

Univerzita Karlova  
Pedagogická fakulta  
Katedra anglického jazyka a literatury

BAKALÁŘSKÁ PRÁCE

Critical comparison of the existing Czech translations of E. Hemingway's  
A Farewell to Arms

Kritické srovnání existujících českých překladů románu E. Hemingwaye A  
Farewell to Arms

Markéta Lhoťanová

Vedoucí práce: Mgr. Jakub Ženíšek, Ph.D.

2018

Odevzdáním této bakalářské práce na téma Kritické srovnání existujících českých překladů románu E. Hemingwaye A Farewell to Arms potvrzuji, že jsem ji vypracovala pod vedením vedoucího práce samostatně za použití v práci uvedených pramenů a literatury. Dále potvrzuji, že tato práce nebyla využita k získání jiného nebo stejného titulu.

V Praze dne 12.07.2018

Ráda bych poděkovala svému vedoucímu Mgr. Jakubu Ženíškovi Ph.D. za vstřícný přístup a podnětné rady. Dále bych ráda poděkovala kolegyni Karlíkové za psychickou podporu.

## ABSTRAKT

Tato práce porovnává dva české překlady románu *Sbohem, armádo!* od Ernesta Hemingwaye. Porovnání je založeno na překladatelských teoriích Jiřího Levého a Dagmar Knittlové. Překlady sice byly vydány jen pár let od sebe, ale dělí je změna politického režimu. První překlad vytvořil Josef Škvorecký v roce 1958 a druhý vytvořil Vladimír Stuchl v roce 1974. Porovnání se zaměřuje na schopnost překladatelů udržet Hemingwayův minimalistický styl jak na lexikální, tak na syntaktické úrovni. Dále práce porovnává strategie překladatelů při řešení problematických pasáží a poukazuje na to, jak je důležité, aby překladatel ctil záměry autora.

## KLÍČOVÁ SLOVA

Překlad, Hemingway, Stuchl, Škvorecký, příkrášlování

## ABSTRACT

This thesis compares two Czech translations of Ernest Hemingway's novel *A Farewell to Arms*. The comparison is based on the translational theories by Jiří Levý and Dagmar Knittlová. The two translations were published only few years apart but they are divided by the change of political regime. The first translation was made by Josef Škvorecký in 1958 and the second was made by Vladimír Stuchl in 1974. The comparison focuses on the translators' faithfulness to Hemingway's minimalistic style on both lexical and syntactic level. It also compares their strategies of dealing with problematic passages and shows the importance of respecting the author's intentions.

## KEY WORDS

Translation, Hemingway, Stuchl, Škvorecký, embellishment

## Table of contents

1	Introduction.....	8
2	Theory of Translation .....	9
2.1	The translational process according to Jiří Levý .....	9
2.2	Double standard in translation according to Jiří Levý.....	11
2.3	Addition and embellishment.....	12
3	Author and Translators .....	13
3.1	Ernest Hemingway .....	13
3.2	The translators .....	15
3.3	Plot summary of AFTA.....	17
3.4	Style of AFTA .....	17
4	Analysis of the two translations.....	20
4.1	Lexical level .....	20
4.1.1	Verba Dicendi .....	20
4.1.2	Verbs .....	21
4.1.3	Adverbs, Adjectives .....	22
4.1.4	Terms of endearment .....	23
4.1.5	Foreign words.....	24
4.1.6	Vulgarisms .....	26
4.2	Syntactic level.....	27
4.2.1	Complex sentence .....	27
4.2.2	Expressing parallel times.....	29
4.2.3	Repetition and gradation .....	29
4.2.4	Passive voice .....	31
4.2.5	Disjuncts .....	31
4.2.6	Graphic record.....	32
4.2.7	Sentence discourse function .....	33
4.3	Problematic passages.....	35
4.3.1	Phrase.....	35
4.3.2	Simile .....	36
4.3.3	Reference to the extra-linguistic reality.....	36
4.4	Mistranslations.....	38

5	Conclusion .....	40
6	Bibliography .....	41

## 1 Introduction

The principal objective of this thesis is the critical analysis of two translations of Ernest Hemingway's *A Farewell to Arms* (hereinafter abbreviated as *AFTA*) to Czech.

The second chapter of this thesis focuses on theoretical questions of translation. The main sources are *Umění překlada* by Jiří Levý and *Překlad a překládání*<sup>1</sup> by Dagmar Knittlová. Translator's work is not an easy task, as the process of translation is complicated and challenging. There are also multiple criteria that ought to be fulfilled by the resulting text. The author of translation needs to be more than a master of the given language, but he also needs to be a thorough reader and stylist. Moreover, his work has to achieve a certain authenticity in the literature of the second language as a work of the author of the original.

*AFTA* is a semi-autobiographic novel published in 1929. It is one of the most prominent books of the American literature and it is a manifestation of the author's specific minimalistic style and the art of omission. It can be synoptically described as a story of war and love.

The first translation was made by Josef Škvorecký in the 1950s and it has since been published in three editions that differ in the translator's comment. The second translator is Vladimír Stuchl, whose version was published in 1974. These translations will be compared analysed with regard to their lexical and syntactic aspects. Furthermore, they will be compared from the viewpoint of the preservation of the author's style. The thesis is focused on problematic passages that proved to be challenging for the translator, and it analyses the translators' distinct strategies of approaching these matters.

---

<sup>1</sup> Citations from both books translated by Markéta Lhot'ánová.

## 2 Theory of Translation

Before we can proceed to the analysis of the two translations, we need to examine some important points and questions of the theory of translation, particularly those pertaining to the aspects which will be examined in the analytic chapter.

“A good translation should not be perceived as a translation but as an original work of art written in the given language” (Knittlová 14) states Bronislava Grygarová and she then defines three fundamental criteria that ought to be achieved by a successful translation. The first one is the **natural use of language**. There are possible challenges for the translator as he/she<sup>1</sup> needs to be careful not to distort the flow of the given language. The second criterion is the achievement of the **identical meaning** to the original text and the last one is the **preservation of the dynamics** of the original text. The third criterion is deemed the most important for the purposes of this thesis, as the translations are analysed chiefly in the contrast with Hemingway’s economical style, which is widely seen the predominant stylistic feature of the novel.<sup>2</sup>

### 2.1 The translational process according to Jiří Levý<sup>3</sup>

Any translational process is inevitably connected to the genesis of the original text. He depicts the whole process as a chain of communication. First there is a certain reality which is afterwards chosen and formulated by the author and thus the text is created. In this instance comes the translator as a reader, who needs to decipher the communication of the text. He then enciphers the given communication into a new register. Finally, there is the last process of deciphering, which is done by the reader of the translated text.

Levý also defines phases of the translator’s work and summarizes them into three requirements.

---

<sup>1</sup> Generic pronoun “he” will be used throughout the thesis to denote both masculine and feminine gender.

<sup>2</sup> Knittlová, Dagmar, a kolektiv. *Překlad a překládání*. Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci, 2010. pp. 14-15

<sup>3</sup> Levý, Jiří. *Umění překlada*. Apostrof, 2012. pp. 42-77

1. **Comprehension** of the model<sup>1</sup>
2. Interpretation of the model
3. Re-stylization of the model

The first requirement is **comprehension of the model**. Levý underlines the necessity of the translator's reading skill and he divides it into three levels. The first level is philological comprehension. It is a matter of preparation and practice and it does not require any special talent. The second level is the comprehension of the ideological and aesthetic value of the text. This level is quite challenging because the translator ought to be capable of recognition and identification of various stylistic devices. The last level is the comprehension of artistic units, that are realized in the characters and their relationships, in the settings and background of the story, and in the author's ideological intentions. This level is perceived to be the most demanding, as the translator needs to comprehend how the original work was assembled from smaller units into greater compositions that create the resultant piece. Therefore, skilful imagination and perceptiveness are necessary, because most of the translator's miscomprehensions are caused by his lack of imagination or by his incorrect understanding of the semantic level of the given language.

