in front of a proper name: *For which this noble Theseus anon / Leet senden after gentil Palamon* (I 2975-6) – *Théseus v zájmu toho zákona / dal ihned poslat pro Palamona* (PR 2117-8)
76. Syntactic inversion: *The grete tounes se we wane and wende* (I 3025) – *A stejně zříme zánik velkých měst* (PR 2166)
77. The Historic Present: *Thus endeth Palamon and Emelye* (I 3107) – *Tak ona skončila i její druh* (PR 2249)

Category 3

78. *Have ye so greet envye / Of myn honour, that thus compleyne and crye?* (I 907-8) – *Či závidíte mi / mé pocty nářkem svým a slzami?* (PR 49-50)
79. *Lord, to whom Fortune hath yiven / Victorie, and as a conqueror to lyven* (I 915-6) – *Pane, tobě osud dal, / k vítězství abys žil a dobýval* (PR 57-8)

80. The correct form is *Peirithoos* (Svoboda 459): *A worthy duc that highte Perotheus* (I 1191) – *že chrabry knize, Peirithous zvaný* (PR 333)
81. *That frothen whit as foom for ire wood* (I 1659) – *...až pěnou stříkal hněv* (PR 801).
82. *For every wight that lovede chivalrye* (I 2106) – *Každý, kdo rád měl rytířování* (PR 1248)
83. The correct form is *Aigeus* (Svoboda 40): *Savyng* (i.e. except for) *his olde fader Egeus* (I 2838) – *krom jeho otce, kmeta Aegea* (PR 1980)

Metre and Rhyme

84. Assignment of stresses unusual in Czech: *žil vévoda kdys jménem Théseus* (PR 2)
85. Highly predictable rhymes: *For Goddes sake, to letten of his wille, / Ther as a beest may al his lust fulfille* (I 1317-18) – *a v bázni boží rvát se s touhami, / jez každé zvíře ukojiti smí* (PR 459-60)
86. Regular iambic pentameter: *A s těmi slovy zazněl šípů chřest* (PR 1500)
87. Highly predictable rhymes: *With long swerd and with mace fighteth youre fille, / Gooth now youre wey; this is the lordes wille* (I 2559-60) – *Mlatem a mečem běžte potýkat se! / A ted' svou cestou! Tak si přeje vládce!* (PR 1701-2)
88. Alliteration: *The helmes they tohewen and toshrede* (I 2609) – *Pod prudkou ranou praskla přílbice* (PR 1751)

89. Alliteration: *He foyneth on his feet with his tronchoun, / And he hym hurtleth with his hors adoun* (I 2615-6) – *Povedla / se prudká rána; sok spad ze sedla* (PR 1757-8)
90. Regular iambic pentameter: *He rolleth under foot as dooth a bal* (I 2614)

The Miller's Tale

Category 1

91. “Termes“ – legal English: *But first I make a protestacioun* (I 3137) – *Však říkám napřed na námitky něčí* (PM 29).
92. “Termes“: *And koude a certeyn of conclusiouns, / To demen by interrogaciouns, / If that men asked hym, in certein houres* (I 3193-5) – *tak třeba doved – hromadu znal triků – / když ses ho zeptal v pravém okamžiku, / uhodnout předem ledaskterou věc* (PM 85-7)
93. *This sely jealous housbonde to bigyle* (I 3404) – *nad žárlivým a tupým pantatíkem* (PM 296)
94. *This sely carpenter hath greet merveyle* (I 3423) – *Bláhový tesař podivem byl jat* (PM 315)
95. *This sely carpenter goth forth his wey* (I 3601) – *Ten hloupý tesař sebral se a k paní* (PM 493)
96. *This sely carpenter bigynneth quake* (I 3614) – *Ten nekňuba se všecek rozklepal* (PM 506)

