Filozofická fakulta Univerzity Palackého v Olomouci

Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky

Linguistic Interference in Tourism Website Presentations

DIPLOMOVÁ PRÁCE

Autor: Bc. Pavlína Hrubá

Studijní program: Anglická filologie

Vedoucí práce: Mgr. Ondřej Molnár, Ph.D.

Olomouc 2018

PROHLÁŠENÍ

Prohlašuji, že jsem tuto diplomovou práci vypracovala samostatně pod odborným dohledem vedoucího diplomové práce a uvedla jsem všechny použité podklady a literaturu.

V Olomouci dne 17. 5. 2018

Podpis ....

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

"Linguistic interference is a part of any translation", especially, when a text is translated from the translator's first language (L1) into his or her second one (L2) (Hopkinson 2007, 13). The term 'interference' itself can be perceived on many different levels even from the point of view of translation studies, therefore, this explains the wide variety of definitions among various experts in this domain. Moreover, interference is closely linked with 'interlanguage' – a term firstly introduced by Selinker (1972) referring to the translator's mental representation of his or her L2. During the translation process, this may result in interlanguage interference in the target text (TT). Such translation may contain non-standard forms of the target language (TL) on various levels. To minimize such errors and to improve their interlanguage, the translators should consider systemic and structural differences between the languages they are working with. From the point of view of grammar, each language behaves differently, so consequently, when translators try to reach the exact equivalence in the TL and do not pay sufficient attention to these differences, interference from the source language (SL) may occur in their translation. Therefore, the subject of this diploma thesis is a comparative analysis of English translations of Czech texts presented in the Zlín Region tourism website presentations in order to discover the most frequent examples of linguistic interference. The comparative analysis is based on a premise that the analysed texts tend to use syntactic, lexical, and morphological forms of the SL in the TL.

In fact, the analysed texts can be classified as 'promotional' ones (Bhatia 2004) since their main function is not only to inform but also to persuade potential tourists to visit the particular destination, so consequently, they can be considered as a part of the marketing strategy of the chosen tourist destination. Insufficient attention to translation of these texts would not contribute to the positive image of the region from the perspective of English-speaking tourists because, for them, a large extent of the SL interference may build on the incomprehensibility of the TTs.

This diploma thesis is divided in two main parts: theory and analysis. The theoretical part focuses on key terms connected with linguistic interference as well as on approaches and research findings of experts in the domain of translation studies. The aim of the analysis is to apply the theoretical knowledge on particular texts taken from five website presentations of chosen tourist destinations in the Zlín Region; more precisely: the

official website of the city of Zlín, the town Vizovice located in Wallachia, the spa town Luhačovice, the Archbishop's Chateau and Gardens Kroměříž belonging to the UNESCO World Heritage Sites since 1998, and the website of the Veronica Centre in the ecological village of Hostětín located in the White Carpathians Protected Landscape Area. The analysis is based on findings of Hopkinson's case study (2007) of linguistic interference in the translation from Czech as L1 into English as L2. Although it is a corpus-based study, it deals with similar text types. In this diploma thesis, the chosen texts are analysed with regard to linguistic interference on three levels: syntactic, lexical, and morphological. The most part of the analysis deals with the syntactic level, while the analysis of lexical and morphological issues are covered by two less detailed sections. The outcome of the analysis provides an overview of frequent cases of linguistic interference that occur in translation of texts published on tourism website presentations. Therefore, in the future, this diploma thesis might help translators to avoid such errors in translation of similar text types.

I. THEORY

1   INTERFERENCE

To a certain extent, interference is a part of every translation, especially, when a text is translated from the translator's L1 into his or her L2. The term itself as described by Veisbergs "is fuzzy, a blanket term comprising various and differing phenomena" (2016, 30) which embodies a multitude of concepts, so consequently, it can be perceived on many different levels even from the point of view of translation studies.

Therefore, it is obvious that there are various definitions from different perspectives concerning interference. Most of them define interference in connection with languages in contact as well as with terms such as the 'third language' or a 'translationese'. A produced translation may contain a non-standard version of the TL referred to as the 'third language' by Duff (1981), who dealt with problems of translation into English, or as a 'translationese' which is a term coined by Gellerstam (1986) who studied the difference between texts translated from Swedish into English. Both these terms refer to 'interlanguage' – a term introduced by Selinker (1972) which represents the translator's mental representation of his or her L2. The issues connected with 'interlanguage' can be further explained as follows: "Briefly, the interlanguage theory states that learners' (or translators') imperfect foreign language production results in an intermediate language…lying somewhere between two 'true' languages (the L1 and L2)" (Hopkinson 2007, 13). During the translation process, this may result in interlanguage interference which can appear on various levels.

Furthermore, perception of interference on different levels shapes the perspective of the term itself. This explains the wide variety of definitions among various experts in the field of translation studies. Newmark (1991, 78) defines interference from both narrow and wide perspective – the former includes cases "when, apparently inappropriately, any feature of the source or a third language notably a syntactic structure, a lexical item, an idiom, a metaphor, or word-order is carried over or literally translated...into the target language (TL) text" whereas the latter describes "cases when sentence length, punctuation, proper names, neologisms, or cultural words are evidently transferred in the translation, in fact all cases where the language of the translation is manifestly affected whether appropriately or not by the language of the original" (1991, 78). In his former work, Newmark provides a definition in connection with semantics by claiming that interference is "literal translation from SL or third language that does not give the right or required sense" (1988, 283). Similarly, Aixelá tries to provide a more general definition by arguing that "it is the

importation into the target text of lexical, syntactic, cultural or structural items typical of a different semiotic system and unusual or non-existent in the target context" (2009, 75). In a similar way, Kufnerová provides a general and simple definition that describes interference as a process when the TL is influenced by SL, moreover, it is a phenomenon every translator has to deal with (2009, 45). On the other hand, Thorovský perceives interference on different linguistic levels, and, therefore, specifies 'linguistic interference' as "an unintentional transfer of some elements of the SL to the target TL" (2009, 86). As far as Bussman is concerned, the term interference represents "the influence of one linguistic system on another in either (a) the individual speaker (transfer) or (b) the speech community (borrowing, language in contact). In an individual, interference is seen as a source of errors…in a speech community, as a cause of language change" (2006, 581). Consequently, Bussman's perspective suggests the result of interference in a longer period of time as well as the fact that one may not perceive interference only in a negative way because it can eventually be beneficial for the TL. For instance, it can enrich lexis of one language since the language may adopt new words (e.g. borrowings or calques).

1.1 Positive and Negative Aspects of Interference

The arguments about positive aspects of interference differ among experts in the field of translation studies. In Newmark's view, it is possible to find positive aspects (or according to his terminology, 'virtues') of interference "when translator decides to introduce into the TL some specific universal, cultural, personal or linguistic values in the source text" and, in a more general way, it can be beneficial for the TL in connection with literal translation of non-culture-specific idioms (1991, 79). In contrast to this, Richards refers to interference in terms of language learning only in connection with 'negative transfer', so consequently, there cannot be found any positive aspect of interference because it results in an incorrect or unnatural form of the TL (2010, 323). Moreover, quite similar is Crystal's opinion since he considers interference to be an error as well (2001, 165). In addition, Aixelá acknowledges that interference has its advocates (mostly dealing with literary or religious texts) and provides a current mainstream argument in translation of technical texts by stating that there is a general opinion that, to some extent, normalisation can be beneficial, on the other hand, "interference is essentially evil" (2009, 78). However strong this argument may be, it suggests that approaches to interference might differ according to various genres and text types.

The perception of positive and negative aspects of interference as well as the term itself are also connected with the concept of intentionality. In the previously mentioned definition of 'linguistic interference' by Thorovský, he directly refers to this term as "an unintentional transfer" (2009, 86). On the other hand, the further explanation of Aixelá's definition includes both intentional and unintentional "importation" (2009, 75). As far as Newmark (1991, 78) is concerned, interference can have several degrees and its suitability is partially based on the text type of the TT. For example, cultural and idiolectal interference can have beneficial effects on literary texts (Newmark 1991, 78). In this sense, it is possible to perceive intentional interference as a positive aspect in translation provided it does not function as a disturbing element in the text. Nevertheless, Veisbergs argues that intentionality of interference or "translator's motivation" to a certain strategy during the translation process "does not make any difference" for the target readership or audience (2016, 32). It indeed does not play an important role because, in simple terms, readers "do not like having to make an additional reading effort to understand and cope with texts" which are not in a conventional form of the given text type (Aixelá 2009, 77). Therefore, in this sense, the intention of the translator seems irrelevant for the target readers, however, the extent of interference in the TT is certainly essential.

1.2   Degrees of Interference

As was previously mentioned in the statement by Newmark, interference can have several degrees (1991, 77). Thorovský differentiates between three possible degrees of interference: the first "may produce a text that is comprehensible, but sounds unnatural in the TL (contains unidiomatic language)", in contrast to this, the second one "produces a text that sounds natural in the TL, but fails to preserve the ST meaning" and the third one is a mixture of the two previous cases since "it sounds unnatural and the meaning is lost" (2009, 97). On the other hand, Aixelá refers to various degrees of interference in connection with certain text types that might seem to allow a greater degree of interference, nevertheless, such attempts of those who justify "different levels of interference" collide "with the rejection of overt versions by publishers and readers, who are not generally prepared to accept translations" that include syntactic structures and lexical forms not corresponding with "the asymmetrical nature of languages and cultures" (2009, 76-77).

As a result, various degrees of interference may cause various problems in the TT. One of them can be "the misinterpretation of the ST", therefore, the meaning of the author

is changed, another issue may be "omission" of a certain part of the ST that translator considers too "difficult", or there might appear "an inappropriate word-for-word translation" that does not contribute to the clarity of the intended meaning for the target reader (Thorovský 2009, 97). In the literature concerning interference in translation, there is a general tendency for most types of texts to "minimise it" as much as possible (Aixelá 2009, 77). This might be the case of translated promotional and informative texts in which interference tends to occur most frequently (Kufnerová 2009, 45). Since the analysed texts in this diploma thesis are taken from tourism website presentations, they have both promotional and informative character, so consequently, they might represent a challenging task for translators with regard to interference.

However, even translators of other types of texts must cope with interference since "no translation is completely devoid of formal equivalents, i.e. of manifestations of interlanguage" (Toury 1978, 226). More precisely, "linguistic interference is a part of any translation, and when the translator is working from L1 to L2, interference from the source text becomes a key element in the production of the L2 target text" (Hopkinson 2007, 13). Moreover, Kufnerová (2009, 45) states that the influence of the ST becomes stronger the more are both SL and TL closer to each other – most probably because the differences between such languages are less noticeable such as the case of Czech and Polish, or Spanish and Italian. In addition, another factor is when the translator is not much experienced (Kufnerová 2009, 45). On the other hand, Kussmaul argues that it is possible to discover interference in translations of both more or less experienced translators (1995, 17). Similarly, Newmark describes interference as "the spectre of most professional translators, the fear that haunts the translator students; the ever-present trap" (1991, 81). So consequently, if interference is an issue every translator must cope with, could this phenomenon be regarded as a translation universal?

1.3 Interference: A Translation Universal?

Although there seems to be a generally accepted opinion that interference is a part of any translation, there are opposite arguments whether this phenomenon should be considered as a translation universal or not. Baker perceives translation universals as "features which typically occur in translated texts rather than original utterances and which are not the result of interference from specific linguistic systems" (1993, 243). Therefore, Baker's point of view proposes a narrow specification of the whole concept of translation

universal including a statement that interference is not a part of it. On the other hand, Toury proposed two laws of translation to describe certain phenomena that generally occur in translation – one of them being "the law of interference" which refers to a situation in translation when "phenomena pertaining to the make-up of the source text tend to be transferred to the target text"; the other one is "the law of growing standardisation" (1995, 274). So consequently, Toury's perspective is in contradiction to Baker's view, since, from his point of view, interference itself has the property of being universal, while in Baker's perspective, interference is not included among translation universals at all.

Nevertheless, the term 'interference' itself, seems to be quite fuzzy in many publications on translation studies (Mauranen 2004, 67). This could be the reason for its ambiguous and contradictory interpretations. In view of the fact that translation process is strongly associated with at least two languages in contact, it can be considered as "a form of bilingual processing" (Mauranen 2004, 67). Although this bilingual form of interference appears to be a bit narrower concept than interference in translation in general, it still needs to be supported by further research findings (Mauranen 2004, 70). Such research findings should include three areas. The first one is connected with prediction – we should possess the ability to predict not only "where interference occurs" with regard to both SL and TL, but also "where it does not occur" in the TT. Secondly, it is important to demonstrate such occurrences of interference "on a parallel corpus" which includes both the original texts in the SL as well as their versions in the TL. Finally, it is important to prove that such occurrences of interference are particularly specific to the TL as well as other TL texts based on different SLs (Mauranen 2004, 70). Apart from these conditions to prove the form of 'bilingual interference', it would also be attainable to demonstrate "a general tendency" of the possible occurrences of interference with regard to the "transfer from a source to the target" (Mauranen 2004, 70). This rather quantitative form of interference could prove its universal properties, and therefore, it could represent an evidence for the supporters of the view that interference is a language universal. However, according to Mauranen, such evidence needs to be based on a research using a "comparable corpora" including several forms of texts – translations in the TL as well as corresponding texts originally written in the TT: firstly, the texts translated from one particular SL into another particular TL; secondly, it should include TTs translated from various SLs; and finally, the corpus should include corresponding texts originally written in various TLs (2004, 71). Nevertheless, as was demonstrated in Mauraren's study (2004), such practice would only show an abstract

property of the studied languages and not particular occurrences of interference (2004, 79). Moreover, Mauraren's research includes findings supporting both Baker's and Toury's arguments considering interference which were described previously. Therefore, the question whether interference could be considered as a translation universal still cannot be answered unambiguously. It depends on the point of view from which interference is perceived.

1.4 Classification of Interference

Though the term 'translation universal' does not seem to be unambiguously applicable to it, interference is still an issue in every translation because translators are always influenced by the language of the ST to a certain degree (Kufnerová 1994, 47–48). This means that interference can influence "all levels of a language system" but "the causes and intentionality…might differ on different levels of the language" (Veisbergs 2016, 33). Therefore, to determine the degree of interference that includes its various types, many experts from the field of translation studies provide their own classifications.

For instance, Kufnerová (2009) differentiates between two general types of interference: *quantitative* and *qualitative errors*. The first term refers to adopting expressions which are present in the TL but, in the TL, they have a different stylistic function or frequency in comparison to the SL. The second term is connected with adopting expressions that do not appear in the TL at all. In addition, it is sometimes not possible to completely distinguish one from another (2009, 45–46). If fact, classifications of other authors are of similar case since there might be many situations in translated texts to which more than one category is relevant.

Newmark, on the other hand, provides a classification perceiving interference on various levels such as *syntactical*, *lexical, figurative* as well as on the level of *word-order*, *culture* and the *third language* (1991, 83–86).

Similarly, Veisbergs (2016) differentiates among many types of interference such as *morphological*, *lexical*, *semantic*, *idiomatic* and *phrasal*, *syntactic*, or *cultural*. Apart from that, his classification provides categories that describe interference on *orthographic* and *phonetic* levels as well as on the *textual* level including *pragmatic discourse conventions* (2016, 33–45).

Even from the point of view of Aixelá, culture-specific items have its special category in the classification of interference since his classification includes: *lexical*,

syntactic, *cultural* (including proper nouns), and *structural* or *pragmatic interference* – which refers to "genre conventions" (2009, 75).