The second requirement is the **interpretation of the model**. Levý emphasises that since any two languages are asymmetrical on at least some linguistic levels, the mechanical "word by word" translation is impossible: a perfect correspondence of the meaning between two different registers does not exist. Consequently, the interpretation is of the utmost importance because on many occasions the translator needs to specify any ambiguous lexeme which does not have an equivalent form in the other language.

The requirement of interpretation is essential for this thesis since it draws attention to the fact that the translator needs to avoid any temptation of subjective reading which might lead in the resultant translation to the final reader's misinterpretation of the author's meaning. Levý emphasises that the basis of the interpretation has to be the objective value of the artwork. In other words, the

---

<sup>1</sup> "model" is understood as the original text

translator cannot disrupt the meaning and the style of the text by any insertion of aesthetic embellishments or additional meanings.

The last requirement is **re-stylization of the model**. There are two levels of stylization: the first one is the stylization of the objective reality made by the author of the original text, the second one is re-stylization of that text which is made by the translator. The re-stylization needs to maintain the artistic value of the original. This process requires a significant stylistic talent on the part of the translator.

## 2.2 Double standard in translation according to Jiří Levý<sup>1</sup>

The scholarly perspective on the art of textual reproduction has evolved throughout history. In Levý's *Art of Translation*, it is divided into two standards. The first of these is the **standard of reproduction** and the **standard of aesthetics**.

The standard of reproduction is understood as the requirement of faithfulness and accuracy. The faithfulness in this context equals to the reality of the artwork: it is the relation to the original text, therefore here arises the demand of its truthfulness as well as the demand of the preservation of the original style.

The truthfulness of the artwork does not mean a complete correspondence to the objective reality but to the already transformed reality created by the author. Thus, the translated work of art should be perceived as natural and genuine. It is obvious that the translation cannot be exactly identical to the original, however it needs to create the same impression upon the reader.

The requirement of the preservation of the style is rather problematic as it is not entirely achievable at all times. The subject has been approached by the use of two possible strategies so far. The first is a strategy that pursues the preservation of the formal devices that are used in the original artwork. The second strategy can prove to be quite challenging, since it strives to substitute the style of the original artwork with a domestic one.

---

<sup>1</sup> Levý, Jiří. *Umění překladu*. Apostrof, 2012. pp. 82-87

The standard of aesthetics is understood as the requirement of artistic perfection of the translation, that could be perceived as a living part of the national literature. The translator's work is hardened by the fact that the aesthetic value and meaning need to be the same in both languages and literatures. It is in the translator's nature that he tends to correct and embellish the original work, but it is necessary to control these urges, since the addition of any redundant semantic or aesthetic meaning could be proven counter-productive.

### 2.3 Addition and embellishment

The term *embellishment* is introduced in the critical essay written by Christopher M. Dick<sup>1</sup>. In his work he analyses a problematic German translation of *AFTA* and criticises it for its translational embellishments. The term is primarily understood as the translation that is more artistic than the original. The embellishment may appear in various forms but it is often realized in the use of a lexeme that creates a seemingly microscopic shift in meaning. Other means of producing embellishments are: the change of the discourse function of a sentence, the effort to use attractive vocabulary, or even the modification of graphic record of the text. It is necessary to mention that the embellishment may be a desired effect of some translations, but it is unwelcomed in the contrast with Hemingway's style.

According to Jiří Levý the translator should be aware of the difference between objective reality and reality of the artwork. The ignorance of this contrast may lead to distortion of the reality of the artwork, as the translator may produce an addition of some feature that was not expressed by the author.

---

<sup>1</sup> Dick, Christopher M. Transforming Frederic Henry's war narrative: In Einem Andern Land and translational embellishment.. The Free Library, 2012 Ernest Hemingway Foundation 09 Jul., 2018.

### 3 Author and Translators

#### 3.1 Ernest Hemingway

“Writing, at its best, is a lonely life. Organizations for writers palliate the writer's loneliness but I doubt if they improve his writing. He grows in public stature as he sheds his loneliness and often his work deteriorates. For he does his work alone and if he is a good enough writer he must face eternity, or the lack of it, each day.” (Ernest Hemingway The Nobel Prize in Literature 1954 Banquet Speech)

Ernest Hemingway (July 21, 1899 – July 2, 1961) was born in Oak Park, Illinois. His father, Clarence Edmonds Hemingway, was a physician. He encouraged Ernest to participate in various sports as he himself was an ardent sportsman. He taught Ernest to fish, hunt, shoot and camp, and later he supported him to take part in boxing and football. Ernest's mother, Grace Hall Hemingway, was a musician, who frequently performed in local concerts. He had a rather complicated relationship with his mother and, as an adult, he even declared that he hated her. Her musical orientation had a significant impact on his writing, but his father influenced his whole life style. From 1913 until 1917 he attended Oak Park and River Forest High School, where he had a journalism class. The experience with the school newspaper *The Trapeze* was essential for his following career. Soon after the graduation, he became a reporter in the *Kansas City Star*<sup>1</sup>, where he was lead to use short sentences and resolute yet brief expressions. Assuredly his truthful and self-critical style has its roots in his first publications. He worked there for almost six months, but early in 1918 he enlisted in the Red Cross and assigned to become an ambulance driver in Italy. He drove with ambulances for two months until he was severely wounded on July 8 by mortar fire. He was given the Italian Silver Medal of Bravery. He had to spend six months at the Red Cross hospital in Milan, where he met his first love, Agnes von Kurowsky. Their relationship was heading towards marriage but Agnes broke their engagement in a letter, in which she stated that she is to become a wife of someone else. According to Jeffrey Meyers this rejection caused his future problems with relationships, as he was

---

<sup>1</sup>Paul, Steve. “Ernest Hemingway and The Star.” *The Kansas City Star*, 18. Sept. 2005, <https://www.kansascity.com/latest-news/article295452/Ernest-Hemingway-and-The-Star.html>

afraid to be abandoned again. His first experiences with war, death, injury and love are apparent in his later novel *A Farewell to Arms*.<sup>1</sup>

After the war he found himself immensely changed and in a need of a job. Not having any other occupation, he accepted an offer to write for the *Toronto Star Weekly*. While still working for the magazine he moved to Chicago, where he eventually got a position as an associate editor of the journal *Monthly Commonwealth*. In Chicago he met his first wife Hadley Richardson. Soon after their marriage they moved to Paris, where Hemingway worked as a foreign correspondent for the *Toronto Star Weekly*. His stay in Paris was essential for his work as a journalist, but what is more, it was vital for his career as a writer. He met and befriended a fair number of modernist writers, poets and painters, such as James Joyce, John Doss Passos, Francis Scott Fitzgerald, Pablo Picasso, Ezra Pound and Gertrude Stein. It was her, who had a significant influence on his style and who was his mentor. She introduced him at her salon, where he met other artists of the Montparnasse Quarter, whom Gertrude Stein referred to as the “Lost Generation”. Hemingway became the most prominent representative of the Lost Generation. Even though he participated in the literary life of Paris, he disliked the notion of any literary group or movement, because he preferred to work alone. In 1926 he published his novel *The Sun Also Rises*. His marriage to Hadley deteriorated and they divorced in 1927<sup>2</sup>.