97. This sely Absolon herde every deel (I 3744) – Všechno to slyšel chudák Absolón (PM 636)
98. “He did not stop to sell bread or ale on the way”, i.e. he wasted no time: *And doun gooth al; he foond neither to selle, / Ne breed ne ale, til he cam to the celle* (I 3821-22) – *A bum! A slít! Chléb s pivem lítly spolu, / až na práh dopad se vším všudy dolů* (PM 713-14)

Category 2

Semantic shifts

99. *Lat be thy lewed dronken harlotrye* (I 3145) – *Těch lumpáren tvých opilých je dost* (PM 37)
100. Addition of expressivity: *A riche gnof, that gestes heeld to bord* (I 3188) – *co bral si lidi na kvartýr a žvanec* (PM 80)
101. Addition of expressivity: *Was turned for to lerne astrologye* (I 3192) – *spíš ku astrologickým študiům* (PM 84)
102. Addition of expressivity: *After his freendes fyndyng and his rente* (I 3220) – *ze štipendií, z půjček od přátel* (PM 112)

Loose translation

103. A direct speech translated as the narrator’s speech: *And swoor, “By armes, and by blood and bones“* (I 3125) – *a při krvi a kostech Páně klel* (PM 17)
104. A declarative sentence translated as a rhetorical question: *I wol bileve wel that I am noon* (I 3162) – *věřím, že nejsem; proč se trápit, nač?* (PM 54)

105. A rhetorical question translated as an exclamation: *Who rubbeth now, who froteth now his lippes / With dust, with sond, with straw, woth clooth, with chippes* (I 3747-8) – *Jak si ted' prachem, pískem drh, dřel pysky, / jak slámu bral a látku, ba i třísky* (PM 639-40)
106. “*Why, nay,*“ *quod he,* “*God woot, my sweete leef*“ (I 3792) – „*Ne, ružíčko má,*“ *odpověděl jí* (PM 684)

Additions and deletions

107. *Whil that hir housbonde was at Oseneye* (I 3274) – *když její manžel odjel na den pryč* (PM 166)

Omission of features characteristic for the original text

108. *This clerk was cleped hende Nicholas* (I 3199) – *Každý mu říkal chytrý Mikuláš* (PM 91)
109. Syntactic inversion: *A chambre hadde he in that hostelrye* (I 3203) – *V tom domě bydlel v malém pokojíku* (PM 95)
110. *And seyde, “Ywis, but if ich have my wille, / For deerne love of thee, lemman, I spille.”* (I 3278) – *a povídá: „Když nechceš, abych zchřad, / miláčku, láskou, dej mi, co bych rád!“* (PM 169-70)
111. *This* in front of a proper name: *This Absolon, that jolif was and gay* (I 3339) – *Náš Absolón, ten mladík zářící* (PM 231)
112. *Joly* is not translated: *Fro day to day this joly Absolon* (I 3371) – *Náš Absolón, jak za dnem míjel den* (PM 263)

113. *Hende* is not translated: *Now ber thee wel, thou hende Nicholas* (I 3397) – *Nu, Mikuláši, ať se ti to daří* (PM 289)
114. *This* in front of a proper name and the Historic Present: *This sely carpenter hath greet merveyle* (I 3423) – *Bláhový tesař podivem byl jat* (PM 315)
115. The Historic Present: *This sely carpenter goth forth his wey* (I 3601) – *Ten hloupý tesař sebral se a k paní* (PM 493)
116. The Historic Present: *This sely carpenter bigynneth quake* (I 3614) – *Ten nekňuba se všecek rozklepal* (PM 506)
117. *Ye* is not translated: *What do ye, hony-comb, sweete Alisoun* (I 3698) – *Co děláš, ty má sladká, medová?* (PM 590)
118. *Allas* is translated as *ach*: *“Allas,“ quod Absolon, “and weylawey.”* (I 3714) – *„Ach!“ rozklepal se Absolónův hlas* (PM 606)
119. *This* in front of a proper name: *This sely Absolon herde every deel* (I 3744) – *Všechno to slyšel chudák Absolón* (PM 636)
120. *Allas* is not translated: *But Absolon, that seith ful ofte, „Allas!“* (I 3749) – *náš Absolón, jak zuřil, kdo to poví* (PM 641)