Another classification provided by Hopkinson (2007) might appear to be a rather simple one in comparison to the previous classifications. Nevertheless, many categories of the previous authors tend to overlap. Another factor influencing these classifications is connected with the different types of texts the authors deal with. Hopkinson, who deals with English translations of texts taken from Czech websites of various cities, towns, and regions (2007, 13), perceives linguistic interference according to systemic and structural differences between Czech and English on three levels; in particular: *morphological*, *syntactic*, and *grammatical* levels of the interlanguage (2007, 18–21).

Finally, the general classification of 'linguistic interference' given by Thorovský (2009), who deals with Czech translations of English science-fiction literature, is based on the 'source of interference' and it includes four categories which are listed as follows: *lexical* (at the word and collocation level), *grammatical*, *syntactic* interference, and interference in *orthography*, although, he then decided to focus only on the lexical level since there was a large number of events connected with lexical interference in his study (2009, 87).

For the purpose of the analysis in this diploma thesis which is focused on linguistic interference, I have chosen a classification according to which the texts are analysed mainly on *syntactic level*. In addition, this part of the analysis will be followed by two less detailed sections dealing with interference on other two levels, namely: interference on *lexical* and *morphological level*. This classification will follow the example of Hopkinson (2007) since his corpus-based study dealt with text types including texts from tourism website presentations. The analysis on *syntactic* and *morphological level* is inspired by Hopkinson's classification according to the systemic and structural differences between Czech and English. Moreover, in his case study, Hopkinson also deals with interference on lexical level, so consequently, the analysis of the lexical level will apply his findings as well.

Moreover, an additional part of the analysis includes a brief overview of other problematic aspects of the analysed texts such as punctuation. Although, this topic seems to be often ignored (at least, by most of the authors' classifications listed above), it appears to be a problematic issue as well.

It is important to note that the listed categories tend to overlap in practice since the analysed texts may also include borderline cases that combine more than one level of interference together.

The main aim of this chapter was to describe the concept of interference as well as to introduce various definitions and classifications of this term by the experts from the field of translation studies. In many cases, their opinions and perspectives differ with regard to this matter. Nevertheless, as Aixelá (2009) claims, it is simply a matter of perspective since issues connected with interference in translation will always include approaches in contradiction to each other. Even though, the translator may check whether a certain term is considered as acceptable not only in the L2, but also by his L2 readership, it still does not mean that his translation solution for that particular term will be perceived as a good one by some critics. (2009, 85). Although, Aixelá deals predominantly with translations of scientific and technical texts in his article, I believe that this could be applicable to translation in general, including translation of texts from tourism website presentations. This suggests that interference is a quite problematic issue for translators, especially, when translating from their L1 into L2, or in other words from their native language into their second one. Therefore, the next chapter deals with translation from L1 into L2 as well as with other issues connected with this type of translation. Apart from the more particular issues dealing with translation from Czech into English, the chapter also includes answers for a fundamental question: Why is it important to translate into L2 at all?

2   TRANSLATION FROM L1 INTO L2

This chapter deals with topics connected with translation into the second language. Besides terms concerning the translation process from L1 into L2 such as 'interlanguage' or 'translation competence', it also includes arguments provided by experts from the field of translation studies about its usefulness or (dis)advantages. Moreover, with regard to the main subject of this diploma thesis – the translation of texts from tourism website presentations from Czech into English – it is essential to discuss the importance and necessity of translation from various languages, including Czech, into English.

Although it is an important and necessary issue, and nowadays, even an everyday reality for many professional translators, translation from L1 into L2 seems to be quite neglected by many authors in the translation studies literature (Campbell 1998, 20). In fact, if translation from L1 into L2 is discussed in the literature, it is, for the most part, connected with listing its disadvantages (Posey 2009, 88). Moreover, some authors even absolutely refuse the whole practice of translating from L1 into L2. For example, Newmark (1988) considers such form of translation as unnatural, inaccurate and even ineffective since, in his opinion, a desirable form of the TT can be achieved only by translating from L2 into L1 (1988, 3).

In contrast to this, Posey's study (2009) tries to prove the opposite since it is based on a premise that translation from L1 into L2 "has its advantages and its end product can be achieved with equal competency" (Posey 2009, 88). The subject of this study is a comparative analysis of two Spanish translations of a children's book originally written in English, in which one translator was working into his L1, while the other one was translating into his L2. The outcome of the analysis has proved that, in this case, translating into the translator's L2 is not only advantageous but it may also result in a translation of better quality than when translating into L1 (Posey 2009, 99).

The historical development of translation supports Newmark's argument because even Martin Luther was of a similar view that there is no better translation than into the 'mother tongue' – referring to L1, moreover, since that time, the translation from L1 into L2 was regarded only as an instructive tool used by translation theorists (Baker and Malmkjaer 1998, 64). Therefore, the translation from L1 into L2 has never gained a superior position over the translation from L2 into L1, however, it might be considered as a subject of controversy nowadays.

In the literature concerning translation studies, it is possible to find many labels for L2, such as 'inverse' or 'reverse' form of translation referring to an indirect form of translation, and therefore, suggesting as if it were not the right way to translate (Pavlović 2007). So consequently, it is better to use the term 'second language' which sounds more unbiased than the other labels mentioned above since it refers to a language that has been "consciously learned, as opposed to that being inductively acquired, usually from birth" (Adab 2005, 227). However, Campbell points out that differentiating between L1 and L2 is a rather complex issue which might not always be done quite easily (Campbell 1998, 71).

2.1   Disadvantages of Translation from L1 into L2

When translating from L2 into L1, the most problematic issue is to perfectly understand the ST, on the other hand, when translating vice versa – from L1 into L2 – the main problem is the production of the TT "in a language in which composition does not come naturally" (Campbell 1998, 57). So consequently, Campbell emphasizes that each form of translating requires different skills – in the first case, the main emphasis in on "comprehension skills", whereas in the second one, "productive skills" of the translator are needed the most (1998, 58).

When translating from L1 into L2, it is possible to claim that "second language proficiency" represents an integral part of the translator's 'translation competence' – a set of skills which are characteristic of a translator (Campbell 1998, 58). Nevertheless, not everybody who performs a translation fulfils all the requirements for an ideal professional translator; and even with regard to professional translators, Campbell (1998) specifies that the term "second language proficiency" refers to its "very special variety" – meaning that, for the translators, there are certain limitations depending on "stages" of "language development" of each of translator which are possible to identify in the final product of the whole translation process (1998, 58). In addition, there is another limitation for those translating from L1 into L2, and that one is connected with the ST, so consequently, this form of translation can be considered as "a very special variety of second language writing" as well since the author of the original text composes it in accordance with his writing and language abilities (Campbell, 1998, 58).

Although, there are some limitations even for the author of the ST, depending especially on the type of text or other circumstances of the writing, there is still a greater or lesser aspect of freedom in this variety of writing which then represents limitation for the

translator of the text (Campbell 1998, 58–59). Therefore, such double limitation tests the translator's abilities – backgrounding his or her skills since the text does not seem unnatural to the target reader, and at the same time, foregrounding the mistakes because they will most probably draw attention of the TT reader.

2.2   The L2 Competence

Furthermore, Campbell's classification of 'translation competence', or more precisely, 'second language competence', can be perceived on three different levels according to the analysis in his study (1998, 69):

- *substandard competence*
- *pretextual competence*
- *textual competence*

Each TT of a translator belonging to a different category according to his or her level of competence has different characteristics. In the case of the TT translated by a translator of *substandard competence*, it involves inaccurate spelling, the length of the TT does not correspond with the one of the ST because it is much shorter, moreover, there is a higher number of content words in comparison to function words, and in addition, the translation has a rather indirect form. In contrast to this, a TT translated by a *pretextually competent* translator has an accurate spelling, nothing from the ST is omitted in the translation, however, the TT is longer due to the higher number of function words instead of lexicalizations, and in addition, structures of the TT sentences follow the ST standard and they are rather verbal. On the other hand, in the case of a *textually competent* translator, there is nothing inaccurate in spelling, the ST corresponds with the TT since nothing has been omitted during the translation process, moreover, the TT involves dense sentences achieved through lexicalizations, and in addition, the lexis varies and involves rather longer words. The whole style of the TT is perceived as nominal and its syntax is characterised by grammatical shifts following the TL standard (Campbell 1998).

Without a doubt, the ideal level of 'translation competence', that a professional translator should possess, is the last one – the level of *textual competence*. In this sense, the term 'textual competence' should also include "sensitivity to differences in register" as well as "sensitivity to naturalness" (Bachman 1990, 94–95). This is also connected with "the special character of written language" (Campbell 1998, 59) which differs from the

spoken one in various aspects that were described by Chafe and Tannen (1987) in their study. So consequently, the vocabulary of written language usually varies, nous, adjectival or passive constructions are more frequent, and it is more complex than in the case of the spoken variety. Therefore, if a translator wants to "increase lexical diversity" of the text, then the number of function words should be reduced in favour of the number of content words, or he may incorporate synonyms of certain terms in the text to show his or her "grammatical ability" (Campbell 1998, 59). Nevertheless, this might not always be possible. For instance, when translating scientific or technical texts, the use of proper terminology is essential, so consequently, the use of synonyms is not an option for the translator of this type of text. Another case is translation of administrative texts such as business letters or reports in which it is important to use special constructions or fixed phrases. In addition, the task of the translator becomes even a more complex issue when translating literary texts since it is essential to maintain the style of the author in the TT (Campbell 1998, 60).

2.3 Advantages of Translation from L1 into L2

It may seem that the position of the translator from L1 in to L2 can be only disadvantageous. However, in the case of a *textually competent* translator, it is still possible to perceive such form of translation as beneficial. In fact, all those limitations, which the translator from L1 into L2 must face and which were described above, may even became advantages over the translator from L2 into L1. As Posey (2009) claims, these advantages over the translator from L2 into L1 can have at least three forms, so consequently, the translator from L1 into L2 is better in having (2009, 91–92):

- *higher cultural competency*
- *less likelihood of misunderstanding the ST*
- *greater care with the use of the TL*

Therefore, if a translator working from L1 into L2 wants to become a *textually competent* translator, his or her training process should be different from the one intended for a translator working from L2 into L1. In other words, there is a need to focus on different skills as Campbell rightly points out (1998, 58).

Nevertheless, supporters of translating from L1 into L2 have also other arguments apart from *textual competence* of the translator. For instance, Ahlsvad (1978) argues that

this form of translation is sometimes favoured even more than translation from L2 into L1, especially, in translation of technical texts because the target readers are used to texts translated from L1 into L2, and in addition, "accuracy is more important than stylistic felicity" in this type of text (Campbell 1998, 57). Therefore, it is even possible to find areas in which translating from L1 into L2 is valued more than the form of translation towards the mother tongue.

2.4   Why Is Translation from L1 into L2 Important?

Both Newmark's (1988) and Posey's (2009) arguments, which were discussed above, may have its supporters as well as opponents. Since there is only a small number of "perfectly balanced bilinguals", and consequently, "virtually all human translation activity falls into one of the two categories – into or from the second language" (Campbell 1998, 57), it is not surprising that this issue divides the experts in the field of translation studies. Nevertheless, the truth is that translation from L1 into L2 is necessary in the nowadays' era of globalization, especially, because it might not always be feasible to find a competent translator from a particular L2 into a particular L1 to perform the required translation (Adab 2005, 227), especially, when it comes to languages with a small number of speakers. Moreover, apart from other aspects, it is also a question of "geographical, commercial and cultural proximity" of the particular languages, therefore, the more they are in contact, the less difficult is to find a translator from the particular L2 into the particular L1 (Baker and Malmkjaer 1998, 65). So consequently, it would be much easier to find a competent translator from Spanish into English, than from Czech into English, provided that Spanish and Czech refer to the translator's L2, while English represents his or her L1.

It is not a surprising fact that, nowadays, English plays a key role in the global communication since it is the language of modern technologies that are used across all disciplines and fields of study. So consequently, English represents so called *lingua franca* especially in Europe where there is a large number of countries speaking different languages (Anderman and Rogers 2005, 20), and at the same time, they need to cooperate in business and political affairs since they are a part of the EU or other international organizations such as NATO or UNESCO. With regard to the need for translation of documents that would be understood internationally, the demand for translation from other languages into English is quite high nowadays (Anderman and Rogers 2005, 13–14). Therefore, a high demand is for the translation from L1 into L2 since, especially, in the

case of Europe, there is a much higher number of native speakers of other languages than those of English. Furthermore, with regard to issues concerning such form of translation, which were discussed earlier in this chapter, it is obvious that the probability of interference in these translations might be quite high. Moreover, since many European languages belong to different language families than English, the probability of aspects of interference in translation may be even higher, for instance, when translating from Czech – belonging to the category of West Slavonic languages (Price 2000) – as L1 – into English – a West Germanic language (Price 2000) – representing the translator's L2.

2.5 'Czenglish'

While it is possible to describe 'Japanese English' or 'Greek English' etc. as particular varieties of "mother-tongue influence" (Swan and Smith 1987, xi), there is also a coined expression 'Czenglish' referring to Czech interlanguage interference in English which was used by Sparling (1989) in his publication *English or Czenglish?* providing a guide to Czech speakers in order to avoid errors resulting from Czech interlanguage interference in English.

Furthermore, 'Czenglish', in its extreme form, serves as a source of many jokes, especially, with regard to lexical interference in connection with semantics and literal translation – for instance, the Czech expression *vinné sklepy* (as an equivalent of English *wine cellars*) might be transferred into English as *guilty basements* under the influence of Czech language (Masaryk University n.d.). Since, unlike in English, *vinný* may refer to both *wine* and *guilty* in Czech. Of course, such examples concerning interlanguage interference in its extreme form are created artificially in order to fulfil the purpose of the joke. However, not quite far from these jokes are texts published in tourism website presentations using automatic translation tools (see Chapter 5) which might be confusing for their target readers.

During the process of L2 acquisition, L1 "necessarily influences" the person's L2, while in the case of translators, "it is the source language…that influences the target language" (Mauranen 2004, 66). Therefore, there is a high probability of interlanguage interference in both cases. Nevertheless, as Campbell argues, the ability to perform a translation from a translator's L1 into his or her L2 "develops in a systematic way" (1998, 70), so consequently, it is very likely to improve in time. Moreover, another way of improving this ability as well as to avoid the 'mother-tongue principle' is possible by

having the TT revised or edited after the translation. Although these expressions may suggest that they refer to the same concept, there is a slight difference between the two of them. The person responsible for revision needs to understand the SL to be able to connect the translation with it. On the other hand, the person responsible for editing concentrates solely on the TT, so consequently, he or she does not need to have the knowledge of the SL which may sometimes lead to confusion or misunderstanding (Wagner 2005, 225). Nevertheless, due to the high demand for texts to be translated into English, the most common method is to have the texts translated by translators who have English as their L2 in combination with editing performed by L1 speakers of English (Wagner 2005, 225–226). Of course, this suggests that mistakes in case of translation in combination with editing may be sometimes unavoidable, both these methods provide an important feedback to the translator. In addition, both revision and editing represent a new way of job opportunities for translators as well as for linguists (Wagner 2005, 226).

The aim of this chapter was to discuss issues connected with translation from L1 into L2 with regard to both advantages and disadvantages that are connected with this form of translation. In addition, it was essential to define particular terms concerning L2 translation such as 'second language competence' and to discuss the importance of L2 translation for today's world in connection with international communication. Furthermore, the focus was on Czech interlanguage interference in English as well as on particular methods that may help translators to develop their ability to translate from L1 into L2. With regard to this, the next chapter describes the most problematic systemic and structural differences between English and Czech that may lead to errors when translating from Czech as L1 into English as L2.