Hemingway later moved back to America with his second wife Pauline Pfeiffer, who was the mother of his second son. The childbirth was strenuous and Hemingway later fictionalized it in *A Farewell to Arms*. They lived in Key West, where he had a quiet and calm life, but it would seem that he was quite restless. In 1933 the married couple travelled to Africa to go on a safari. The journey gave him the inspiration for *Green Hills of Africa* and various short stories.

In 1937, Hemingway decided to become a reporter on the Spanish Civil War for the *North American Newspaper Alliance* and he took part in the project *The*

---

<sup>1</sup> Reynolds, Michael S. *The Young Hemingway*. W.W. Norton Company, 1998.

<sup>2</sup> Schiller, Bill. “How Hemingway came of age at the Toronto Star.” *The Toronto Star*. <http://ehto.thestar.com/marks/how-hemingway-came-of-age-at-the-toronto-star>

*Spanish Earth* as a screenwriter. He was joined there by the journalist and writer Martha Gellhorn, whom he met previously in Key West.

After the war his second marriage was brought to an end and soon after that he married Martha, who was the key impulse and inspiration for his best-known novel, *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, that was published 1940. They went together on an assignment to China and their marriage disintegrated in 1945. During the World War II he was a correspondent for the *Time* magazine. He was present at the Normandy Landings, the Liberation of Paris and the Battle of Hurtgen Forest.

His fourth marriage was to Mary Welsh, whom he met while he was still married to Martha. During the post-war years his family and he himself experienced a string of hardships. Nevertheless, he did not cease to work, and wrote *The Old Man and the Sea*, a book that brought him international fame and eventually he won the Pulitzer Prize in May 1952. His restlessness brought him back to Africa but the journey was unfortunate, because he was almost fatally injured twice.

In 1954, Hemingway was awarded with the Nobel Prize in Literature. The final chapters of his life were accompanied by physical illnesses and depressions. On July 2, 1961, Hemingway committed suicide.

Ernest Hemingway is one of the most significant American writers. He influenced generations of both readers and authors across the whole world not only by his writing but also by his life style. He became a prominent person of the American journalism. He published numerous short stories, novels and novellas.<sup>1</sup>

### 3.2 The translators

The first translator of *AFTA* was Emanuel Vajtauer, a journalist and politician. His translation was published in only one edition in 1931, further editions were dismissed for his unsuitable political activities.

The next translation was made by Josef Škvorecký (September 27, 1924 – January 1, Toronto) a significant Czech writer, translator, essayist and publisher. He

---

<sup>1</sup> Baker, Carlos. *Ernest Hemingway: A Life Story*. New York, Collier Books, 1988.

was a novelist in the first place but some of his works could not be published because of political reasons and therefore he had to earn money elsewhere. He studied English language and philosophy at the Faculty of Arts at Charles University and later he was given an employment in the Anglo-American publishing house *Státní nakladatelství krásné literatury a umění* that is nowadays called *Odeon*. After the revolution in 1968 he seized the opportunity and emigrated to USA and then he moved to Canada where he became a professor at Toronto University. Škvorecký and his wife Zdena Salivarová founded the publishing house *Sixty-Eight Publishers*.

The influence of Ernest Hemingway is quite apparent in Škvorecký's novels as he was captivated by his style, yet it cannot be said that he would copy the great author. Their work is distinguished by their individual experiences in life, by their age and nationality, and finally by the themes and meanings of their texts.

Škvorecký also translated works of Ray Bradbury, William Faulkner, Sinclair Lewis, Alan Silioe and William Styron.

His translation of *AFTA* was first published in 1958, then revised in 1965 and the last version was printed in 1999, which is now generally considered canonical and it is the only one that acknowledges the assistance of Lubomír Dorůžka<sup>1</sup>.

When Josef Škvorecký went to exile his works could not be published because he became an enemy of the socialist regime. Therefore, the third translations of *AFTA* was created by Vladimír Stuchl (April 18, 1922 – April 4, 1990) a nowadays almost forgotten Czech poet, translator and author of literature for children. When reading his poems, it can be said that at least before 1968 he was an enthusiastic supporter of communism and socialism. He was an editor of the *Práce* daily, later he worked for the *Lidové noviny* and *Květy*. He was removed from office during the process of normalization. A vital source of his inspiration was his journey to USA but it can be said that he did not really appreciate the American life-style. His translation of *AFTA* was published in 1974 and it was the only official version up to the Velvet revolution in 1989<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Špirit, Michael. "Josef Škvorecký". *Slovník české literatury po roce 1945*. 5. Jan. 2013. <http://www.slovníkceskeliteratury.cz/showContent.jsp?docId=439&hl=josef+škvorecký+>

<sup>2</sup> Hemelíková, Blanka. "Vladimír Stuchl." *Slovník české literatury po roce 1945*. 12. Aug. 2006. <http://www.slovníkceskeliteratury.cz/showContent.jsp?docId=1127&hl=vladimír+stuchl+>

### 3.3 Plot summary of *AFTA*

American lieutenant Frederick Henry serves in the Italian army as an ambulance driver during the World War I. After his winter leave, he is introduced by his friend Rinaldi to an Englishwoman, the hospital aide Catherine Barkley. They start the relationship as an elaborate game of seduction that, despite their numbness caused in Frederick's case by the horrors of war and in Catherine's by the loss of her fiancée, develops through the novel in firm and passionate love.

When Frederick is wounded on the front and brought to a hospital in Milan, Catherine is transferred there too. This gives them the opportunity to develop their relationship as they are spending all their free time together. Catherine reveals there to Frederick that she is pregnant and they both begin to look forward to having a future together.

When Frederick is cured from jaundice, he is sent back to the front, where the war is taking a turn to the worse. Consequently, the Austro-Hungarian army breaks through the Italian lines and the Allied forces start to retreat. When he re-joins the retreat, angry soldiers are executing Italian officers, blaming them for their defeat. Frederick escapes his capture and by jumping into a river and swimming to a safe distance, then he boards a train to Milan and reunites with Catherine in the town of Stresa. In the end they settle down in Switzerland after a bold night escape across a lake in a small boat.

Although Frederick is sometimes haunted by his experience during the war, they succeed to live a peaceful life and leave the war behind them. One morning Catherine goes to labour, that is exceptionally complicated and painful. It results in the child being stillborn and Catherine dying of a haemorrhage with Frederick by her side. He is unable to say goodbye to her and after her death he walks back to his hotel in rain.

### 3.4 Style of *AFTA*

Hemingway is a master story-teller, whose style became an interminable source of discussion and literary research. "He was not surpassed by any of his

contemporaries in the sensitive description of nature and in his sparkling and compact narrative style” (Ondryášová 131). There are some significant features of *AFTA* that should be further explored in order to understand the difficulties that both the translators had to deal with.

As it was said before, the novel is loosely based on Hemingway’s experience with World War I, however it was published ten years after the war. The main character Frederick is also an American, who came to Europe as an ambulance driver. The events from the front are taken from Hemingway’s life; he also saw a soldier, whose legs were torn off and who died in few moments just like Passini did, he was also hit by a mortar shell and suffered wounds to both legs, then he was brought to the field hospital through explosions and was moved to the hospital in Milan afterwards.

An ordinary reader might say that there is nothing special about *AFTA* as the language is artistically unique and even though the story is sad, it is not exceptional. Nevertheless, Josef Škvorecký says in the translator’s comment<sup>1</sup> that the novel is a composition of associations and that the simplicity of the syntax and lexis are the means of achieving the truthful. The emotional load of the novel is given to the reader in stern and curt descriptions of events and almost shallow conversations. It is typical for Hemingway’s style to use the iceberg theory which leaves the reader filled with emotions, that are not specifically explored in the text, and the reader must live relive them. The meaning of the book is only hinted at, and even though Hemingway does not use metaphors the whole book is “an epic metaphor about life and its cruel end, about death” (288). “The novel is actually an associational melodrama on a high artistic level.” (288).