Category 3

121. *Of lycorys or any cetewale* (I 3207) – *jak valerián nebo lékořice* (PM 99)
122. *And by hir girdel heeng a purs of lether* (I 3250) – *Z pasu jí visel pěkný míšek z kůže* (PM 142)
123. *And caughte the kultour by the colde stele* (I 3785) – *A z chladné strany popad za ocel* (PM 677)

Metre and Rhyme

124. "This wol I yeve thee, if thou me kisse." / This Nicholas was risen for to pisse
(I 3797-8) – „A bude tvůj, když hubičku mi dáš!“ / Vymočit právě šel se
Mikuláš (PM 689-90)

Links Between *The KT* and *The MT*

125. *The KT*: Now with his love, now in his colde grave / Allone, withouten any
compaignye (I 2778-9) – Dnes vřelý cit a zítra hrob a chlad, / kde společníci
je nám jenom tma (PR 1920-1).

The MT: A chambre hadde he in that hostelrye / Allone, withouten any
compaignye (I 3203-4) – V tom domě bydlel v malém pokojíku / sám pro
sebe a neměl společníků (PM 95-6).

The Wife of Bath's Tale

Category 1

126. *Lyes* – “lees (dregs)“: Thus seistow, olde barel-ful of lyes (III 302) – to
pořád meleš, starý sude lží! (PŽB 308)
127. *Coltes tooth* – “youthful tastes, desires“: But yet I hadde alwey a coltes tooth
(III 602) – hříběcí chrup jsem si však podržela (PŽB 608)
128. *Rude* – “humble“: Al were it that myne auncestres were rude (III 1172) –
Třebaže hrubí byli snad mi předci (PŽB 1178)

129. *Peter!* – “by, in the name of, St. Peter”: *Peter! I shrewe yow, but ye love it weel* (III 446) – *Trápím tě, Petře, máš to ale rád* (PŽB 452)
130. *Motes* – “specks of dust”: *As thikke as motes in the sonne-beem* (III 868) – *jak v záři slunce rozptýlení moli* (PŽB 874)

Category 1/2

131. The colloquial dropping of *ne* particle is not reflected: *What that he mente therby, I kan nat seyn* (III 20) – *Já ale nevím, co měl na zřeteli* (PŽB 20)
132. *Wilde fyr* – “řecký oheň”: *Thou liknest it also to wilde fyr* (III 373) – *anebo také k výhni rozpoutané* (PŽB 379)
133. *Roode beem* – “beam supporting the cross at the entrance to the choir of the church”: *And lith ygrave under the roode beem* (III 496) – *a víc než křížek na svém hrobě nemá* (PŽB 502)
134. *Who peyntede the leon, tel me who?* (III 692) – *Kdo namaloval čerta na stěně?* (PŽB 698)

Category 2

Semantic shifts

135. Addition of expressivity: *Now wherwith sholde he make his paiement, / If he ne used his sely instrument?* (III 131-2) – *A čím by dluh byl jinak zaplacen, / ten požehnaný nemít inštrument?* (PŽB 137-8)

136. *Kaynard* – “dotard“: *Sire olde kaynard, is this thyn array?* (III 235) – *Zač stojíš, držgrešle, víš, jak je žena / souseda dneska zase vyfintěná?!* (PŽB 241-2)
137. Addition of expressivity: *Thanne seistow that it is a tormentrie* (III 251) – *to zase fňukal bys jí za zády* (PŽB 257)
138. *Dišputace* is colloquial: *Swiche manere wordes hadde we on honde* (III 451) – *To byly naše stálé dišputace* (PŽB 457)