3   STRUCTURAL AND SYSTEMIC DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ENGLISH AND CZECH

This chapter deals with systemic and structural differences between English and Czech. The main focus is on differences that might most probably lead to errors in translation, especially, when translating from Czech as the translator's L1 into English representing the translator's L2. Moreover, the structure of this chapter is in accordance with the structure of the analysis which follows in the second part of this thesis (see Chapter 5).

3.1   Syntactic Level

On syntactic level, there is a difference between these two languages with regard to information structures in relation with a concept firstly introduced by Mathesius (1942) to the Czech context as "aktuální členění větné" which was later translated into English by Firbas as the "functional sentence perspective" (FSP) (1974, 11). Firbas, apart from other scholars, contributed to the theory of FSP with his ideas about 'communicative dynamism' (CD). In general, the distribution of CD (*given* and *new* information, *topic* and *focus*, or *theme* and *rheme*) is determined by the interplay of *linearity*, *context* and *semantics* as well as by *intonation* in spoken language (Firbas 1992 10–11). Although Mathesius argued that English is less prone to the FSP than Czech (1942, 187), Firbas (1966) was of a different view since he perceived the role of FSP to be essential in both languages. Apart from semantics, both Czech and English use different means to indicate CD in a sentence. In case of Czech, the distribution of CD in a sentence depends on *linearity* (or in other words, word order) for the most part. On the other hand, English uses other means (such as special information structures) to indicate the CD in a sentence (Firbas 1992, 254).

The use of information structures to fulfil various communicative purposes can be considered as a *language universal*, however, the use of particular syntactic constructions for particular communicative purposes is *language-specific* (Tárnyiková 2009, 115). In every language, it is possible to express same concepts in various ways, nevertheless, speakers adjust their choices to specific communicative purposes instead of making random decisions (Birner and Ward 1998, 1). In Czech, the relatively free word order allows to highlight any element in a sentence according to its degree of the CD. Whereas English uses other means since its word order determines the syntactic function of each element in a sentence (Dušková 1999b, 118). These other means refer to special syntactic

constructions also known as 'information packaging' structures (Chafe 1976) which have the purpose of structuring information in a sentence according to the intended communicative purpose of the author who adjusts the message to his or her receiver. Tárnyiková (2009) provides a classification of such constructions in English according to two main criteria (2009, 82):

1. *Degree of explicitness* of the construction
2. *Pre-posing* and *post-posing processes*

I will use the first one of them concerning the degree of explicitness to differentiate between information constructions in this chapter. The main focus is on "explicit signals or frames" of a given construction which may be present or missing "in the surface structure of the text" (Tárnyiková 2009, 82).

Considering the way in which both Czech and English indicate information structure in a sentence, it is possible to claim that "Czech is inherently explicit whereas English is inherently implicit" (Hopkinson 2008, 93). Nevertheless, since the English language allows its speakers or writers to choose from various constructions, these constructions differ from each other in their degree of explicitness. Therefore, the first category of constructions according to the *degree of explicitness* includes constructions that are considered as *explicit*, *implicit* and *partially explicit* (Tárnyiková 2009, 82–83).

The first category of *explicit* constructions refers to *cleft*, *pseudo-cleft* and *existential constructions* (Tárnyiková 2009, 82). With regard to the first one of them – the cleft construction or 'cleft sentence' – the speaker or writer can decide which element of the sentence will become the focus. It is possible to perceive such sentence as consisting of two parts: the first one of them begins with the semantically empty subject *It* and the verb *to be* in a corresponding tense followed by the highlighted element which is then followed by the 'backgrounded' rest of the sentence having a structure similar to a relative clause (Quirk et al 1985, 89). For example:

a) *Tom was playing ice hockey yesterday.*
b) *It was Tom that/who was playing ice hockey yesterday.*
c) *It was ice hockey that Tom was playing yesterday.*
d) *It was yesterday that Tom was playing ice hockey.*

The above examples demonstrate possible ways of highlighting various elements of a sentence with the canonical word order (a) in a cleft sentence (b–d). In a similar way, it is possible to highlight certain elements in a sentence via pseudo-clefts which have two sub-types − *pseudo-clefts proper* and *inverted pseudo-clefts* (Quirk et al 1985, 1384). Both these types of pseudo-clefts are illustrated in the example below:

a) *What she likes the most is dancing.*

b) *Dancing is what she likes the most.*

The example (a) represents a pseudo-cleft construction with its typical structure beginning with a clause introduced by a *WH*-element (*What she likes the most*) which is then followed by *to be* in a corresponding tense (*is*) and by the highlighted constituent (*dancing*) towards end of the sentence (Tárnyiková 2009, 90). In contrast to this, the example (b) representing an inverted pseudo-cleft construction begins with the highlighted part of the sentence and is followed by *to be* and a clause introduced by the *WH*-element (Tárnyiková 2009, 90).

Nevertheless, both cleft and pseudo-cleft constructions have their limitations. In other words, when using these constructions, it is not possible for the speaker or writer to highlight just any element he or she chooses. In contrast to this, the relatively free word order of Czech allows its speakers or writers more possibilities of highlighting various sentence elements (Tárnyiková 2009, 112), especially when using special constructions − "vytýkací důrazový opis" (Daneš et al 1987, 537) or "důrazově vytýkací kontrukce"(Karlík 2017) which is a form of parallel to the English clefts and pseudo-clefts as the examples below demonstrate:

a) *Viděl to Petr.* (inverted word order)

b) *Byl to Petr, kdo/který to viděl.* (cleft-sentence)

c) *Kdo to viděl, byl Petr.* (pseudo-cleft sentence)

d) *Ten, kdo to viděl, byl Petr.* (pseudo-cleft sentence introduced by *ten*)

While the inverted word order in the example (a) exists in Czech, such construction cannot be used in English (**Saw it Peter.*). On the other hand, English parallels to the Czech examples (b) and (c) are possible: (b') *It was Peter who/that saw it.* (c') *Who saw it was Peter.* Nevertheless, the example (d) does not have its English parallel since such introductory element (*ten*) is not typical in English pseudo-clefts (Tárnyiková 2009, 113).

Moreover, in some cases, Czech appears to be richer with regard to the introductory pronouns of the relative clause (for more examples, see Tárnyiková 2009, 113).

Apart from clefts and pseudo-clefts, another type of explicit constructions represented by *existential constructions* is shown in the examples below:

a) *A book is on the table.*

b) *There is a book on the table.*

c) *Kniha je na stole.*

d) *Na stole je kniha.*

In comparison to the structure following the English canonical word order (a), the example (b) demonstrates the use of an existential construction which includes two subjects: 'grammatical' subject (SUBJ) (represented by *There*) and the 'notional' or semantic SUBJ (*a book*) from the original sentence (a) (Quirk et al 1985, 1403). Existential constructions follow a simple structural pattern: "there + be indefinite + noun phrase" (Quirk et al 1985, 1406). In addition, the use of such constructions allows the speaker or writer to move the semantic SUBJ towards the end of a sentence as in (b), so consequently, it can function as an equivalent for the Czech example in (d) which differs from the example in (c) only in the changed the word order (Tárnyiková 2009, 113).

The second category referring to *implicit* constructions includes *fronting* and *inversion*. Fronting or more generally 'pre-posing' represents a construction in which an element with canonically post-verbal position is moved to the pre-verbal (fronted) position (Birner and Ward 1998, 31) as in the example (a) below:

a) *Do you think she is angry? – Angry, she is not.*

b) *Myslíš, že je naštvaná? – Naštvaná není.*

In contrast to the example (a), the word order of the Czech equivalent illustrated by the example (b) is not as marked as its English counterpart in (a) because of its relatively free word order (Tárnyiková 2009, 113). In addition, both these examples demonstrate that fronting not only changes the information structure in a sentence or utterance, but it also contributes to the cohesion of the whole text (Tárnyiková 2009, 101).

In the literature, there are two prevailing views concerning *inversion*. The first one of them perceives inversion as a change in the canonical word order which leads to its

marked form (Tárnyiková 2009, 105). In contrast to this, the second one is more specific since inversion is viewed as the "reverse order of subject and predicate" (Crystal 1988, 200). With regard to the structure of inversion, Birner (1994) argues that its "logical subject appears in post verbal position" whereas a different constituent, which follows the verb according to the canonical word order, "appears in a clause-initial position" (1994, 235) which is shown in the example (a) below:

a) *Here comes the train.*

In contrast to fronting in which the highlighted constituent occupies the initial position, inversion highlights a constituent – a SUBJ (*the train*) by moving it to the final post-verbal one (Tárnyiková 2009, 105). Nevertheless, it is possible to find examples combining inversion with fronting, especially in literary texts as in the example (b) below (taken from Tárnyiková 2009, 106):

b) *No pain felt she.* (fronted object + inversion)

The third category of *partially explicit* constructions represents a transition between the two previous categories including *left-dislocation*, *right-dislocation* and *extraposition*. The first two types of constructions belonging to this category are shown in the examples below:

a) *My father, he's in the garden.* (left-dislocation)
b) *He's in the garden, my father.* (right-dislocation)

Both these examples (a) and (b) involve a 'dislocated constituent' (*my father*) placed either "to the left or right" next to the clause (*he's in the garden*). Moreover, the constituent is co-referential with the clause via the pronoun (*he*) (Huddleston and Pullum 2002, 1408). Therefore, in this aspect, left-dislocation differs from fronting:

a) *This car, I want to buy.* (fronting)
b) *This car, I want to buy it.* (left dislocation)

In the example (a), there is no such co-reference between the dislocated constituent (*This car*) and the clause (*I want to buy*) as opposed to the example (b). With regard to the main function of left-dislocation, the opinions differ. There are linguists who claim that its main function is to highlight the 'referent' which plays an important role in the communication

(Geluykens 1992, 158). On the other hand, Prince (1997) differentiates between three types of left-dislocation – one of them represents information new to the discourse (1997, 124). Its main function is also viewed as a form of reintroducing "information that has not been talked about for a while" (Tárnyiková 2009, 107). In contrast to this, right-dislocation usually involves information old to the discourse since it functions as a form of explanation for the co-referential element in the clause, nevertheless, it is highlighted because of the post-posed position (Birner and Ward 1998, 191).

Extraposition is the last type of construction belonging to the category of partially implicit constructions:

a) *That they didn't come to the party was a pity.*

b) *It was a pity that they didn't come to the party.* (extraposition)

The example (a) represents a sentence with the canonical word order in which the SUBJ position is occupied by a subordinate clause (*that they didn't come*). The original (semantic) SUBJ is post-posed in the example (b) and its original position is filled by a grammatical SUBJ (*it*) (Huddleston and Pullum 2002, 1403). This type of construction represents another tendency in English according to which 'heavy constituents' tend to be placed towards the end of a sentence (Tárnyiková 2009, 109).

Of course, English uses a wide range of information constructions apart from those listed above and many of them have a similar function since it is necessary to fulfil various communicative purposes which need to be adapted to various text types (Tárnyiková 2009, 114–115). In a similar way, it functions with regard to the use of active or passive voice. In general, the passive voice is less frequent in Czech than in English, for example, in literary texts (Knittlová 2010, 123). On the other hand, it is equally used in scientific texts in both Czech and English (Dušková 1999a, 176). Therefore, its use is closely linked with stylistics. Apart from certain texts types, its use is also affected by the structure of the whole text – so called 'texture' (Tárnyiková 2009, 114). Moreover, the structure of the passive construction enables the speaker two major possibilities – either to delete the agent or put the agent to the *rhematic*, and therefore, highlighted, position (Huddleston and Pullum 2002, 1428). A passive construction with an agent in the rhematic position allows English to create an equivalent for what can be achieved in Czech only by a simple change of word order (Dušková 1999a, 176) as in the examples below:

a) *Petr napsal ten dopis.*

b) *Ten dopis napsal Petr.*

c) *Peter wrote the letter.*

d) **The letter wrote Peter.*

e) *The letter was written by Peter.*

The examples (a) and (b) demonstrate that, in Czech, it is possible to switch positions of SUBJ and object (OBJ) in order to fulfil the FSP principle. In English, however, such practice does not work, so consequently, the active form of the example (d) must be replaced by its passive counterpart (e) to be grammatically correct.

One of the major differences between the Czech and English word order represents the possibility to omit the SUBJ in a Czech sentence. Although, it is possible to use 'elliptical subjectless sentences' in English, especially, in spoken communication (such as *Glad to see you. Just kidding! Really?* or some other fixed phrases), according to the basic principle of the structure of a sentence, English does not have an exact structural equivalent for this phenomenon that occurs in Czech (Dušková 1999b, 176). Even with regard to various information structures in English, the SUBJ position is occupied either by a semantic SUBJ or by its substitution in the form of a grammatical SUBJ (such as *it* or *there*) as was described earlier in this chapter.

Furthermore, there is a tendency in English to use so called 'complex condensation' (Mathesius 1975). The use of condensed forms is typical for English since the non-finite forms (such as infinitives or participles) are more frequent in English than in Czech and some of them (such as gerunds), do not exist in Czech at all, so consequently, they are usually replaced by subordinate clauses in Czech (Dušková 1999b, 9). This suggests that English agents tend to be implicit as opposed to the Czech ones being expressed rather explicitly, nevertheless, it is possible to find even opposite examples (see Hopkinson 2008, 92).

Other differences connected with syntax occur even on the phrasal level. For instance, there is a difference between Czech and English with regard to nominals. While 'noun chains' consisting of nominal premodifiers and a head are typical in English, Czech, on the other hand, indicates relations in a noun phrase (NP) using preposition or cases (Hopkinson 2008, 89). This phenomenon is closely linked with lexis and morphology; therefore, it will be discussed in the two following sections as well.

3.2 Lexical Level

Both English and Czech seem to have rather opposite systemic tendencies which are noticeable especially on the lexical level. One of these tendencies is the tendency in English to use nominal (or verbo-nominal) expressions in a sentence as opposed to the tendency in Czech to use rather verbal expressions (Tárnyiková 2007, 224). With regard to this, Vachek's study (1955) revealed that English verbs are rather semantically vague in comparison to their Czech equivalents. In English, verbs most frequently appear in combination with nouns which have the function of the 'semantic centre of gravity' (Tárnyiková 2007, 224), or in other words, they carry most of the semantic meaning of the particular expression. These tendencies are illustrated by the examples (a) and (b) below:

a) English: *take a breath*
b) Czech: *nadechnout se*

The examples above demonstrate another tendency in English to be analytical (a) in contrast to the synthetic nature of Czech (b). This is true especially with regard to predicates since they tend to be multi-word in English, while they are usually represented only by a one-word expression in Czech. Of course, these are only tendencies, so consequently, it is possible to find even opposite examples in both of these languages (see Tárnyiková 2007, 224–25).

Moreover, especially in the case of verbs, there is a strong tendency to use verbs with more general meaning in English, in contrast to their more specific counterparts in Czech (Knittlová et al 2010, 48) as in the example (borrowed from Knittlová et al 2010, 48): *go : jít/jet*. The example shows that the Czech expression involves an additional specification concerning the fact whether the movement involves a means of transport or not − an aspect of semantics missing in its English counterpart (Knittlová et al 2010, 48), and therefore, it must be expressed implicitly in the context (Hopkinson 2008, 89).

In addition, when discussing differences between English and Czech with regard to explicitness in relation with reflexive verbs, Dušková (1999a) argues that explicit expressions of reflexivity are rather obligatory in Czech, in contrast to their more optional use in English (1999a, 211) as in the following example (taken from Dušková 1999a, 211): *umývat se : to wash (oneself)*.

