

UNIVERZITA PALACKÉHO V OLOMOUCI  
FILOZOFICKÁ FAKULTA  
Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky



**Dominika Špurková**

**THE ANALYSIS OF THE ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS OF THE  
PLAY *THE CONQUEST OF THE NORTH POLE* WRITTEN BY  
ZDENĚK SVĚRÁK AND LADISLAV SMOLJAK**

**ANALÝZA ANGLICKÝCH PŘEKLADŮ DIVADELNÍ HRY  
*DOBYTÍ SEVERNÍHO PÓLU* OD AUTORŮ ZDEŇKA SVĚRÁKA  
A LADISLAVA SMOLJAKA**

**Diplomová práce**

Vedoucí práce: Mgr. Jitka Zehnalová, Dr.

Olomouc 2023

Prohlašuji, že jsem tuto diplomovou práci vypracovala samostatně a uvedla úplný seznam citované a použité literatury.

V Olomouci dne 8. 12. 2023

**Dominika Špurková**

### **Acknowledgements**

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my thesis supervisor Mgr. Jitka Zehnalová, Dr. for her guidance, useful advice, and patience. I would also like to thank my dearest husband, my family, and my friends for being my support while I was writing this thesis.

## **List of Abbreviations**

ST – source text

TT – target text

TL – target language

CET – Cimirman English Theatre

# Table of Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>The Theoretical Part</b>	<b>10</b>
2.1	Defining Humour	10
2.2	Defining Drama and Comedy	12
2.3	About Cimirman Theatre and Plays	13
2.3.1	Dobytí severního pólu / The Conquest of the North Pole	15
2.3.2	The Specifics of Humour in Cimirman plays	16
2.4	About the Authors	18
2.4.1	Zdeněk Svěrák	18
2.4.2	Ladislav Smoljak	19
2.5	Translating Theatre	20
2.6	About Craig S. Cravens	22
2.7	About The Cimirman English Theatre	23
2.8	Gideon Toury and the Three-Phase Methodology	24
<b>3</b>	<b>The Practical Part – The Analysis</b>	<b>26</b>
3.1	Methodology	26
3.2	The Treatment of Characters' Names	27
3.3	The Analysis of the Existing Translations with Respect to Humour	29
3.3.1	Detailed Analysis of Craig Cravens' Translation	32
3.3.2	Detailed Analysis of CET Translation	41
3.4	Additional Comments on Humorous Instances	49
3.4.1	The Character of Frištenský	49
3.4.2	The Interaction with the Audience and the “Live Paintings”	49
3.4.3	Situational Humour in General	50
<b>4</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Summary</b>	<b>58</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Resumé</b>	<b>61</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>List of Pictures and Screenshots</b>	<b>64</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>65</b>

8.1	Works Cited	65
8.2	Online Sources	66
<b>9</b>	<b>Annotation</b>	<b>68</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>Anotace</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>11</b>	<b>Appendices</b>	<b>70</b>

# 1 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this diploma thesis is to explore the realms of humour, theatre, and translation. Humour in its many forms represents an integral part of our lives. When it comes to translating comedy, for instance in various films or sitcoms, linguists are often met with a challenge. In my bachelor thesis, I have focused on the differences between the perception of humour by native speakers of Czech and English in relation to an episode of *Doctor Who*. For this diploma thesis, I have decided to start from the other side, that is the Czech language, and analyse the work of Zdeněk Svěrák and Ladislav Smoljak who are famous for their specific kind of humour which is, among others, represented by comedies surrounding the fictive character of Jára da Cimrman. This series of comedies undoubtedly constitutes a very specific and influential phenomenon of Czech culture and entertainment. Since it slowly becomes recognized in other parts of the world, I believe it is an intriguing task to analyse their work from the point of view of translation, in this case from Czech into English.

I have decided to focus on the play *Dobytí severního pólu* which premiered in October 1985 (Svěrák and Smoljak 2010, 324) and two corresponding English translations – both of which are called *The Conquest of the North Pole*. The first translation was created by Craig Stephen Cravens, senior lecturer at the Indiana University Bloomington (Indiana University Bloomington, n. d.). The second translation was published in 2022 by a group of translators, namely Emília Machalová, Brian Stewart, and Hanka Jelínková. This version is used for the purpose of performing by *The Cimrman English Theatre*, a group founded in 2014 (Cimrman English Theatre 2020) which offers Cimrman plays for the English-speaking audience.

The concept of humour evokes a wide range of associations and can be difficult to define. In the first section of the theoretical part of this thesis, I introduce a small overview of existing definitions and conclude which one of these is the most suitable for the purpose of this research. In other words, after defining humour in general, I aim to specify the type of humour which exists in comedies. According to my own research and observation, I conclude that in this case, it is most suitable to speak of “performance humour,” which is a term used by Rod A. Martin and Thomas E. Ford (Martin and Ford 2018, 19). This constitutes the first section of the theoretical part of the thesis.

The following section aims to introduce *Žižkovské divadlo Járy Cimrmana* (*Žižkov Theatre of Jára Cimrman*) and describe its relevant elements – the history of the theatre, the members, as well as the plays. I also include a subsection focused on the specifics of humour in Smoljak and Svěrák’s plays in order to further introduce what might be expected during the analysis.

The theoretical part also comments on the process of translating drama and its specifics. As already stated, for the purpose of this thesis, two translations were chosen. I, therefore, introduce the origin of both translations and in the case of *The Cimrman English Theatre*, I have also decided to add a short commentary about its existence and activity, since the translation subjected to analysis exists purely for the purposes of this theatre and is therefore closely related to it.

After concluding the theoretical part, which should provide an overview of all relevant terms and phenomena, the practical part of the thesis follows. First, the methodology is detailed. I have chosen to carry out a comparative analysis. The process is to be specified as the following: before the analysis itself, I have gathered data based on the recording of *Dobytí severního pólu* which was broadcasted by Česká televize in the year 2006. During watching, I have recorded all instances that I consider to be sources of humour. This is based subjectively, that is, on my own perception of humour, and supported by the reactions of the audience which can be heard in the recording. Then, I created a list of these humorous instances, where “instance” presents a unit of analysis. This set of data serves as a starting point.

All these instances were put into a table with both of the English translations next to them. This main table can be found in Appendices as Table 3 and only selected instances are included in the practical section itself. In the process of the comparative analysis, I have looked at the similarities and differences that emerged as a result of the translation and provided my own comments on the matter. For each instance, I have marked one of the following options: 1) humour was expressed using the same linguistic devices, both in the Czech as well as in the English version, 2) humour was expressed using different linguistic devices, 3) humour was not expressed at all, 4) the category “miscellaneous” intended for the instances which do not fit into any of the previous categories. The results have then been quantified in the form of a table. This analysis is based on Gideon Toury’s “three-phase methodology,” which was proposed for use in the branch of descriptive translation studies (DTS) and developed in order to



present a unified way of translation analysis (Munday 2016, 175). I will describe each of the relevant stages of the process in detail.

My own comments are related to the main aim of this thesis, which is to answer the following research questions: 1) What devices does the original text use to convey humour? 2) Do the translations use the same devices, or do they differ? 3) If they differ, in which situations does that happen, and why? And finally, 4) What are the possible effects on the audience?

The last part of this diploma thesis includes a conclusion based on the observations and results from the analysis. I answer the research questions chosen earlier in detail and provide my own comments.

## 2 THE THEORETICAL PART

### 2.1 *Defining Humour*

Humour is a term that evokes a wide range of associations and exists in a large variety of forms, ranging from everyday interactions to media (Martin and Ford 2018, 19). It can also be difficult to define it precisely. Nevertheless, I am going to present a series of possible definitions from relevant literature in order to introduce it in a general way. After that, a more specific definition relevant to this thesis will follow.

From a very broad perspective, according to the Cambridge Dictionary, by “humour” we can understand

- a) “the state of one’s feelings” (e. g. *to be in a good humour*),
- b) a situation, when someone does “what someone else wants so that they do not become annoyed or upset” (e. g. *He did it just to humour his parents.*) or
- c) “the ability to find things funny, the way in which people see that some things are funny, or the quality of being funny”.

The last notion of humour is the one which is the focus of this thesis.

In a study focused on the analysis and qualitative research of humour, Anindya Sen from the Northern Illinois University in the United States introduces two main definitions of humour, one by Crawford and one by Cruthird and Romero. Crawford (1994, 57) defines humour as “any communication that generates a ‘positive cognitive or affective response from listeners’”. Cruthirds and Romero (2006, 59) state that humour refers to “amusing communications that produce positive emotions and cognitions in the individual, group, or organization”. These two definitions are very similar and also very general, since they connect communication and its positive effects.

William O. Beeman (1999, 103) from the Brown University begins his article on humour with the following definition: “Humour is a performative pragmatic accomplishment involving a wide range of communication skills including, but not exclusively involving, **language, gesture, the presentation of visual imagery, and situation management.**”

Beeman also states, similarly to Crawford, Cruthirds and Romero, that humour “aims at creating a concrete feeling of enjoyment for an audience” (Beeman 1999, 103). However, Beeman’s definition is more precise in that it specifies the use of languages

and gestures, which is highly relevant (not exclusively) for theatre plays. He also relates humour to incongruity.

This leads us to the definition introduced by Rod A. Martin and Thomas Ford (2018, 19), who focused on humour from the psychological and sociological point of view and describe it in the following way: “Humour is a form of **social play** elicited by a perception of playful incongruity that produces the emotional response of mirth expressed through smiling and laughter.”

What is important here is the social aspect. Humour relies heavily on the cooperation of the one who produces it and the audience (Beeman 1999, 103). Furthermore, it has been shown that we laugh and joke more frequently when we are with other people than when we are alone (Martin and Kuiper 1999, 376). Therefore, we can argue that watching a comedy show or a theatre performance on television is a specific form of laughter and humour. However, this seems not to make a significant difference, as it is still considered “social” in the sense that it involves “the imagined or implied presence of other people,” meaning that the viewers respond to the characters from the given “non-social” stimulus (Martin and Ford 2018, 20). Regarding our scenario, this situation applies to watching a recording of a theatre performance. However, dramas are primarily made to be introduced to a live audience, which allows the actors and actresses to engage with the receivers in the traditional sense.

While defining humour, it seems important to illustrate the difference between it and a similar term – **wit**. In M. H. Abrams’s *Glossary of Literary Terms* (1999, 331), we can find that wit “is always intended by the speaker to be comic,” even though sometimes we find a certain speaker humorous even if it was not their intention. Furthermore, it “refers only to the spoken or written word” (Abrams 1999, 331). In contrast with that, humour, according to Abrams (1999, 331), “has a much broader range of reference”. Therefore, we can see that wit merely resembles a specific kind of humour.

Abrams (1999) defines **comic** as “any element in a work of **literature**, whether a **character, event, or utterance**, which is designed to amuse or to excite mirth in the reader or audience” (1999, 329). He also uses comic as an umbrella term which includes “wit” and “humour” and states that wit was originally related to intelligence and inventiveness and connected with the ability to invent unique and surprising figures of speech, for instance in metaphysical poetry (1999, 330). Nowadays, it refers to a “verbal

expression which is brief, deft, and intentionally contrived to produce a shock of comic surprise” (1999, 330).

This is also supported by Martin and Ford (2018, 10–11), who distinguish between wit and humour clearly in the following way, based on the historical development: “In theories of **dramatic comedy**, *wit* represented comedy based on intellect, while *humour* represented comedy based on character. ... *Wit* was intellectual, sarcastic and related to antipathy; *humour* was emotional, congenial, and related to ‘fellow-feeling’.”

This is relevant for the topic of this thesis since the focus is on comedy. Although the description of the specifics of Cimrman plays will follow, for now, it is safe to say that both wit and comic appear in these comedies, and in this case, it is not necessary to clearly differentiate from each other during the analysis.

Martin and Ford have created an exhaustive publication focused on humour, its history, psychology, and definitions. In the publication *The Psychology of Humor: An Integrative Approach*, they describe the many forms that humour can take and introduce four broad categories of everyday humour: 1) performance humour, 2) jokes, 3) spontaneous conversational humour, and 4) unintentional humour. For the purposes of this thesis, the term performance humour is the most suitable one, and it is defined as follows: “*Performance humour* includes things like television sit-coms, stand-up comedy, humorous **books** and movies, in which people produce **humour as part of staged performance or ‘act’.**”

To sum up, humour thus can be defined as a social phenomenon in that it includes the one who produces it (in our case, the actors) and the intended audience. The actors and actresses use language and visual signs, such as gestures, wit, and humour to produce a positive cognitive effect, that is, their actions are meant to result in amusement on the part of the audience.

## ***2.2 Defining Drama and Comedy***

Since this thesis focuses on the analysis of a drama, it is necessary to introduce the definition of a play and comedy.

A **dramatic composition**, or also a play, can be defined in the following way: “The form of composition designed for **performance in the theater**, in which actors take the roles of the **characters**, perform the indicated action, and utter the written dialogue.” (Abrams 1999, 69).

Plays are typically subdivided into **acts** and **scenes**. **An act** is a major division of a drama, introduced by Elizabethan dramatists (Abrams 1999, 2). Nowadays, in the most typical scenario, a play has three acts.

These acts are often further subdivided into **scenes**, which are smaller units of action in the play, in which there is “no change of place or break in the continuity of time” (Abrams 1999, 3).

In the case of *The Conquest of the North Pole*, this drama begins rather unusually with a “**seminar**”, an introductory sequence of lectures characteristic for Cimrman plays. The origins and characteristics of a seminar will be described further in section 2.3. The seminar is then followed only by scenes and there are five of them altogether.

*Dobytí severního pólu* falls into the subcategory of **comedy** which is another important term that needs to be defined. It is customarily applied to plays for the stage (as in our case) or to motion pictures and it refers to a fictional work in which the materials are selected and used in order to interest and amuse us (Abrams 1999, 38). In addition to that, the audience should feel confident that no disaster will occur, and comedies also typically feature a happy ending (Abrams 1999, 38).

### **2.3 About Cimrman Theatre and Plays**

In this subchapter, I aim to introduce the *Jára Cimrman Theatre* (*Divadlo Járy Cimrmana* in Czech, often referred to using the abbreviation “DJC”) and shortly describe its history and specifics.

First, I would like to mention that the phenomenon of the *Jára Cimrman Theatre* represents an important element of Czech culture. Although it has a more than 50-year-old history, it still remains popular (for instance, the number of repeats of the first drama, *Akt*, exceeds 850 (iROZHLAS 2022)). From the 15 plays altogether, only one has had its last performance. For that reason, it is surprising that the information about its history is rather incomplete and scattered within interviews, memoirs, and popular literature.

*Divadlo Járy Cimrmana* originated in the 1960s. Its roots are represented by a radio programme called *Nealkoholická vinárna U Pavouka* (*The Non-alcoholic Wine Cellar by the Spider*, translation by Andrew Roberts) introduced in the year 1965 which included a series of humorous radio plays based on mystification and pseudo-science. This programme was created by Jiří Šebánek, a Czech screenwriter and author, and

Zdeněk Svěrák (Maleček 2020, 12). Another important personality when we speak of the origins of “cimrmanology” was Helena Philippová who also took part in the creation of the radio plays as a screenwriter. She became the only woman in the group, although the upcoming theatre project was originally meant to be male-only (Svěrák et al. 1993, 6). Furthermore, she has the nickname “the famous founder of theatres” since she contributed to the creation of another Czech popular theatres, *Semafor* and *Na zábradlí* (Maleček 2020, 14).

On the 29<sup>th</sup> October 1966, Jiří Šebánek called a meeting in which all of the crucial names connected with the beginning of Cimrman plays participated; besides Šebánek, Svěrák and Philippová, Ladislav Smoljak and Miloň Čepelka were also invited (Maleček 2020, 13). The aim was to discuss the form and features of a newly created theatre. Svěrák and Šebánek promised that by the end of 1966, they will have written a play. Each of these plays was said to appear as if it had been written by a forgotten Czech author, Jára Cimrman (Maleček 2020, 14). The figure of Jára Cimrman first appeared in relation to the radio programme *Nealkoholická vinárna U Pavouka*, however, at that time, this character was slightly different. It was regarded to be simply a naive researcher (Maleček 2020, 13). The meaning and dimension of this personality as we know it nowadays came later. For today’s audience, Jára Cimrman represents a forgotten author and a genius, a man of many skills and abilities whose inventions have been in most cases either stolen or forgotten completely. The name “Cimrman” was introduced by Jiří Šebánek himself who was inspired by a Czechoslovakian ice-hockey player (Maleček 2020, 15). The members of DJC then fulfil roles of intellectuals who shed light on the origins of Cimrman’s inventions and explain the supposedly real story. They also call themselves experts on “cimrmanology” since they are said to gather and piece together parts of Cimrman’s notes and diaries.

The first play that was finished was *Akt/Act* written by Zdeněk Svěrák, introduced at the end of 1966 (Maleček 2020, 15). In the following months, this theatre group had a plan to introduce a performance consisting of two one-act plays, besides *Akt*, they wanted to include Šebánek’s *Domáci zabijačka*. However, Jiří Šebánek had not finished the play yet, so for that reason, they were forced to improvise. The solution turned out to be their blessing – the company had written a series of lectures describing Jára Cimrman’s life and work (Maleček 2020, 16). As it was later shown, these lectures have been ever more successful than the play itself and are included as an introductory part in

the rest of DJC plays. The idea for the lectures, in general called the “seminar”, stems from Svěrák, Smoljak, Philippová, Šebánek, Miloň Čepelka, Jan Trtílek, and Oldřich Unger (iROZHLAS 2023).