Not only that Hemingway evades metaphors, he is very careful not to slide into cliché because it is empty and it may cause the reader to create a false connotation. It needs to be underlined that truth is of the utmost importance. Blanche Gelfant states that there is also a moral undertone of the cliché because it “...implies a kind of moral capitulation, a willingness to settle for less than truth or clarity of vision and a willingness to embrace words for the comfort of their familiarity” (173). She then

---

<sup>1</sup> Hemingway, Ernest. *Sbohem, armádo!*. Translated by Josef Škvorecký, Státní nakladatelství krásné literatury a umění, 1965. pp. 287-288

shows that Hemingway uses the cliché in order to submit his hero to a crucial confrontation of courage and despair.<sup>1</sup> It is the monologue about Catherine's possible death in the final chapter of the novel that repetitively operates with the question "What if she should die?" and answers with stereotypical phrases that leaves Frederick and the reader helpless and with no hope. The repetition of it gives the reader a chance to find a whole new meaning which is diametrically opposed to the presupposed one. A repeated joke ceases to be a joke and repeated soothing ceases to sooth.

Daniel J. Schneider<sup>2</sup> proclaims that *AFTA* is "one of the purest lyric novels ever written" because Hemingway keeps the central idea and feeling throughout each part and that he does not write anything redundant or unfilled. Schneider says that "Hemingway's art has both virtues and limitations of lyricism: maximum intensity on the one hand, extremely limited range on the other" (283). Schneider says that the central emotion and meaning of the whole book is bitterness and that every single passage is submitted to this feeling. He explains that there are numerous images that hold the connection of various situations, locations and characters with the same sense. One of these images is rain, which Škvorecký labels as a leitmotif along with mud, meals and love. It is questionable whether *AFTA* should be read as a lyric novel, as it would seem rather doubtful that Hemingway would write with the aim to capture only one feeling. Anything that is true is essential and it cannot be overshadowed by a single emotion.

In conclusion the potential translator needs to understand the minimalism of Hemingway's style and then convert it correctly into his own language without changing the meaning. Speaking about Czech it should be mentioned that it is not a language that would be convenient for minimalism because in its very structure it does not allow as many monosyllabic and monomorphemic words as English. This potential translator needs to keep in mind, that the truth is the highest purpose of Hemingway's writing. There is no word or punctuation that would be redundant therefore it is vital that nothing is omitted or added.

---

<sup>1</sup> Gelfant, Blanche. *Language as a Moral Code in 'A Farewell to Arms.'* In *Modern Fiction Studies*, vol. 9, no. 2, 1963, pp. 173–176. JSTOR, JSTOR, [www.jstor.org/stable/26278471](http://www.jstor.org/stable/26278471).

<sup>2</sup> Schneider, Daniel J. *Hemingway's 'A Farewell to Arms': The Novel as Pure Poetry.* in *Modern Fiction Studies*, vol. 14, no. 3, 1968, pp. 283–296. JSTOR, JSTOR, [www.jstor.org/stable/26278608](http://www.jstor.org/stable/26278608).

## 4 Analysis of the two translations

As it was mentioned before the art of omission and the iceberg theory are the most important features of Hemingway's style. In this section it will be shown that a translator needs to use words that are natural for the reader and that correspond with the original. According to Jiří Levý understatement is a typical feature of English. Hemingway then recreates this feature into a meaningful instrument of communication and therefore it is crucial that a translator honours that and does not add any redundant explicitness, specification or intensification, and that his choice of words does not fabricate any superfluous meaning.

### 4.1 Lexical level

#### 4.1.1 Verba Dicendi

Hemingway's style is based on the reader's ability to detect the emotions and attitudes of characters via dialogues thus the author does not use various verba dicendi but he restrains himself to the use of the most common one: *to say*. This verb is omnipresent in the book and it is the reader's quest to create right associations and uncover hidden layers of each dialogue, even if it may seem dull or insignificant. English writers generally incline to use *to say* more than any other verb of speaking but there is a wide range of alternative options that can help with creation of a dynamic, ever-changing text such as *to ask, to wonder, to frown, to mutter, to think, to tell, to holler, to yell*, etc. As Hemingway does not use them intentionally, the translator should respect that.

H<sup>1</sup>: “‘Then we won't get three thousand lire,’ **Catherine said.**” (107)

Š<sup>2</sup>: “‘Tak nedostaneme tři tisíce lir?’ **řekla Catherine.**” (113)

---

<sup>1</sup> “H” stands for: Hemingway, Ernest. *A Farewell to Arms*. Bantam Books, 1951.

<sup>2</sup> “Š” stands for: Hemingway, Ernest. *Sbohem, armádo!*. Translated by Josef Škvorecký, Státní nakladatelství krásné literatury a umění, 1965.

S<sup>1</sup>: “‘Takže tři tisíce lir se rozplynuly ve větru,’ **posmutněla Catherine.**”  
(115)

Vladimír Stuchl often substituted simple *to say* with verbs that create a shift in the meaning. He may have not realized, that by his effort to enrich the novel he has in fact deprived it of its ambiguity. This embellishment was added to every dialogue that occurred in the novel. It would be pointless to analyse each similar substitution since the error would still be the same: the addition of meaning and disrespect of the author’s style. However, let us have a look at few verbs that Stuchl used as a translation of *to say*: *prohodit* (45), *přikývnout* (45), *vysvětlovat* (51), *prosit* (74), *ušklíbnout se* (150), *vyštěknout* (195), *žertovat* (268), *vykřiknout* (271), etc. It might sound severe to call it a disrespect of the author but during the process of translation the author is expected to reject any temptations to change the author’s style, even if he believes that he could create a better version. In contrast Josef Škvorecký refrained himself from these temptations and used the verb *řít* which is perfectly correct.

#### 4.1.2 Verbs

Hemingway’s minimalistic style is noticeable also in other verbs than those of speaking. The honesty of his narration is partly achieved by the choice of verbs and thus it is not surprising that *to be* predominates. He operates with this verb even when he is describing action, however he still manages to achieve the swiftness and the power of his narration. Therefore, a devoted translator ought to follow his footsteps accurately. Once again Stuchl’s tendency to recreate and embellish Hemingway’s style is striking.

H: “There **was** much traffic...” (1)

Š: “V noci **byl** velký provoz...” (7)

S: “Noci **rozechvíval** provoz...” (7)

It is rather unlikely that Stuchl did not understand the sentence and hence could not translate it correctly. There are several passages of the book with similar deviations from the original sense. It mainly concerns the question of interpretation.

---

<sup>1</sup> “S” stands for: Hemingway, Ernest. *Sbohem, armádo!*. Translated by Vladimír Stuchl, Melantrich, 1974.

Jiří Levý states that some translators tend to explain what is unrevealed and by that they disrupt the structure of the original (132-133). In this instance Stuchl added the notion of noise, ferment and restlessness but the reader himself should be able to uncover these impressions without being told what to imagine.

#### 4.1.3 Adverbs, Adjectives

Hemingway's style of description inclines once again to the use of simple words. He does not intensify attributes and adverbs by anything more remarkable than *very*. In the example below, it is obvious how Stuchl chose a supplement that gives an impression of archaism and lyricism.