When searching for equivalents during the translation process, it is possible to encounter various situations with regard to lexical level. In general, there are two major

types of them – either the equivalent exists in the TL, or it does not (Knittlová et al 2010, 25). A large part of non-existing equivalents in the TL is represented by 'culture-specific items', for instance (the example is borrowed from Baker 1992, 21): the translation of the English expression *Speaker of the House of Commons* into other languages. The issues connected with 'non-equivalence' (including translation strategies and methods that translators should adopt in such situation) are discussed in more detail by Baker (1992). On the other hand, when the equivalent exists in the TL, it can be: absolute (*July : červenec*), partial (*rolls : housky*), or there can be more of them (*go : jít/jet*) (Knittlová et al 2010, 25). With regard *to partial equivalents*, Knittlová et al (2010) provide a classification according to which it is possible to differentiate among:

- *Formal* differences
- Differences in *denotative meaning*
- Differences in *connotative meaning*
- Differences in *pragmatic meaning*

The first category of *formal differences* refers to the analytical nature of English as opposed to the synthetic Czech (for instance, *a poor little thing : chudáček*), in addition, this category involves the degree of explicitness of both languages, especially in relation with 'noun chains'. English tends to be rather implicit with regard to the relations between the nominals which may lead to ambiguity; in Czech, on the other hand, the relations are expressed explicitly through the means of cases or prepositions (Knittlová 2003, 38–41), for example: *cinema ticket price : cena vstupenky do kina*.

The second category of differences in *denotative meaning* involves, for the most part, questions of specification and generalization, for instance, the issues connected with semantically weak verbs in English as opposed to their more specific Czech equivalents as was discussed above.

Thirdly, there are differences in *connotative meaning* referring to diminutives, colloquial expressions or vulgarisms, apart from many others. Therefore, this category is closely linked with stylistics.

The last category concerning differences in *pragmatic meaning* involves phenomena such as omission, substitution or explanation.

3.3 Morphological Level

On the morphological level, English and Czech differ from each other with regard to inflection. In comparison to Czech, the system of inflectional morphology of English is less developed, and therefore, an implicit function must be identified from the context. In Czech, it is possible to identify such function from the particular word itself since it is expressed explicitly through the more elaborated system of inflectional morphology (Hopkinson 2008, 91). Furthermore, in comparison to Czech, the lack of inflection in English seems to be the cause of its larger number of cases involving ambiguity (Dušková 1999b, 199). Apart from that, ambiguity is not only the case of morphology, it may also be found on the syntactic level (see Dušková 1999b).

With regard to morphology, the most problematic issues for translators might involve the grammatical category of *number*, *gender*, *person*, *tense*, *verbal aspect* and *voice* (Knittlová et al 2010, 121). The reason for this is quite simple: the SL may have a specific grammatical category that is completely missing in the TL, or one grammatical category of SL might be more developed than the corresponding one of the TL. In such cases, the TL must express the category in a more implicit way – through the context or through the use of "other linguistic means" (Hopkinson 2008, 91). However, when a translator uses lexical means as a substitution for such missing or less developed grammatical category in the TL, it may sometimes lead to an overemphasis of a certain meaning which might be unnecessary in that particular case, for example: *She was wearing a ring. : Měla na ruce jakýsi prsten.* (Knittlová et al 2010, 121). On the other hand, in the opposite case when the TL has a particular category that is completely missing or less developed in the SL, it still needs to be expressed explicitly in the TT.

Of course, this represents a challenging task for the translator since it might not always be possible to identify such information in the context. For example, in English, it is irrelevant whether *a cook* is male or female, however, the translator from English into Czech would need to know such information to translate it either *kuchař* or *kuchařka* since the grammatical gender must be expressed in Czech in this case (Knittlová et al 2010, 121).

On the other hand, the category of tense is less developed in Czech than in English (Hopkinson 2008, 91), so consequently, when translating from English into Czech, it is necessary to search for other means in order to reach equivalence. For instance, when translating an English text involving past participle forms, the translator should express it

explicitly via lexical means (such as *tehdy* or *předtím*) as a form of compensation for the less developed category of tense in Czech (Knittlová et al 2010, 122).

With regard to case, verbal aspect and person, English is not as developed as Czech. Therefore, when translated into English, the translator should use various linguistic means or express these categories implicitly in the context of the TT (Hopkinson 2008, 91-92). In Czech, these categories will remain explicit as, for instance, in the case of noun chains such as *club discussion : debata v klubu, discussion club : diskuzní klub* (Knittlová 2010, 45). In this case, cases are indicated by inflection or even by a preposition in Czech, whereas in English they remain implicit. Moreover, the Czech examples specify the relationship between the premodifier and the head even more than their English equivalents (Knittlová 2010, 45). With regard to verbal aspect and person, both languages behave in a similar way. In Czech, the morphological form of the verb itself indicates either perfective (*přijít*) or imperfective aspect (*jít*). In contrast to this, English may use other means such as particles, prefixes or various syntactic constructions (Knittlová 2010, 122), for instance: *run out : vypotřebovat*, *misuse : zneužít*, *he used to say : říkával*. Similarly, the Czech category of person T/V (the use of informal or polite form of addressing) must be expressed via other linguistic means or remain implicit in the English TT (Hopkinson 2008, 92).

The question of the category of voice seems to be quite problematic for the translators as well. Morphologically, the passive voice has two forms in Czech – 'periphrastic' (*být* + past participle: *E-mail byl poslán.*) and 'reflexive' (verb + *se*: *E-mail se posílá.*), whereas English has only one form (*be* + past participle: *The e-mail was sent.*) (Dušková 1999a, 150). So consequently, apart from agreement in gender in Czech, both Czech and English passives share the periphrastic form (Dušková 1999a, 149). Moreover, the use of both forms depends on the context since the periphrastic one describes a result of an activity, while the reflexive one focuses on the process (Havánek and Jedlička 2002, 105). Besides the particular situation in the text, the translator should also consider the genre of the TT since the use of voice is connected with stylistics as was discussed above.

The aim of this chapter was to describe differences between English and Czech that might most probably represent the source of interference in translation from Czech as L1 into English as the translator's L2. Nevertheless, it is obvious that, when translating, grammar or lexical issues are not the only important matter. Apart from that, the translator

must also consider to whom is the TT intended, or in other words, who his or her target readers are, as well as what is the communicative purpose of the TT which is closely linked with the text type of the particular translation. The next chapter deals with the comparative analysis of linguistic interference with regard to syntactic, lexical, and morphological level in the English translation of the texts taken from Czech tourism website presentations.

II. ANALYSIS

4 THE COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF LINGUISTIC INTERFERENCE IN THE ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF CZECH TOURISM WEBSITE PRESENTATIONS

The second part of this diploma thesis includes a comparative analysis of linguistic interference in English translation of texts originally written in Czech that were taken from five tourism website presentations of particular places in the Zlín Region. More precisely, the texts are analysed on three levels: syntactic, lexical, and morphological. Nevertheless, I have decided to concentrate primarily on the syntactic level, therefore, issues connected with syntax cover the most part of the analysis.

This chapter starts with a section describing methods that were used in order to analyse the texts. Apart from that, this section also includes the motivation behind the choice of the texts as well as reasons why the topic of this diploma thesis should deserve more attention. The following sections are structured according to particular levels of interference which I have decided to deal with: syntactic, lexical, and morphological. The most part of the analysis covers the syntactic level, while the analysis of lexical and morphological issues are covered by two less detailed sections. Moreover, the last part of the analysis includes an additional section providing an overview of other problematic aspects of the analysed texts.

4.1 Methodology

For the purpose of this analysis, I have chosen texts as well as their English translations which were taken from five tourism website presentations of particular places in the Zlín Region. The choice of the websites was predominantly influenced by one factor: there were not many options since many tourism website presentations of the Zlín Region use automatic translation tools to create other language versions of the Czech texts. Such practice may lead to confusion and it definitely does not contribute to a good marketing strategy of the particular destination as can be seen in the examples below which are randomly taken from various tourism website presentations of particular places in the Zlín Region that use automatic translation tools:

- *Zámek Žerotínů : lock Žerotínů* (Turistické informační centrum Valašské Meziříčí n.d.)

- *Vinný sklep U Včelky : Wine Cellar For Bees* (Uherské Hradiště n.d.)
- *Akce : Action* (Informační portál města Holešov n.d.)

Although such websites include information that may appear incomprehensible to English-speaking tourists, most of the tourism website presentations of particular places in the Zlín Region still choose this method instead of using services of professional translators.

For the purpose of the analysis, I have chosen texts taken from five websites that do not use automatic translation tools; they are listed in *Table 1* below:

Table 1: Analysed Websites

	Tourist Destination	**Website URL**
W1	Zlín	http://www.ic-zlin.cz/
W2	Vsetín	http://www.mestovsetin.cz/
W3	Luhačovice	http://www.luhacovice.cz/
W4	Kroměříž	http://www.zamek-kromeriz.cz/
W5	Hostětín	http://hostetin.veronica.cz/

The chosen websites are marked with a particular abbreviation (comprising of a letter 'W' standing for 'website' and a corresponding number) which will be used throughout the analysis. Each of these texts represent a different part of the Zlín Region as well as a different type of a tourist destination: the official website of the city of Zlín (W1), the town Vizovice (W2) in Wallachia, the spa town Luhačovice (W3), the Archbishop's Chateau and Gardens Kroměříž (W4) belonging to the UNESCO World Heritage Sites since 1998, and the website of the Veronica Centre, located in the ecological village of Hostětín (W5) in the White Carpathians Protected Landscape Area.

The analysis is based on findings of Hopkinson's case study (2007) of linguistic interference in the translation from Czech as L1 into English as L2. Although it is a corpus-based study, it deals with Czech texts and their English translations taken from websites dealing with communication with English-speaking people from abroad. So consequently, apart from others, his study also includes the same text type that represents the topic of this diploma thesis – texts involved in tourism website presentations. Hopkinson's study is based on the concept of 'interlanguage' that was firstly introduced by Selinker (1972). Furthermore, the study describes factors that play major role in various types of linguistic

interference, namely: inadequate reference materials, generalisation from false hypotheses, and systemic and structural differences between Czech and English. The first two factors are closely linked with lexical interference and they include several types of errors: different segmentation of the sematic field of the two languages, lexical errors connected with exact syntactic equivalence, false cognates connected with lexical generalisation, and generalisation in word formation. The last factor includes three categories of different systems: morphological, syntactic, and grammatical.

For the purpose of this diploma thesis, I have decided to deal with linguistic interference on three levels: syntactic, lexical, and morphological. Each section starts with types of interference that the analysed texts share, and then, they are followed by particularities. The analysis is based on a premise that the analysed texts tend to use syntactic, lexical, and morphological forms of the SL in the TL. The major part of the analysis deals with interference on syntactic level which tries to discover the use of similar syntactic structures of the SL in the TL in the analysed texts. On lexical level, the texts are analysed in order to discover non-standard lexical TL forms, e.g. cases connected with inadequate reference materials resulting in lexical interference when translators try to reach the exact syntactic equivalence between the ST and the TT (Hopkinson 2007, 14). With regard to morphological level, the aim is to discover the use of ST morphological forms in the TT. Nevertheless, the borders between these levels of interference are not fixed since there are cases in which one type of interference appears in combination with another one (for example, the syntactic and lexical interference). Therefore, the provided examples may include more than one type of interference, so consequently, my suggestions for translation of such examples may involve reformulation of each aspect of interference (for instance, the syntactic as well as the lexical form).

Furthermore, the analysis also includes a section providing an overview of other problematic aspects which have been discovered in the analysed texts; in particular: problems with the ST, punctuation following the SL standard, semantic changes in translation, and typing errors.

4.2 Interference on Syntactic Level

The first section deals with interference on syntactic level and its main aim is to discover the use of non-standard forms of TL – Czech-English interlanguage interference – to support the argument that there is a tendency to use syntactic structures of the SL in the TL

in the analysed texts. This section is structured according to various types of interference on syntactic level which have been discovered in the analysed texts; namely: zero-subject constructions, constructions with switched position of SUBJ and verb, existential constructions, and various types of interference on syntactic and phrasal level.

One type of interference on syntactic level represents the phenomenon of *elliptical zero-subject constructions*. With the exception of the W2 and W4, examples connected with this type of interference have been discovered in all of the analysed texts as can be seen in *Table 2* below:

Table 2: Zero-Subject Constructions

		SL	TL
W1	a)	Přijeli jste do Zlína na dovolenou a kromě památek vás zajímá také kulturní život města?	Have you come to Zlín on holiday and are interested in the town's cultural life besides the landmarks?
	b)	Nachází se 4 km od Zlína směrem na Holešov a patří mezi nejnavštěvovanější místa…	It is located 4 km in the Holešov direction and is one of the most-visited places…
W3	c)	Proslulé jsou přírodními léčivými prameny…	Famed are the natural medicinal springs…
W5	d)	Vede cestou vpravo, kolem sochy… zase zpět do obce.	Leading way to the right, past the statue of… and then turns back to the village.
	e)	Ekopenzion Centra Veronica je postaven jako pasivní dům a je ukázkou ekologické architektury.	ECO-INN Centre Veronica is built as a passive house and is an example of organic architecture.

As *Table 2* above shows, the examples in the TL column use one characteristic feature of the SL − the possibility to omit the SUBJ in a Czech sentence. In English, the SUBJ is usually implicit in imperatives but not in declarative or interrogative sentences (Quirk et al 1985, 803). Although, it is possible to use 'elliptical subjectless sentences' in English, especially, in spoken communication, according to the basic principle of the structure of a sentence, English does not have an exact structural equivalent for this phenomenon that occurs in Czech (Dušková 1999b, 176).

The same examples from the preceding *Table 2* are presented in the following *Tables 3-5* and they are discussed in more detail:

Table 3: Zero-Subject Constructions

		SL	TL
W1	a)	Přijeli jste do Zlína na dovolenou a kromě památek vás zajímá také kulturní život města?	Have you come to Zlín on holiday and are interested in the town's cultural life besides the landmarks?

The example W1 (a) in *Table 3* above includes two different interrogative constructions. While there is a zero SUBJ in the first construction in Czech, in English, the SUBJ is explicit (*you*). The SL predicates (Ts) refer to two different SUBJs – one being implicit (*vy*), and the other one expressed explicitly in the second part of the sentence (*kulturní život města*). Although, in both parts of the TL sentence, the Ts refer to the same SUBJ – *you*, both the Ts have a different form – the first one is expressed in a perfective aspect, and the second one is in the passive voice. Moreover, the whole sentence has an interrogative form which is characterised by the inverted operator in front of SUBJ in '*yes-no* interrogatives' (Quirk et al 1985, 803). Of course, it is possible to use an elliptical construction in English, however, with regard to interrogatives, we can omit either the SUBJ and operator, or the operator alone (Quirk et al 1985, 898). So consequently, either the elliptical construction should be used in proper way and the coordinated constituents should be structured in a similar way (Quirk et al 1985, 911), or the SUBJ (*you*) cannot be omitted in the second part of the sentence: *…are you interested in the town's cultural life…?*

With regard to declaratives, it works in a similar way as can be seen in *Table 4* below:

Table 4: Zero-Subject Constructions

		SL	TL
W1	a)	Nachází se 4 km od Zlína směrem na Holešov a patří mezi nejnavštěvovanější místa…	It is located 4 km in the Holešov direction and is one of the most-visited places…
W5	b)	Ekopenzion Centra Veronica je postaven jako pasivní dům a je ukázkou ekologické architektury.	ECO-INN Centre Veronica is built as a passive house and is an example of organic architecture.