After the success of the first play, DJC has been accepted to a group called *Státní divadelní studio*, which at that time had a control over the existing theatre companies (Maleček 2020, 17). Nevertheless, the following months brought the first sings of disagreements within the group (Maleček 2020, 17). At first, only changes within the hierarchy and positions took place after a disagreement between Phillipová and Šebánek on one side, and Smoljak (later on Svěrák as well) on the other (Maleček 2020, 22). Over time, the conflict escalated and Phillipová gave an ultimatum: it was either her, or Smoljak. Šebánek took her side and for that reason, Svěrák was the one to decide the faith of the theatre. Finally, this situation resulted in the departure of Šebánek and Phillipová (Maleček 2020, 26). This way, the theatre has lost its founding members and the play *Domáci zabijačka* was removed from the repertoire.

Without Šebánek, there would be no *Jára Cimrman Theatre* and the same can be said about Helena Philippová. However, this split was probably inevitable since Šebánek’s sense of humour differed from the one preferred by Svěrák and Smoljak. Šebánek went on to pursue his artistic goals along the lines of dry, black humour (Maleček 2020, 27).

In the following years, the company has increased the number of plays in its repertoire and accepted many new members. During the time of its existence, the DJC faced several crises, from issues related to finding the appropriate facility to perform in, to the risk of being banned due to the social and political situation during the period of normalisation (Maleček 2021, 200).

Nevertheless, the group has withstood all complications and although this theatre has a very long history of existence, the plays remain popular. Even though many of DJC members have reached an advanced age, they still regularly perform and “Cimrman’s” catchphrases are known to the older, as well as younger generations.

### ***2.3.1 Dobytí severního pólu / The Conquest of the North Pole***

*Dobytí severního pólu* was the last play which originated during the Czechoslovakian totalitarian era (Maleček 2020, 76). Unlike the previous play, *Lijavec*, which was considered problematic and banned several times, *The Conquest of the North Pole* had

been assessed as politically acceptable and it was therefore possible to keep it in the repertoire (Maleček 2022, 201).

According to Zdeněk Svěrák, Smoljak was of the opinion that it is their best play (Svěrák et al. 1993, 1). Ladislav Smoljak was, in his own words, keen on the idea of using ski as a stage prop which led Svěrák to the idea of a journey to the north pole (Švagrová 2002, 18). *Dobytí severního pólu* had its premiere on October 17<sup>th</sup>, 1985 (Svěrák et al. 1993, 1) and it was very well received, as illustrated by the reviews from that time (Maleček 2020, 76–77).

### ***2.3.2 The Specifics of Humour in Cimrman plays***

The humour in Svěrák and Smoljak's plays is known to be very specific, unique, and closely related to Czech people and culture. In this subsection, I will attempt to examine the type of humour that appears in Cimrman plays in detail.

First, it seems apt to characterise Czech humour in general, since Cimrman represents integral part of it, and vice versa. The Czechs generally love to laugh, no matter the type of humour, which is the first characteristic trait. As Sir Michael Palin, a British comedian and a former member of the famous comedy group Monty Python noted when asked about the funniest people in the world, “Czechs have a feeling that everything is up for laughter“ (Twitter 2019). Some more prominent features of Czech humour include satire and black humour. Satire was especially substantial shortly after World War I and during the 1920s (one of the most telling examples is the worldwide known book *Osudy dobrého vojáka Švejka* by Jaroslav Hašek) (Pešta 1981, 97). When it comes to black humour, Maria Němcová Banerjee (1985, 14) explains that black humour “thrives on catastrophe” and oftentimes emerges from feelings of powerlessness. Given that Czech culture often existed on the edge of extinction, it is not surprising that Czechs have developed a kind of “virtuosity” in black humour.

As already mentioned, the humour in Cimrman plays is based on pseudo-science and **mystification**. Mystification can be in narrow sense defined as „games of truth and lies“ (Pořízková 2012, 10). This notion of mystification separates it from lying in general and it also differs from what is usually understood as mystification in English-speaking countries. In English, *mystification* has a broader meaning, synonymous with *hoax*, and it is also often used interchangeably with terms like *fake*, *forgery*, *deception*, or *fraud* (Pořízková 2012, 10). For the purposes of this thesis, the Czech notion of



mystification applies, although, it is interesting to note this difference since it may be relevant when introducing the work of Svěrák and Smoljak to Anglophone countries.

The most prominent sign of mystification in the plays under study is the character of Jára Cimrman himself. This completely fictional polymath is said to be the author of all dramas, and the seminars focused on details from Cimrman's life contribute to plausibility. In addition to that, the seminars also include a large number of personal names and toponyms to increase the scientific character and credibility of the given lectures (Dvořáková 2011, 179).

In the work of Svěrák and Smoljak, we may also most typically find instances of irony, sarcasm, and puns. Below, we may see one example of irony, although in this case, it is unintentional on the side of the speaker.

a) *NÁČELNÍK: Nezlob se, Václave, ale to bylo od tebe nedomyšlený. Kdyby ses převlík za opici, prosím, to se dá poznat, že je to legrace. Ale tučňák – mě to taky zmejlilo, natožpak takovýho primitiva, jako je tady Frištenský. FRIŠTENSKÝ: Děkuji ti, náčelníku, že ses mě zastal.<sup>1</sup>*

Smoljak and Svěrák also love wordplay and in the following examples, you may see instances taken from *Dobytí severního pólu*.

b) *LÉKÁRNÍK: ... K nám. Domů. Do Prahy. Do Podolí. Do lékárny. Do prdele, to je mi smutno!<sup>2</sup>*  
*UČITEL (v komickém převleku tučňáka): Já se s tím tejdem šiju a von to do mě našije.<sup>3</sup>*

---

<sup>1</sup> English translation created by CET translators:

CHIEFTAIN: Don't be angry Václav, I mean your plan was a little ill-conceived. I mean if you'd come out dressed as a monkey we all would have realised the joke immediately - but a penguin? Here, in the North. Given the two of us were taken in by it, it is not surprising that an idiot like Frištenský would end up shooting you.

FRIŠTENSKÝ: Thanks for standing up for me, Chief.

<sup>2</sup> English translation created by CET translators:

PHARMACIST: ... To our country. To home. To Prague. To Podolí. To the pharmacy. To hell with this. It's making me sad.

<sup>3</sup> TEACHER: It took me a week to sew this and now you've just shot me.

The verbal component of a play also includes the stylization of spoken language, for instance the differences between the standard language and its colloquial form, and the registers of individual characters. In some cases, we may see an example of a register clash in Cimrman plays. One such example can be found directly in *Dobytí severního pólu* as instance 14), which can be seen below. The third column includes the translation from *The Cimrman English Theatre* since Craig Cravens has not translated this instance at all.

14)	BRUKNER: <b>Ano, já jsem to celé pozorně vyslechl a vyvodil jsem z toho ten závěr, že bude-li ještě někdy příležitost a budu-li požádán o nějakou další rekonstrukci, že se vám na to vyseru.</b>	<b>Yes, I have listened carefully to the whole thing, and the conclusion I draw is that if I am ever offered the opportunity to re-draft a play in the future, I'll say: "Screw you!"</b>
-----	---	---

In this case, we may see a clash between the standard speech that Petr Brukner typically uses as a scholar, and the non-standard speech which includes a vulgarity. This clash then results in a humorous effect.

Generally, Cimrman plays often make use of colloquial speech to enhance the overall humorous effect. However, the focus on stylization and register will not be a part of the analysis with the exception of specific cases, such as the one seen above.

## ***2.4 About the Authors***

In this subchapter, I aim to briefly introduce the authors of *Dobytí severního pólu*, Zdeněk Svěrák and Ladislav Smoljak.

### ***2.4.1 Zdeněk Svěrák***

Zdeněk Svěrák is a Czech author, lyricists, playwright, actor, screenwriter, and humourist. He was born on the 28<sup>th</sup> March 1936 in Prague as a “miracle child” of František and Růžena, who have lost their first child, also named Zdeněk, due to sepsis (Čermáková 2009, 10–11).

---

These translations have been inserted here for the purpose of clarity and the presented instances will be analysed further in the practical part of this thesis.

During grammar school, Svěrák started showing interest in literature and writing, and started creating his own work, for instance short stories, which he used to amuse his classmates (Čermáková 2009, 13).

František Svěrák wanted his son to become an electrical engineer, so Zdeněk applied to ČVUT (České vysoké učení technické v Praze; Czech Technical University in Prague) (Novák 1994, 55). However, he was still very much fond of literature and wanted to pursue teaching. For that reason, Svěrák decided to change his initial plan and went on to study Czech language and literature on the Faculty of Education at Charles University in Prague (Novák 1994, 56).

After graduating, Svěrák worked as a teacher and continued writing at the same time, first only for himself (Čermáková 2009, 16). Since his job as a teacher became too time consuming and did not allow him to focus on writing entirely, in 1962, he decided to join *Československý rozhlas* (Čermáková 2009, 24). This marks the beginning of his career as an author. At that time, his focus was on short stories and fairy tales (Novák 1994, 59).

After meeting Jiří Šebánek, Svěrák expanded his portfolio to include dramas and later films as well. He is the co-author or author of all Címrman plays except for *Vyšetřování ztráty třídní knihy* which was written by Ladislav Smoljak.

Beside dramas, Svěrák is also the author of many songs, mostly targeted at children, books, and screenplays. Svěrák's movies are humorous, often co-written with Ladislav Smoljak. Some examples include *Jáchyme, hod' ho do stroje*, *Jára Címrman ležící, spící*, *Vesničko má středisková*, *Na samotě u lesa*, *Marečku, podejte mi pero!*, or *Kolja*, an Oscar-winning film.

### ***2.4.2 Ladislav Smoljak***

Ladislav Smoljak was a Czech actor, screenwriter, and film and theatre director. He was born on the 9<sup>th</sup> December 1931 in Prague (Biografie - Ladislav Smoljak, n. d.).

After grammar school, he applied for DAMU (Divadelní fakulta Akademie múzických umění v Praze; Theatre Faculty of the Academy of Performing Arts in Prague), nevertheless, he was not accepted (Fikejz 2008, 166). Instead, he opted, similarly to Svěrák, for studies at the Faculty of Education, however, he graduated in mathematics and physics (Biografie - Ladislav Smoljak, n. d.).

Before devoting his life entirely to theatre, he worked as an assistant, teacher, and a TV critic. Later, he pursued his career as an editor in the *Mladý svět* magazine, and in

the publishing house *Mladá fronta*. Finally, he became a screenwriter (Biografie - Ladislav Smoljak, n. d.).

He is most famous for the work created together with Zdeněk Svěrák. Smoljak is the co-author of the aforementioned plays and films. In addition to that, he has written a play for *Divadlo Na Zábřadlí*, and several other publications (Biografie - Ladislav Smoljak, n. d.).

Ladislav Smoljak died of cancer on the 6<sup>th</sup> June 2010 at the age of 78.

## 2.5 *Translating Theatre*

In this subchapter, I am going to describe the specifics of drama translation.

When a translator is presented with a drama, they should ensure, similarly to other types of texts, that they meet the requirements for equivalence. Povejšil (1994, 139) comments on the theoretical approach to plays and states that one should, similarly to other types of texts, consider the following types of equivalence, introduced by Werner Koller: denotative (content), connotative (related to stylistics), text-normative (text types), pragmatic (communicative), and formal (the individual characteristics of the source text (ST)) equivalence.

From the practical point of view, Povejšil (1994, 140) introduces two approaches to translating drama. The first constitutes a situation when the translation exists purely to be published as a book. That is, the play is only meant to be read. This is the case of Craig Cravens' translation, his version of *The Conquest of the North Pole* was published, together with his other Cimrman translations, on his own personal website as "a source of amusement, by introducing the **reader** to the humor of Czech culture through the Czech tradition of Cimrman" (Cravens 2010).

The second approach needs to be taken once a translator is assigned a translation that is meant to be used as a script for a stage performance, which is the case of the second text under analysis, made by the CET translators. In this situation, the translation is created in cooperation with the theatre group, it is "tailored" to the group's needs, and the state of future staging is of the highest importance (Povejšil 1994, 140). The first version of such a translation is quite often only a "rough" material which will be later modified to better fit the needs of the actors and actresses, for instance to ensure that the crucial features of a dramatic performance, that is speakability and intelligibility (Levý 2011, 129), meet the expectations.

This results in different starting points of the translations under study. Craig Cravens has the option of explaining his choices via footnotes. His translation includes eight footnotes in total with comments about the translation process. See the following example in Picture 1.

**Picture 1: Craven's footnotes - example**

---

<sup>1</sup> Němec, of course, means German, and there is a play on this name near the end of the drama. It could conceivably be changed to another name that designated a nationality in English. Karel Dutch, for example.

<sup>2</sup> The original has Varel Frištenský, who is the cousin of the famous 19th-century Czech wrestler Gustav Frištenský. Varel is not a Czech name, but in the vocative case, Varle, it is the Czech word for testicle. I changed the name to Richard Schwarzenegger, who is known to English speakers, and his nickname is Dick, which is, of course, not as funny as the original testicle.

17

Using footnotes allows Craig Cravens to explain his choices and possibly fill in blank spaces and compensate for such instances where the transfer of humour was not possible.

On the other hand, CET has not only the verbal, but also the non-verbal component at their disposal. Actors and actresses may for instance adapt their gestures, pauses, intonation, and facial expressions to strengthen the desired effect (Povejšil 1994, 142). This will influence the reception on the side of the audience, both positively as well as negatively. The intelligibility of discourse on stage has been largely investigated from the perspective of acoustics (Levý 2011, 133) and poor acoustics may hinder the intelligibility and therefore the understanding of crucial passages, which is avoided when reading a text. As Jiří Levý (2011, 148) states, “the written text can only roughly suggest the phonetic attributes of oral speech; suprasegmental prosodic attributes, including chiefly the tempo and intonation, cannot be captured unless indicated by syntax etc.”

Generally, it can be said that both types of translation include many shifts, whether they be stylistic or semantic. If they are intentional, we speak of the so called foregrounding (Povejšil 1994, 124). This is also related to adaptation to a different cultural and social environment. In this case, the aim is to avoid it since the intention of both Cravens and the group of translators from CET is to focus on the source text and source culture, both translations therefore aim at foreignization.

## 2.6 About Craig S. Cravens

Most of the following information about Craig Cravens was taken from a CV published on his personal website (Cravens 2010)<sup>4</sup>.

Dr. Craig Stephen Cravens is an American scholar who is interested in Slavic languages and literature, especially the Czech language and culture, as well as Russian. He has earned his BA degree from Amherst College in Massachusetts focusing on Russian literature. In 1998, he received his Ph. D. from Slavic Languages and Literatures (Czech and Russian) from the Princeton University in New Jersey. In his dissertation, he focused on the first-person narrative form in Czech and Russian, using the work of Pushkin, Dostoevsky, Čapek, and Kundera to illustrate his ideas. He is a lecturer, author, scholar, and translator. From the pedagogical point of view, he participated as a lecturer in several language institutes, including the Summer Schools of Czech Studies at Masaryk University in Brno and Charles University in Prague. Between the years 2003 and 2006, Craig Cravens was an Editor and Vice President in Charge of membership at IATC, International Association of Teachers of Czech.

Cravens has published several books, articles, and book chapters. His own publications include for instance *Culture and Customs of the Czech Republic and Slovakia*, published in 2006. He is also a very productive translator. From Czech to English, he has translated Jan Neruda's *Prague Tales From the Little Quarter* and Vladimír Páral's *Lovers & Murderers*. Furthermore, he has translated a short story by Svatava Antošová, and most notably, several works by Ladislav Smoljak and Zdeněk Svěrák.

Craig Cravens has translated the following Cimmrman plays: *Long, Wide, and Shortsighted: A Fairy Tale that Failed Among Children*; *Pub in the Glade: An Operetta*; *The Conquering of the North Pole by the Czech Karel Němec*; *Africa: The Czechs Among the Cannibals*; *Murder on the Bohemian Express*; and *The Plum Tree: A Dramatic Amnesiacon*. In his CV, Cravens lists all of these with the note “unpublished”.

According to his website, it seems that these translations were created due to personal and professional pedagogical interest, to “demonstrate the use of teaching language with drama in the classroom” (Cravens 2010). Furthermore, Craig Cravens has organised several productions of the translated plays at the University of Texas and in

---

<sup>4</sup> <https://jaracimrman.wordpress.com/about-craig-cravens/>

the Czech Republic that have been performed in Czech with English supertitles (Cravens 2010).

## **2.7 About The Cimirman English Theatre**

*The Cimirman English Theatre* (CET) was founded in 2014 (Cimirman English Theatre 2022). The main aim of this theatre company is to introduce Svěrák and Smoljak's work to an English-speaking audience by translating and providing faithful reproductions of the plays. So far, the company has performed in Prague, Brno, České Budějovice, Košice, and in 2017, thanks to a crowd-funding campaign, they managed to go on a tour in the United States (Cimirman English Theatre 2022).

The idea for CET stems from Emília Machalová and Brian Stewart. After receiving a permission to translate *Záskok (The Stand-In)* from the representatives of Zdeněk Svěrák and Ladislav Smoljak's estate, Emília and Brian have completed the first draft. In their own words, keeping the "Czechness" of the play was crucial (Cimirman English Theatre 2022). For that reason, Machalová and Stewart were more than happy to start cooperating with Hanka Jelínková, an English teacher, translator, and in a way "guardian of Svěrák and Smoljak's work", since she is the daughter of Zdeněk Svěrák (Cimirman English Theatre 2022).

