The submitted BA thesis attempts to analyse Jeff Torrington’s novel *Swing Hammer Swing!* from the perspective of its potential translation into the Czech language. Methodologically the discussion follows M.A.K. Halliday’s classification, consisting of two basic levels in which the process of translation is approached, a macro and a micro level (in this Halliday’s model in fact echoes the communicative theory of Anton Popovič of the 1970s). The thesis thus consists of three basic parts, a chapter on the macro-level properties of the text, a chapter on the micro-level characteristics and the Appendix presenting the student’s translation of the first four chapters of the novel.

Of these three parts the first one is the most substantial. It predominantly deals with the cultural, literary and socio-political context which determined the specific character of Torrington’s novel and as such it makes a very lucid account of the tendencies of Scottish fiction in the recent decades. Dana Křepelová proves that she is acquainted with basic critical sources and oriented in the literary context of the times. What, however, remains unclear is how this contextualisation can help a future translator in his or her decisions; the only practical reference concerns the use of the Holy Bible and even this brief remark shows that in such cases the decision is purely arbitrary. (A certain discrepancy, however, can be found on pp. 21-22, when she first characterizes *Swing* as a modernist text and then places it among the works of fiction that display “post-modern and existential upsurge of energy”.)

The following part, Chapter IV, seems much more problematic. The three subchapters, focusing on the field of discourse, tenor and mode, are divided into passages presenting stylistic analysis of the original text and those discussing problems of translation. Both are rather disappointing: the student’s stylistic analysis consists mostly of general remarks, some of them repeated from the previous sections (the number of repeated points is annoyingly high); a text analysis is also hardly possible without a single quotation from the analysed text. This confusion is then reflected in the parts devoted to the discussion of translation strategies: thus in the chapter on the Field of Discourse all is reduced to whether names should be translated or not; in the chapter on Tenor to the rather stale problem of dialects, without an actual argument why to choose certain registers for rendering the linguistic (dialectical) plurality of the original (showing instead which words the student preferred in two very brief passages); and in the chapter on Mode to how to deal with figurative language. This can hardly be accepted as a relevant discussion of the stylistic characteristic of the novel; we do not know to what extent the selected passages are representative, but what is even more aggravating, the student quite often argues inaccurately and her translation is not free of errors (e.g. when she translates the sentence “Kerouacs by the dozen could be found lipping the Lanny…” as “Celé tucty Kerouaců byly spatřeny, jak slovim tvoří tu postavu Lannyho…”, not knowing that Lanny is in fact cheap wine and not a literary character and that her sentence should go “V parku… bylo možné nalézt celé tucty Kerouaců, jak si ke rtům tisknou láhev levného vína” 43). Other inaccuracies can be documented during the defence. Also, some of her attempts offer two different solutions without justification or explanation – why is it so?

Moreover, the thesis shows marks of rather negligent final editing: there are occasional language mistakes and occasional misspelling (Lewis Carol, 21), not all the titles are properly italicized (see p. 15; there is an unfinished sentence on the same page too), on p. 13 the student refers to the discarded title of her thesis. It is not clear why she persistently uses “tell-
names” when the appropriate and common literary term is “speaking names”. And by the way, one of Communist symbols is the hammer and sickle, not scythe (18). I regret that the student was not able to clear her thesis of these deficiencies the more that I have informed her about them and asked her to re-read her thesis carefully.

To conclude: I recommend the BA thesis of Dana Křepelová for defence with the preliminary mark of good (dobře).
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