Both examples from W1 (a) and W5 (b) in *Table 4* above include constructions in present tense having the first Ts in passive voice (*is located/is built*), while their second Ts are represented by a linking verb *be* in present tense (*is*). Moreover, the linking verb is followed by a SUBJ complement in both cases (*one of the most-visited places/an example of organic architecture*). It is possible to use ellipsis of SUBJ in SUBJ complement declarative constructions, nevertheless, the main verb *be* must be ellipted as well to make the sentence acceptable (Quirk et al 1985, 897). Otherwise, the 'prop-SUBJ' *it* must be expressed explicitly (Quirk et al 1985, 898). Moreover, both constructions in the TL examples (a) and (b) are coordinated by means of the coordinator *and* and since the

coordinated constructions must be of the same type (Quirk et al 1985, 911), the examples from *Table 4* should be reformulated as follows:

a) *It is located 4 km away from Zlín in the Holešov direction and it is/represents one of the most-popular tourist destination…*

b) *The Veronica Centre Eco-Guest House is built as a passive house and it is an example of sustainable architecture.* or *The Veronica Centre Eco-Guest House is built as a passive house – an example of sustainable architecture.*

In a similar way, the example W5 (a) in *Table 5* below demonstrates a case in which there is a zero SUBJ in each part of the sentence:

Table 5: Zero-Subject Constructions

		SL	TL
W5	a)	Vede cestou vpravo, kolem sochy… zase zpět do obce.	Leading way to the right, past the statue of…, and then turns back to the village.

Both constructions in the TL example from W5 (a) are coordinated by means of the coordinator *and then* which represents a consequence (Quirk et al 1985, 930). Although coordination requires constituents of the same type (Quirk et al 911), each of the constituents in the example W5 (a) above has a different form: the first one represents a present participle (*Leading way to the right, past the statue of…*) referring to the SUBJ of the preceding sentence in the text, while the second one is a 'subjectless elliptical construction' *(…and then turns back to the village)*. So consequently, at least a 'pro-form' co-referential with the SUBJ of the preceding sentence should be used to occupy the SUBJ position (Quirk et al 1985, 863). Therefore, the example can be reformulated as follows:

a) *Leading way to the right, past the statue of…, it then turns back to the village.*

Another type of interference on syntactic level, which has been discovered in the analysed texts, is connected with one particular movement – *placing the verbal element before the SUBJ* in declaratives as can be seen in *Table 6* below:

Table 6: V-S Word Order

		SL	TL
W2	a)	Ačkoliv je dnes Vsetín moderním městem, mezi jeho nejvýraznější dominanty patří renesanční zámek ze	Even though Vsetín is quite modern today, among its most outstanding dominant features is its 17th-century renaissance

		17. století…	chateau…
	b)	…kde se v historickém centru dochovala perla valašské architektury farní kostel Panny Marie Sněžné…	…where right in the historic centre is a jewel of Vallachian architecture – the Parish Church of the Virgin Mary of the Snow…
	c)	Mezi nejznámější lyžařské oblasti na Valašsku patří bezesporu Pustevny…	Without a doubt, among the most significant ski areas in Vallachia are Pustevny…
	d)	Kolem všech skalních útvarů vede naučná stezka Vařákovy Paseky…	Surrounding all of these rock formations winds the Vařákovy Paseky educational nature trail…
	e)	Na Valašskomeziříčsku – Kelečsku je celkem 150 km cyklotras…	In the region around Valašské Meziříčí and Kelč is a 150-km cycling path…
W3	f)	…od této doby bylo na území Luhačovic „objeveno" celkem 16 kyselek…	On the territory of Luhačovice bubble forth 17 sodium hydrocarbonate acidulous springs…

As *Table 6* shows, most of the examples above switch the SUBJ and T positions, especially, when describing an existence of something, when using the verb *be* in its present form, or there are both these situations in combination. This is the case of most of the W2 (b–e) and W3 (f) examples. Some of them could be reformulated by means of existential construction *there is/are* which enables the semantic SUBJ to follow the T while still being considered as a well-formed English sentence. It includes a semantically empty – grammatical – SUBJ (*There*) occupying the SUBJ position, so consequently, it can be followed by the T (*is/are*) which can then be followed by the semantic SUBJ (Quirk et al 1985, 1403). At the same time, it can function as an equivalent for the ST example with regard to FSP (Tárnyiková 2009, 113). Examples of reformulated sentences using existential constructions are listed below:

b) *right in the historic centre, there is a jewel of the Wallachian architecture – the Parish Church of Our Lady of the Snows…*

e) *In the region around Valašské Meziříčí and Kelč, there is a 150-km long bike path.*

f) *Since that time, there have been found 16 mineral water springs in the territory of Luhačovice.*

Though the W2 examples (a, c, d) from *Table 6* could be reformulated by means of the existential construction as well, there is also another option which would be even more suitable with regard to the ST. The SL construction in W2 (a) *mezi jeho nejvýraznější*

dominanty patří renesanční zámek, in W2 (c) *Mezi nejznámější lyžařské oblasti na Valašsku patří,* as well as in W2 (d) *Kolem všech skalních útvarů vede naučná stezka* allows the SUBJ to follow the T, and since, according to the English canonical word order, the SUBJ precedes the T in declaratives (Quirk et al 1985, 803), there is a need to search for other equivalent constructions in the TL which would be grammatical (such as the use of passive voice). So consequently, these examples could be reformulated as follows:

a) *Even though Vsetín has become a modern town today, the 17th-century renaissance chateau is (still) one of its most outstanding dominant features…*

c) *Without a doubt, the ski resort Pustevny is considered as one of the most popular ones in Wallachia…*

d) *All the rock formations are surrounded by the educational trail "Vařákovy Paseky"…*

In a similar way, the following example in *Table 7* represents another instance of switched positions of SUBJ and T:

Table 7: V-S Word Order

		SL	TL
W5	a)	Skupinám více než 10 osob zajistíme plnou penzi či polopenzi.	Groups of more than 10 people is offered full board or half board.

In this way, the example from the W5 (a) in *Table 7* represents a special case. Both the SL and TL examples use a different voice – active in the former case, passive in the latter one. In English, the passive voice allows to rhematize or even delete the Agent which occupies the SUBJ position in the active form of the sentence (Huddleston and Pullum 2002, 1428). Therefore, the use of passive voice is quite an appropriate solution in this case since the personal pronoun *we* does not have to be used explicitly in the text because such information can be understood from the context. However, the form of the sentence seems to be ungrammatical because there is no agreement between the SUBJ and T. More precisely, the plural from of the SUBJ *Groups of more than 10 people* is not reflected in the T *is offered*. Moreover, it seems as if the T reflects the singular form of the OBJ *full board or half board* which would be in the SUBJ position in a standard passive construction in English (Huddleston and Pullum 2002, 1428):

a) *Full board or half board is offered to groups of more than 10 people.*

Such construction would work perfectly in Czech: *Plná penze či polopenze je zajištěna skupinám vice než 10 osob.* From this point of view, it is possible to assume that the SL passive construction influenced the resulting construction in the TT, therefore, even this example represents a case of interference on the syntactic level.

It is important to note that English translations of texts from W1 and W4 do not include examples connected with switched positions of SUBJ and T in declarative sentences.

On the other hand, the example from W3 (a) in *Table 8* below represents a different case of inverted word order:

Table 8: V-S Word Order

		SL	TL
W3	a)	Proslulé jsou přírodními léčivými prameny…	Famed are the natural medicinal springs…

The example W3 (a) in *Table 8* represents a syntactic construction typical for Czech: *SUBJ complement – verb (copula) – SUBJ* which, however, does not have an exact equivalent in English since the SUBJ would have to occupy the initial position in this case (Hopkinson 2007, 20–21). So consequently, the exact SL equivalent for the TL sentence in W3 (a) would be: *Proslulé jsou přírodní léčivé prameny…* and it would be considered as a proper sentence in Czech with an emphasis on the SUBJ which is occupies the rhematic position. Nevertheless, the SL example in W3 (a) has a different morphology and its SUBJ is implicit. With regard to the morphology and the context, it refers back to the SUBJ of the preceding sentence (*Luhačovice*) in the text:

<u>Luhačovice</u> jsou největší moravské lázně s dlouhou tradicí lázeňské léčby dýchacích cest, trávicího ústrojí, diabetu a pohybového aparátu. <u>Proslulé jsou</u> přírodními léčivými prameny…

So consequently, from the point of view of the translation, there is also a slight semantic change. The TL example from *Table 8* could be reformulated as follows:

c) *The town is famous for its healing springs…*

Another type of the SL interference in the analysed texts occurs when describing existence of something. The following *Tables 9–11* below demonstrate several examples of interference in the TTs connected with *existential constructions*:

Table 9: Existential Constructions

		SL	TL
W2	a)	Je zde pět značených okruhů…	There are five marked trails here…
	b)	Je zde také 10 studánek…	There are also 10 springs here…
	c)	…platí zde úplný zákaz horolezecké činnosti.	…there is a comprehensive ban on rock-climbing activities here.
W5	d)	V průběhu zimy se tady uskutečňují také zajímavé kulturní akce…	During the winter here there are also interesting cultural events…

As can be seen in *Table 9* above, the most problematic aspect of this type of interference seems to be the Czech expression *zde* or *tady*. This is the case of W2 and W5. Of course, the existential construction *there is/are* includes the expression *there* which functions as a grammatical SUBJ in the clause (Quirk et al 1985, 1403) and which, therefore, does not represent a substitution for the adverbial of place (AdvP) (*there*). Nevertheless, the existential construction itself describes a particular existence of something, and from the context, the reader can quite easily identify to which place it relates. So consequently, there is no need to add the AvdP *there* explicitly in the TL examples from W2 (a), (b) and (c). With regard to the example from W5 (d), the order of adverbials *During the winter* and *here* seems to be quite infrequent in the TL (Quirk et al 1985, 500–501). Thus, the examples from *Table 9* could be reformulated as follows:

a) *There are five marked trails…*

b) *There are also 10 natural springs…*

c) *All rock climbing activities are banned here.*

d) *During the winter, various cultural events take place here.*

Other examples concerning existential constructions are shown in *Table 10* below:

Table 10: Existential Constructions

		SL	TL
W2	a)	Najdete zde…	Here they have…
W3	b)	…měly měšťanskou školu…	…they had a city school…

	c)	Na lázeňském náměstí je Kruhová fontána.	On Lázeňské náměstí (Spa Square) is the Kruhová fontána (Circular Fountain).

Table 10 above shows also other examples describing existence of something in which, however, the analysed TTs do not use existential constructions. In case of W2 (a) and W3 (b), the use of the existential construction *there is/are* seems to be a better solution since the use of *have* in existential meaning is not frequent in British English (Clarke 2017). On the other hand, the example from W3 (c) represents a case in which the TT follows the syntactic construction of the ST, so consequently, the SUBJ and T positions are switched, and since it is a declarative sentence, it does not follow the standard word order of English declaratives (Quirk et al 1985, 803). In this case, it is possible to use the existential construction *there is* which would allow the SUBJ to be placed in the rhematic position: *In the square "Lázeňské náměstí," there is a fountain called "Kruhová".* Another option would be to follow the proper word order of the TL, so consequently, the example could be reformulated as follows: *A fountain called "Kruhová" is in the square "Lázeňské náměstí."*

The example from W4 (a) represents another case concerning the description of existence of something that is also connected with non-standard word order in the TL as can be seen in *Table 11* below:

Table 11: Existential Constructions

		SL	TL
W4	a)	…proč se v zahradě nachází řada domácích i exotických zvířat.	…why are there so many domestic and exotic animals.

The example from W4 (a) in *Table 11* shows an indirect wh-question, indicated by a full stop, that has a form of the wh-interrogative in the TT. In Czech, direct questions can have the same form as interrogatives and they can be indicated only by a question mark at the end of the sentence in written language (e.g. *…proč se v zahradě nachází řada domácích i exotických zvířat?*). Whereas in English, interrogatives differ from indirect questions (Quirk et al 1985, 1029) since interrogatives involve inversion – the fronting of operator (Quirk et al 1985, 803). Therefore, the interrogative form of the wh-indirect question in the TL can be perceived as an example of SL interference on the syntactic level.

As the preceding *Tables 9–11* suggest, examples of interference concerning existential constructions occur in each of the analysed texts with the only exception of the W1.

Apart from zero-subject constructions, constructions with switched position of SUBJ and verb, and existential constructions, *other types of interference on syntactic or phrasal level* has been discovered in each of the analysed texts as well. Such examples are shown in the following *Tables 12–17*:

Table 12: Other Types of Interference on Syntactic and Phrasal Level

		SL	TL
W3	a)	V polovině 19. století měly lázně 10 pojmenovaných domů…	In the middle of the 19th century, the spa had 10 named houses…
W5	b)	Infopanel je doplněn o přehlednou mapu…	The infopanel is complemented by a clear map…

As *Table 12* above shows, both examples from W3 (a) and W5 (b) in the TL column follow the syntactic structure of the SL examples (a) and (b). Although, in the case of example (a), the introductory constituent – the adverbial of time (AdvT) *In the middle of the 19th century* with the right border indicated by a punctuation mark – is a phrase following the TL standard, the rest of the construction represents a case in which English tends to use the verb *be* instead of *have* typical in Czech (Sparling 1989, 111). Although English language allows the use of *have* in existential meaning, its use is not frequent in British English (Clarke 2017). Therefore, a better solution would probably be the use of existential construction. Nevertheless, the SL example itself does not provide a good basis for translation in this case. In a similar way, the TL sentence of the example (b) follows the SL syntactic pattern, and though generally, the English language uses passive constructions more frequently than Czech (Knittlová 2010, 123), existential construction might seem to be a more appropriate solution in this case as well. Therefore, the examples (a) and (b) could be reformulated as follows:

e) *In the middle of the 19th century, there were 10 spa buildings (with specific names) in the town.*

f) *In addition, there is a clearly arranged map on the information board.*

On the other hand, the example W5 (a) in *Table 13* represents a different case:

Table 13: Other Types of Interference on Syntactic and Phrasal Level

		SL	TL
W5	a)	Máte víc času?	You have more time?

Although a Czech interrogative sentence can have the same word order as declarative, the interrogative form of the TL sentence suggests that the word order needs to be changed. The declarative sentence *You have more time.* follows the standard TL word order, but its interrogative equivalent needs the inversion of operator, which is *do* in this case (Quirk et al 1985, 803). So consequently, the interrogative sentence can be reformulated as follows: *Do you have more time?* Nevertheless, even such elliptical constructions without the *do* support can be considered as acceptable in English, however, they are more common in colloquial speech (Dušková 1999b, 176). Therefore, this example refers to the spoken variety of the English language. Nevertheless, if there is an intention to attract the reader by means of less formal language, such construction can be appropriate.

Another type of interference on sentence level is closely linked with punctuation, and therefore, with stylistics, as can be seen in *Table 14* below:

Table 14: Other Types of Interference on Syntactic and Phrasal Level

		SL	TL
W2	a)	Z jejího ochozu máte město i působivou hornatou krajinu kolem jako na dlani.	From its observation gallery the impressive mountainous countryside looks as though you could hold it in the palm of your hand.
W4	b)	V druhém patře dále navštívíte Manský sál…	On the second floor you will visit the Liege Hall…
	c)	Po celou dobu své existence byly majetkem olomouckých biskupů…	For the whole duration of their existence the castle and the gardens were property of Olomouc bishops…

The TL examples (a–c) in *Table 14* above seem to follow the standard of the SL with regard to punctuation. It is possible to start a declarative sentence in English with an introductory phrase such as the prepositional phrase in the form of AvdP in the example W2 (a) *From its observation gallery*, AdvP in W2 (b) *On the second floor*, and AdvT in W4 (c) *For the whole duration of their existence*, nevertheless, the right border of such constituent should be indicated by a comma, especially, when the constituent is more

complex (Turabian 2013, 297) as in the example W4 (c). On the other hand, this does not apply to the ST examples since Czech punctuation differs from the English one in this case, so consequently, it is possible to assume that the TT follows the standard of the ST.