Once the translation was completed, the group recruited English-speaking actors located in Prague and on the 9<sup>th</sup> February 2014, the company managed to present a successful try-out performance (Cimirman English Theatre 2022). After that, it was necessary to negotiate a place where it would be possible to produce the performance on a regular basis for a larger audience. After some discussions, CET gained permission to perform at the *Žižkovské divadlo Járy Cimrmana (Žizkov Theatre of Jára Cimirman)* (Cimirman English Theatre 2022). Nowadays, CET consists of actors who come from many different parts of the world, for instance the United Kingdom, Germany, Australia, or Canada (Cimirman English Theatre 2022).

As for the translators, the CET website currently lists five translators. Besides the "founding trio" (Emília Machalová, Brian Stewart, and Hanka Jelínková), Brian Caspe and Dagmar Caspe have also joined the company.

As for the translation of *Dobytí severního pólu*, it was created in 2022 by Emília Machalová, Brian Stewart, and Hanka Jelínková. Emília Machalová has originally worked in media and is a co-founder of and a co-translator in the CET project

(Cimrman English Theatre 2022). Brian Stewart, the second co-founder of CET, is also a playwright. His play *Castro's Beard* was performed off-Broadway and had its tour in the UK. Stewart is also one of the founding members of a Prague-based *Eesk Theatre Company*.

Hanka Jelínková is an author, publisher of children's books, teacher of English, and a translator (Cimrman English Theatre 2022). In the CET project, she fulfils several roles – editor, contributor, and co-translator. She also makes sure that the plays stay true to their original versions as much as possible (Cimrman English Theatre 2022).

## ***2.8 Gideon Toury and the Three-Phase Methodology***

In this section, I aim to introduce a framework that serves as the basis for my translation analysis. I have decided to apply Gideon Toury's so called "**three-phase methodology**".

Gideon Toury was a linguist of Israeli origin, a professor at Tel Aviv University, and a pioneer in the field of the so-called descriptive translation studies (DTS). He worked together with another influential scholar in the field of linguistics, Itamar Even-Zohar. In the 1970s, Itamar-Even Zohar introduced the "polysystem theory" where translated literature exists as a system on its own and in various relationships with the original versions (Venuti 2000, 123). Even-Zohar and Toury see literature as a "polysystem" of interrelated forms that create "norms" which constrain the translator's choices and strategies (Venuti 2000, 123). Toury takes the "target-oriented" approach and explains how the translation is always influenced by the target norms and how this affects the search for equivalence (Venuti 2000, 123). He also states that the target-oriented approach does **not** mean that we focus only on target conditions and culture, but that this is "where the observations begin", but not where they will also end (Toury 2012, 31). In this sense, Toury seeks to describe how one may explain the "acceptability" of the translation in the receiving culture and states that the shifts in translation (which always inevitably occur) constitute a type of equivalence that reflects the target norms at a certain point in time (Venuti 2000, 123).

Toury focused on the development of a general theory of translation. He aimed to create a systematic descriptive branch within the field of DTS in order to obtain a methodology which would provide a way of intersubjectively testing the many free-



standing studies on the matter (Munday 2016, 175). This way, one may unify the many subjective translation analyses in a clear manner.

As a result, the **three-phase methodology** was proposed as a systematic approach within the field of descriptive translation studies (DTS).

This approach includes the following steps. First, it is necessary to **situate the translations within the target language (TL) cultural system**. Secondly, one should proceed with a **textual analysis of the source text (ST) and the target text (TT)** in order to identify relationships between the corresponding segments in the two texts. As the last step of this methodology, Toury proposes to **attempt generalizations** about the patterns identified in the two texts which helps to reconstruct the process of translation for the given pair (Munday 2016, 175).

As for this thesis, the first step is being represented by the theoretical section, where I am to introduce the origins of the translations and their original function, that is, the target audience. In this case, the audience constitutes of English-speaking people who are possibly interested in Czech humour and culture. Both English texts are directly presented as translations, due to the specifics of the ST, the fact that they are translations is almost stressed. Both translations introduce the translators on the first page right after the title. For that reason, it is not only necessary to keep the humour in the translation, but also to focus on what makes the humour so specific, which includes the aforementioned “Czechness” and possibly some cultural knowledge, regarding history for instance.

The practical part of this thesis, that is the comparative analysis, constitutes the second step of Toury’s methodology. The aim is to take individual humorous situations, see them side by side and compare them to see the changes made and gain a first insight into the process of translation.

The last step of the methodology will be included partially in the analysis, but mostly in the closing section of this thesis. I will attempt to draw generalisations and conclusions based on the results of my analysis.

### 3 THE PRACTICAL PART – THE ANALYSIS

#### 3.1 Methodology

As already stated, the first step of the analysis includes noting down the humorous instances from the whole comedy, that is both from the seminar and then from the play itself. An “instance” constitutes a unit of analysis for this thesis, and it does not represent a linguistic or textual unit. An instance can have a single humorous element, or several. If an instance has several humorous elements, it is still treated as a single unit because the individual elements contribute to the overall humorous effect. That means that if these elements were divided, their synergistic effect would disappear. These instances have been gathered based on my subjective notion of what I consider to be amusing, and supported by the reactions of the audience that can be heard in the background. The focus is on the verbal component of the play, for additional comments on other components that contribute to humour in *Dobytí severního pólu*, please see section 3.4.

After creating rough notes with timestamps, the instances have been put into a table which can be found in the appendices as Table 3. Each instance has been assigned a number, and both Cravens’ and CET’s translation have been listed next to each instance. In addition to that, the word count for the Czech original and both English versions is also included. After that, the analysis of every instance follows; this includes focus on the humorous aspect each given situation contains, and for each instance, one of the following options applies:

1. Humour was transferred using the same linguistic devices.
2. Humour was transferred using different linguistic devices.
3. Humour was not transferred at all.
4. The category “miscellaneous”, intended for instances which do not fit into any of the previous categories and need to be described further.

The option for each instance has been put into the last column of Table 3. After this step of the data analysis has been finished, the amount of each option for both

translations has been calculated to obtain an objective representation of the translators' tendencies.

This numerical representation is then followed by specific comments accompanied by examples and generalisations.

### 3.2 *The Treatment of Characters' Names*

This chapter comments on the proper nouns in *Dobytí severního pólu* with focus on the names of the characters and their translations made by Craig Cravens and *The Cimrman English Theatre*.

In the seminar, the characters bear the names of the actors with randomly assigned academic titles (Kubík 2023). Craig Cravens keeps the names as they are since his translation is meant for reading only. In contrast to that, the CET translation includes names of the CET actors who play the respective parts, since the text was made with the intention of being performed by previously chosen actors.

In the Table 1 below, you may see the names of the characters and their translation.

**Table 1: The characters' names and their translation**

Czech original	Cravens' translation	Translation from CET
Náčelník Karel Němec	Chief Karel Němec	Chieftain Karel Deutsch
Pomocný učitel Václav Poustka	Teaching Assistant Václav Poustka	Assistant Teacher Václav Poustka
Lékárník Vojtěch Šofr	Pharmacist Vojtěch Šofr	Pharmacist Vojtěch Šofr
Varel Frištenský	Richard Schwarzenegger	Boleslav Frištenský
Americký Čech, poručík Beran	American Czech, lieutenant Koláč	American Czech, lieutenant Beran

The names of Václav Poustka and Vojtěch Šofr remain unchanged. As for the chief's name, Cravens has decided to keep it as in the original, however, at the beginning of the play, he adds a list of the characters and the following footnote:

**Picture 2: Cravens' comment on Němec's name**

---

<sup>1</sup> Němec, of course, means German, and there is a play on this name near the end of the drama. It could conceivably be changed to another name that designated a nationality in English. Karel Dutch, for example.

This way, although the humour is then lost in the given section of the play, he provides at least an insight into the original intention.

The CET translators, on the other hand, have chosen to use the German word “Deutsch”, which means “German” (used as an adjective) or “German language”. From the point of view of humour, the whole situation is described in section 3.3.2.3.

The name of Varel Frištenský presents a challenge for the translators. The humorous effect stems from the fact that “Varel” has the form “Varle” in the vocative case, which means “testicle”. In order to keep the humorous effect in some way, Cravens changed Frištenský’s name to Richard Schwarzenegger with the following explanation:

**Picture 3: Cravens’ comment on Frištenský’s name**

<sup>2</sup> The original has Varel Frištenský, who is the cousin of the famous 19th-century Czech wrestler Gustav Frištenský. Varel is not a Czech name, but in the vocative case, Varle, it is the Czech word for testicle. I changed the name to Richard Schwarzenegger, who is known to English speakers, and his nickname is Dick, which is, of course, not as funny as the original testicle.

The CET translators have changed the name to “Boleslav Frištenský”. I have not found any explanation for this change; the reason therefore remains unknown.

The last character is the American Czech. His last name, in Czech “Beran”, is of crucial importance in scene 5, where it serves as a basis for a wordplay. The characters think that Varel has a “beran” (ram) with him, but in reality, he suggests eating the frozen lieutenant Beran. Cravens has kept the humorous effect in the same way by naming him “Koláč” and he explains his choice in the following way:

**Picture 4: Cravens’ comment on Beran’s name**

<sup>6</sup> The original name is *Beran*, which means ram. When they decide to eat him later, there is a play on the name—*baked ram*. I think koláče are fairly well known to English speakers. It's not the best solution, but it's difficult to find a Czech-sounding name that also means a type of food in English.

The CET translators have kept the name as it is in the Czech original.

### 3.3 *The Analysis of the Existing Translations with Respect to Humour*

In this chapter, I am going to focus on the detailed analysis of the translation tendencies based on the results of my findings. First, I am going to present the general results. After that, I will proceed with comments about individual situations as well as general discussion about both Cravens and the CET group of translators.

In the Table 2 below, you may see the results of the transfer of humour for both translators.

**Table 2: Transfer of humour - results**

The options	Cravens' translation	Translation from CET
1. Humour was transferred using the same linguistic devices.	26 (65%)	27 (67.5%)
2. Humour was transferred using different linguistic devices.	0 (0%)	2 (5%)
3. Humour was not transferred at all.	9 (22.5%)	6 (15%)
4. The category "miscellaneous".	5 (12.5%)	5 (12.5%)

As we may see from the results, in most of the cases, the humour was transferred using the same linguistic devices. As for Craig Cravens' translation, this option applies for 26 instances out of 40, that is in 65% of the cases. By the translation created by a group of translators from *The Cimrman English Theatre*, this transfer applies for 27 cases out of 40, meaning that the translators used the same linguistic devices in 67.5% of the instances. Cravens did not use different linguistic devices in any case, the CET translators in 2 instances (5%). Craig Cravens did not translate humour at all in 9

instances (22.5%) and the CET translators in 6 cases (15%). Regarding the “miscellaneous” category, there are 5 instances (12.5%) for both English translations.

It seems crucial to specify the choices during the analysis, starting with what it means to “use the same linguistic devices” as it may not always be clear-cut. The following quick overview therefore serves as an insight into the process of the transfer assessment. The first translation in the table is by Craig Cravens, the second by translators from *The Cimrman English Theatre*.

When it comes to using the same linguistic devices, some cases can be considered representative of this option. See example 6) below.

6)	Jen onehdy, když náčelník usnul, slezli jsme se s Frištenským a Šofrem pod jednu deku a vyprávěli si o požáru Národního divadla.	But just the other day, when the chief fell asleep, Schwarzenegger, Šofr, and I crept beneath a blanket and talked about the fire at the National Theater.	Just the other day, when the chief was asleep, I crawled under the blanket with Frištenský and Šofr and we discussed the National Theatre burning down.	1. / 1.
----	--	--	---	---------

The amusement stems from mentioning an important even from Czech history, the fire at the National Theatre, which is being put to contrast to the situation the protagonists find themselves in. They are freezing and hoping to warm themselves up by talking about things that are related to the feeling of warmth. Although one may speculate about the humorousness of the utterance for non-Czech audience given its relation to Czech history, in this case, the translators did not change the device carrying humour. Although there are grammatical and semantic differences between the individual sentences (“fire” being a noun, “burning” a present participle), they are not relevant to the transfer of humour.

As for the second option, that is transfer using different linguistic devices, I am going to use the instance 29) and the CET translation to demonstrate it.

29)	FRIŠTENSKÝ: Víte co? Sníme Berana. LÉKÁRNÍK: Ty máš berana? To je naše spása! Ty se vždycky	<i>Schwarzenegger:</i> You know what? Let’s eat Koláč. <i>Pharmacist:</i> You’ve got	FRIŠTENSKÝ: You know what? Let’s eat Beran. PHARMACIST: You have Bran? This	1. / 2.
-----	--	--	---	---------

	s něčím vytasíš... Kde ho máš?	koláče? Our savior! You're always pulling something out of your sleeve ... Where are they?	is our salvation! You are always coming up with something. Where is it?	
--	--------------------------------	--	---	--

In the Czech original, the humour is based on the homonymy of the word “beran” (ram), which is used to refer to the animal and as a name of one of the characters. This double meaning results in misunderstanding. Although Craig Cravens does not use the word “ram”, the humour is transferred in the same way by naming the character Koláč. That is, the translator has also used a homonym, which denotes a food, but can also be used as a last name. The other characters then think that Frištenský has a batch of kolaches with him. For that reason, option number 1. was assigned for Cravens’ translation.

In the second translation, option number 2. was chosen. The group of CET translators has transferred humour; however, they did not make use of homonymy to do so, but similar sounding words, “beran” and “bran”. This way, they combined the original name of the character and a similar sounding English word. The humorous effect is kept when the characters mishear the word.

Nevertheless, one may argue about the functionality of these solutions with respect to the knowledge of the audience, since one possible option would also be to replace “Beran” with “Goat”. This way, the transfer does not have to rely on the recipients’ knowledge of Czech food.

The third option includes instances where the original humorous intention gets completely lost in the translation. See instance 2) below as an example.

2)	Mladá fronta DNES loni napsala:	/	The daily newspaper Mladá Fronta wrote last year:	3. / 3.
----	---------------------------------	---	---	---------

In this case, Cravens completely omits not only the given sentence, but also the entire section of the seminar focused on one of the Cimrman plays called “Přetržené dítě” (“Snapped child”). This section of the seminar is largely based on wordplay and therefore presents a translation challenge. CET translators did translate this part of the play; however, the given sentence was translated literally which causes the loss of

humour. However, as in the previous example, there is a possibility of a functional solution, for instance by using a literal translation, “the newspaper Young Front TODAY”. More detailed comments on this section of the play will follow in the next chapters.

As for the last option, the category “miscellaneous”, this includes instances which do not fit into any of the previous categories. To illustrate this case, I am going to present instance 17).

17)	UČITEL: Varle!	<i>Teacher: Dick!</i>	TEACHER: So, Boleslav, Bolek, little Bolek, ...	4. / 3.
-----	----------------	-----------------------	---	---------

Option number 4. relates to Cravens’ translation. Craig Cravens managed to transfer humour using a vulgar word which relates to male reproductive organs as in the Czech original. However, in his text, this part includes a footnote with explanation about the source of humour in the original text and about his choices. Again, a more detailed analysis of this case will follow in the next section of the thesis which focuses on the transfer of humour in Cravens’ translation.

### ***3.3.1 Detailed Analysis of Craig Cravens’ Translation***

As already stated, Cravens transferred humour using the same linguistic devices in 26 instances out of 40, which makes up 65%. He did not transfer humour using different linguistic devices in any of the studied instances. In 9 cases (22.5%), he did not transfer humour at all. And finally, in the category “miscellaneous”, there were 5 instances (12.5%).

#### ***3.3.1.1 Cravens’ Translation - Option Number 3***

The first four of these 9 instances, numbered 1), 2), 13), and 14), are all part of the seminar, more specifically, of its subsection called “Cimrmanova záhadná hra Přetržené dítě” (Cimrman’s mysterious drama “Snapped child”). In this section of the seminar, the authors describe the discovery of one of Cimrman’s lost plays which was to be reviewed by Petr Brukner. The play was originally said to have been dictated by Cimrman himself to an old man with little to no education. For that reason, the old man wrote down everything as he had heard it. Nevertheless, Cimrman has supposedly been dealing with some respiratory issues at that time which changed the sound of some of



the words due to a nasal obstruction. This nasal voice then results in different meanings of some words. For instance, in such a speech, “m” can become “b”. This way, in Czech, “máma” (mother) can become “bába” (old woman). Petr Brukner is then accused of overlooking this mistake and introducing the play as it was written which results in the introduction of slightly brutal elements. Especially in the following exchange between parents:

- a) A: “Ubyl jsi ho?”  
*“Did you beat him to death?”*  
 B: “Ubyl.”  
*“I did.”*

In this case, “ubyl” was supposed to be “umyl”, which means “to wash”. Instead, it was understood as the verb “ubít” which means “to beat somebody to death”. Considering the play is supposed to take place at the tailor’s workshop, the title of the play starts then making more sense after realising that the original name was “Přetržené nitě” (“Broken threads”), not “Přetržené dítě” (“Snapped child”).

Some other examples of the humorous excerpts from this section of the seminar are included in instance 13). The last column of the following tables features Cravens’ translation (if there is any).

13)	Přetržené dítě. [...] Všichni byli na mé prebiěře, jenom ty jsi debyl. [...] Je mi nějak divně. Dám si padáka! [...] Deserte, deserte! [...] Už leží? Leží. Ubyl jsi ho? Ubyl. [...] Potřebuji nutně vybočit.	/
-----	--	---

Instance 1) includes humour in the form of a similar wordplay, using “dehet” (tar) instead of “nehet” (nail), and it also combines situational humour introduced by the actor nervously biting his nails since his mistakes are being presented.