H: "And things went **very badly**." (2)

Š: "A šlo to **od desíti k pěti**." (8)

S: "A vyvíjely se **tuze nepříznivě**." (8)

Even though Škvorecký translated the sentence loosely as well, his translation still corresponds more with the original meaning. It needs to be pointed out that these deviations sometimes appear in his version too. It is possible that Škvorecký wanted to produce a text that would feel natural for the reader, but on some occasions, he created an undesirable digression which is underlined by the unnecessary use of cliché.

H: "I am **happy**." (10)

Š: "Jsem **ve své kůži**." (16)

S: "Já jsem **šťastný**." (15)

Škvorecký's loose translation is inappropriate and needless in this occasion because there seems to be no reason why should the reader perceive the exact translation as uncommon.

#### 4.1.4 Terms of endearment

Czech language allows its users to use various types of word formation to address a person for whom they feel love or affection. The most frequent are diminutives that are formed by suffixation. Czech even gives the opportunity to use double diminutive such as *máma – mamka – maminka*. English approach to terms of endearment is somewhat different because the language does not have such a wide range of diminutive forms.

Hemingway inserts these terms into the dialogues of *AFTA* but he constantly uses the same ones, the most recurring are *my sweet*, *darling*, and *baby*. The first two appear in conversations between Frederick and Catherine to express their mutual affection, the last one is used frequently by Rinaldi, who is Frederick's roommate. Rinaldi often speaks to him as if Frederick was his junior. However, Rinaldi is an Italian so the expression might not be necessarily used to show his superiority over Frederick but it might be meant to express his fondness for a friend. It could also be used as an indicator of the differences in between the two nationalities of the two characters and Rinaldi's Italian temperament.

H: "Nothing, **baby**." (33)

Š: "To nic, **chlapečku**." (38)

S: "Za málo, **děťátko**." (40)

This is not only a cultural difference between the two men but also another method of manifestation of the main character's reluctance to use emotional words. Škvorecký's translation is seemingly better than Stuchl's because the word *děťátko* has the connotation of a child and it sounds quite strange that an adult man would address a fellow adult using this word. Nonetheless, the original also feels unnatural because the word *baby* in English is used between lovers and if Hemingway used this term in order to make Rinaldi look unusual, then Stuchl's translation is more suitable.

Frederick uses the other remaining words only when he is speaking in English and when he is with Catherine, who is the only person he has ever truly loved. Consequently, the translator should choose a single supplement for each word instead of changing them throughout the novel. Škvorecký translates *my sweet* as *duše* and

*darling* as *miláček* and he does not change it so it makes the same impression as in the original text that these terms are the lovers' private ways of addressing each other and that these words almost become their names. Stuchl selected a more accurate word for *my sweet* – *drahoušek* but alas he keeps on changing it into *brouček*, *kocourek*, etc. He is more consistent with the word *darling* that he translates as *miláček*.

#### 4.1.5 Foreign words

It is of a foremost importance that Frederick speaks fluent Italian because it gives him the opportunity to become a lieutenant in the Italian army and it creates yet another difference between him and Catherine. Hemingway indicates the situations that are spoken in Italian by utilization of Italian words or phrases. In some cases, the indicator is Catherine who says that she does not understand and asks for clarification of what the other person said.

H: “What are you doing here in *borghese*?” (201)

Š: “Co tady děláte v *borghese*?” (209)

S: “Kde se tady berete? A co že máte na sobě *borghese*?” (210)

*Borghese* is a word for civilian clothes. Both translators usually leave the Italian words the same as in the original but Škvorecký's edition also contains an explanatory glossary. The most repeated word is *tenente* which means *lieutenant*. The remaining Italian expressions are used for things that describe the typical local life, situations and facts.

In some passages of the book Hemingway's Italian is quite confusing because of its incorrect manner of record. On page 46, a wounded soldier moans “Dio te salve, Maria” which is a combination of Italian and Spanish and both Škvorecký and Stuchl converted it into Italian “Dio ti salvi, Maria”. It would seem suitable to use the correct version of Italian as there is no reason to believe that the wounded soldier, who was an Italian, would not know his own mother tongue.

A unique situation occurs when a speaker is saying something in pidgin Italian in order to be understood by the American lieutenant. This simplification of the

language is shown in the English version. This is rather challenging for the translator because he needs to understand the meaning and recreate it with similar strangeness.

H: “Priest every night one against five.” (4)

Š: “Kněz ho vždycky v noci do hrsti.” (10)

S: “Velebníček zápasit každou noc pěti prsty s jedním.” (10)

Stuchl’s translation again added something more to the sentence once again. Knowing that the speaker is trying to be intelligible, it would seem improbable that he would use such an unusual noun as *velebníček*, since the word itself carries additional expressive meaning and it might cause the reader to connotate it to something more. Also, the verb *zápasit* is exaggerated even though the preposition *against* suggests a fight, but on the whole it is unnecessary because there is no verb at all in the original.

Another challenging non-English word is *wallah*. According to the Oxford Dictionary it means “*A person concerned or involved with a specified thing or business.*” and it originates from Hindi.

H: “I’ll see the medical **wallahs**.” (49)

Š: “Zajdu za těmi doktorskými **lampasáky**.” (52)

S: “Pohovořím si s těmi doktorskými **nafoukanci**.” (56)

The word is an upper-class British slang from the days of the colonies in India and it refers to someone who is doing a job. The person who says this word in the novel is an Englishman, and it is expected that he knows what the word means. Both translations are not adequate and it would seem that neither Škvorecký nor Stuchl knew the meaning of the word. In this case it would be more suitable to use some less expressive word and thus avoid any misinterpretation because the Czech history does not have any similar events that would provide the Czech vocabulary with corresponding lexemes.

#### 4.1.6 Vulgarisms

The American publisher did not wish to publish a book that is filled with vulgarisms and blasphemies. Hemingway did not want to completely leave out the problematic passages and so he consented to the replacement of the words with a hyphen. However, he has refilled these words in two printouts and presented them to his friends (one of them was James Joyce) and thanks to this action there are existing versions of the text that are uncensored even though they are not published yet. Publishers in other countries censored the novel as well and for example the British version is even more conservatively edited. James B. Meriwether<sup>1</sup> writes that these graphic substitutions carry the difficulty of the “danger that too many dashes, ellipses, or initial letters substituted for original obscenities will mar the verbal texture of the passage and weaken the fictional illusion.” (453). It is of course a question concerning the era of the publication but the translators’ solutions are worthy our attention.

Josef Škvorecký as a writer had his own experience with censorship on the occasion of publication of his novel *Zbabělci*. However, the passages were altered primarily for political reasons of the communist regime.

H: “The **son of a bitch**,...” (169)

Š: “**Chlap mizerná**,...” (175)

S: “**Potvora**,...” (177)

Both translators substituted the uncensored lexeme with considerably less offensive term of abuse. It is rather peculiar because they both used the word *kurva* as a translation of *harlot* (H,138) in a different part of the book. It displays that they were not reluctant to operate with such an explicit word, as it appears in multiple passages. It is possible that they worked with some of those more censored versions and that they had to actually invent the original word that would be fitting and translate it afterwards. If it was that case then it would be necessary to say that Stuchl’s translation is inadequate because in Czech this word would be used either for an animal or a

---

<sup>1</sup> Meriwether, James B. *The Dashes in Hemingway's 'A Farewell to Arms.'* in *The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, vol. 58, no. 4, 1964, pp. 449–457. JSTOR, JSTOR, [www.jstor.org/stable/24300822](http://www.jstor.org/stable/24300822).

woman not only because its grammatical gender is feminine but also because it implies the connotation of a cunning or deceitful person.