The use of adverbials in the TTs appears to be quite problematic as can be seen in *Table 15* below:

Table 15: Other Types of Interference on Syntactic and Phrasal Level

		SL	TL
W1	a)	Jeho vedení si již někdy před rokem 1930 vytklo za cíl budovat samostatné výrobní jednotky…	His leadership at some time before 1930 set as the target to develop individual production units…
W5	b)	…je několik možností zimního lyžování.	…there are several options in the winter for skiing.

In the case of W1 (a), the AdvT (*at some time before 1930*) separates the SUBJ (*His leadership*) and the T (*set as the target to develop*) as an 'parenthetical element' (see Turabian 2013, 299). From the perspective of phrases, the AvdT represents a prepositional phrase (PP) which does not modify the head of the NP (*leadership*) but it does not function as a 'complement' of the verb *set* in the sentence because if it was omitted, the construction would still be grammatical: *His leadership set as the target to develop individual production units…* (complements of verbs are further discussed in Quirk et al 1985, 1150–1220). In general, the position of adverbials in a sentence is relatively free in comparison to other constituents, therefore, it is possible to place an adverbial in medial position (between SUBJ and T), however, the boundaries of more complex constituents should be indicated by commas (Quirk et al 1985, 492–493):

a) *His leadership, at some time before 1930, set as the target to develop individual production unit.* Or *(At) some time before 1930, his leadership set as the target to develop individual production units…*

On the other hand, the example from W5 (b) shows a case in which there is a non-standard order of modifiers inside the NP (*several options in the winter for skiing*). According to the standard structure of an English NP, the PP (*for skiing*) represents a light post-head complement, therefore, it should directly follow the head (*options*) and it should not be preceded by a post-head modifier (*in the winter*) (Huddleston and Pullum 2002, 454). On the other hand, instead of PP in the form of an adverbial (*v zimě*), the Czech

version uses an adjective (*zimního*) which modifies the noun (*lyžování*), so consequently, it can precede the noun. There for the TL example could be reformulated as follows:

b) *…there are several options for skiing in the winter.*

In a similar way, there are examples concerning syntactic interference with regard to the division of a verb from its operator as can be seen in *Table 16* below:

Table 16: Other Types of Interference on Syntactic and Phrasal Level

		SL	TL
W4	a)	Ze zelinářské a ovocnářské zahrady byla v 17. století přebudována na zahradu barokní.	From vegetable-growing and fruit-growing garden, it was in the 17th century rebuilt to baroque garden.
W5	b)	V současnosti můžete v původních sklepeních a sýpkách zhlédnout expozici o historii hradu…	Currently you can in the original cellars and granaries see an exhibition about the history of the castle…

In the case of the example from W4 (a) in *Table 16* above, operator and verb (*was rebuilt*) is divided from each other by the PP in the form of AdvT (*in the 17th century*). According to the standard form of English word order, majority of adverbials occur in the 'end-position' following the verb and its complements (Quirk et al 1985, 500). In this case, the complement of the verb *rebuilt* represents the OBJ of preposition (*to baroque garden*), nevertheless, as was discussed above, the position of adverbials is relatively free in comparison to other syntactic elements, however, this 'medial position' is most frequently occupied by short, usually one-word, adverbials and the borders of more complex ones should be indicated by commas (Quirk et al 1985, 492–493).

The example from W5 (b) shows a similar situation because the operator and verb *can see* is divided by the PP in the form of AdvP (*in the original cellars and granaries*). These examples could be reformulated as follows:

a) *The vegetable-growing and fruit-growing garden was turned into a baroque garden in the 17th century.*

b) *In the original cellars and granaries, you can currently see an exhibition focused on the history of the castle…*

With regard to the order of constituents in a sentence, there is another example in *Table 17* below:

Table 17: Other Types of Interference on Syntactic and Phrasal Level

		SL	TL
W5	a)	Přímo „od zdroje“ si u nás pochutnáte na známém Hostětínském moštu…	Directly "from the source" with us you will enjoy the famous Hostětín juice…

In the example from W5 (a) in *Table 17*, an adverbial of manner (AdvM) (*Directly "from the source"*) and the OBJ of preposition (*with us*) precede both the SUBJ and T in this sentence. Although, it is possible to start a sentence with an introductory phrase in this form and there are constructions that allow fronting of objects in English (Huddleston and Pullum 2002, 1372), such movement should be indicated by punctuation marks (Turabian 2013, 297), which, in this case, are missing. In addition, the motivation for the movement of these two constituents to the front together seems to be influenced by the ST sentence pattern in this case. A better solution would probably be one of the following ones:

a) *Directly "from the source", you can enjoy the popular Hostětín apple juice with us…*

b) *With us, you can enjoy the popular Hostětín apple juice directly "from the source"…*

Other occurrences of interference concerning phrases that have been discovered in the analysed texts can be seen in *Tables 18–20* below:

Table 18: Other Types of Interference on Syntactic and Phrasal Level

		SL	TL
W1	a)	Vyžití nejen pro děti nabízí stezky zdraví, kde je mnoho možností *pro aktivní trávení volného času…*	The health trails offer activities not only to children *for actively spending free time…*

As *Table 18* above shows, the PP in the TL example from W1 (a) follows the phrasal structure of the example from the SL column. Moreover, it seems that the form of the SL example does not provide a good basis for the translation since, because of the verbal tendency in Czech (Tárnyiková 2007, 224), the constituent would seem to be more natural in the form of a subordinate clause (*jak aktivně strávit volný čas*). Similarly, the PP in the TL example could be reformulated by means of a non-finite construction since Czech subordinate clauses are usually replaced by infinitives in English translation (Dušková 1999b, 9): *to spend their free time in an active way…*

Another type of interference concerning phrases is demonstrated in *Table 19* below:

Table 19: Other Types of Interference on Syntactic and Phrasal Level

		SL	TL
W4	a)	známá též pod názvem	known also as

The example from W4 (a) is connected with the expression *also*. The word order inside the phrase seems to be unnatural in the TL since, in English, there is a fixed phrase: *also known as*, abbreviated as 'aka' (Cambridge Dictionary 2018). This expression seems to be quite problematic in this TT because there are other examples of this phenomenon to be found in the texts taken from W4 such as: *also there are several restaurants…* Therefore, the more appropriate word order would be the following one: *there are also several restaurants…*

Another particular type of interference on phrasal level concerning noun chains occurs in W5 as can be seen in *Table 20* below:

Table 20: Other Types of Interference on Syntactic and Phrasal Level

		SL	TL
W5	a)	Centrum Veronica	Centre Veronica
	b)	správce zahrady	manager garden
	c)	průvodce zahradou	guide garden
	d)	členové klubu přátel Veronica	club members Veronica friends

Each of the examples from W5 (a–d) in *Table 20* above demonstrate a NP in contradiction with the proper structure of the English NP in which modifiers such as adjectives and nouns precede the head of the NP, while PPs and clauses represent its post-modifiers (Quirk et al 1985, 1238–1239). On the other hand, in Czech, relations in the NP are indicated by the use of prepositions or cases (Hopkinson 2008, 89). So consequently, the examples could be reformulated as follows: (a) *Veronica Centre*, (b) *garden manager*, (c) *garden guide*. The example (d) represents a bit more complex NP than the preceding ones, nevertheless, it needs to be reformulated as well: *members of the Veronica friends club* or *Veronica friends club members* since the head of the NP is *members*.

The main objective of this section was to discover non-standard syntactic constructions in the analysed texts which result from interlanguage interference. The examples above demonstrate that such non-standard syntactic constructions occur in the analysed texts and their source can be traced back as the SL influence. Such constructions have been discovered in all of the analysed texts, so consequently, the premise that the analysed texts tend to use similar syntactic constructions of the SL in the TL seem to be true in many aspects. In general, the types of syntactic interference that the analysis has discovered involve: zero-subject constructions, constructions with switched position of SUBJ and verb, existential constructions, and various types of interference on syntactic and phrasal level (such as the order of constituents in a sentence, or the structure of particular phrases). Although, not all of these types of interference on syntactic level can be found in each of the analysed texts, some of these types share only some of them. Moreover, some types of interference on syntactic or phrasal level occur only in particular ones. As the analysis has shown, not all of these types of interference represent only stylistic problems since there are cases (such as V-S word order or the structure of particular phrases) that demonstrate problems with the TL grammar. The next section deals with linguistic interference on lexical level.

4.3   Interference on Lexical Level

The second section of this chapter focuses on interference on lexical level. From the lexical perspective, the texts are analysed in order to discover non-standard lexical TL forms that result from interlanguage interference. Hopkinson (2007) claims that such cases are caused by two main factors: the first one is connected with 'inadequate reference materials' (for example, when translators try to reach the exact equivalence on the syntactic level between the ST and the TT), and the second one represents 'generalization from false hypotheses' (such as lexical generalization connected with 'false cognates' or with word formation) (2007, 14–18). So consequently, this section is structured according to these two major factors influencing the choice of lexical expressions in the analysed texts. Nevertheless, the majority of occurrences of interference in the analysed text is connected with the first factor, therefore, for the most part, this section is focused on lexical interference concerning inadequate reference materials.

With regard to the first factor influencing lexical interference, Hopkinson (2007) differentiates between two particular causes of interference on lexical level: the first one is

connected with different ways of 'segmentation of the semantic field' in the languages that the translator is working with (2007, 14–15). For example, this refers to cases in which "a single Czech word has a wider range of referents than its various English equivalents" (Hopkinson 2007, 15). Examples from the analysed texts concerning this case are shown in *Table 21* below:

Table 21: Different Segmentation of the Semantic Field

		SL	TL
W1	a)	Pro cykloturisty nabízí okolí Zlína nejen více než 23 kilometrů cyklostezek, ale i celou řadu rekreačních *okruhů* v zalesněných kopcích…	The Zlín surroundings offer 23 kilometres of cycle paths and many recreational *circuits* in forested hills…
W2	b)	*trasy* pro běžecké lyžování	cross-country skiing *paths*
	c)	horská *chata*	mountain *cabin*
W3	d)	*Město* Luhačovice	The c*ity* of Luhačovice
	e)	V polovině 19. století měly lázně 10 pojmenovaných *domů*…	In the middle of the 19th century, the spa had 10 named *houses*…
W4	f)	*nespočtem* volně chovaného zvířectva	the *quantity* of freely moving animals
W5	g)	po modré *trase*	you can follow the blue *route*

The first example from W1 (a) involves the Czech expression *okruh* which can generally refer to: *radius – sphere – circle* (Fronek 1998, 924). However, from the context of the SL, the meaning of the expression is even more specific since it refers to *okružní trasa*, therefore, the TL expression *circuit* should rather function as a modifier specifying the meaning: *circuit trail*.

In the example from W2 (b), the Czech expression *trasa* has various referents in English: *route – line* (Fronek 1998, 1141). The TL example *path,* however, does not express the semantic meaning of "a marked or beaten path" which is involved in the expression *trail* (The Free Dictionary 2018), and therefore, it would be a relevant expression in the ST context. In a similar way, the example (c) shows the SL expression *chata* which can have English equivalents such as: *hut – cabin – cottage – lodge* (Fronek 1998, 743). The TL example *cabin*, however, does not refer to a "building offering shelter in the backcountry, as to mountaineers" in contrast to the expression *hut* (The Free Dictionary 2018). Similarly, the SL example (g) from W5 involves the expression *trasa*

translated into the TL as *route*. However, *route* does not represent the "marked" tourist *trail* (The Free Dictionary 2018) so consequently, a more appropriate expression would be *blue marked trail* in this case.

The example (d) from W3 involves a Czech expression *město* which, however, can have more referents in English: *town – city* (Fronek 1998, 832). In the context of the Czech Republic, the TL example *city* referring to "a town of significant size and importance" does not seem to be the right equivalent for a small *town* such as Luhačovice (The Free Dictionary 2018). Another example (e) from W3 represents a case in which the SL example *dům* was translated in the TL as *house*. In English, the SL expression may refer to: *house – block – centre – building*, therefore, it involves meanings referring to both 'dwelling' and 'construction' (Hopkinson 2007, 15). On the other hand, the TL example *house* involves only a part of its meaning – 'dwelling' (The Free Dictionary 2018). In this case, a more appropriate expression could be *spa building* modified by an adjective to specify the meaning.

Although, both expressions in the example (f) refer to "number or amount", the TL example may refer to both "specified or indefinite number or amount" (The Free Dictionary 2018), in contrast to this, the form of the SL example itself (*nespočet*) refers to the indefinite number.

With regard to the different segmentation of the semantic field of the two languages, another problematic expression appears to be *příroda* as can be seen in *Table 22* below:

Table 22: Different Segmentation of the Semantic Field – 'příroda'

		SL	TL
W2	a)	Město a jeho okolí láká své návštěvníky zejména krásnou přírodou.	The town and its surrounding area attract its visitors with its beautiful *nature*.
W3	b)	krásná *příroda*	beautiful *nature*

Both examples (a) and (b) taken from two different websites (W2 and W3) involve the same case. In both of them, the SL expression *příroda* was translated as *nature*. Nevertheless, the Czech expression *příroda* can refer to: *nature – country – countryside* (Fronek 1998, 1026). With regard to the context of the ST, the expression *nature* refers to

the more abstract meaning as opposed to the more specific one in *countryside* (Sparling 1989, 153) which would be more appropriate expression in this case.

The second factor of lexical interference concerning inadequate reference materials which was discussed by Hopkinson (2007) is connected with cases in which translators try to reach "the exact syntactic equivalence" in both ST and TT (2007, 16). Examples concerning this case taken from the analysed texts are shown in *Table 23* below:

Table 23: Lexical Interference Based on Exact Syntactic Equivalence– 'v okolí/v blízkosti'

		SL	**TL**
W2	a)	Zajímavá místa *v okolí* Vsetína	Places of Interest in Vsetín's *Vicinity*
W3	b)	*v blízkosti* nádraží	in the *vicinity* of the station
W4	c)	…*v blízkosti* zámku je několik restaurací.	…there are several restaurants in the near *vicinity* of the castle.

All the examples (a–c) above taken from three different websites (W2, W3 and W4) include the Czech expression *okolí* or *blízkost* that was translated into English as *vicinity*. Although, this is an archaic expression, it is listed as the first translation in frequently used dictionaries (Hopkinson 2007, 17). In this case, a better translation solution would be to use a phrase such as *the surrounding area* or *the area around* (examples taken from Hopkinson 2007, 17) instead of one-word equivalent.

The second factor of interlanguage interference on lexical level is connected with 'generalization from false hypotheses'. With regard to this factor, Hopkinson (2007) differentiates between two main areas: lexical generalisation concerning 'false cognates' as well as 'generalization in word-formation' (2007, 17–18). Since the following section of this chapter focuses on interference on morphological level, I will discuss only the first area – 'false cognates' – in this section. Examples demonstrating lexical interference in connection with 'false cognates' or in other words – 'false friends' – are shown in *Table 24* below:

Table 24: Lexical Generalization from False Hypotheses: False Friends

		SL	**TL**
W3	a)	Zrekonstruované	reconstructed
	b)	areál lázní	spa area

W5	c)	Infopanel	infopanel
	d)	v areálu	in the area

As *Table 24* above shows, all the examples (a–d) taken from W3 and W5 represent cases in which the SL expressions resemble to the TL ones, however, they are not the proper equivalents of each other (Hopkinson 2007, 17). In the example (a) from W3, the Czech expression *zrekonstruovaný* was translated into English as *reconstructed*, though the expression used in the TL does not involve the semantic meaning connected with 'making extensive structural repairs' (The Free Dictionary 2018) – as in *rebuilt* – which would be more suitable with regard to the ST context.