Loose translation

139. A declarative sentence translated as a rhetorical question: *...so nys it no repreve / To wedde me, if that my make dye, / Withouten excepcion of bigamye* (III 84-6) – *Co vytknout mi kdo může, vynajdu-li / si jiného po smrti svého muže? / Kdo bigamii v tomhle vidět může?* (PŽB 90-2)
140. A declarative sentence translated as a rhetorical question: *I nyl envye no virginitee* (III 142) – *Cožpak má slova panenskost snad hani?* (PŽB 148)
141. *How pitously a-nyght I made hem swynke!* (i.e. “work“) (III 202) – *když vzpomenu si, jak se měli k lásce* (PŽB 208)
142. *Thus shulde ye speke and bere hem wrong on honde* (III 226) – *Co chcete dostat, vynuťte si směle* (PŽB 232)
143. A question translated as an exclamation: *What helpith it of me to enquere or spyen?* (III 316) – *Však uvidíš! A nepomůže ani / tvé hlídání a tvoje špehování!* (PŽB 321-2)
144. *Thanne wolde the cat wel dwellen in his in* (III 350) – *zůstane ležet na pelechu tiše* (PŽB 356)

145. *She wol nat dwelle in house half a day* (III 352) – *nehledá nijak cestu domů zpátky* (PŽB 358)
146. *Yet koude I make his berd* (“deceive him“), *so moot I thee* (“as I may prosper“) (III 361) – *sklapne mu, zrak at’ jak chce přibystří* (PŽB 367)
147. *I ne owe hem nat a word that it nys quit* (III 425) – *že chytrá žena muži zrak vždy vytře!* (PŽB 431)
148. *For if I wolde selle my bele chose* (III 447) – *Být jedna z těch, co krásu prodat běží* (PŽB 453)
149. *Whan that he wolde han my bele chose* (III 510) – *kdykoli toužil dostat moji čičku* (PŽB 516)
150. A declarative sentence and an exclamation translated as rhetorical questions:
But what! He may nat do al as hym liketh. (III 914) – *Ale co dělat? Což měl na vybranou?* (PŽB 920)

Additions and deletions

151. *He seith* deleted: *He seith that to be wedded is no synne* (III 51) – *Manželství přece není žádný hřích* (PŽB 57)
152. *Pardee* deleted, *páni* added: *Ye woot wel what I meene of this, pardee* (III 200) – *vy dobře víte, co tím myslím, páni* (PŽB 206)
153. *Benedicite* deleted: *What rowne ye with oure mayde? Benedicite!* (III 241) – *Co s děvečkou sis tuhle šuškal asi?* (PŽB 247)
154. *Benedicite* deleted: *Out of hir owene houses; a, benedicite!* (III 280) – *z vlastního domu. Kdopak za to může?* (PŽB 286)

155. *With sorwe* (“bad luck to you“) deleted, *pečlivě a zchytra* added: *But tele me this: why hydestow, with sorwe, / The keyes of thy cheste away fro me?* (III 308-9) – *Spíš řekni, proč tak pečlivě a zchytra / přede mnou skrýváš klíče od pokladny?* (PŽB 314-5)
156. *Dame Alys* deleted, *pravda zvítězí* added: *I knowe yow for a trewe wyf, dame Alys* (III 320) – *Jsi věrná žena, pravda zvítězí!* (PŽB 326)
157. *At his lanterne* deleted: *A man to lighte a candle at his lanterne* (III 334) – *Kdyby si druhý připálil svou svíci* (PŽB 340)
158. *Pardee* deleted: *He shal have never the lasse light, pardee* (III 335) – *neměl bys přece světla o nic méně* (PŽB 341)
159. *Seint Joce* deleted: *But he was quit, by God and by Seint Joce* (III 483) – *Ale to ví sám Pánbůh, brzy již...* (PŽB 489)
160. *That feele I on my ribbes al by rewe, / And evere shal unto myn endyng day* (III 506-7) – *Ubohý hřbet můj, tak byl často ztýrán, / že modřiny mi sotva mizely* (PŽB 512-3).
161. *God it woot* deleted: *And so I dide ful often, God it woot, / That made his face often reed and hoot* (III 539-40) – *To často šlo tak daleko, že pán by / se málem zalkl pod přívalem hanby* (PŽB 545-6)
162. *But if I telle tales two or thre / Of freres er I come to Sidyngborne* (III 846-7) – *když nepovím vám cestou o fráterech / dvě či tři historcky...* (PŽB 852-3)
163. *“Thou standest yet,“ quod she, “in swich array / That of thy lyf yet hastow no suretee“* (III 902-3) – *Napořád ještě v sázce je tvůj vaz / a napůl mrtev, napůl živ jsi ted’* (PŽB 908-9)