1)	Pokud jde o zoufalou hmotnou situaci v rodině, krejčovské dítě nemělo takový hlad, že by muselo okusovat dehet. Kolega Brukner to, jak vidíte, sám dělá dodnes.	/
----	---	---

Instances 2) and 14) are also taken from this section of the seminar but are not directly related to the wordplay described above. Instance 2) bases humour on the oxymoron made of the title of a newspaper (Mladá fronta DNES, where “dnes” means “today”) and a temporal adverb (“loni”, meaning “last year”). The positioning of two contrastive terms next to each other results in an amusing effect.

2)	Mladá fronta DNES loni napsala:	/
----	---------------------------------	---

As for instance 14), it features Brukner’s reaction to the criticism and bases the humour on the use of a swear word which exists in a contrast to the rest of the very formal discourse.

14)	BRUKNER: Ano, já jsem to celé pozorně vyslechl a vyvodil jsem z toho ten závěr, že bude-li ještě někdy příležitost a budu-li požádán o nějakou další rekonstrukci, že se vám na to vyseru.	/
-----	--	---

All these instances have not been translated at all, therefore there was no transfer of humour. Craig Cravens does not provide any comments regarding the reasoning behind omitting this section of the play, so one may only speculate. It is possible that the amount of wordplay and associated difficulty hindered Cravens from attempting to translate the given section. This part of the seminar presents only a small section of the play; however, it is sophisticated and contains many sources of humour. Since wordplay presents an integral part of Cimrman humour, it seems understandable, but rather unwanted that this section was omitted.

Instance 22) was taken from a scene where the characters desperately contemplate killing Frištenský and eating him. They talk about how well-built he is and in the Czech

original, the pharmacist states that he surely is “libový” (lean), referring to the fact that he has a lot of muscle. This seems comical since this adjective is most typically used when referring to animal meat. Craig Cravens has decided to change the entire sentence, avoids this comparison entirely and instead inserts a supportive exclamation.

22)	LÉKARNÍK (uvažuje): A on bude možná i libovej.	Pharmacist (thinking): Yeah, let's fry him!
-----	--	---

In the next situation, instance 30), the humour stems from a pun based on the words “krajan” (fellow countryman) and “krajní” (an adjective meaning “extreme”). The sentence “Já osobně ho budu jíst jen s krajním odporem.” has been translated to “Personally I will eat him only with extreme disgust.” which keeps the original meaning but does not compensate for the pun in any way and the humour therefore gets lost. This could have been avoided for example by translating functionally along the lines of: “Our utmost dear countryman?” [...] “Personally, I will eat him only with utmost disgust.”

30)	UČITEL: Jo, ty myslíš poručíka Berana? Krajana? [...] UČITEL: Já osobně ho budu jíst jen s krajním odporem.	Teacher: Oh, you mean Lieutenant Koláč? Our countryman? [...] Teacher: Personally I will eat him only with extreme disgust.
-----	---	---

In instance 32), the humour in the original version is based on the semantic contrast between “česká” (an adjective meaning Czech) and “Němec” (a German), which is used as a proper noun. Since the chief first introduces their group as a Czech expedition and then proceeds to introduce himself, there is a tendency to understand his utterance in the sense of a nationality rather than a name. The translation by Cravens uses the chief's name in the original form. However, for an audience that does not speak Czech, this carries no meaning, and the humour is therefore not functionally transferred. One possibility to keep the humour would be to change the chief's last name to “German”.

32)	NÁČELNÍK: Ano. My jsme česká polární expedice. Já jsem Němec.	Chief: Yes. We're a Czech polar expedition. I'm Němec.
-----	---	--

Instance 33) is related to the comedic nature of lieutenant Beran, a Czech American who combines the two languages resulting in incomplete sentences, nonsense expressions, or simply utterances that mix up Czech and English words. In the given instance, the humour stems from the word “cvrkly” which is supposed to be “scvrklý” (shrunk). In addition to that, “cvrkly” sounds like an adjective derived from the verb “cvrknout si” which means “to wet one’s pants”. However, the translation features the adjective “shriveled up” without any ungrammatical elements that would carry the humorous effect.

33)	BERAN: ... Pane profesore, bože, vy jste cvrkly! Já byl taky tak cvrklý?	Koláč: ... My God, Professor, you're kind of shriveled up. Was I that shriveled up?
-----	--	---

Instance 34) is again based on Beran’s way of speaking. In the original, humour is conveyed by unnatural sounding word order and ellipsis. In addition to that, the humour is expressed via use of an offensive language. Since Cravens has kept the offensive addressing (“idiots”), this instance shows mixed characteristics. However, in general, Cravens did not alter Beran’s, or in his case Koláč’s, way of speaking and therefore did not transfer the main unit of humour.

34)	BERAN: A vy mě oživilí za jediný rok? Za to já vám neděkuju! Vy mě otrávilí. Jeden rok zimní spánek! Jako nějaké zvíře! Vy se mně nelíbíte za tohle. Vy blbci.	Koláč: And you revived me after only a year? Thanks for nothing! This is really annoying. One year of hibernation! Like some animal. You idiots!
-----	--	--

To sum up, Cravens did not transfer humour in the following cases. First, if it was part of the section of the seminar called “Snapped child”. This specific section includes humour based on wordplay, the use of swear words, and an oxymoron, and remained untranslated most probably due to the challenge it presents. Secondly, Cravens did not transfer the instance which bases humour on the unusual use of “libový” when referring

to a person. The reason might be that when “lean” is used in English, it can be connected both to a person, and to meat, which could still result in the loss of humour. Thirdly, Cravens did not transfer a pun based on the words “krajní” and “krajan”. Fourthly, a loss of humorous effect occurred when Cravens kept the name of the character of Němec as is, which resulted in the loss of humorous contrast. And lastly, Cravens omitted the unusual way of speaking Beran uses which indicates that he is a foreigner.

#### ***3.3.1.2 Cravens’ Translation - Option Number 4***

In this subsection, I am going to analyse the “miscellaneous” category for Craig Cravens’ translation. Altogether, there are 5 instances that fall into this category.

The first instance contains several interesting aspects. Part of this instance is based on Czech historical events, another part focuses on repetition and introduction of unexpected elements. The humour based on history relates to the personality of Alois Jirásek, an author who focused on Czech history, Libuše, a legendary ancestor of the House of Přemysl, and Jan Hus, a Czech Church reformer, who was sentenced to death by burning. By Alois Jirásek, the humour stems from saying that he was looking into the past, and this is put into humorous contrast to Libuše, who was supposed to prophesy the existence of the city of Prague, therefore, she looks into the future. These two live paintings are then completed by the statement “Koniáš is looking into a pit”. As for the personality of Koniáš, the play most probably refers to the Czech priest Antonín Koniáš, who is known for destroying Czech books during the 18<sup>th</sup> century, and who is viewed rather negatively. The live painting of him staring into a pit may have a certain meaning, one option being that the “pit” refers to an “anus”, however, it is also probable that it is an expression of absurd humour. Mentioning that people with fireplace could enjoy the live painting of Jan Hus after his trial introduces black humour. Craig Cravens has decided to keep part of this instance as is, namely when translating the section about Alois Jirásek, Libuše, and Jan Hus. This way, he transferred humour using the same devices with the presupposition that the audience will be aware of these historical figures, or at least able to infer their history and importance. As for Koniáš, he did not transfer this live painting, instead, he mentions a Slovak linguist Ján Kollár. Although he managed to transfer humour in a different way as Slovaks usually struggle with the pronunciation of Czech “ř”, I would conclude that it is another piece of information that an English-speaking audience might not be

familiar with. Nevertheless, supposing the audience will have the information necessary to understand the joke, Cravens has transformed this part to better match the intended audience.

3)	Vaše babičky si možná vzpomenou na taková oblíbená dílka jako například „Jirásek se dívá do minulosti“, „Libuše se dívá do budoucnosti“, „Koniáš se dívá do díry“, početnějším rodinám byl určen „Hus před koncilem kostnickým“, početnějším rodinám s krbem „Hus po koncilu kostnickém“.	Perhaps your grandmothers remember such famous works as “Alois Jirásek Looks into the Past,” “Libuše Looks into the Future,” or “Jan Kollár looks for a way to pronounce the Czech Ř.” For more numerous families, Cimrman created works such as “Jan Hus before the Council at Constance,” and for more numerous families with a fireplace, “Jan Hus After the Council at Constance.”
----	---	--

Instance 17) has already been commented on in the introductory part of chapter 3.3. This part of the play makes use of the first name of Varel Frištenský which, when used in vocative, has the form “varle”, meaning “testicle”. Cravens translated Frištenský’s first name as Dick in order to keep the vulgarity, however, at the beginning of the translation, Cravens inserts a footnote where he explains in detail the original source of humour. This way, he also comments on his inability to find appropriate solution in English. To sum up, he did transfer the humour, however, he also provided an insight into the original humorous intention to compensate for his feeling of inadequate translation. See Picture 5 below for the complete comment which also includes a historical background related to the character of Varel.

**Picture 5: Cravens’ footnote - Frištenský’s first name**

<sup>2</sup> The original has Varel Frištenský, who is the cousin of the famous 19th-century Czech wrestler Gustav Frištenský. Varel is not a Czech name, but in the vocative case, Varle, it is the Czech word for testicle. I changed the name to Richard Schwarzenegger, who is known to English speakers, and his nickname is Dick, which is, of course, not as funny as the original testicle.

17)	UČITEL: Varle!	Teacher: Dick!
-----	----------------	----------------

Instance 20) bases its humour on a wordplay connected with the verb “šít”. “Šít” means “to sew” and “našít to do někoho” is a fixed expression meaning “to shove somebody” or “to bump into someone”. The humorous effect is then created by the accumulation of the same verb with different meanings. For this instance, Cravens includes, similarly to the previous case, a footnote. See Picture 6 below.

**Picture 6: Cravens’ footnote - “našít to do někoho”**

<sup>3</sup> Obviously there’s an untranslatable joke here, and my solution is not ideal.

Although he does not go into detail about the original source of humour, he admits that there originally was a joke that he attempted to translate, but that he does not find his “solution ideal”. Beside this explanatory footnote, his translation includes an alliteration, marked with bold formatting. He also uses an offensive word “nincompoop” which is slightly euphemised as opposed to the original “cretin”. This means that Cravens has transferred humour with the use of different linguistic devices and also provided an additional information about the process via a footnote.

20)	UČITEL (v tučňáckém): Au! (Chytí se za loket.) Frištenský, ty seš takovej vůl. Copak nevidíš, že to je legrace? Komickej převlek? Já se s tím tejdén šiju a von to do mě našije. Kretén!	Teacher (in the penguin suit): Ouch! (clutches at his elbow) Schwarzenegger, you’re such an idiot! Can’t you see it’s a joke? This is my comic disguise. I spend a week knitting it, and this <b>nitwit nearly nixes</b> me. <b>Nincompoop!</b>
-----	--	---

Instance 23) revolves around a misunderstanding between the characters which is based on a polysemy. In Czech, “mít housera” (to have a gander) can either mean to own the animal, in the literal meaning, or “to have a backache”, which is the metaphorical use. Cravens has shifted the situation to a slightly obscene level by using the word “cock” which makes the other characters think he is talking about his genitalia. In addition to that, he inserts a footnote which can be seen below:

**Picture 7: Cravens’ footnote - the word “houser”**

<sup>5</sup> In Czech the play is on the word *houser*, which means both a gander (male goose) and a backache.

This way, the audience is again introduced to the original intentions with addition to Cravens' solution.

23)	<p>FRIŠTENSKÝ: Zač bych se měl stydět? Tejden vám to melduju. V pondělí povídá tady lékárník, že mu kručí v břiše. Já nato, že mám housera. A ty, náčelníku, jsi sám řek, to nevadí, zatni zuby a táhni. V úterý zase učitel, že by jed hřebíky. Já povídám: Mám housera. Zase jste mě vodbyli. Ve středu jste všichni kňučeli hlady. Já na to: Ještě pořád mám toho housera. A co řek náčelník? No vzpomeň si. Ještě slovo, jsi řek, a zapíšem tě do deníku, bačkoro.</p>	<p>Schwarzenegger: Why should I be ashamed? I've been telling you about it for a week.  On Monday, the pharmacist says his stomach is rumbling. And I say, "Here's a cock."  And you, Chief, you yourself said, "We'll have none of your disgusting talk." And then on Tuesday, the teacher said he was so hungry he could eat nails. And I said, "How about this cock of mine." And you told me to knock it off again. On Wednesday, you were all whining with hunger, and I said, "I've still got a cock!" And what did the chief say? Go on, try to remember. You said, "One more word, and I'll write you down in the logbook, you blockhead."</p>
-----	--	--

The last situation which was assigned the category "miscellaneous" is instance 31). In this case, the humorousness of the situation is created by the combination of English and Czech. The fact that Beran is a Czech American is a part of his personality and, as was already stated, his unnatural sounding Czech monologues add to the humorous effect. Since we analyse the English translations, it is more difficult to see Beran as a foreigner. Cravens has decided to not change the sentences or language at all and adds another footnote, the screenshot of it can be seen below in Picture 8.

**Picture 8: Cravens' footnote - Beran's language**

<sup>7</sup> Koláč is speaking English in the original.



31)	BERAN: Hallo, boys! Good evening everybody! (Jde od jednoho k druhému a potřásá jim rukama.) My name is George Beran. I'm very glad to see you.	Koláč: Hello, boys! Good evening everybody! (He goes from one explorer to the other shaking his hand.) My name is George Koláč. I'm very glad to see you.
-----	---	---

To sum up, for Cravens' translation, the category "miscellaneous" includes the following situations. In the first instance that has been described, he combines options 1. and 2., that is, he transfers part of the source of humour using the same devices; for the rest, he has chosen different devices, probably to better match with the supposed knowledge of the audience. In the rest of the instances, Cravens makes use of footnotes. First, to explain the origins of the name "Varel" and his reason for changing the name to Richard/Dick. In another comment, he claims the original joke to be untranslatable and criticises his solution. The third and fourth footnotes, again, explain the sources of humour in the Czech version.

It is also important to note that in Cravens' text, the humorous effect often gets lost unnecessarily since there are options that could have been implemented and which would keep the humorous effect. Although the assessment of the translations' quality is not the aim of this thesis, it is necessary to focus on the functionality of the solutions in order to draw conclusions.

### ***3.3.2 Detailed Analysis of CET Translation***

As already stated, the group of translators from *The Cimrman English Theatre* has transferred humour using the same linguistic devices in 27 instances out of 40, that is in 67.5% of the recorded cases. In 2 instances (5%), the humour was transferred using different linguistic devices. In 6 cases (15%), the humour was not transferred at all. And finally, in the category "miscellaneous", there were 5 instances (12.5%).

#### ***3.3.2.1 CET Translation - Option Number 2***

*The Cimrman English Theatre's* translators transferred humour with the use of different linguistic devices compared to the original in 2 instances, marked with numbers 24) and 29).

Instance 24) relates to the “houser” pun which has been described in chapter 3.3.1.2. The instance inserted below features an interaction that happened after the characters have clarified the misunderstanding. As Frištenský leaves to start a fire, he mumbles offendedly and uses another wordplay, stating that he also “has a wolf”, which, in Czech, can either literally mean “to own the animal”, or metaphorically “to suffer from intertrigo”. The CET translators have omitted the original wordplay and chosen to use an amusing monologue instead. This way, they have enriched the play with several sentences, two of which include idiomatic expressions, “an itch I’d like to scratch”, and “you guys got fur on the brain”. To sum up, the original pun was omitted, but compensated for by the monologue and idioms.

24)	FRIŠTENSKÝ ( <i>na odchodu si mumlá</i> ): Bačkoro, bačkoro. Mám vlka například. A nestěžuju si.	<i>FRIŠTENSKÝ: Sissy? Sissy? Yeah I've got an itch I'd like to scratch, it's you guys! Me hallucinatin? It's you guys got fur on the brain. Think I'm an animal huh? What? A poodle maybe?</i>
-----	--	--

Instance 29) was already introduced in section 3.3. The original source of humour is based on using the word “beran” (ram) to refer to the animal and as a name of one of the characters, which results in misunderstanding. The group of CET translators has transferred humour; however, they did not make use of homonymy to do so, but similar sounding words, “beran” and “bran”. The humorous effect is kept when the characters mishear the word.

29)	FRIŠTENSKÝ: Víte co? Sníme Berana. LÉKÁRNÍK: Ty máš berana? To je naše spása! Ty se vždycky s něčím vytasíš... Kde ho máš?	FRIŠTENSKÝ: You know what? Let's eat Beran. PHARMACIST: You have Bran? This is our salvation! You are always coming up with something. Where is it?
-----	---	--

To sum up, the group of CET translators has transferred humour with the use of different linguistic devices in two cases. The first instance originally includes a pun and is transferred as a monologue with idiomatic expressions, the second one features a homonymy and the humour was transferred using similar sounding words.

### 3.3.2.2 CET Translation - Option Number 3

This subchapter analyses the instances in which the group of translators from *The Cimrman English Theatre* did not transfer humour at all.

The first instance that has been left untranslated, is instance 1). This utterance can be found in the seminar section called “Snapped child”. Although the CET translators have translated this section, as opposed to Craig Cravens, they have shortened it and omitted some of its components. Instance 1) is one such example of omission; it was already described previously in relation to Cravens’ translation and the humorous effect is based on wordplay of the similar sounding words “dehet” (tar) and “nehet” (nail). The humorous effect is also strengthened by the actions of the actor who represents Petr Brukner, that is by situational aspects, however, these do not constitute a part of the analysis.