In a similar way, the examples (b) from W3 and (d) from W5 demonstrate a case in which the SL expression *areál* was translated into the TL as *area*, though both these expressions refer to different semantic meanings (The Free Dictionary 2018). The expression *areál* can have various English referents such as: *grounds – premises – campus – centre – site* (Fronek 1998, 631–632). On the other hand, the English expression area can be translated into Czech as: *plocha – rozloha – oblast – kraj – prostor – sféra* (Fronek 1998, 23).

The example (c) from W5 represents another case. Though the exact form of the SL expression is not a proper English word that can be found in a dictionary, expressions *info* and *panel* exist in the TL separately. Nevertheless, in combination, they do not express the exact equivalent for the SL expression. So consequently, the TL expression could be reformulated as follows: *tourist information board*.

As the examples demonstrated in this section have shown, aspects of interference on lexical level occur in each of the analysed texts. For the most part, the texts involve occurrences of lexical interference based on 'inadequate reference materials'. On the other hand, aspects interference resulting from lexical generalization concerning 'false cognates', represent only exceptional cases. The next section deals with linguistic interference on morphological level.

4.4 Interference on Morphological Level

This section focuses on morphological level and its main aim is to discover the use of SL morphological forms in the TL in the analysed texts. As the analysis has shown, aspects of

interference concerning morphology have been found in the analysed texts especially in connection with word-formation and they represent two main types: derived nominal and adjectival forms, and 'zero-derived forms'.

The first type of interference on morphological level that has been discovered in the analysed texts involves derived nominal and adjectival forms. Examples of such cases are shown in *Table 25* below:

Table 25: Derived Nominal and Adjectival Forms

		SL	TL
W1	a)	Vyžití nejen pro děti nabízí stezky zdraví, kde je mnoho možností pro aktivní *trávení* volného času…	The health trails offer activities not only to children for actively *spending* free time…
W2	b)	cyklostezka	cycling path
W4	c)	…zookoutkem a nespočtem volně *chovaného* zvířectva.	…the little zoo, and the quantity of freely *moving* animals.

The first example from W1 (a) in *Table 25* demonstrates a case in which the SL expression *trávení* was translated into the TL as *spending*. As Hopkinson argues, this is one of the cases in which the interlanguage interference is most likely to influence the TL, e.g. when the Czech expression involves the suffix *ní* preceded by a vowel, since the Czech morphological system is "more regular" than English in this case (2007, 19). Moreover, as was discussed in one of the preceding sections (see the section 5.2 Interference on Syntactic Level), in this case, the form of the SL example does not provide a good basis for translation. Instead of the NP, it would be more suitable to use a subordinate clause: *jak aktivně strávit volný čas* which could be translated into English as *to spend their free time in an active way*.

The other two examples W2 (b) and W4 (c) represent cases of derived adjectival forms in the TL, though in these cases, it would be more suitable to translate the SL expressions by such TL one expressions that "use zero-derived forms" (Hopkinson 2007, 19). As Hopkinson (2007) argues, the Czech translator, influenced by the interlanguage, tends to choose "visibly adjectival suffixes" in the TL since the Czech system of morphology is "almost universally" explicit with regard to adjectives (2007, 19). Therefore, the examples W2 (b) and W4 (c) could be reformulated as follows:

b) *bike path* or *cycle path*

c) *...the little zoo with a large number of animals in the open range section.*

The second type of interference on morphological level that the analysed texts involve is connected with 'zero-derived forms'. Examples of this case are shown in *Tables 26–27* below:

Table 26: Zero-Derived Forms – 'Municipal'

		SL	TL
W3	a)	budova *obecního* úřadu	*municipal* office building

The SL word-formation system allows to transform the nominal expression *městský* to *město,* in English, on the other hand, it is more suitable to use a 'zero-derived form' in this case – *town* or *city* since the expression *municipal*, apart from some fixed phrases, is used primarily administrative style (Hopkinson 2007, 19–20). Therefore, the example (a) in *Table 26* above can be reformulated as follows:

a) *the town hall building*

Other occurrences of morphological interference concerning 'zero-derived forms' that have been discovered in the analysed texts belong to the category of 'culture-specific items'. This term refers to SL expressions that do not have equivalents in the TL, therefore, when dealing with texts involving such expressions, the translator must consider proper translation methods and strategies (Baker 1992, 21). Examples of such expressions from the analysed texts are shown in *Table 27* below:

Table 27: Zero-Derived Forms – Culture-Specific Items

		SL	TL
W2	a)	Kolem *vsetínského zámku* stoupá k…	It then continues up to *Vsetín's chateau*…
W3	b)	*Maxmilián z Lichtenštejna*	*Maxmilián of Lichtenštejn*
	c)	bratři *Kubovi*	the brothers *Kubovi*
W5	d)	u sochy *Zvoničky*	at the statue *Zvoničky*

With regard to the translation of 'culture specific items', the morphological system of the TL must be taken into consideration as well. Nevertheless, this is not the case of the

examples (a–d) above. Therefore, the examples from *Table 27* could be reformulated as follows:

    a) *Vsetín chateau*

    b) *Maximilian of Liechtenstein*

    c) *the Kuba brothers*

    d) *at the "Zvonička" statue*

As the examples demonstrated in this section have shown, aspects of interference on morphological level can be found in each of the analysed texts, though there are not as many occurrences as on the two levels (syntactic and lexical) discussed above. For the most part, the texts involve occurrences of morphological interference connected with word-formation, in particular, there are two main types: derived nominal and adjectival forms, and 'zero-derived forms'. Nevertheless, both these types of morphological interference do not occur in all of the analysed texts in combination. The first type represents only exceptional cases. On the other hand, there are many occurrences of the second one in W2, W3 and W5. The next section deals with other problematic aspects of the analysed texts.

4.5 Other Problematic Aspects of the Analysed Texts

This section provides an overview of other problematic aspects of the analysed texts that have been discovered during the analysis. More precisely, these problematic aspects include several areas; namely: problems with the ST, punctuation following the SL standard, semantic changes in translation, and typing errors. Examples of such cases are shown in *Tables 28–31* below.

The first category is connected with the *problems of the ST*. The analysed texts involve cases in which the ST includes non-standard forms of the TL. So consequently, the ST might not provide a good basis for translation. Examples demonstrating this phenomenon are shown in *Table 28* below:

Table 28: Problems with the ST

		SL
W1	a)	Vyžití nejen pro děti nabízí stezky zdraví, kde je mnoho možností *pro aktivní trávení volného času…*
W2	b)	Trasa vede většinou lesem, *občas pěkné výhledy.*
W3	c)	…vtiskli městu svérázný půvab a *neopakovatelnou tvář.*
W4	d)	*V areálu zámku i zahrad možnost drobného občerstvení,* v blízkosti zámku je

		několik restaurací.
W5	e)	Můžete si zde zakoupit *tématickou* literaturu

The next area of problematic aspects is connected with *punctuation*. There are many cases in the analysed texts, in which the TL punctuation follows the standard of the SL one. One large area of such occurrences is connected with more complex introductory phrases which were partially discusses above (see the section 5.2 Interference on Syntactic Level). Examples of the SL punctuation standard reflected in the TL are demonstrated in *Table 29* below:

Table 29: Punctuation

		SL	TL
W2	a)	Při sestupu se otevře po pravé straně nádherný pohled na převážnou část Vsetína	When descending a beautiful view on a major part of Vsetín opens on the right side…
W3	b)	Rozkládá se v údolí, jehož nadmořská výška je minimálně 250 m n. m.	It occupies a valley, whose elevation is a minimum of 250m above sea level.
W5	c)	Přímo „od zdroje" si u nás pochutnáte na známém Hostětínském moštu…	Directly "from the source" with us you will enjoy the famous Hostětín juice…

Apart from problematic aspects concerning stylistics, a large part of the analysed texts represents occurrences of *semantic changes* in the translation. Examples of this phenomena are shown in *Table 30* below:

Table 30: Semantic Changes

		SL	TL
W2	a)	Údržba a značení okruhů probíhá každoročně.	Last year these trails were all remarked.
	b)	Nenáročná trasa	A demanding trail
W3	c)	Proslulé jsou přírodními léčivými prameny…	Famed are the natural medicinal springs…
W4	d)	Vláček má v nabídce dvě základní trasy a trasu pro děti.	The train runs on two different routes – one basic one and one especially for children.
W5	e)	Sochy Vodníka a Adama s Evou	Goblins and statues of Adam and Eve

Another area of problematic aspects is connected with *typing errors* as can be seen in *Table 31* below:

Table 31: Typing Errors

		SL	TL
W2	a)	Na *Valašsku*	In *Vallachia*
W3	b)	*16…*kyselek	*17*….acidulous springs
	c)	význam kvalitního a bohatého kulturního a společenského života v *místě*.	significance of a qualitative and rich cultural and social life in the *city*.
W5	d)	…založen *a* obranu proti Uhrům.	…founded a defense against the Hungarians.

As the examples in *Tables 28–31* show, not only the translators but also the producers of the ST have paid insufficient attention to the texts that have been analysed in this diploma thesis. The problematic aspects concerning the ST, punctuation, semantics, and typing errors in the majority of the analysed texts suggest that such texts may not contribute to a good marketing strategy of the particular tourist destination as well as to the positive image of the region from the perspective of English-speaking tourists which is in contradiction to the aim of the Czech tourist industry to attract foreign tourists by other regions in the country (COT 2017).

CONCLUSION

The main objective of this diploma thesis was to analyse English translations of Czech texts presented on the Zlín Region tourism website presentations in order to discover the most frequent examples of linguistic interference.

The comparative analysis is based on findings of Hopkinson's case study (2007) of linguistic interference in the translation from Czech as L1 into English as L2. Although it is a corpus-based study, it deals with Czech texts and their English translations taken from websites dealing with communication with English-speaking people from abroad. So consequently, apart from others, his study also includes the same text type that represents the topic of this diploma thesis. Hopkinson's study is based on the concept of 'interlanguage' that was firstly introduced by Selinker (1972). Furthermore, the study describes factors that play major role in various types of linguistic interference,

The analysis was based on a premise that the analysed texts tend to use syntactic, lexical, and morphological forms of the SL in the TL. The premise seems to be true especially in connection with linguistic interference on syntactic level because non-standard syntactic constructions that can be traced back as the SL influence have been discovered in all of the analysed texts. Generally, the types of syntactic interference that the analysis has discovered involve: zero-subject constructions, constructions with switched position of SUBJ and verb, existential constructions, and various types of interference on syntactic and phrasal level (such as the order of constituents in a sentence, or structures of particular phrases), though, not all these types of interference can be found in each of the analysed texts. As the analysis has shown, these types of interference do not represent only stylistic problems since there are cases (such as V-S word order or the structure of particular phrases) that demonstrate problems with the TL grammar. With regard to interference on lexical level, the majority of the texts involve occurrences of lexical interference based on 'inadequate reference materials'. On the other hand, aspects interference resulting from lexical generalization concerning 'false cognates', represent only exceptional cases. Aspects of interference on morphological level can be found in each of the analysed texts as well, though, generally, occurrences of this form of interference are not as frequent as those discovered on the two preceding levels. For the most part, the texts involve occurrences of morphological interference connected with word-formation including two main categories; namely: derived nominal and adjectival

forms, and 'zero-derived forms'. Nevertheless, both these types of morphological interference do not occur in all of the analysed texts in combination. The first type represents only exceptional cases. On the other hand, there are many occurrences of the second type in certain texts.

In addition, the analysis has revealed other problematic aspects of the analysed texts such as problems with the ST, punctuation following the SL standard, semantic changes in translation, and typing errors. This suggests that such texts may not contribute to a good marketing strategy of the particular tourist destination as well as to the positive image of the region from the perspective of English-speaking tourists.

The outcome of this diploma thesis is an overview of cases of linguistic interference that frequently occur in translation of texts presented on tourism websites. Therefore, in the future, this diploma thesis might help translators to avoid errors connected with this phenomenon in translation of this text type.

RESUMÉ

Předmětem této diplomové práce je komparativní analýza anglických překladů českých textů uvedených na webových stránkách turistických destinací ve Zlínském kraji s cílem odhalit nejčastější případy lingvistické interference.

Analýza je založena na případové studii Ch. Hopkinsona (2007), která se zabývá lingvistickou interferencí při překladu z češtiny (L1) do angličtiny (L2). Tato případová studie sice využívá korpusová data, nicméně se mimo jiných zabývá i texty prezentovanými na webových stránkách turistických destinací – tedy stejným typem textu, který je předmětem komparativní analýzy v této diplomové práci. Hopkinsonova případová studie je založena na konceptu, který v roce 1972 definoval Selinker jako ‚interlanguage‘ („mezijazyk"), Jedná se o abstraktní formu jazyka, který se nachází mezi L1 a L2. Předmětem Hopkinsonovy studie jsou hlavní faktory, které ovlivňují vznik lingvistické interference v překladu. Konkrétně se jedná o nedostatečné referenční materiály, generalizaci na základě chybných hypotéz, a v neposlední řadě také o systémové a strukturální rozdíly mezi oběma jazyky. První dva faktory úzce souvisejí s lexikální interferencí a zahrnují několik typů chyb jako jsou chyby v důsledku rozdílného dělení sémantického pole v daných jazycích, lexikální chyby spojené se situací, kdy se překladatel snaží dodržet přesnou syntaktickou ekvivalenci, „falešní přátelé" (‚false friends‘ nebo ‚false cognates‘), a v neposlední řadě také chyby v důsledku generalizace, které souvisejí se slovotvorbou. Třetí faktor zahrnuje tři kategorie různých systémových rovin. Jedná se o rovinu morfologickou, syntaktickou a rovinu gramatických kategorií.

Tato diplomová práce je rozdělena na dvě části: teoretickou a praktickou. Teoretická část se zaměřuje na základní pojmy, které souvisí s lingvistickou interferencí, jakož i na přístupy a výzkumné poznatky odborníků z oblasti translatologie. Cílem praktické části je aplikovat teoretické poznatky na anglické překlady konkrétních textů z pěti webových stránek vybraných turistických destinací ve Zlínském kraji. Analýza daných textů se zabývá lingvistickou interferencí ve třech rovinách: v syntaktické, lexikální a morfologické. Praktická část je zaměřena převážně na rovinu syntaktickou, naopak rovinou lexikální a morfologickou se zabývají její dvě méně detailnější části. Cílem analýzy je ověřit předpoklad, že mají dané texty tendenci používat syntaktické struktury a lexikální a morfologické tvary výchozího jazyka (VJ) – češtiny – v jazyce cílovém (CJ) – v angličtině. Na syntaktické rovině se analýza snaží odhalit používání syntaktických struktur

VJ v CJ. Pokud jde o rovinu lexikální, analýza si klade za cíl odhalit používání lexikálních tvarů nestandardních pro CJ, u kterých lze potvrdit, že je ovlivňuje některý z faktorů lingvistické interference. Naopak pokud se jedná o rovinu morfologickou, analýza se snaží najít případy, kdy CJ používá morfologické tvary VJ.