164. *Quod she* deleted: “*Bifore the court thanne preye I thee, sir knyght,*“ / *Quod she*, “*that thou me take unto thy wyf* (III 1054-5) – *Rytíři, žádám, celý soud to slyší,* / *aby sis vzal mě hnedka za svou choť* (PŽB 1060-1)

Omission of features characteristic for the original text

165. *Allas* omitted: *I was aboute to wedde a wyf; allas!* (III 166) – *A já se ondy právě ženit chtěl!* (PŽB 172)
166. *Nay, thou shalt drynken of another tonne* (III 170) – *Z jiného ještě ochutnáte sudu* (PŽB 176)
167. Syntactic inversion: *Of alle men his wysdom is the hyste* (III 326) – *Ten muž si zvolil nejmoudřejší cestu* (PŽB 332)
168. Syntactic inversion: *Deceite, wepyng, spynnyng God hath yive / To wommen kyndely, whil that they may lyve* (III 401-2) – *pro celý život Bůh nám štědrě vdych / slzy a lest a chutě do pletich* (PŽB 407-8)
169. The Historic Present: *The queene thanketh the kyng with al hir myght* (III 899) – *Dík vzdala králi horoucimi slovy* (PŽB 905)
170. *Tel me what that ye seken, by youre fey!* (III 1002) – *Řekni mi ale pravdu, co tu chceš* (PŽB 1008).

Category 3

171. The correct form is *Dáreios* (Svoboda 132): *As was the sepulcre of hym Daryus* (III 498) – *jaká kdys kryla hrobku Dariovu* (PŽB 504)

172. *For which he often tymes wolde preche, / And me of olde Romayn geestes teche* (III 641-2) – *Kázal mi proto, četl v jednom karé / z jedné své knihy římské bajky staré* (PŽB 647-8)
173. The correct form is *Déianeira* (Svoboda 134): *Of Hercules and his Dianyre* (III 725) – *jak Herkules pro Dejaniru, ženu* (PŽB 731)
174. The correct form is *Eriphylé* (Svoboda 176): *Eriphilem, that for an ouche of gold* (III 743) – *jak za šperk zlatý zrádná Erifyla* (PŽB 749)
175. The correct form is *Tullus Hostilius* (Svoboda 635): *Was thilke Tullius Hostilius* (III 1166) – *jak Tullius Hostilius se vynes* (PŽB 1172)

The Nun's Priest's Tale

Category 1

176. Legal terms: *By heigh ymaginacioun forncast* (VII 3217) – *zchytralým plánem řídě svoje spády* (PKJ 451).
177. *As kan the hooly doctour Augustyn* (VII 3241) – *tak jako svatý doktor Augustinus* (PKJ 475)

Category 1/2

178. *For she was, as it were, a maner deye* (VII 2846) – *a tak si žila ve své chýši chudé* (PKJ 80)
179. *Snowte* – “snout“: *His snowte smal, with glowynge eyen tweye* (VII 2905) – *V nevelké hlavě oči planuly mu* (PKJ 139)

Category 2

Semantic shifts

180. Addition of expressivity: *Ye been so scarlet reed aboute youre yen* (VII 3161) – *na šarlat kolem vašich očiček* (PKJ 395)
181. Addition of expressivity: *Herden thise hennes crie and maken wo* (VII 3376) – *když slyšely, jak slípky vyvádějí* (PKJ 610)