H: "...a dog who - " (21)

Š: "...pes, když se mroucá." (26)

S: "...pes, když ho svrbí..." (28)

The strategies of substituting the dash are quite different, yet they share the same feature: the utilization of an explicit verb that is omitted in the original. Škvorecký did not admit the existence of the censorship in this passage but elsewhere in the book he uses the same graphic symbol instead of the vulgarism. This inconsistency is rather regrettable and can be confusing for the reader. Stuchl's solution is closer to the original and even though he changed the original punctuation, it seems more natural in the Czech text, because the hyphen usually marks a sudden ending of a statement. Unfortunately, he made the same mistake as Škvorecký and for example on page 170 used a dash instead of three dots.

## 4.2 Syntactic level

As it was repeatedly mentioned the reader of Hemingway needs to be extremely observant to every single little detail so that he could uncover and understand each hidden meaning or emotion. Hemingway's syntax is simple and when reading *AFTA* it is not difficult for the reader to follow the structure of each sentence. Thanks to the simplicity of the syntax, the reader's perception of the central meaning and emotion is not disrupted by any complicated elements or digressions.

### 4.2.1 Complex sentence

The English syntactic structure might be ideal for practicing minimalism because the word order is to a certain extent fixed and therefore it allows the writer to operate with repetition and gradation more effectively. The Czech language has complicated system of lexemes because most of the words have various word-forms which naturally affects the syntactic structure. Moreover, Czech speakers tend to use

quite long and complex sentences whose graphic record requires a great deal of commas. Knittlová states that it is given by “**syntactic condensers** that are common in English and that are connected to its nominal character and its denser and more economical formulations” (94). This is challenging for the author of the translation since he should be careful not to add any unnecessary dependent clauses and choose the right conjunctions to connect them. Naturally there are structures that cannot be translated equally.

H: “I went out swiftly, all of myself, and I knew I was dead and that it had all been a mistake to think you just died.” (45)

Š: “Najednou jsem byl bez sebe, úplně a naprosto, a věděl jsem, že je po mně a že to byl všechno strašný omyl, myslet si, že člověk jenom tak prostě umře.” (49)

S: “A náhle jsem se všeho zbavil, nadobro jsem se zbavil sám sebe, a v tu chvíli jsem pochopil, že jsem mrtev a že jsem se strašně mýlil, když jsem si myslel, že zemřít je docela obyčejná záležitost. (52)

This example perfectly depicts the difference between English and Czech complex sentences. It would be very difficult to translate the sentence without making it longer than the original, but still it is obvious that Stuchl did not even try to shorten it. On the contrary he added two more finite verb forms. First one is in the repetition of *zbavil jsem se* where he once again creates a redundant embellishment and the second one is in the substitution of *to think* with finite *myslel jsem si*. In this case Škvorecký is more accurate but nevertheless, his sentence is apparently more complicated than the original.

Hemingway’s straightforward structure causes another problem and that is the adequacy of the translation, because the meaning is not clearly expressed. The adverb *just* in the last part of the sentence is an adverbial of time (not manner) and therefore both translators have misinterpreted it and the meaning is different from the original. Hemingway probably wanted to say that it is nonsensical to think that you just died because if you are capable of thinking then you must be alive. Both translators understood it as a question of the manner of dying. In the context this way of thinking does not seem logical because Frederick then collects himself from the shock of being hit and reacts to his surroundings. The whole passage seems to be a description of

what happens to a man when he is hit with a mortar shell. It is rather unlikely that Hemingway would try to describe any spiritual experience since it never happens in the book again.

#### 4.2.2 Expressing parallel times

The density of English syntax is also demanding for the translation because the author needs to organize syntactic constituents in the right order and manage to keep both the impression of natural Czech and the original sequence of events. This is quite difficult because English has more ways of expressing parallel times. Czech language has the option of transgressive verb form but it is viewed as archaic and most of the speakers do not even know how to form it correctly.

H: “He **took** my glass and **filled** it, **looking** at my eyes all the time, but not **losing** sight of the priest.” (4)

Š: “**Vzal** mou sklenici, **nalil** mi a přitom **se** mi pořád **díval** do očí, ale kněze **neztrácel** z dohledu.” (10)

S: “**Zvedl** mou sklenku a **naplnil** ji a vytrvale mi **hleděl** do očí, ale na kněze **se** přitom **dívat nepřestal**.” (10)

This example shows that both translators were capable of keeping the sequence of events in the right order. Stuchl’s translation of the last part can be confusing for the reader because it creates an ambiguous meaning. It is not clear whether the person (an unspecified captain from the mess) is looking at the narrator or at the priest. The original meaning is that the captain is looking at Frederick but he uses his peripheral vision to track the priest. It is partly because he uses the verb *hledět* that is close to English *gaze* or *stare* and so it slightly changes the meaning.

#### 4.2.3 Repetition and gradation

As it was mentioned earlier in this chapter, English is a perfect language for the use of repetition and gradation and those are significant features of minimalism. Is there any better way of expressing a strong feeling, such as helplessness, than the

constant reiteration of a single thought? Hemingway uses this to instil an emotion into the reader's head and the more he repeats it, the more the feeling grows. Therefore, the translator must try to use as many similar words as he can, or he would deprive the passage of its urgent meaning.

H: "It is never hopeless. But sometimes I cannot hope. I try always to hope but sometimes I cannot." (60)

Š: "Nikdy to není beznadějně. Ale někdy už neumím doufat. Vždycky se snažím doufat, ale někdy mi to nejde." (63)

S: "Nikdy to není beznadějně. Ale občas už beznaději propadám. Pokouším se pořád naději oživovat, ale někdy na to nemám dost sil." (67)

Škvorecký's translation is overall satisfactory even though the second sentence does not feel natural to a Czech reader. It would be more effective if he used the same verb *nejde mi* in the last sentence not only because it would feel less like a translation but also because it would support the effect of repetition. Unfortunately, he did not manage to achieve the other effect of repetition which is given by the similar forms of *hopeless* and *to hope*.

By achieving the repetition of the word forms he shifted the syntactic structure. That is the reason why Stuchl's solution is in contrast with Škvorecký's inadequate because he did not consider the author's style. First of all, he shifted the meaning of the second sentence and made it sound exceedingly more despairing, only because he used the collocation *propadat beznaději*. Another problem with this sentence is its length. In the original the whole statement grows. It starts with a single simple sentence, then the next one is slightly longer and then the finishing one is a compound sentence. Stuchl's choice of words disrupts this gradation. Yet the greatest source of difficulty is his choice of verbs. He substitutes simple short verbs with overly expressive long verbs. This example shows perfectly how Stuchl recreates Hemingway's style into something completely different and it perfectly shows how he deprives the syntax of its straightforwardness and casualness.

#### 4.2.4 Passive voice

As it was mentioned earlier in this thesis in general English syntax is characterized by the utilization of passive verb constructions. Hemingway does not use them as much because he tends to use the active voice but still there are noticeably more of them than there is in the Czech usage, which is rather surprising since the language has two types of passive.

H: “What **is** there **written** in war-time?” (216)

Š: “Co **se** vlastně **píše** o válce?” (223)

S: “Co **vyšlo** teď za války?” (225)

This example is a part of a dialogue and it has a tone of informality. Škvorecký managed to keep the passive voice by using the reflexive passive but he mistranslated the adverbial and thus shifted the meaning. Although Stuchl’s translation of the adverbial is correct, he did not maintain the passive voice.

As it was mentioned before Czech language does not operate with the passive voice because it sounds unnatural and artificial. Therefore, there are some sentences that cannot be translated without shifting the voice into active. The example below is a sufficient demonstration of this phenomenon.