1)	Pokud jde o zoufalou hmotnou situaci v rodině, krejčovské dítě nemělo takový hlad, že by muselo okusovat dehet. Kolega Brukner to, jak vidíte, sám dělá dodnes.	/
----	---	---

The following instance, instance 2), is also a part of the “Snapped child” section of the seminar. However, instead of omitting the given source of humour as in the previous case, the relevant sentence was translated literally which results in loss of humour. The pun is based on two contradictory words next to each other, “dnes” (today) and “loni” (last year), where “DNES” is a part of the name of a newspaper. The humour stems from the contrast which has not been transferred in the CET version.

2)	Mladá fronta DNES loni napsala:	The daily newspaper Mladá Fronta wrote last year:
----	---------------------------------	---

Instance 5) was taken from scene 4 where the teacher lists appropriate topics for conversation ordered by the chief. Since the group agrees that discussing things related to the feeling of warmth weakens their spirit, the only appropriate themes are cold-related. “Děda Mráz” (literally translating to “grandpa frost”; also known as Ded Moroz) is a fictional character from Slavic mythology who is similar to Santa Claus, Father Christmas, or Czech Christkind. So, the literal translation would be “Frost – the

best grandpa”. The humorous effect stems from the contrast between the harsh nature of the frost with the affectionate and familiar term “grandpa”. The translation created by CET refers to a metaphorical expression used to refer to winter itself (Oxford Dictionaries | English, n.d.)<sup>5</sup> and this option lacks the contrast that can be found in the original version.

5)	Sobota: Mráz – nejlepší děda.	Saturday: Old Man Winter.
----	-------------------------------	---------------------------

The following instance refers to the name of Varel Frištenský. As already stated, in Czech, this name in the vocative case sounds like the Czech word for “testicle”. This source of humour was not transferred in the CET translation, the group of translators has used the name Boleslav instead which carries no humorous meaning. The use of proper nouns in the translations has already been discussed in section 3.2.

17)	UČITEL: Varle!	TEACHER: So, Boleslav, Bolek, little Bolek, ...
-----	----------------	---

Instance 20) is connected to the situation when the teacher appears in his penguin costume. This scene is based on situational humour for the most part, however, as already noted, this instance also includes the wordplay based on the verb “šít”. The CET translators did not transfer the humour since they used literal translation which does not have any idiomatic meaning in English.

20)	UČITEL ( <i>v tučňáckém</i> ): Au! ( <i>Chytí se za loket.</i> ) Frištenský, ty seš takovej vůl. Copak nevidíš, že to je legrace? Komickej převlek? Já se s tím tejdén šiju a von to do mě našije. Kretén!	TEACHER: Ouch! Frištenský, you're such an idiot. Can't you see that this is comical disguise? It took me a week to sew this and now you've just shot me. Cretin.
-----	--	--

---

<sup>5</sup>[https://web.archive.org/web/20180418225958/https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/us/Old\\_Man\\_Winter](https://web.archive.org/web/20180418225958/https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/us/Old_Man_Winter)

Another pun was used in instance 30), this time based on the word “krajní” (extreme) and “krajan” (fellow countryman). Again, the translation does not feature any wordplay or another compensatory element that would provide a humorous effect.

30)	UČITEL: Jo, ty myslíš poručíka Berana? Krajana? [...]         UČITEL: Já osobně ho budu jíst jen s krajním odporem.	TEACHER: Oh, you mean Lieutenant Beran. Our countryman? [...]         TEACHER: Personally, I will eat him only it will stick in my throat for he's a fellow Czech.
-----	--	---

To sum up, the CET translators have not transferred humour in 6 instances. Four of these instances based humour originally on wordplay, and two of them on contrast.

### 3.3.2.3 CET Translation - Option Number 4

This subchapter focuses on the category “miscellaneous” which shows mixed characteristics. There are 5 cases in this category.

Instance 3) focuses on the section of the play that comments on Cimrman’s live paintings. The CET translators have omitted the live paintings which describe A. Jirásek, Libuše, and Koniáš. They only transferred the section which mentions the live painting of Jan Hus and the humour was transferred with the use of explanation regarding the historical context of this figure. This solution is more functional, it facilitates the understanding of humour in the given instance and is interesting in the sense that it omits a part of the ST in order to insert an internal explanation.

3)	Vaše babičky si možná vzpomenou na taková oblíbená dílka jako například „Jirásek se dívá do minulosti“, „Libuše se dívá do budoucnosti“, „Koniáš se dívá do díry“, početnějším rodinám byl určen „Hus před koncilem kostnickým“, početnějším rodinám s krbem „Hus po koncilu kostnickém“.	For larger families he created more elaborate scenes. In one, we see Jan Hus, the Czech religious reformer, accused of heresy, at the Council of Constance before his final judgment of death by burning’. For families with a large fireplace, Cimrman could offer them "Jan Hus after his judgment".
----	---	--

Instance 12), similarly to the previous one, transfers humour with the help of explanation. The translators explicitly describe the source of humour that is based on Czech personal pronouns. Again, this leads the audience to better understanding of the original source of humour.

12)	A právě dualita této řeči, toto splynutí 1. Osoby „já“ s 2. Osobou „ty“, vedlo Cimrmana k pojmenování sněžného člověka výstižným slovem „játy“, které později Angličané zkomolili na „yeti“.	In this duality of speech we see how it merges the first person I, in Czech Já, and the second person you which, in Czech, is ty. So the terms I and YOU, Já and ty in Czech, led Cimrman to name this creature a "játy", which the English later garbled into "yeti".
-----	--	--

The following instance with number 13) is taken from the sophisticated “Snapped child” section of the seminar. On one hand, the translators used similar means to transfer humour, that is the “nasal voice”, on the other hand, they have changed some of the sentences and omitted certain sections (such as the wordplay on “deserte” (“dessert” in vocative) and “neserte” (“do not piss me off”)). For that reason, option 4 was selected. To create a wordplay as seen in the original (“dát si panáka” - “to take a shot of alcohol” versus “dát si padáka” - “to fire oneself from a job”), they used the expression “to marry/burry a bride”. This way, they have also further enhanced the brutal elements that emerge because of the nasal voice.

13)	Přetržené dítě. [...] Všichni byli na mé prebiéře, jenom ty jsi de byl. [...] Je mi nějak divně. Dám si padáka! [...] Deserte, deserte! [...] Už leží? Leží. Ubyl jsi ho? Ubyl. [...] Potřebuji nutně vybočit.	The abused child. [...] Was everyode else at the prebiere? Yep. You? Dope. [...] Toborrow you barry your bride. [...] / [...] Is he laying still? He’s laying still. It was a good family beating. Yes, it was a good family beating. [...] I really bust uridate.
-----	--	--

As for instance 31), it relates to Beran's way of speaking. In the original version, he speaks either English, or he combines it with Czech, which he does not speak very well. Although in the translation, he speaks English, which would indicate that this linguistic trait would disappear, there are a few compensation mechanisms. However, these are not detectable from this instance alone. To gain a wider perspective, it is necessary look at the context of the utterance. See the text below:

TEACHER: It's fine, Chief. I speak English. [*Slowly with an accent in English*] Hello. How are you?

BERAN: [*Speaking too fast*] Thank you for asking. I have to say that having endured the sophisticated freezing process developed specifically by professor Mc Donald, I'm feeling in surprisingly good shape.

*The Teacher doesn't understand anything.*

TEACHER: [*In English with an accent*] Erm,...Thank you... My name is Václav Poustka. I am teacher. **I'm an ass...** sistant teacher.

BERAN: Václav Poustka! It is a Czech name, isn't it? Czechs! Češi! Dobrý den! Já jsem taky Čech. Finally, a chance to speak Czech again, **though confess I must my Czech now rusty a little is.**

CHIEFTAIN: We are the Czech polar expedition. **I'm Deutsch...**

BERAN: **Ah, Deutsch, a German Czech! Ich bin ein Amerikaner Czech! Sehr Geert ihnen zu treffen.** I am an American Czech. Beautiful! Hi guys!

In this excerpt from the CET translation, we may see that the translators have indeed followed the original pattern of language misunderstanding. The relevant sections are marked with bold formatting. First, in the English version, Beran's English is more advanced than the teacher's which can be deduced from the stage directions. Second, the CET translators have added an additional joke when the teacher tries to express his thoughts and makes the impression that he is about to call himself "an ass". Third, the whole idea of a difficulty of communication that creates the humorous effect is strengthened by the fact that Beran admits that he speaks Czech, although not very well, and he also starts speaking German after hearing Deutsch's name, thinking that Deutsch speaks of his nationality.

To sum up, if we were to judge purely from the instance alone, the humour would not be transferred at all. However, because of the context, this instance falls into category 4., since humour was not only transferred, but also added.

31)	BERAN: Hallo, boys! Good evening everybody! ( <i>Jde od jednoho k druhému a potřásá jim rukama.</i> ) My name is George Beran. I'm very glad to see you.	BERAN: Hallo, boys! Good evening everybody! My name is George Beran. I'm very happy you defrosted me successfully, and I'm really looking forward to learning about your new world.
-----	--	---

Instance 23), as already mentioned in chapter 3.3.1.2, revolves around a misunderstanding between the characters which is based on a pun. In Czech, “mít housera” (to have a gander) can either mean to own the animal, in the literal meaning, or “to have a backache”, which is the metaphorical use. The CET translators have used a different linguistic device, namely two homophones “hare” and “hair”, and added an additional pun with the expression “brush my hare aside”. The whole conversation was naturally adjusted to the match the homophony.

23)	FRIŠTENSKÝ: Zač bych se měl stydět? Tejden vám to melduju. V pondělí povídá tady lékárník, že mu kručí v břiše. Já nato, že mám housera. A ty, náčelníku, jsi sám řek, to nevadí, zatni zuby a táhni. V úterý zase učitel, že by jed hřebíky. Já povídám: Mám housera. Zase jste mě vodbyli. Ve středu jste všichni kňučeli hlady. Já na to: Ještě pořád mám toho housera. A co řek náčelník? No vzpomeň si. Ještě slovo, jsi řek, a zapíšem tě do deníku, bačkoro.	FRIŠTENSKÝ: What should I be ashamed of? I've been trying to tell you for a week. On Monday, the pharmacist says his stomach is rumbling. I said: “Well, you can eat my hare cuz it's kind of itchy right now.” And you Chief, you yell at me: “Scratch it, wash it, shape up or ship out.” On Tuesday, the teacher says he could eat nails. I say: “I've still got my hare.” And once again you just <b>brush my hare aside</b> . On Wednesday you're all moanin and groanin how hungry you are, I say: “You can eat my hare.” And what'd you say Chief? “One more word outa you and I'll put you down in my diary as a sissy, going on about your damn hair. I'd rather starve than choke on your lousy itchy greasy hair.”
-----	---	---

To sum up, for CET translation, there are 5 cases in the “miscellaneous” category. For two of them, the CET translators used explanation to ensure the transfer of humour, in the third instance, they kept humour based on nasal speech with minor changes to the



text to match the original intention. In the last two instances, the humour was not only transferred, but the translators have also added an additional source of humour.

### ***3.4 Additional Comments on Humorous Instances***

It seems proper to state that the recorded instances do not introduce the humour in *Dobytí severního pólu* in its entirety. The nature of this thesis requires focus on the verbal component of the play, that is, language only. Nevertheless, there are many other aspects which constitute the comedy under study and whose transfer cannot be judged in the scope of this thesis. The following instances have not been included in the analysis itself, however, they represent an important contribution to the wittiness of the comedy, and even though some instances of verbal humour have not been transferred successfully, as seen in the analysis, the existence of the following factors proves the inability of this thesis to generalise about the transfer of humour in its entirety.

#### ***3.4.1 The Character of Frištenský***

Varel Frištenský is presented as a very simple, naive man, whose inability to read the situation is often the main source of humour. Although every other character in the play possesses specific humorous traits, Frištenský's are emphasised, often by intonation or non-verbal elements. Beside the dialogues, the level of Varel's humorousness will be influenced by the actor's ability to work with voice and gestures. The non-verbal aspects highly contribute to the degree of wittiness of Frištenský's character.

#### ***3.4.2 The Interaction with the Audience and the "Live Paintings"***

*Dobytí severního pólu*, similarly to other Cimrman plays, includes several situations where the actors engage with the audience in order to increase the humorousness in the given moment. This includes for instance the remarks about the safety of people in the front row during the testing of new theatre personnel at the beginning of the play, and the "live painting" related to insurance. The actors pick people from the audience to participate directly on stage and often have to improvise.

Another humorous instance that was not a part of the analysis is the other "live painting" called "bratraci Veverkovi" (the Veverka cousins). The source of humour is situational and relies heavily on the ability of the actors to present it aptly.

Another example would be the very last scene of the play which includes a "live painting" with all characters.

### ***3.4.3 Situational Humour in General***

An instance which relies heavily on situational humour appears when the character of teacher changes into his penguin costume. Although this part of the comedy includes some verbal instances of humour, the humorous effect of the situation is largely based on the costume and reactions of the actors.

As already noted in section 2.5, phonetic attributes also play an important role. For instance, change in intonation or loudness can represent a source of humour as illustrated during the interview with the new technical staff, where the humorousness is based on the volume of the characters' speech. As seen in Screenshot 1 below, Svěrák is standing before the curtain and conducting a public interview with Mr. Měcháček, who is hiding behind the stage on the right side and answering quietly.

**Screenshot 1: Interviewing new technical staff**



## 4 CONCLUSION

In this chapter, I am going to answer all research questions defined in the Introduction and summarise the results of the analysis.

### *1) What devices does the original text use to convey humour?*

The devices that the original text uses to convey humour have already been foreshadowed in chapter 2.3.2 when describing the humour in Cimrman plays in general. In the following paragraphs, I am going to focus on the devices used in *Dobyťí severního pólu* specifically.

The most common device used to convey humour is wordplay, which appears in 24 out of the 40 recorded instances. Wordplay can take various forms, in the majority of the cases, the authors use puns. Beside puns, Svěrák and Smoljak have also made use of oxymoron (instance 2)), a made-up nonsense word (instance 10)), polysemy (instance 23)), and homonymy (as in 29)).

The second most common way of expressing humour is to base it on contrast, which has been observed in 6 instances out of 40, namely in instances 5), 6), 8), 14), 28), and 35). Quite often, these instances show mixed characteristics when it comes to humour. In the case of instance 6), the contrast combines with mentioning an event from Czech history, in instances 14) and 35), the contrast is combined with the use of offensive words.

3 of the recorded instances base humour on misunderstanding and mixing of languages which results in unnatural sounding speech, namely instances 31), 33), and 34). In 2 of the instances, 9) and 38), humour stems from an allusion to a previously introduced fact.

The 5 remaining instances each create a humorous effect from different devices. Instance 3) combines a wide array of devices, namely repetition, absurd and black humour, and reference to Czech history. Instance 7) bases humour on relation to Czech culture and history. In instance 15), we may find an example of synecdoche, instance 19) features an idiom, and finally, instance 40) uses irony, although unintentional, to express humour.

*2) Do the translations use the same devices, or do they differ?*

A detailed answer to the second research question is included in chapter 3.3 and its respective subchapters. The main results have been summarized in Table 2: Transfer of humour - results.

To sum up, Craig Cravens uses the same devices in 26 instances (65%), does not use different linguistic devices in any instance, does not transfer humour in 9 (22.5%) instances, and finally, 5 (12.5%) of his instances belong to the “miscellaneous” category.

For the category “miscellaneous”, in Cravens’ case, it can be said that the humour was transferred as well, although not in its entirety, and with the help of explanatory footnotes.

The CET translators, Emília Machalová, Brian Stewart, and Hanka Jelínková, have transferred humour using the same linguistic devices in 27 instances out of 40 (67.5%), used different devices in 2 cases (5%), not transferred humour at all in 6 (15%) instances, and finally, 5 (12.5%) instances from this translation fall into the category “miscellaneous”.

Similarly to Cravens, when it comes to the “miscellaneous” category, humour was generally transferred with some omission, explanations, or compensation mechanisms.

*3) If they differ, in which situations does that happen, and why?*

In Craig Cravens’ translation, there was not any instance in which he would transfer humour using different linguistic devices.

The translators from CET have transferred humour using different linguistic devices in 2 cases, in instances 24) and 29). The first instance originally includes a pun as a source of humour, which is transferred through a monologue with an idiomatic expression, the second one features a homonymy in the original and the humour was transferred using similar sounding words.

Instance 24) follows the situation where misunderstanding occurs based on the polyseme “houser”. Frištenský is offended and during his mumbling, he adds another similar pun, “mít vlka” (“to have a wolf” or “to suffer from intertrigo”). It is possible that it was challenging for the translators to find another wordplay that would connect animals and physical issues resulting from a strenuous walk in cold temperatures. Since they also, unlike Cravens, could fully implement the non-verbal component, I would say

that their aim was to compensate for the wordplay via amusing monologue with additional idioms, “an itch I’d like to scratch”, and “you guys got fur on the brain”.