Loose translation

182. A rhetorical question translated as a declarative sentence: *What sholde I moore unto this tale sayn?* (VII 3046) – *Podotknout k tomu více lze už stěží* (PKJ 280)
183. *Reed eek of Joseph, and ther shul ye see* (VII 3130) – *Co o Josefu říká historie?* (PKJ 364)

Additions and deletions

184. *He sayde* deleted: *“In alle haste com to me!” he sayde.* (VII 3007) – *A pospěš, než se stane věc ta děsná!* (PKJ 241)
185. *But herkneth!* deleted: *But herkneth! To that o man fil a greet mervaille* (VII 3076) – *Jednomu z nich však div se přihodí tu* (PKJ 310).
186. *Daun* deleted: *Looke of Egipthe the kyng, daun Pharao* (VII 3133) – *Hle, faraóna, krále egyptského* (PKJ 367)

Omission of features characteristic for the original text

187. *Thou is not translated: Be blithe, though thou ryde upon a jade. / What thogh thyn hors be bothe foul and lene? (VII 2812-3) – A netrapte se, i když harcujete / na hnusné herce, samá kost a kůže! (PKJ 46-7)*
188. Syntactic inversion: *No wyn ne drank she, neither whit ne reed (VII 2842) – nepila vína, červená ni bílá (PKJ 76)*
189. “Termes“: *By nature he knew ech ascencioun / Of the equynoxial in thilke toun (VII 2855-6) – vždyť v celém okolí znal od náture, / jak slunce stoupá a zas klesá shůry (PKJ 89-90)*
190. The Historic Present: *Certes this dreem, which ye han met to-nyght, / Cometh of the greet superfluytee (VII 2926-7) – A tak i to, co vám se dneska snilo, / zajisté mělo za příčinu vzniku (PKJ 160-1)*
191. *Allas omitted: Seyde, “Gentil sire, allas, wher wol ye gon?“ (VII 3284) – a „Kampak račte,“ říká, „vzácný pane?“ (PKJ 518)*
192. *This in front of a proper name: This Chauntecleer his wynges gan to bete (VII 3322) – Kokrháč nato počal křídly tlouci (PKJ 556)*
193. *This in front of a proper name: This Chauntecleer stood hye upon his toos (VII 3331) – Náš Kokrháč si stoup na prstů špičky (PKJ 565)*
194. *He omitted: Certes, he Jakke Straw and his meynee / Ne made nevere shoutes half so shrille (VII 3394-5) – že ani Jack Straw se svou chasou celou / tak pronikavě nekřičeli sami (PKJ 628-9)*
195. *Now, sire, faire falle yow for youre tale! (VII 3460) – Žehnej vám za tu historku Bůh v nebi! (PKJ 694)*

Category 3

196. The correct form is *Pyrrhos* (Svoboda 515): ...and Pyrrus with his streite swerd (VII 3357) – ani když hrozný Pyrrhus ve výpadu (PKJ 591)
197. The correct form is *Kartágo* (Svoboda 288): And that the Romayns hadde brend Cartage (VII 3365) – když Kartáginu sžehly římské voje (PKJ 600)

Metre and Rhyme

198. Alliteration: *That trewely she hath the herte in hoold / Of Chauntecleer, loken in every lith (VII 2874-5) – že Kokrháči každou žilkou háral / cit lásky k ní a do morku svých kostí... (PKJ 108-9)*
199. Alliteration: *Men dreme alday of owles and of apes, / And of many a maze therwithal (VII 3092-3) – lidem se denně o opicích zdává, / či o sovách, vše jako ve fantase (PKJ 326-7)*

Links Between *The WBT* and *The NPT*

200. *The WBT*: “Nay, thanne,“ quod she, “I shrewe us bothe two!“ (III 1062) – „To radši peklo!“ odsekla mu na to (PŽB 1068).
- The NPT*: “Nay thanne,“ quod he, “I shrewe us bothe two.“ (VII 3426) – „To tak!“ děl kohout. „Ať jsme oba kleti...“ (PKJ 660).