H: “A shot was fired at us from the side-road.” (177)

Š: “Z vedlejší cesty po nás někdo vystřelil.” (182)

S: “Z boční cesty po nás někdo vystřelil.” (185)

#### 4.2.5 Disjuncts

Let us focus on a more pragmatic function of syntax. It is represented as the writer’s attitude towards the propositional content of a sentence. Hemingway uses disjuncts chiefly in dialogues, so the attitude is not his but the speaker’s. Even though there are not many disjuncts throughout the novel, the subject cannot be left out because Hemingway tried to achieve a truthful narration. Therefore, it is necessary to emphasize the importance of a correct interpretation because a single mistake can eventually create a considerable shift in meaning.

H: “I will **probably** marry Miss Barkley.” (8)

Š: “**Asi** se se slečnou Barkleyovou ožením.” (13)

S: “**Vypadá to**, že se se slečnou Barkleyovou vezmeme.” (14)

This is a statement that Rinaldi says to Frederick before they go to see Miss Barkley. Rinaldi is not even dating Miss Barkley and it seems that he barely knows her, because she is new in the hospital and he is known to be volatile. Also, the subsequent situation implies that there is no relationship between him and Catherine, because when she meets Frederick, she obviously prefers his company to Rinaldi's, who seems to be indifferent to the fact. Therefore, the *probably* in his statement is a content disjunct and it expresses the degree of possibility seen from his point of view. The statement itself might mean that Rinaldi actually considers the possibility of marrying Miss Barkley but given the context it is an exaggeration of their relationship.

Škvorecký's translation seems to once again beat the one of Stuchl, considering the facts above. He unfortunately took the one element of the sentence that is not essential and reformed it into an independent clause. In his presentation Rinaldi does not only think about the possibility but he declares that it is about to happen. This small misinterpretation can confuse the reader who might believe that Rinaldi and Catherine are engaged and it can considerably change the image of the two characters.

#### 4.2.6 Graphic record

Hemingway's minimalistic approach to punctuation is also evident in his reluctance to use exclamation mark. It is yet another requirement on the reader to imagine and insert the emotion and strength of the mood himself. The simplicity of the graphic record is most striking in the final chapter where Catherine is in labour and she is experiencing agonizing pain. Her proclamations to Frederick are interspersed with requests in italics. It has two possible interpretations: either it shows that Catherine is not talking to Frederick but to the doctor or it displays her suffering. The exclamations in italics are underlined with exclamation marks and when she is talking about her pains with Frederick it seems like a mere statement.

H: “Give it to me quick. *Give it to me!*” (268)

Š: “Pust’ mi ho, rychle. *Pust’ mi ho!*” (277)

S: “Honem mi to dej! *Dej mi to!*” (277)

The importance of repetition and gradation was analysed before but this is another perfect example, because it is accentuated by both italics and punctuation. Stuchl’s use of exclamation mark is counter-productive because it disrupts the progress of gradation.

#### 4.2.7 Sentence discourse function

Stuchl also embellishes the graphics of the book by changing the structure of a statement into an exclamation. It happens in a substantial number of passages but sometimes he does not change only the structure of the sentence but also its meaning and impression which changes the features of characters.

H: “I see.” (28)

Š: “Aha.” (33)

S: “Že jste konečně kápnul božskou!” (34)

This exemplification could be analysed on more than syntactic level but the process of embellishment and fabrication of artificial information was attended to in another chapter. The main concern here is the change of sentence discourse function from statement to exclamation and it forcefully shifts the meaning of the utterance. In the context Frederick simply says that he understands another soldier. It is clear from his following actions that he does not judge the person and that he wants to help him. Therefore, Stuchl’s translation causes confusion and it deranges the subsequent situation.

The last example is an illustration of how Stuchl was capable of changing a simple statement into an inner dialogue which is a very unique form of narration and which Hemingway does not use.

H: “I thought she was very beautiful.” (20)

Š: “Pomyslel jsem si, že je velice krásná.” (25)

S: “Jsi nádherná, pochopil jsem.” (26)

## 4.3 Problematic passages

### 4.3.1 Phrase

English phrases have become an uneasy task for translators because they require a thorough knowledge of the language. Incorrect phrases can be met on every corner not only in books but also in subtitles at the cinema or in voice acted series on television. Interestingly enough, some excellent translators tend to create an exact translation of a common phrase and thus make a confusing statement that does not agree with the given situation.

H: "I'm awfully sorry." (14)

Š: "Promiňte, prosím." (19)

S: "Odpust'te, nerad." (20)

This is Frederick's reaction to Catherine's statement: "It belonged to a boy who was killed last year." (14) and with this polite phrase he wishes to express his pity for the boy and for Catherine. The ideal translation would be "To mě strašně mrzí." which carries the same meaning but both translators misinterpreted it and both solutions seem quite unnatural in the given context. This instance shows a very common mistake and it is rather strange that neither Škvorecký nor Stuchl knew the use of this phrase.

H: "How do you do?" (13)

Š: "Dobrý večer." (18)

S: "Vítám vás." (19)

This is an example of two different strategies of translating a formal empty greeting phrase which is usually said in the situation where people meet for the first time which is exactly what happens in the context (Frederick becomes acquainted with Catherine). Although Škvorecký's translation is not ideal the generalization of the sentence makes it look natural and carries similar emptiness of the proposition. It would seem that he was careful not to risk. Stuchl's translation is in the setting of a hospital garden rather unnatural, because Catherine is the one who is new on the front

and it can be supposed that Frederick, being an ambulance driver, has been to the hospital before and thus it would be absurd that she would greet him as a host greets a guest at home.

#### 4.3.2 Simile

“The secondary implications of each word are also important to allegoric expressions, their connections to the reality of sense, and the relation between the thought and its artistic meaning.” (Levý 118).

H: “I’m like a big flour-barrel.” (255)

Š: “Jsem jako bečka piva.” (265)

S: “Vypadám jako pytel mouky.” (264)

A simile needs to be translated accordingly to the usage of the language and it is often unsuitable to give the exact equivalent of the simile word by word. It is desired that the simile is chosen from the range of similes that are common in the language or there is a chance that the translation might seem unnatural or unclear for the reader. The example above illustrates two strategies of translation of a simile. Stuchl built his interpretation on the word *flour* but changed the type of container as it is a more common image for a Czech person. Škvorecký however remained with the barrel and used a simile that is quite ordinary. This change would feel less accurate if the speaker was an Italian but it is Catherine who says that about herself. The word *barrel* is a simile to her shape because she is pregnant. Both translations are acceptable but the difference is that Škvorecký managed to keep the image of a heavy round object whilst Stuchl achieved the impression of something that requires a lot of strength to be moved.

#### 4.3.3 Reference to the extra-linguistic reality

“Only when lexical unit carries the meaning which is typical for the historic background of the original, it is possible to leave it in its original version (...) Such a word is a carrier of the meaning that cannot be expressed by any means of the native

language and therefore it can enrich the Czech language. A translation that goes against the purity of the language, is a translation that uses foreign words without semantic purpose,..." (Levý 110). The example below manifests a similar redundancy of a foreign word in a translation.

H: "The old superman,..." (140)

Š: "Náš starý nadčlověk,..." (147)

S: "Vida, náš slavný superman,..." (148)

This is an instance in which the translator ought to have researched the etymology of the word, if he does not wish to cause confusion. The word *superman* is an English calque of German *Übermensch* and the Czech equivalent is *nadčlověk* and it was introduced to all three languages by Nietzsche in nineteenth century. The word *superman* came into Czech language with the famous DC comics and it is a name of a super-hero, who first appeared in 1938. Therefore, for a Czech reader the word *nadčlověk* carries the same reference as *superman* in the time of the novel whereas *superman* in Czech refers to the super-hero.