24)	FRIŠTENSKÝ ( <i>na odchodu si mumlá</i> ): Bačkoro, bačkoro. Mám vlka například. A nestěžuju si.	<i>FRIŠTENSKÝ: Sissy? Sissy? Yeah I've got an itch I'd like to scratch, it's you guys! Me hallucinatin? It's you guys got fur on the brain. Think I'm an animal huh? What? A poodle maybe?</i>
-----	--	--

As for instance 29), the humour is based on homonymy of the word “beran”, which is used as a name of one of the characters. Since the CET translators have kept the name as is, they lost the ability to base the humour on the same linguistic device. Their solution consists of choosing a similar sounding word to “beran” and basing the humour on mishearing. In addition to that, ideally, this word had to present a food. For that reason, they have chosen “bran”. This way, the humorous effect is kept with different devices.

29)	FRIŠTENSKÝ: Víte co? Sníme Berana. LÉKÁRNÍK: Ty máš berana? To je naše spása! Ty se vždycky s něčím vytasíš... Kde ho máš?	FRIŠTENSKÝ: You know what? Let's eat Beran. PHARMACIST: You have Bran? This is our salvation! You are always coming up with something. Where is it?
-----	---	--

It seems apt to also comment on the category “miscellaneous” which shows mixed characteristics in regard to the transfer of humour. There were 10 instances in this category altogether, 5 in Cravens’ translation, and 5 in the CET translation. In all of these instances, humour has been transferred, but usually with the help of different devices with an addition or omission of various humorous aspects.

Instances 3), 23), and 31) fall into the “miscellaneous” category by both English translations. These instances were specific since they all combine various devices to convey humour, making it more difficult for the translators to transfer, which is most probably the reason why they had to be less true to the original.

In instance 3), Cravens (see the third column below) omitted the absurd humour (which is also based on historical knowledge) expressed by the sentence “Koniáš se dívá do díry” and compensated for this humour by adding “Jan Kollár looks for a way

to pronounce the Czech Ř”. This was possibly an attempt to include struggle that the audience might be familiar with.

The CET translators (see the fourth column below), on the other hand, have transferred humour only partially, keeping the section related to Jan Hus only. One may only speculate about the reason for this choice, one possibility being that they would not believe that the other historical figures would be known to the audience and therefore, there was a smaller chance that the humour would be recognised.

3)	Vaše babičky si možná vzpomenou na taková oblíbená dílka jako například „Jirásek se dívá do minulosti“, „Libuše se dívá do budoucnosti“, „Koniáš se dívá do díry“, početnějším rodinám byl určen „Hus před koncilem kostnickým“, početnějším rodinám s krbem „Hus po koncilu kostnickém“.	Perhaps your grandmothers remember such famous works as “Alois Jirásek Looks into the Past,” “Libuše Looks into the Future,” or “Jan Kollár looks for a way to pronounce the Czech Ř.” For more numerous families, Cimrman created works such as “Jan Hus before the Council at Constance,” and for more numerous families with a fireplace, “Jan Hus After the Council at Constance.”	For larger families he created more elaborate scenes. In one, we see Jan Hus, the Czech religious reformer, accused of heresy, at the Council of Constance before his final judgment of death by burning’. For families with a large fireplace, Cimrman could offer them “Jan Hus after his judgment”.
----	---	--	--

Instance 23) includes humour based on wordplay, more specifically on polysemy. This is a specific concept that seems difficult to transfer into English. For that reason, most possibly, the translators have compensated the humour in other ways.

Craig Cravens has decided to add an obscene humour by using the word “cock” which bears two meanings; it either refers to an animal, or to a penis. This way, he can transfer the situation successfully (Frištenský has an animal they can eat but the others do not believe him since they focus on the other meaning of the word) and keep the humour at the same time.

The CET translators have also introduced two possible meanings, but this time, with focus on homophony, using the words “hair” and “hare”. Moreover, they have added a wordplay of their own, “to brush my hare (hair) aside”.

23)	<p>FRIŠTENSKÝ: Zač bych se měl stydět? Tejden vám to melduju. V pondělí povídá tady lékárník, že mu kručí v bříše. Já nato, že mám housera. A ty, náčelníku, jsi sám řek, to nevadí, zatni zuby a táhni. V úterý zase učitel, že by jed hřebíky. Já povídám: Mám housera. Zase jste mě vodbyli. Ve středu jste všichni kňučeli hlady. Já na to: Ještě pořád mám toho housera. A co řek náčelník? No vzpomeň si. Ještě slovo, jsi řek, a zapíšem tě do deníku, bačkoro.</p>	<p><i>Schwarzenegger</i>: Why should I be ashamed? I've been telling you about it for a week. On Monday, the pharmacist says his stomach is rumbling. And I say, "Here's a cock." And you, Chief, you yourself said, "We'll have none of your disgusting talk." And then on Tuesday, the teacher said he was so hungry he could eat nails. And I said, "How about this cock of mine." And you told me to knock it off again. On Wednesday, you were all whining with hunger, and I said, "I've still got a cock!" And what did the chief say? Go on, try to remember. You said, "One more word, and I'll write you down in the logbook, you blockhead."</p>	<p>FRIŠTENSKÝ: What should I be ashamed of? I've been trying to tell you for a week. On Monday, the pharmacist says his stomach is rumbling. I said: "Well, you can eat my hare cuz it's kind of itchy right now." And you Chief, you yell at me: "Scratch it, wash it, shape up or ship out." On Tuesday, the teacher says he could eat nails. I say: "I've still got my hare." And once again you just brush my hare aside. On Wednesday you're all moanin and groanin how hungry you are, I say: "You can eat my hare." And what'd you say Chief? "One more word outa you and I'll put you down in my diary as a sissy, going on about your damn hair. I'd rather starve than choke on your lousy itchy greasy hair."</p>
-----	--	---	--

Instance 31) bases humour on the fact that the character of Beran is supposed to speak a different language. The fact that the texts were translated into English explains why it was inevitable to find other ways of expressing humour so that it does not get

lost. Cravens used footnotes, the CET translators included stage directions and also let Beran speak German.

31)	BERAN: Hallo, boys! Good evening everybody! ( <i>Jde od jednoho k druhému a potřásá jim rukama.</i> ) My name is George Beran. I'm very glad to see you.	<i>Koláč: Hello, boys! Good evening everybody! (He goes from one explorer to the other shaking his hand.) My name is George Koláč. I'm very glad to see you.</i>	BERAN: Hallo, boys! Good evening everybody! My name is George Beran. I'm very happy you defrosted me successfully, and I'm really looking forward to learning about your new world.
-----	---	--	---

It seems difficult to generalise about the cases which lead the translators to opt for different devices. The cases described above were usually very specific, based on wordplay, and I would not hesitate to claim that finding the appropriate translation was demanding. For that reason, an omission or compensation in any way was expectable. Nevertheless, the CET translators generally tend to accommodate the Anglophone audience more, even if it means that they have to make more changes to the text. Craig Cravens often applies solutions which do in theory transfer humour, but it might be harder to recognise for the audience. He expects knowledge, that the recipients might not have, and if they try to fill in the gap by their own research, it can affect reading fluency.

Both translations present cases where humour is omitted unnecessarily, nevertheless, Craig Cravens does that more frequently. His text includes more instances that were not translated at all, that is 9 (as opposed to 6 in the CET translation), and from these 9 instances, the CET translators have transferred humour in 6 cases.

#### 4) *What are the possible effects on the audience?*

This overview of devices that are used to create a humorous effect in *Dobytí severního pólu* is based on the 40 selected instances only. It is important to note that the notion of humour is subjective, for that reason, this overview presents only a limited insight into what creates humour in said comedy. The humorous effect, as already mentioned, is not created by the verbal component only, but also by the non-verbal factors. For these reasons, there are potentially more humorous instances created with the use of different



devices. In addition to that, some instances, as already stated, show mixed characteristics in the Czech version and the devices used to express humour might be difficult to clearly determine.

With respect to the audience, it is important to remind that both translations were created with a different purpose. Cravens' text is meant for reading only. Because of this, he can provide the reader a better insight into the original work via footnotes. On the other hand, he cannot make use of the non-verbal component, which is partially substituted with the reader's imagination, and with stage directions. The CET translation was made for the purposes of a theatre group, meaning that the text is intended for the actors only and not for publishing. This means that the humour which is not expressed in the text is supplemented by the non-verbal components, such as gestures, facial expressions, and phonetic attributes of a speech, provided by the actors, and in many cases, the possibility of a successful transfer lies in the acting skill.

*Dobytí severního pólu* (similarly to other Cimrman plays) also include references to Czech history (Jan Hus, the fire at the National Theatre) or culture (the Sokol exclamation). Since both Cravens and the CET translators aim to bring "Czechness" and "cimrmanology" nearer to non-Czech audience, they have the tendency to not localise these culture-specific terms. This may weaken the chance of transfer of humour by the non-Czech audience due to their possibly limited knowledge. On the other hand, those interested in Cimrman plays, whose only obstacle is the language, might be familiar with said facts and therefore recognise the humour easily.

To sum up, I would not hesitate to state that both translations were successful in regard to the transfer of humour. The translators were creative and have used various devices to ensure that the majority of the humour is kept in the English versions. However, there were also cases where the humorous effect was unnecessarily lost, which were more frequent by Cravens' text. Nevertheless, this conclusion is based only on the 40 selected instances, which do not represent the humour in *Dobytí severního pólu* in its entirety.

## 5 SUMMARY

The purpose of this diploma thesis was to explore the realms of humour, theatre, and translation. Humour in its many forms represents an integral part of our lives. When it comes to translating comedy, for instance in various films or sitcoms, linguists are often met with a challenge. In this diploma thesis, I have decided to focus on the transfer of Czech humour and analyse the work of Zdeněk Svěrák and Ladislav Smoljak. These authors are famous for their specific kind of humour which is, among others, represented by comedies surrounding the fictive character of Jára da Cimrman. This series of comedies undoubtedly constitutes a very specific and influential phenomenon of Czech culture and entertainment. Since it slowly becomes recognized in other parts of the world, I believe it is an intriguing task to analyse their work from the point of view of translation, in this case from Czech into English.

I have decided to focus on the play *Dobytí severního pólu* and two corresponding English translations – both of which are called *The Conquest of the North Pole*. The first translation was created by Craig Stephen Cravens, senior lecturer at the Indiana University Bloomington (Indiana University Bloomington, n. d.). The second translation was published in 2022 by a group of translators, namely Emília Machalová, Brian Stewart, and Hanka Jelínková. This version is used for the purpose of performing by *The Cimrman English Theatre*, a group founded in 2014 (Cimrman English Theatre 2020) which offers Cimrman plays for the English-speaking audience.

In the first section of the theoretical part of this thesis, I aim to define humour. First, I introduce a small overview of existing definitions and conclude which one of these is the most suitable for the purpose of this research. According to my own research and observation, I conclude that in this case, it is most suitable to speak of “performance humour”, which is a term used by Rod A. Martin and Thomas E. Ford (Martin and Ford 2018, 19). This chapter is then followed by the definitions of drama and comedy.

The next part of the theoretical section aims to introduce *Žižkovské divadlo Jára Cimrmana* (*Žižkov Theatre of Jára Cimrman*) and describe its relevant elements – the history of the theatre, the members, as well as the plays. I also include a subsection focused on the specifics of humour in Smoljak and Svěrák’s plays in order to further introduce what might be expected during the analysis, and a short commentary on the

origins of *Dobytí severního pólu*. The theoretical part also includes basic information about Zdeněk Svěrák and Ladislav Smoljak.

The next chapter of the theoretical section then comments on the process of translating drama and its specifics. As already stated, for the purpose of this thesis, two translations were chosen. I, therefore, introduce Craig Cravens, the origin of both translations and in the case of *The Cimrman English Theatre*, I have also decided to add a short commentary about its existence and activity. The theoretical section ends with the description of Gideon Toury's "three-phase methodology" which was proposed for use in the branch of descriptive translation studies (DTS) (Munday 2016, 175) and serves as a basis for the analysis in this thesis.

After concluding the theoretical part, which should provide an overview of all relevant terms and phenomena, the practical part of the thesis follows. First, the methodology is detailed. I have chosen to carry out a comparative analysis. The process is to be specified as the following: before the analysis itself, I have gathered data based on the recording of *Dobytí severního pólu* which was broadcasted by Česká televize in the year 2006. During watching, I have recorded all instances that I consider to be sources of humour. This is based subjectively, that is, on my own perception of humour, and supported by the reactions of the audience which can be heard in the recording.

All of these instances have then been put into a table with their respective English translations, where "instance" presents the unit of analysis in this thesis. This table can be found in Appendices as Table 3. Only selected instances are then included in the practical section of the thesis. After creating the main table, I have looked at the similarities and differences that emerged as a result of the translation and provided my own comments on the matter. For each example, I have marked one of the following options: 1) humour was expressed using the same linguistic devices, both in the Czech as well as in the English version, 2) humour was expressed using different linguistic devices, 3) humour was not expressed at all, 4) the category "miscellaneous" intended for the instances which do not fit into any of the previous categories.

The results have then been quantified in the form of a table. The practical section of the thesis includes comments relating to the translation of the characters' names, this commentary is then followed by a detailed analysis of the results from the table, where I describe the individual instances, both for Cravens' as well as CET's translation.

My own comments are related to the main aim of this thesis, which is to answer the following research questions: 1) What devices does the original text use to convey humour? 2) Do the translations use the same devices, or do they differ? 3) If they differ, in which situations does that happen, and why? And finally, 4) What are the possible effects on the audience?

The original text uses the following devices to convey humour, arranged from the most common device to the least used: wordplay (puns, oxymoron, a made-up nonsense word, polysemy, homonymy, and synecdoche), contrast, history and culture based humour, offensive words, misunderstanding and mixing of languages which results in unnatural sounding speech, allusion to previously introduced fact, repetition, absurd and black humour, idioms, and unintentional irony.

The results have shown that in the vast majority of the instances, the translations use the same devices, with little numerical difference between the English versions. The translators have opted for different linguistic devices in instances that were based on a sophisticated wordplay, or which have combined several ways of expressing humour, presenting a translation challenge.

It has also been described how the origins of the two selected translations affect the perception of the audience. Craig Cravens' translation was created for reading only which allows the translator to offer the reader a better insight into the original work via footnotes and explanations. Nevertheless, unlike the CET translators, Cravens cannot make use of the non-verbal component. The CET translation was made for the purposes of a theatre group, meaning that the text is intended for the actors only and not for publishing. This means that the humour which is not expressed in the text is supplemented by the non-verbal components, such as gestures, facial expressions, and phonetic attributes of a speech, provided by the actors, and in many cases, the possibility of a successful transfer lies in the acting skill.

To sum up, based on the 40 instances, which do not represent the humour in *Dobytí severního pólu* in its entirety, the transfer of humour was successful by both English versions, with possibly different effects on the intended non-Czech speaking audience. The translators were also praised for their creativity. However, in some cases, it was unnecessary that the humour was not transferred, especially by Cravens' translation.

## 6 RESUMÉ

Cílem této diplomové práce byl průzkum oblastí humoru, divadla a překladu. Humor ve svých mnoha podobách představuje nedílnou součást našich životů. Co se týče jeho překladu, například v rámci různých filmů či sitcomů, představuje pro jazykovědce a jazykovědkyně často výzvu. Rozhodla jsem se v této diplomové práci zaměřit na převod českého humoru a zanalyzovat dílo Zdeňka Svěráka a Ladislava Smoljaka. Tito autoři se proslavili svým specifickým smyslem pro humor, který je nejvýrazněji zastoupen v komediích založených na fiktivní postavě Járy da Cimrmana. Tyto divadelní hry bezpochyby představují specifický fenomén české kultury. Jelikož je toto dílo stále více známé i v zahraničí, věřím, že je zajímavé zaměřit se na tento fenomén z pohledu překladatelství, v tomto případě ve směru do angličtiny.

V této práci se zaměřuji na divadelní hru *Dobytí severního pólu* a dva anglické překlady, oba nesou název *The Conquest of the North Pole*. První z překladů vytvořil Dr. Craig Stephen Cravens z univerzity Indiana University Bloomington (Indiana University Bloomington, n. d.). Druhý zvolený překlad publikovali v roce 2022 Emília Machalová, Brian Stewart a Hanka Jelínková. Tato verze byla vytvořena pro účely divadelního souboru *The Cimrman English Theatre*, který vznikl v roce 2014 (Cimrman English Theatre 2020) a nabízí představení cimrmanovských her pro publikum, které nehovoří česky.

První sekce teoretické části této práce je zaměřená na definování humoru. Nejprve uvádím přehled dostupných definic, a poté určuji, která z nich je nejpřesnější s ohledem na účely práce. Na základě vlastní rešerše jsem došla k závěru, že nejvhodnějším označením je tzv. “performance humour” (humor v rámci představení), což je termín zavedený Rod A. Martinem a Thomasem E. Fordem (Martin and Ford 2018, 19). Po této sekci následují definice divadelní hry a komedie.

Další sekce teoretické části zahrnuje informace o *Žižkovském divadle Járy Cimrmana* – popisují historii divadla, členy, a také divadelní hry. Daná sekce také obsahuje podkapitolu věnovanou specifikům humoru ve hrách Smoljaka a Svěráka s cílem nastínit, co lze očekávat v průběhu analýzy, a komentář o vzniku *Dobytí severního pólu*. Teoretická část také zahrnuje základní informace o Zdeňku Svěrákovi a Ladislavu Smoljakovi.

Další kapitola teoretické části popisuje specifika překládání dramatu. Jak již bylo řečeno, pro účely této práce byly zvoleny dva překlady. Představuji tedy osobnost Craiga Cravense, původ obou překladů, a v případě skupiny *The Cimmerian English Theatre* také uvádím krátký komentář o její existenci a činnosti. Teoretická část je zakončena popisem metodologie “three-phrase methodology” (třífázová metodologie) od Gideona Touryho, která vznikla za účelem využití v rámci deskriptivní translatologie (descriptive translation studies, DTS) (Munday 2016, 175) a slouží jako základ pro analýzu v rámci této práce.