Na základě výsledků analýzy lze tvrdit, že se hlavní předpoklad z velké části potvrdil, neboť případy syntaktických struktur netypických pro CJ, u kterých je zřejmé, že podléhají vlivu VJ, se vyskytují ve všech zkoumaných textech. Obecně se jedná o typy interference, které souvisí s větnými strukturami, které nemají vyjádřený podmět, dále se jedná o struktury, ve kterých se objevuje sloveso před podmětem, existenciální konstrukce, a také další typy interference v syntaktické nebo frázové rovině. Ne všechny tyto typy interference však lze najít v každém z analyzovaných textů. Z výsledků analýzy je parné, že dané typy interference nesouvisejí pouze se stylistickými nedostatky, neboť jsou zde případy, které poukazují na nedostatky gramatické (například větné struktury, ve kterých se objevuje sloveso před podmětem, nebo některé frázové struktury). Pokud se jedná o rovinu lexikální, většina zkoumaných textů zahrnuje případy, které souvisejí s nedostatečnými referenčními materiály. Naproti tomu případy, které se vztahují k ‚false friends‘, jsou pouze ojedinělé. Případy interference, které souvisejí s rovinou lexikální, lze najít v každém ze zkoumaných textů, přestože jich není tolik jako v rovině syntaktické či lexikální. Velká část případů tohoto typu souvisí se slovotvorbou a lze ji rozdělit do dvou kategorií: první souvisí s odvozenými nominálními či adjektivními tvary a další se vztahuje k implicitním tvarům odvozeným slov (‚zero-derived forms‘). Ne vždy však zkoumané texty zahrnují oba tyto typy morfologické interference najednou. Případy prvního typu jsou spíše ojedinělé, naopak případy druhého typu se v některých ze zkoumaných textů opakují velmi často.

Kromě výše popsaných případů analýza odhalila i další problematické aspekty zkoumaných textů. Konkrétně se jedná o problematické jevy ve výchozím textu (VT), interpunkci ovlivněnou VT, sémantické posuny v překladu, a v neposlední řadě také překlepy. Na základě těchto zjištění lze tvrdit, že se daným textům nedostává dostatečné pozornosti, která by napomohla k lepší propagaci daných turistických destinací a tím pádem i celého kraje.

Výsledkem analýzy je tedy přehled častých případů lingvistické interference při překladu textů na webové stránky turistických destinací. Tato diplomová práce může tím

pádem v budoucnu pomoci překladatelům vyhnout chybám spojených s interferencí při překladu daného typu textu.

REFERENCES

Adab, Beverly. 2005. "Translating into a Second Language: Can We, Should We?" In *In and Out of English: For Better, for Worse?*, 227–241. Edited by Gunilla M. Anderman and Margaret Rogers. Clevendon/Buffalo/Toronto: Multilingual Matters.

Anderman, Gunilla M., and Margaret Rogers. 2005. "English in Europe: For Better, for Worse?" In *In and Out of English: For Better, for Worse?*, 1–26. Clevendon/Buffalo/Toronto: Multilingual Matters.

Aixelá, Javier Franco. 2009. "An Overview of Interference in Scientific and Technical Translation." In *JoSTrans* 11:75-87. Accessed November 20, 2017. http://www.jostrans.org/issue11/art_aixela.pdf.

Bachman, Lyle F. 1990. *Fundamental Considerations in Language Testing*. Oxford: Oxford University.

Baker, Mona. 1992. *In Other Words: A Coursebook in Translation*. London: Routledge.

Baker, Mona. 1993. "Corpus Linguistics and Translation Studies: Implications and Applications." In *Text and Technology: In Honour of John Sinclair*, edited by Mona Baker, Gillian Francis and Elena Tognini-Bonelli, 233–250. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Baker Mona, and Kirsten Malmkjaer, eds. 1998. *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London and New York: Routledge.

Bhatia, Vijay K. 2004. *Worlds of Written Discourse: A Genre-Based View*. London: Continuum.

Birner, Betty J. 1994. "Information Status and Word Order: An Analysis of English Inversion." In *Language* 70: 233-59. Accessed March 17, 2018. http://www.cxrlinguistics.com/UploadFile/20091115175341974.pdf.

Birner, Betty J., and Gregory Ward. 1998. *Information Status and Noncanonical Word Order in English*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Bussman, Hadumod. 2006. *Routledge Dictionary of Language and Linguistics*. London and New York: Routledge.

Cambridge Dictionary. 2018. "Aka." Accessed May 1, 2018. https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/aka.

Campbell, Stuart. 1998. *Translation into the Second Language*. London: Longman.

Chafe, Wallace L. 1976. "Givenness, Contrastiveness, Definiteness, Subjects, Topics and Point of View." In *Subject and topic*, edited by Charles N. Li, 25–56. New York: Academic Press.

Clarke, Melvyn. 2017. "052 Have: Various Uses." Czechlist. Accessed May 1, 2018. http://czechlist.cz/?p=385.

COT. 2017. "Přivedou ambasadoři turisty do regionů?" Accessed May 4, 2018. https://www.icot.cz/privedou-ambasadori-turisty-do-regionu/.

Crystal, David. 1988. *Rediscover Grammar with David Crystal*. Harlow: Longman.

Crystal, David. 2001. *A Dictionary of Language*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Daneš František, Zdeněk Hlavsa, and Miroslav Grepl. 1987. *Mluvnice češtiny 3*. Praha: Academia.

Duff, Alan. 1981. *The Third Language: Recurrent Problems of Translation into English*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Dušková, Libuše. 1999. *Studies in the English Language, Part I and II*. Praha: Karolinum.

Fronek, Josef, and John Dunn. 1998. *Anglicko-český, česko-anglický slovník*. Voznice: Leda.

Firbas, Jan. 1966. "Non-thematic Subjects in Contemporary English." In *Travaux Linguistiques de Prague* 2:239–256.

Firbas, Jan. 1992. *Functional Sentence Perspective in Written and Spoken Communication*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gellerstam, Martin. 1986. "Translationese in Swedish Novels Translated from English." In *Translation Studies in Scandinavia*, edited by L. Wollin and H. Lindquist, 88–95. Lund: CWK Gleerup.

Geluykens, Ronald. 1992. *From Discourse Process to Grammatical Construction: On Left-Dislocation in English*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Havránek, Bohuslav, and Alois Jedlička. 2002. *Stručná mluvnice česká*. Praha: Fortuna.

Hopkinson, Chris. 2007. "Factors in Linguistic Interference: A Case Study in Translation." In *SKASE Journal of Translation and Interpretation* 2:13–23. Accessed November 17, 2017. http://www.skase.sk/Volumes/JTI02/pdf_doc/2.pdf.

Hopkinson, Christopher. 2008. *Shifts of Explicitness in Translation*. Ostrava: Ostravská Univerzita v Ostravě.

Huddleston, Rodney, and Geoffrey K. Pullum. 2002. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Informační portál města Holešov. n.d. "Akce." Accessed April 30, 2018. https://www.holesov.info/akce#!.

Karlík, Petr. 2017. "Důrazově vyzýkací konstrukce." CzechEncy. Accessed April 20, 2018. https://www.czechency.org/slovnik/D%C5%AERAZOV%C4%9A%20VYT%C3%9DK AC%C3%8D%20KONSTRUKCE.

Knittlová, Dagmar. 2003. *K teorii i praxi překladu*. Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci.

Knittlová, Dagmar, Bronislava Grygová and Jitka Zehnalová. 2010. *Překlad a překládání*. Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci.

Kufnerová, Zlata. 1994. *Překládání a čeština*. Jinočany: H & H.

Kufnerová, Zlata. 2009. *Čtení o překládání*. Jinočany: H & H.

Kussmaul, Paul. 1995. *Training the Translator*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Mauranen, Anna, and Pekka Kujamäki, eds. 2004. *Translation Universals: Do They Exist?* Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Masaryk University. n.d. "Angličtina pro začátečníky." Accessed April 18, 2018. https://www.fi.muni.cz/~xobsivac/angl.html.

Mathesius, Vilém. 1942. "Ze srovnávacích studií slovosledných." In *Časopis pro moderní filologii* 28:181–190, 302–307.

Mathesius, Vilém. 1975. *A Functional Analysis of Present Day English on a General Linguistic Basis*. Edited by Josef Vachek, translated by Libuše Dušková. Prague: Academia.

Newmark, Peter. 1988. *A Textbook of Translation*. London: Prentice Hall Europe.

Newmark, Peter. 1991. *About Translation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Pavlović, Nataša. 2007. "Directionality in Translation and Interpreting Practice: Report on a Questionnaire Survey in Croatia." In *FORUM: Revue internationale d'interprétation et de traduction/International Journal of Interpretation and Translation*. 5(2):79–99.

Posey, Meghan. 2009. "The Advantages of L2 Translation in *The Cat in the Hat*: A Closer Look at Translation Directionality." In *Letras* 46:87-100. Accessed April 13, 2018. http://revistas.una.ac.cr/index.php/letras/article/viewFile/1659/1574.

Price, Glanville, ed. 2000. "Encyclopedia of the Languages of Europe." Accessed April 20, 2018.
http://www.blackwellreference.com/public/book?id=g9780631220398_9780631220398.

Prince, Ellen F. 1997. "On the Function of Left-Dislocation in English Discourse." In *Directions in Functional Linguistics*, edited by Akio Kamio, 117–143. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.

Richards, Jack C. and Richard Schmidt. 2010. *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. 4th ed. Harlow: Pearson.

Selinker, Larry. 1972. "Interlanguage." In *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching* 10 (3):209–231. Accessed April 30, 2018. http://www.academia.edu/21533333/Selinker-Interlanguage.

Sparling, Don. 1989. *English or Czenglish?* Prague: SPN.

Swan, Michael, and Bernard Smith, eds. 1987. *Learner English: A Teacher's Guide to Interference and Other Problems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tárnyiková, Jarmila. 2007. *Sentence Complexes in Text: Processing Strategies in English and in Czech*. Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci.

Tárnyiková, Jarmila. 2009. *From Text to Texture: An Introduction to Processing Strategies*. 4th ed. Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci.

The Free Dictionary. 2018. Accessed May 1, 2018. https://www.thefreedictionary.com/.

Thorovský, Martin. 2009. "Lexical Linguistic Interference in Translations of Science-Fiction Literature from English into Czech." In *Ostrava Journal of English Philology* 1:86–98.

Toury, Gideon. 1979. "Interlanguage and Its Manifestations in Translation." In *Meta: Journal des traducteurs* 24:223–231. Accessed November 27, 2017. http://www.erudit.org/en/journals/meta/1979-v24-n2-meta284/004502ar.pdf.

Toury, Gideon. 1995. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond.* Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Turabian, Kate L. 2013. *A Manual for Writers of Research Papers, Theses, and Dissertations*. 8th ed. Revised by Wayne C. Booth, Gregory G. Colomb, Joseph M. Williams, and the University of Chicago Press. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Turistické informační centrum Valašské Meziříčí. n.d. "Volný čas." Accessed April 30, 2018. http://www.info-vm.cz/vismo/ou.asp?p1=60&di_druh_zarizeni_h=1099.

Uherské Hradiště. n.d. "Významné památky města." Accessed April 30, 2018. http://www.mesto-uh.cz/pamatky.

Vachek, Josef. 1955. "Some Thoughts on the So Called Complex Condensation in Modern English." In *Sborník prací Filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity* 4 (A3):63-77. Accessed April 20, 2018. https://digilib.phil.muni.cz/bitstream/handle/11222.digilib/100224/A_Linguistica_03-1955-1_8.pdf?sequence=1.

Veisbergs, Andrejs. 2016. "Translationese, Translatorese, Interference." In *Meaning in Translation: Illusion of Precision*, edited by Larisa Ilynska and Marina Platonova, 25–52. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Wagner, Emma. 2005. "Translation and/or Editing – The Way Froward?" In *In and Out of English: For Better, for Worse?*, 214–226. Edited by Gunilla M. Anderman and Margaret Rogers. Clevendon/Buffalo/Toronto: Multilingual Matters.

ANNOTATION

ABSTRAKT

Autor diplomové práce: Bc. Pavlína Hrubá
Název katedry a fakulty: Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky, Filozofická fakulta Univerzity Palackého v Olomouci
Název diplomové práce: Lingvistická interference na webových stránkách turistických destinací
Vedoucí diplomové práce: Mgr. Ondřej Molnár, Ph.D.

Předmětem této diplomové práce je komparativní analýza anglických překladů českých textů uvedených na webových stránkách turistických destinací ve Zlínském kraji s cílem odhalit nejčastější případy lingvistické interference.

Tato diplomová práce je rozdělena na dvě části: teoretickou a praktickou. Teoretická část se zaměřuje na základní pojmy, které souvisí s lingvistickou interferencí, jakož i na přístupy a výzkumné poznatky odborníků z oblasti translatologie. Cílem praktické části je aplikovat teoretické poznatky na anglické překlady konkrétních textů z pěti webových stránek vybraných turistických destinací ve Zlínském kraji. Analýza daných textů je provedena z hlediska lingvistické interference ve třech rovinách: v syntaktické, lexikální a morfologické. Praktická část je zaměřena převážně na rovinu syntaktickou, naopak rovinou lexikální a morfologickou se zabývají její dvě méně detailnější části. Výsledkem analýzy je přehled častých případů lingvistické interference při překladu textů na webových stránkách turistických destinací. Tato diplomová práce může tím pádem v budoucnu pomoci překladatelům vyhnout chybám spojených s interferencí při překladu daného typu textu.

Klíčová slova: překlad, interference, mezijazyk, webové stránky turistických destinací, Zlínský kraj, systémové rozdíly, strukturální rozdíly, morfologie, syntax, lexikum, český jazyk, anglický jazyk

ABSTRACT

Author of the Thesis: Bc. Pavlína Hrubá
Department and Faculty: Department of English and American Studies, Philosophical Factulty, Palacký University in Olomouc
Title of the Thesis: Linguistic Interference in Tourism Website Presentations
Supervisor: Mgr. Ondřej Molnár, Ph.D.

The subject of this diploma thesis is the comparative analysis of English translations of Czech texts taken from tourist website presentations of particular destinations in the Zlín Region in order to discover the most frequent examples of linguistic interference.

This diploma thesis is divided in two main parts: theory and analysis. The theoretical part focuses on key terms connected with linguistic interference as well as on approaches and research findings of experts in the domain of translation studies. The aim of the analysis is to apply the theoretical knowledge on particular texts taken from five websites of chosen tourist destinations in the Zlín Region. The chosen texts are analysed with regard to linguistic interference on three levels: syntactic, lexical, and morphological. The most part of the analysis deals with the syntactic level, while the analysis of lexical and morphological issues are covered by two less detailed sections. The outcome of this diploma thesis is an overview of cases of linguistic interference that frequently occur in translation of texts presented on tourism websites. Therefore, in the future, this diploma thesis might help translators to avoid errors connected with this phenomenon in translation of this text type.

Keywords: translation, interference, interlanguage, tourism website presentations, Zlín Region, systemic differences, structural differences, morphology, syntax, lexis, Czech language, English language

LIST OF SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS

L1   First Language

L2   Second Language

TT   Target Text

TL   Target Language

SL   Source Language

ST   Source Tesxt

FSP   Functional Sentence Perspective

CD   Communicative Dynamism

SUBJ   Subject

OBJ   Object

NP   Noun Phrase

T   Predicate

AdvP   Adverbial of Place

AdvT   Adverbial of Time

PP   Prepositional Phrase

AdvM   Adverbial of Manner

LIST OF TABLES