#### 4.4 Mistranslations

It is obvious from the preceding chapters that Stuchl made a significant amount of errors in his translation of *AFTA* (for example he translated *jaundice* as *tyfus* (H 88, S 95)), but Škvorecký made mistakes too, even though not as many as Stuchl did. In this chapter we will analyse the most noticeable ones.

H: “The barman waved back **deprecatingly**.” (224)

Š: “Barman **energicky** zamával na nás.” (231)

S: “Barman nám taky **povzbudivě** pokynul rukou.” (232)

It would seem, that neither of the two translators understood the word and they both changed the meaning. Škvorecký evidently thought that the adverb is connected to the manner of the movement, and so he worked with the visual effect of the wave. Stuchl’s translation is even more unfortunate because it changes the meaning to its opposite because according to Oxford Dictionary *deprecating* expresses disapproval.

Škvorecký’s mistranslations are chiefly in the passages where there are words that he apparently had not known. Such instances are quite similar to the example above. Other mistakes can be found in the natural flow of the Czech language. It is obvious in these translations that he understood the meaning, but he did not manage to switch to his mother tongue and thus created sentences that are clearly translated from English: it is either in their structure or in the translation of single lexemes. The latter is manifested in the example below, where he translated the word *other* incorrectly and thus created a sentence that is strikingly strange to a Czech reader.

H: “‘He’s an American,’ one of **the other** captains said.” (51)

Š: “‘To je Američan,’ řekl jeden z **těch druhých** kapitánů.” (54)

S: “‘Je to Američan,’ upozornil ho **jeden** z kapitánů.” (58)

It is observable that Stuchl’s knowledge of the English language was not as thorough as Škvorecký’s, because he managed to make mistakes in quite ordinary phrases; for example, he translated the sentence “I made sure he was dead.” (H 46) as “Pochopil jsem, že je načisto mrtvý.” (S 53). He even fabricated in some passages of

the novel completely different meaning; for instance, he translated “They seemed glad to see me.” (H 19) as “Měl jsem dojem, že jsem nepřišel zrovna vhod.” (S 25). His inventions, embellishments, specifications, explicitness, similes or fabrications of artificial content are the most striking violations of Hemingway’s style. Stuchl also created confusion in the process of the story by misleading the reader into miscomprehension of the given situation, context or character. Some of his translations have nearly comical character:

H: “Don’t be a bloody hero.” (49)

Š: “Jenom ze sebe nedělejte hrdinu.” (52)

S: “Odložte to krví pomalované hrdinství.” (56)

## 5 Conclusion

After a head-to-head comparison of the two translations, it is safe to conclude that Stuchl's translation is generally inferior, as his imprecise and artistically pretentious interventions alter the whole meaning of the novel. His greatest translational "sins" are embellishments of the lexical level of the novel; passages that are brief and straightforward are in his version filled with similes, metaphors and expressive lexemes. His translation did not achieve Grygarová's three criteria listed in chapter two. Even though he might have been an accomplished poet, his style does not feel quite natural; it often seems overly artificial, it is most striking in the dialogues. The characters of the novel are altered by the utterances that he puts into their mouths. It was already mentioned in many chapters that he did not keep the identical meaning of the book. Finally, he did not manage to preserve the dynamics of the original text. He changed it to such a great extent that the translation is vastly different from Hemingway's original novel.

It is difficult to say what made Vladimír Stuchl imbue *AFTA* with new meanings which are not even implied by the original. It is possible that he simply did not understand Hemingway's style and that he thought it too straightforward and unimaginative. It may be the case that Stuchl used the original text as a means of self-realization and projection of his own poetic language. It is also probable that he decided to create a better translation than Josef Škvorecký who was by that time in exile and whose work could not be published.

Josef Škvorecký's translation is very satisfying because it keeps the minimalistic style of the original and because it feels very natural. He was able to show Hemingway with his all essential features and yet use a non-artificial language that can be read easily.

Reading both translations, one can say that those are two books containing the same story but one is written by Ernest Hemingway and the other by Vladimír Stuchl. It is unsurprising that after the Velvet Revolution the publishers came back to Škvorecký's translation.

## 6 Bibliography

- Baker, Carlos. *Ernest Hemingway: A Life Story*. New York, Collier Books, 1988.
- Dick, Christopher M. *Transforming Frederic Henry's war narrative: In Einem Andern Land and translational embellishment..* The Free Library, 2012 Ernest Hemingway Foundation 09 Jul., 2018.  
<https://www.thefreelibrary.com/Transforming+Frederic+Henry%27s+war+narrative%3a+In+Einem+Andern+Land+and...-a0293352493>.
- Gelfant, Blanche. *Language as a Moral Code in 'A Farewell to Arms.'* In *Modern Fiction Studies*, vol. 9, no. 2, 1963, pp. 173–176. JSTOR, JSTOR, [www.jstor.org/stable/26278471](http://www.jstor.org/stable/26278471).
- Hemelíková, Blanka. “Vladimír Stuchl.” *Slovník české literatury po roce 1945*. 12. Aug. 2006.  
<http://www.slovníkceskeliteratury.cz/showContent.jsp?docId=1127&hl=vladimír+stuchl+>
- Hemingway, Ernest. *A Farewell to Arms*. Bantam Books, 1951.
- Hemingway, Ernest. *Sbohem, armádo!*. Translated by Vladimír Stuchl, Melantrich, 1974.
- Hemingway, Ernest. *Sbohem, armádo!*. Translated by Josef Škvorecký, Státní nakladatelství krásné literatury a umění, 1965.
- Knittlová, Dagmar. *K teorii i praxi překlada*. Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci, 2000.
- Knittlová, Dagmar, a kolektiv. *Překlad a překládání*. Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci, 2010.
- Levý, Jiří. *Umění překlada*. Apostrof, 2012.
- Meriwether, James B. *The Dashes in Hemingway's 'A Farewell to Arms.'* in *The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, vol. 58, no. 4, 1964, pp. 449–457. JSTOR, JSTOR, [www.jstor.org/stable/24300822](http://www.jstor.org/stable/24300822).
- Mounin, Georges. *Teoretické problémy překlada*. Translated by Milada Hanáková, Karolinum, 1999.

- Ondryášová, Jindra. *English and American Literature*. Státní pedagogické nakladatelství, 1979.
- Reynolds, Michael S. *The Young Hemingway*. W.W. Norton Company, 1998.
- Schiller, Bill. “How Hemingway came of age at the Toronto Star.” *The Toronto Star*. <http://ehto.thestar.com/marks/how-hemingway-came-of-age-at-the-toronto-star>
- Schneider, Daniel J. *Hemingway's 'A Farewell to Arms': The Novel as Pure Poetry*. in *Modern Fiction Studies*, vol. 14, no. 3, 1968, pp. 283–296. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/26278608](http://www.jstor.org/stable/26278608).
- Paul, Steve. “Ernest Hemingway and The Star.” *The Kansas City Star*, 18. Sept. 2005, <https://www.kansascity.com/latest-news/article295452/Ernest-Hemingway-and-The-Star.html>
- Svozil, Bohumil. *Česká literatura ve zkratce: období od 9. století po konce 20. století*. Brána, 2013.
- Špirit, Michael. “Josef Škvorecký”. *Slovník české literatury po roce 1945*. 5. Jan. 2013. <http://www.slovníkceskeliteratury.cz/showContent.jsp?docId=439&hl=josef+škvorecký+>
- Večerková, Michaela. *Tři české překlady Hemingwayova románu A Farewell to Arms: komparativní analýza*. Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci, 2014.