Po teoretické sekci, která obsahuje přehled všech relevantních termínů a jevů, následuje praktická část. Nejprve se věnuji popisu metodologie. Byla zvolena komparativní analýza, jejíž průběh je následující: nejprve jsem posbírala data na základě záznamu hry *Dobytí severního pólu*, který vysílala Česká televize v roce 2006. Při sledování byly zaznamenány všechny instance, které považuji za zdroj humoru. To je založeno na subjektivním základu, tedy na mém vlastním vnímání humoru, a podpořeno reakcemi diváctva, které lze slyšet na záznamu.

Tyto „instance“ představují základní jednotku analýzy a byly vloženy do tabulky s odpovídajícími anglickými překlady a také počtem slov. Tuto tabulku lze najít v přílohách pod označením Table 3 (Tabulka 3). V samotné praktické části jsou pak uvedeny pouze zvolené instance. Po vytvoření této tabulky jsem se zaměřila na podobnosti a rozdíly, které vznikly v důsledku překladu. Pro každou instanci jsem zvolila jednu z následujících možností: 1) humor byl převeden stejnými jazykovými prostředky, 2) humor byl převeden jinými jazykovými prostředky, 3) humor nebyl převeden vůbec a 4) kategorie „různé“, určená pro instance, které nebylo možné zařadit do žádné ze zmíněných kategorií.

Výsledky byly poté kvantifikovány v tabulce. Praktická část této práce nejprve zahrnuje komentáře týkající se překladu vlastních jmen postav, a poté následuje detailní analýza výsledků z tabulky, která zahrnuje popis jednotlivých instancí pro oba překlady.

Vlastní komentáře se týkají cíle této práce, kterým je nalézt odpovědi na následující výzkumné otázky: 1) Jaké jazykové prostředky používá zdrojový text k vyjádření humoru? 2) Používají překlady stejné prostředky, anebo jiné? 3) Pokud používají jiné, kdy tento případ nastává a proč? A nakonec, 4) Jaké jsou možné účinky na publikum?

Zdrojový text používá následující prostředky k vyjádření humoru (seřazeno od nejvíce používaných prostředků po nejméně): hra se slovy (slovní hříčky, oxymóron, neologismus, polysémie, homonymie, synekdocha), kontrast, humor založený na kultuře a historii, sprostá slova, nedorozumění a kombinování různých jazyků, které vede k nepřirozeně znějícímu projevu, narážka na dříve zmíněnou skutečnost, opakování, absurdní a černý humor, idiomy a neúmyslná ironie.

Výsledky ukázaly, že ve většině případů se v překladech objevují stejné jazykové prostředky, přičemž číselný rozdíl mezi anglickými verzemi je nízký. Překládající zvolili jiné jazykové prostředky v instancích, které byly založeny na propracované hře se slovy, nebo které kombinovaly několik způsobů vyjádření humoru, což vyústilo v překladatelskou výzvu.

Účel vzniku překladů také ovlivňuje vnímání diváctva. Překlad Craiga Cravense vznikl pouze ke čtení, což tomuto překladateli umožňuje poskytnout čtenáři či čtenářce lepší náhled do zdrojového textu skrze poznámky pod čarou a vysvětlivky. Cravens však nemá k dispozici neverbální složku, na rozdíl od překládajících z CET. Překlad z CET vznikl pro účely divadelního souboru, text je tedy určen pouze pro herce, a nikoliv pro knižní publikaci. To znamená, že humor, který není nijak vyjádřen v rámci textu, může být doplněn či nahrazen neverbálními faktory, jako jsou například gesta, mimika a fonetické vlastnosti projevu, a v mnoha případech úspěšný převod humoru závisí na hereckých schopnostech.

Na závěr lze říct, že na základě 40 sledovaných instancí, které nereprezentují humor v *Dobytí severního pólu* v celém rozsahu, byl převod humoru úspěšný u obou překladů, působení na publikum, které nehovoří česky, je však jiné u obou verzí. Byla oceněna také kreativita překládajících. Nicméně, v některých případech bylo vynechání humoru zbytečné, a to obzvláště v překladu Craiga Cravense.

## **7 LIST OF PICTURES AND SCREENSHOTS**

Picture 1: Craven's footnotes - example

Picture 2: Cravens' comment on Němec's name

Picture 3: Cravens' comment on Frištenský's name

Picture 4: Cravens' comment on Beran's name

Picture 5: Cravens' footnote - Frištenský's first name

Picture 6: Cravens' footnote - "našít to do někoho"

Picture 7: Cravens' footnote - the word "houser"

Picture 8: Cravens' footnote - Beran's language

Screenshot 1: Interviewing new technical staff



## 8 BIBLIOGRAPHY

### 8.1 Works Cited

- Abrams, Meyer Howard. 1999. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. 7<sup>th</sup> ed. USA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Banerjee, Maria Němcová. 1985. "Czech laughter between Hašek and Kafka." *World Literature Today* 59.1: 14-17.
- Beeman, William O. 1999. "Humor." *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 9, no. 1/2: 103-106.
- Crawford, C. B. 1994. "Theory and implications regarding the utilization of strategic humour by leader." *The Journal of Leadership Studies* 1: 53-67.
- Čermáková, Dana. 2009. *Génius Zdeněk Svěrák*. Praha: Imagination of People.
- Dvořáková, Žaneta. 2011. "Vlastní jména jako prostředek mystifikace." *Bohemica Olomucensia*, no. 1 (March): 174-183.
- Fikejz, Miloš. 2008. *Český film: herci a herečky. III. díl, S-Ž*. Praha: Libri.
- Levý, Jiří, and Zuzana Jettmarová. 2011. *The Art of Translation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Maleček, Tomáš. 2021. "Normalizační šrámy na duši Divadla Jára Cimrmana." *Historie–Otázky–Problémy* 13.1: 184-207.
- Maleček, Tomáš. 2020. "Padesátiletá historie Divadla Jára Cimrmana." Master's thesis, Palacký University Olomouc.
- Martin, Rod A., and Nicholas A. Kuiper. 1999. "Daily occurrence of laughter: Relationships with age, gender, and Type A personality." *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research*: 355-384.
- Martin, Rod A., and Thomas E. Ford. 2018. *The psychology of humor: An integrative approach*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press, an imprint of Elsevier.
- Munday, Jeremy. 2016. *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. New York: Routledge.
- Novák, Mirek. 1994. *Jak jsme začínali*. Praha: Koršach.
- Pešta, Pavel. 1981. "Česká satira v letech 1918—1929." *Česká literatura*: 97-113.
- Požízková, Lenka. 2012. "Mystifikace (nejen) v české literatuře 20. století." Dissertation, Palacký University Olomouc.

- Povejšil, Jaromír, Kufnerová, Zlata, Poláčková, Milena, Skoumalová, Zdena, and Vlasta Straková. 1994. *Překládání a čeština*. Praha: H & H.
- Romero, Eric J., and Kevin W. Cruthirds. 2006. "The Use of Humour in the Workplace." *Academy of management perspectives* 20: 58-69.
- Smoljak, Ladislav, and Zdeněk Svěrák. 2010. *Hry a semináře*. Praha: Paseka.
- Svěrák, Zdeněk, Jaroslav Weigel, Jan Beránek, and Přemysl Rut. 1993. *Dodatky: Historie Divadla Jára Cimrmana*. Praha: Paseka.
- Švagrová, Marta. "Svěrák & Smoljak." *Lidové noviny*, September 21, 2002.
- Toury, Gideon. 2012. *Descriptive translation studies - and beyond*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Pub. Co.
- Venuti, Lawrence. 2000. *The Translation Studies Reader*. London: Routledge.

## 8.2 Online Sources

- Biografie - Ladislav Smoljak. n. d. "Ladislav Smoljak." Accessed September 20, 2023. <http://www.smoljak.cz/biografie/>.
- Cambridge Dictionary. n. d. "Humour." Accessed July 10, 2023. <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/humour>.
- Cimrman English Theatre. 2020. "CET." December 30, 2020. <http://www.cimrmanenglishtheatre.cz/cet/>.
- Cimrman English Theatre. 2022. "History." <http://www.cimrmanenglishtheatre.cz/history-2/>.
- Cimrman English Theatre. 2019. "Translators." <http://www.cimrmanenglishtheatre.cz/translators/>.
- Cravens, Craig. 2010. "About Craig Cravens." *HEADQUARTERS OF THE NORTH AMERICAN CIMRMAN SOCIETY* (blog), October 13, 2010. <https://jaracimrman.wordpress.com/about-craig-cravens/>
- Cravens, Craig. 2010. "Czech culture." *HEADQUARTERS OF THE NORTH AMERICAN CIMRMAN SOCIETY* (blog), October 13, 2010. <https://jaracimrman.wordpress.com/about-craig-cravens/>
- Indiana University Bloomington. n. d. "Craig Cravens." Department of Slavic and East European Languages and Cultures. Accessed May 1, 2023. <https://slavic.indiana.edu/about/faculty/cravens-craig.html>.

- iROZHLAS. 2022. "Divadlo Jára Cimrmana slaví 55 let od premiéry první hry. ‚Akt vypadal ochotnický,‘ vzpomíná Svěrák." October 4, 2022.  
[https://www.irozhlas.cz/kultura/divadlo/divadlo-jary-cimrmana-historie-hra-akt-vyroci-sverak\\_2210041505\\_ako](https://www.irozhlas.cz/kultura/divadlo/divadlo-jary-cimrmana-historie-hra-akt-vyroci-sverak_2210041505_ako)
- iROZHLAS. 2023. "Geniální nouzové řešení. ‚Měla větší úspěch než hra,‘ popisuje Svěrák vznik cimrmanovských přednášek." July 19, 2023.  
[https://www.irozhlas.cz/kultura/divadlo/divadlo-jary-cimrmana-hra-prednaska-nouzove-reseni-sverak-tady-me-napadlo\\_2307191240\\_nel](https://www.irozhlas.cz/kultura/divadlo/divadlo-jary-cimrmana-hra-prednaska-nouzove-reseni-sverak-tady-me-napadlo_2307191240_nel)
- Kubík, Jiří. 2023. "Křepčím, ale tělo mamky Žilové už není tak mrštné, říká Miloň Čepelka." Seznam Zprávy. November 11, 2023.  
<https://www.seznamzpravy.cz/clanek/audio-podcast-galerie-osobnosti-krepcim-ale-telo-mamky-zilove-uz-neni-tak-mrstne-rika-milon-cepelka-239284>
- Oxford Dictionaries | English. n.d. "Old Man Winter: Definition of Old Man Winter in US English by Oxford Dictionaries." Accessed November 16, 2023.  
[https://web.archive.org/web/20180418225958/https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/us/Old\\_Man\\_Winter](https://web.archive.org/web/20180418225958/https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/us/Old_Man_Winter)
- Twitter. 2019. "Arise, Sir Michael Palin! The Monty Python Star Received a Knighthood for Services to Travel, Culture and Geography. Pic.Twitter.Com/Xorderbkmo." News, Channel 5. June 12, 2019.  
[https://twitter.com/5\\_News/status/1138861021047787521](https://twitter.com/5_News/status/1138861021047787521).

## 9 ANNOTATION

<b>Author:</b>	Dominika Špurková
<b>Department:</b>	The Department of English and American Studies
<b>Field of Study:</b>	English Philology – German for Translation and Interpreting
<b>Title of Thesis:</b>	The Analysis of the English Translations of the Play <i>The Conquest of the North Pole</i> Written By Zdeněk Svěrák and Ladislav Smoljak
<b>Thesis Supervisor:</b>	Mgr. Jitka Zehnalová, Dr.
<b>Number of Pages:</b>	82
<b>Number of Characters:</b>	148,577

### Key Words:

translation, humour, Žižkovské divadlo Jára Cimrmana, Zdeněk Svěrák, Ladislav Smoljak, drama, comedy, Dobyetí severního pólu, theatre, comparative analysis

### Abstract:

The aim of this diploma thesis is to analyse the humour in the play *Dobyetí severního pólu* (*The Conquest of the North Pole*) written by Zdeněk Svěrák and Ladislav Smoljak and its transfer into two English translations. One was created by Dr. Craig Stephen Cravens, and the other by Emília Machalová, Brian Stewart, and Hanka Jelínková from the group *The Cimrman English Theatre*. The theoretical section introduces the relevant phenomena such as humour, drama, comedy, and important information about the authors and the origins of the translations. The practical section of the thesis includes a comparative analysis that is based on Gideon Toury's "three-phase methodology". The focus is on the linguistic devices that are used to express humour. It was found that both English translations use the same linguistic devices as the Czech text in the majority of the 40 studied cases. The humour was not transferred at all in a very few instances, and for the rest, the transfer showed mixed characteristics, the translators omitted some sources of humour and compensated for them with different devices.

## 10 ANOTACE

<b>Autorka:</b>	Dominika Špurková
<b>Katedra:</b>	Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky
<b>Studijní obor:</b>	Anglická filologie – Němčina se zaměřením na tlumočení a překlad
<b>Název práce:</b>	Analýza anglických překladů divadelní hry <i>Dobytí severního pólu</i> od autorů Zdeňka Svěráka a Ladislava Smoljaka
<b>Vedoucí práce:</b>	Mgr. Jitka Zehnalová, Dr.
<b>Počet stran:</b>	82
<b>Počet znaků:</b>	148 577

### **Klíčová slova:**

překlad, humor, Žižkovské divadlo Jára Cimrmana, Zdeněk Svěrák, Ladislav Smoljak, divadelní hra, komedie, *Dobytí severního pólu*, divadlo, komparativní analýza

### **Abstrakt:**

Cílem této diplomové práce je analýza humoru v divadelní hře *Dobytí severního pólu* od autorů Zdeňka Svěráka a Ladislava Smoljaka a jeho převod do dvou anglických překladů. První zvolený překlad vytvořil Dr. Craig Stephen Cravens, druhý vypracovali Emílie Machalová, Brian Stewart a Hanka Jelínková z divadelního souboru *The Cimrman English Theatre*. Teoretická část práce definuje základní pojmy, jako je humor, divadelní hra a komedie, a také zahrnuje podstatné informace o autorech hry a vzniku překladů. Náplní praktické sekce je komparativní analýza, která je založena na metodologii Gideona Touryho. Analýza je zaměřena na jazykové prostředky použité k vyjádření humoru. Bylo zjištěno, že ve většině sledovaných případů, kterých bylo celkem 40, byl humor převeden do angličtiny stejnými prostředky. Pouze v několika málo případech nebyl humor převeden vůbec. Zbývající případy vykazovaly smíšené charakteristiky, překládající některé zdroje humoru vynechali a jejich účinek kompenzovali použitím jiných jazykových prostředků.

## 11 APPENDICES

Table 3: Humorous instances in *Dobytí severního pólu* and their transfer

Number for reference	Original (CS)	Word count (CS)	Cravens' translation (EN)	Word count (Cravens)	Translation from CET (EN)	Word count (CET)	Results (w.r.t. the transfer of humor)
1)	Pokud jde o zoufalou hmotnou situaci v rodině, krejčovské dítě nemělo takový hlad, že by muselo okusovat dehet. Kolega Brukner to, jak vidíte, sám dělá dodnes.	26	/	0	/	0	3. / 3.
2)	Mladá fronta DNES loni napsala:	5	/	0	The daily newspaper Mladá Fronta wrote last year:	8	3. / 3.
3)	Vaše babičky si možná vzpomenou na taková oblíbená dílka jako například „Jirásek se dívá do minulosti“,	42	Perhaps your grandmothers remember such famous works as “Alois Jirásek Looks into the Past,” “Libuše Looks into the Future,” or	62	For larger families he created more elaborate scenes. In one, we see Jan Hus, the Czech religious reformer, accused of	49	4. / 4.

	„Libuše se dívá do budoucnosti“, „Koniáš se dívá do díry“, početnějším rodinám byl určen „Hus před koncilem kostnickým“, početnějším rodinám s krbem „Hus po koncilu kostnickém“.		“Jan Kollár looks for a way to pronounce the Czech Ř.” For more numerous families, Cimrman created works such as “Jan Hus before the Council at Constance,” and for more numerous families with a fireplace, “Jan Hus After the Council at Constance.”		heresy, at the Council of Constance before his final judgment of death by burning’. For families with a large fireplace, Cimrman could offer them “Jan Hus after his judgment”.		
4)	Vyprovodil nás vlastně jen Frištenského bratranec Gustav. Tento světový šampión v řeckořímském zápase, který v Německu porazil Schichtela, porazil doma prase a přinesl nám k vlaku bohatou výslužku.	28	The only person to see us off was Schwarzenegger’s cousin, Arnold. This famous Hollywood actor who terminated many a runaway robot, terminated a pig for us at home and brought us a wonderful snack to the train station.	38	The only person to see us off was Boleslav’s cousin Gustav Frištenský, the world famous Greco-Roman wrestler, who slaughtered his opponent in a match in Germany, slaughtered a pig at home and brought us a gift of sausages.	38	1. / 1.
5)	Sobota: Mráz – nejlepší děda.	4	Saturday: Frost – the best father.	5	Saturday: Old Man Winter.	4	1. / 3.
6)	Jen onehdy,	22	But just the	27	Just the other	26	1. / 1.

	když náčelník usnul, slezli jsme se s Frištenským a Šofrem pod jednu deku a vyprávěli si o požáru Národního divadla.		other day, when the chief fell asleep, Schwarzenegger, Šofr, and I crept beneath a blanket and talked about the fire at the National Theater.		day, when the chief was asleep, I crawled under the blanket with Frištenský and Šofr and we discussed the National Theatre burning down.		
7)	NÁČELNÍK : Necht' tedy do rachotu našich slzí zazní naše sokolské „Nazdar!“ . Všichni: Zdar!	13	CHIEF: ... Let our Sokol cry resound among the racket of our falling tears. Nazdar! EVERYONE: Zdar!	17	CHIEFTAIN: ... So to the rattle of our tears let us shout out our Sokol club salute Nazdar! ALL: Zdar!	20	1. / 1.
8)	Já tomu možná nerozumím, ale za sebe bych řekl, že tu nic tak extrovního nevidím. Když to srovnám třeba s tím výletem na Kokořín...	24	Maybe there's something I'm not getting, but I don't really see what's so special. When I compare this with our tip to Kokořín, for example ...	25	Maybe I am missing something, but I don't see anything special in it especially when I compare it with that trip to Kokořín...	23	1. / 1.
9)	Pane Kotku, jestli hledáte tyč, tak je u kliky.	9	Mr. Kotek, if you're looking for the pole, it's right next to the hand crank.	15	Mr. Kotek, if you're looking for the iron bar, it's next to the handcrank!	14	1. / 1.
10)	Vyžvejkaněj korybut.	2	A chewed up korybut.	4	The double-angled scrooter. Worn out.	5	1. / 1.
11)	Punk je způsoben tím, že	28	The punk is caused by the fact that	39	The polar snowman struggles	31	1. / 1.



	<p>himalájský muž trpí větry vanoucími zdola nahoru, od úpatí hor k vrcholům, polární sněžný člověk vzdoruje větrům vanoucím horizontálně proti jeho skloněné šíji.</p>		<p>the Himalayan Snow Man faces winds blowing upwards from below, from the foot of the mountains to the peaks. The Polar Snow Person braves winds blowing horizontally against his inclined shoulders.</p>		<p>against the prevailing horizontal winds with head bowed, whereas the Himalayan Punk hair is because the creature suffers from strong wind blowing upwards along the mountain slopes.</p>		
12)	<p>A právě dualita této řeči, toto splynutí 1. Osoby „já“ s 2. Osobou „ty“, vedlo Cimrmana k pojmenování sněžného člověka výstižným slovem „játy“, které později Angličané zkomolili na „yeti“.</p>	29	<p>It is precisely the duality of this speech, this combination of the 1st-person pronoun <i>já</i> with the second person <i>ty</i>, which led Cimrman to coin the term “játy” for this creature, which the English later corrupted into “yeti.”</p>	38	<p>In this duality of speech we see how it merges the first person I, in Czech Já, and the second person you which, in Czech, is ty. So the terms I and YOU, Já and ty in Czech, led Cimrman to name this creature a “játy”, which the English later garbled into “yeti”.</p>	53	1. / 4.
13)	<p>Přetržené dítě. [...] Všichni byli na mé prebiěře, jenom ty jsi de byl. [...]</p>	35	/	0	<p>The abused child. [...] Was everyode else at the prebiere? Yep. You? Dope. [...] Toborrow you</p>	47	3. / 4.

	Je mi nějak divně. Dám si padáka! [...] Deserte, deserte! [...] Už leží? Leží. Ubyl jsi ho? Ubyl. [...] Potřebuji nutně vybočit.				barry your bride. [...] / [...] Is he laying still? He's laying still. It was a good family beating. Yes, it was a good family beating. [...] I really bust uridate.		
14)	BRUKNER: Ano, já jsem to celé pozorně vyslechl a vyvodil jsem z toho ten závěr, že bude-li ještě někdy příležitost a budu-li požádán o nějakou další rekonstrukci, že se vám na to vyseru.	33	/	0	<b>Yes, I have listened carefully to the whole thing, and the conclusion I draw is that if I am ever offered the opportunity to re-draft a play in the future, I'll say: "Screw you!"</b>	34	3. / 1.
15)	Kapitola 17. – Táhni a srůstej.	5	Chapter 17: Pull and Heal!	5	Chapter 17 Pull and heal.	5	1. / 1.
16)	UČITEL: Představte si, tady čtu, že na všech školách v Rakousku má být lázeň...	28	<i>Teacher:</i> Listen to this. It says here that all schools in Austria must have baths... []	30	TEACHER: Look at this here. Can you believe it? It says here that all schools in Austria have to	32	1. / 1.

	<p>[] Tak ne! Já už na to nevidím. Kázeň! Má být na všech školách.</p>		<p>Wait a minute! I must be blind! Math! Every school has to have math!</p>		<p>have baths. [] Ah! I read it wrong. Maths! All schools need Maths.</p>		
17)	<p>UČITEL: Varle!</p>	2	<p><i>Teacher:</i> Dick!</p>	2	<p>TEACHER: So, Boleslav, Bolek, little Bolek, ...</p>	7	4. / 3.
18)	<p><b>LÉKÁRNÍK: ... K nám. Domů. Do Prahy. Do Podolí. Do lékárny. Do prdele, to je mi smutno!</b></p>	17	<p><i>Pharmacist:</i> ... <b>Homeward! To Prague! To the pharmacy! To Podolí! ... To hell, I'm sad!</b></p>	15	<p><b>PHARMACIST: ... To our country. To home. To Prague. To Podolí. To the pharmacy. To hell with this. It's making me sad.</b></p>	22	1. / 1.
19)	<p>NÁČELNÍK : ... Zima jak v psárně. ...</p>	7	<p><i>Chief:</i> ...It's as cold as a well digger's ass! ...</p>	10	<p>CHIEFTAIN: ...I wouldn't even send the dogs out in this weather. ...</p>	11	1. / 1.
20)	<p>UČITEL (v tučňáckém): Au! (Chytí se za loket.) Frištenský, ty seš takovej vůl. Copak nevidíš, že to je legrace? Komickej převlek? Já se s tím tejdén šiju a von to do mě našije. Kretén!</p>	34	<p><i>Teacher (in the penguin suit):</i> Ouch! (clutches at his elbow) Schwarzenegger, you're such an idiot! Can't you see it's a joke? This is my comic disguise. I spend a week knitting it, and this nitwit nearly nixes me.</p>	39	<p>TEACHER: Ouch! Frištenský, you're such an idiot. Can't you see that this is comical disguise? It took me a week to sew this and now you've just shot me. Cretin.</p>	30	4. / 3.

			Nincompoop!				
21)	LÉKÁRNÍK : Je to dobrák. UČITEL: Od kosti.	7	<i>Pharmacist:</i> He's a good fellow. <i>Teacher:</i> To the marrow.	9	PHARMACIS T: He's a good fellow. TEACHER: To the marrow.	9	1. / 1.
22)	LÉKARNÍK ( <i>uvažuje</i> ): A on bude možná i libovej.	8	Did you notice what a good egg he is compared to us? <i>Pharmacist</i> ( <i>thinking</i> ): Yeah, let's fry him!	18	Have you noticed that he is such a great man. A cut above the rest. PHARMACIS T: Hopefully a lean cut.	20	3. / 1.
23)	FRIŠTENS KÝ: Zač bych se měl stydět? Tejden vám to melduju. V pondělí povídá tady lékárník, že mu kručí v břiše. Já nato, že mám housera. A ty, náčelníku, jsi sám řek, to nevadí, zatni zuby a táhni. V úterý zase učitel, že by jed hřebíky. Já povídám: Mám housera. Zase jste mě vodbyli. Ve středu jste všichni kňučeli	84	<i>Schwarzenegger:</i> Why should I be ashamed? I've been telling you about it for a week. On Monday, the pharmacist says his stomach is rumbling. And I say, "Here's a cock." And you, Chief, you yourself said, "We'll have none of your disgusting talk." And then on Tuesday, the teacher said he was so hungry he could eat nails. And I said, "How about this cock of mine." And	118	FRIŠTENSK Ý: What should I be ashamed of? I've been trying to tell you for a week. On Monday, the pharmacist says his stomach is rumbling. I said: "Well, you can eat my hare cuz it's kind of itchy right now." And you Chief, you yell at me: "Scratch it, wash it, shape up or ship out." On Tuesday, the teacher says he could eat nails. I say: "I've still got my hare." And	137	4. / 4.

	hlady. Já na to: Ještě pořád mám toho housera. A co řek náčelník? No vzpomeň si. Ještě slovo, jsi řek, a zapíšem tě do deníku, bačkoro.		you told me to knock it off again. On Wednesday, you were all whining with hunger, and I said, "I've still got a cock!" And what did the chief say? Go on, try to remember. You said, "One more word, and I'll write you down in the logbook, you blockhead."		once again you just brush my hare aside. On Wednesday you're all moanin and groanin how hungry you are, I say: "You can eat my hare." And what'd you say Chief? "One more word outa you and I'll put you down in my diary as a sissy, going on about your damn hair. I'd rather starve than choke on your lousy itchy greasy hair."		
24)	FRIŠTENS KÝ ( <i>na odchodu si mumlá</i> ): Bačkoro, bačkoro. Mám vlka například. A nestěžuju si.	13	<i>Schwarzenegger (mumbling as he exits: Blockhead, blockhead. I've got crabs, and I don't complain.</i>	14	<i>FRIŠTENSKÝ: Sissy? Sissy? Yeah I've got an itch I'd like to scratch, it's you guys! Me hallucinatin? It's you guys got fur on the brain. Think I'm an animal huh? What? A poodle maybe?</i>	34	1. / 2.
25)	UČITEL: ... Byl to velký polárník. FRIŠTENS KÝ: A co že	13	<i>Teacher: ... He was a great explorer. Schwarzenegger: Why is he</i>	13	TEACHER: ...He was a great, great polar explorer. FRIŠTENSK	15	1. / 1.

	je tak malej?		so small?		Ý: Why is he so small, then?		
26)	NÁČELNÍK : Není pro muže hanbou, když zde, v místě věčného mrazu, uroní kroupu.	13	<i>Chief:</i> Here, in this place of eternal frost, it is no shame for a man to shed a hailstone.	19	CHIEFTAIN: Gentlemen, here in the frozen North it is no shame for a man to shed a few hailstones.	19	1. / 1.
27)	FRIŠTENS KÝ: Já mám hlad. UČITEL: Prosím tě, jak můžeš v takovéhle chvíli myslet na jídlo? Já jsem tak plný dojmů...	20	<i>Schwarzenegger:</i> I'm hungry. <i>Teacher:</i> How can you think of food at a time like this? I'm so full of emotion...	20	FRIŠTENSK Ý: Man, I'm hungry. TEACHER: Please, how can you think about food at a moment like this? I'm so full of emotions.	22	1. / 1.
28)	NÁČELNÍK : Železná zásoba je nedotknutelná. A kromě toho jsme ji včera snědli.	12	<i>Chief:</i> The emergency rations cannot be touched. And besides, we ate them yesterday.	13	CHIEFTAIN: The emergency rations are untouchable. Besides, we ate them yesterday.	11	1. / 1.
29)	FRIŠTENS KÝ: Víte co? Sníme Berana. LÉKÁRNÍK : Ty máš berana? To je naše spása! Ty se vždycky s něčím vytasíš... Kde ho máš?	22	<i>Schwarzenegger:</i> You know what? Let's eat Koláč. <i>Pharmacist:</i> You've got koláček? Our savior! You're always pulling something out of your sleeve ... Where are they?	25	FRIŠTENSK Ý: You know what? Let's eat Beran. PHARMACIST: You have Bran? This is our salvation! You are always coming up with something. Where is it?	25	1. / 2.
30)	UČITEL: Jo, ty myslíš	18	<i>Teacher:</i> Oh, you mean	19	TEACHER: Oh, you mean	27	3. / 3.

	<p>poručíka Berana? Krajana? [...]  UČITEL: Já osobně ho budu jíst jen s krajním odporem.</p>		<p>Lieutenant Koláč? Our countryman? [...]  <i>Teacher:</i>  Personally I will eat him only with extreme disgust.</p>		<p>Lieutenant Beran. Our countryman? [...]  TEACHER:  Personally, I will eat him only it will stick in my throat for he's a fellow Czech.</p>		
31)	<p>BERAN:  Hallo, boys! Good evening everybody!  <i>(Jde od jednoho k druhému a potřásá jim rukama.)</i> My name is George Beran. I'm very glad to see you.</p>	26	<p><i>Koláč:</i> Hello, boys! Good evening everybody!  <i>(He goes from one explorer to the other shaking his hand.)</i> My name is George Koláč. I'm very glad to see you.</p>	28	<p>BERAN:  Hallo, boys! Good evening everybody!  My name is George Beran. I'm very happy you defrosted me successfully, and I'm really looking forward to learning about your new world.</p>	29	4. / 4.
32)	<p>NÁČELNÍK : Ano. My jsme česká polární expedice. Já jsem Němec.</p>	10	<p><i>Chief:</i> Yes. We're a Czech polar expedition. I'm Němec.</p>	9	<p>CHIEFTAIN:  We are the Czech polar expedition. I'm Deutsch...</p>	9	3. / 1.
33)	<p>BERAN: ... Pane profesore, bože, vy jste cvrkly! Já byl taky tak cvrklý?</p>	13	<p><i>Koláč:</i> ... My God, Professor, you're kind of shriveled up. Was I that shriveled up?</p>	15	<p>BERAN: ... My God, Professor, you are so shrunken! Was I cut down so?</p>	14	3. / 1.
34)	<p>BERAN: A vy mě oživilí za jediný rok? Za to já vám neděkuju!</p>	31	<p><i>Koláč:</i> And you revived me after only a year? Thanks for nothing! This is really</p>	25	<p>BERAN: And you revived me after just one year? And for this you think you</p>	29	3. / 1.

	Vy mě otrávilí. Jeden rok zimní spánek! Jako nějaké zvíře! Vy se mně nelíbíte za tohle. Vy blbci.		annoying. One year of hibernation! Like some animal. You idiots!		deserved thanks? How annoyingly. Only one year of hibernation. Like an animal! You morons!		
35)	NÁČELNÍK : Nosič primitiv Varel Frištenský plus profesor Mac Donald...	9	<i>Chief:</i> Sled-puller, savage Richard Schwarzenegger plus Professor MacDonald ...	9	CHIEFTAIN: Dog team and primitive Boleslav Frištenský and Professor McDonald ...	10	1. / 1.
36)	FRIŠTENS KÝ: Ale stejně, jaký my Češi jsme. Doma, to se pereme, hádáme, zkrátka nežereme se. A tady bysme se samou láskou snědli.	22	<i>Schwarzenegger:</i> But still, look at what kind of Czechs we are. At home we fight, argue, practically devour each other. And here we almost want to eat each other up with kindness...	32	FRIŠTENSK Ý: But what kind of Czechs, are we, huh? Oh, at home, we argue, we fight. We eat each other up about small things, but here, we love each other to death.	32	1. / 1.
37)	<i>Dr. Zdeněk Svěrák:</i> Té mladé paní dáme šátek, aby nám dostala venkovský charakter, a pan manžel bude tak laskav a	23	<i>Dr. Zdeněk Svěrák:</i> We'll give this young lady a scarf to give her a more rustic look, and your husband will be so kind as to make you a	30	Now young lady, we will provide you with a headscarf to give you a more rural look. <i>Pitthan ties a headscarf around the</i>	42	1. / 1.



	udělá vás maminkou.		mother.		woman. Rest assured. It will suit you. Paul, if you would be so kind, will make you a mum.		
38)	<i>Dr. Zdeněk Svěrák:</i> Paní doslova píše: „Manžel často lituje, že tenkrát nesehnal lístek někam dopředu, odkud by lépe viděl.“	19	<i>Dr. Zdeněk Svěrák:</i> His wife writes: “My husband often regrets that he didn’t get a seat up front so that he could see better.”	24	He recounts this story quite often though the wife tells us “My husband often regrets that he didn’t get a ticket somewhere nearer the front where he could have got a better view”.	33	1. / 1.
39)	BERAN: ... George, až nás jednou rozmrznou, až my oba budeme zase teplí, jako jsme vždycky byli, my uvidíme jiný svět.	21	<i>Koláč:</i> ... He said to me: “George, once they thaw us out, once we’re warm and gay again like we’ve always been, we’ll see a different world.”	27	BERAN: ... I remember him saying to me. George, when eventually defrost us they do, we will come out of our closets, hand in hand, together like always we have;	37	1. / 1.

					however, a different world you will see.		
40)	NÁČELNÍK : Nezlob se, Václave, ale to bylo od tebe nedomyšlený. Kdyby ses převlík za opici, prosím, to se dá poznat, že je to legrace. Ale tučňák – mě to taky zmejlilo, natožpak takovýho primitiva, jako je tady Frištenský. FRIŠTENSKÝ: Děkuji ti, náčelníku, že ses mě zastal.	45	<i>Chief:</i> Don't be angry Václav, but that was ill considered on your part. If you'd dressed up like a monkey, then of course we'd be able to tell it was a joke. But a penguin? That threw me off, too, not to mention such a simpleton as Schwarzenegger. <i>Schwarzenegger:</i> Thanks for standing up for me, Chief.	56	CHIEFTAIN: Don't be angry Václav, I mean your plan was a little ill-conceived. I mean if you'd come out dressed as a monkey we all would have realised the joke immediately - but a penguin? Here, in the North. Given the two of us were taken in by it, it is not surprising that an idiot like Frištenský would end up shooting you. FRIŠTENSKÝ: Thanks for standing up for me, Chief.	71	1. / 1.