

JIHOČESKÁ UNIVERZITA V ČESKÝCH BUDĚJOVICÍCH

FILOZOFICKÁ FAKULTA

ÚSTAV ANGLISTIKY

DIPLOMOVÁ PRÁCE

LEXICAL ANALYSIS OF NAMES OF CZECH DISHES AND THEIR
TRANSLATION INTO ENGLISH

Vedoucí práce: Mgr. Petr Kos, PhD

Autor práce: Bc. Gabriela Pejšková

Studijní obor: FRL-AJL

Ročník: 3.

2019

Prohlašuji, že svoji diplomovou práci jsem vypracovala samostatně pouze s použitím pramenů a literatury uvedených v seznamu citované literatury.

Prohlašuji, že v souladu s § 47b zákona č. 111/1998 Sb. v platném znění souhlasím se zveřejněním své diplomové práce, a to v nezkrácené podobě elektronickou cestou ve veřejně přístupné části STAG provozované Jihočeskou univerzitou v Českých Budějovicích na jejich internetových stránkách, a to se zachováním autorského práva k odevzdanému textu této kvalifikační práce. Souhlasím dále s tím, aby toutéž elektronickou cestou byly v souladu s uvedeným ustanovením zákona č. 111/1998 Sb. zveřejněny posudky školitele a oponentů práce i záznam o průběhu a výsledky obhajoby kvalifikační práce. Rovněž souhlasím s porovnáním textu mé kvalifikační práce s databází kvalifikačních prací These.cz provozovanou Národním registrem vysokoškolských kvalifikačních prací a systémem na odhalování plagiátů.

České Budějovice 31. 7. 2019

Děkuji svému vedoucímu diplomové práce Mgr. Petr Kos, PhD za odborné vedení, za pomoc a rady při zpracování této práce.

Anotace:

Cílem této diplomové práce je lexikální analýza názvů typických českých jídel a jejich překladů do angličtiny. Pro účel této práce proběhl sběr reálných jídelních lístků z českých restaurací. Teoretická část práce představuje pojmy, které se jeví jako klíčové pro vypracování analýzy – základy překladatelství, různorodé přístupy k významu slova, vztahy v rámci lexikálního pole. Analytická část pak pracuje s těmito poznatky a díky nim se snaží definovat důvody pro zvolený překlad. Na závěr z každé kapitoly je navržen správný překlad danému názvu jídla.

Annotation:

The aim of the thesis is a lexical analysis of names of typical Czech dishes and their translations into English. For this purpose, real menus were collected. The theoretical part introduces concepts that appear to be crucial for the analysis - fundamentals of translation, diverse approaches to the meaning of words, relationships within the lexical field. The analytical part then works with this knowledge and thanks to it tries to define the reasons for the chosen translation. At the end of each chapter, the correct translation of the food name is suggested.

Obsah

1	Introduction.....	7
2	What is translation?.....	8
2.1	Methods of translation.....	8
2.1.1	The notion of untranslatability	10
2.2	Culturally specific items	10
2.2.1	Material culture - food	11
3	Meaning	11
3.1	Descriptive meaning.....	12
3.1.1	General features of descriptive meaning.....	12
3.2	Non-descriptive meaning	14
3.2.1	Expressive meaning	15
3.2.2	Evoked meaning.....	15
3.2.3	Extensions of meaning	16
3.3	Structural aspects of lexical senses	17
4	Lexification	18
4.1	Selectional preferences.....	19
4.2	Collocations	19
5	Concept	19
5.1	The classical approach	20
5.2	Prototype approach.....	21
5.2.1	Prototype effects.....	22
5.2.2	The mental representation of concepts.....	23
5.2.3	Three different levels of categorization	24
5.3	Componential approach	25
5.3.1	Motivation for lexical decomposition	25
5.3.2	Different approaches to componential analysis	26
6	Paradigmatic relations of inclusion and identity	28
6.1	Synonymy	28
6.2	Hyponymy.....	30
6.3	Meronymy	30
o	Necessity	31
7	Material and methodology	32
7.1	Material	32
7.1.1	Soups.....	33
7.1.2	Main course.....	33
7.1.3	Others	34

7.2	Methodology	34
8	Analysis.....	34
8.1	Methods of translation.....	35
8.2	Soups and their history.....	35
8.2.1	Prototype theory	36
8.2.2	Synonymy	37
8.2.3	Componential analysis	37
8.2.4	Hyponymy.....	38
8.3	Main courses	38
8.3.1	Prototype theory	38
8.3.2	Guláš and its history.....	38
8.3.3	Svíčková na smetaně s knedlíkem and its history	40
8.3.4	Moravský vrabec and its history	44
8.3.5	Czech řízek.....	47
8.3.6	Others – tlačěnka, utopenec, kynuté knedlíky.....	50
8.3.7	Utopenec and its origin	51
8.3.8	Tlačěnka s cibulí	52
9	Conclusion	54
10	References.....	56

1 Introduction

Nowadays when the world is changing and developing every minute, there is a strong desire for travelling, discovering exotic place, but also getting to know new cultures with all their specificities. One of the easiest ways how to know a different culture is to taste and experience their food, because food is integral part of a culture. Foreign travellers are attracted by our cuisine and want to taste it a get to know our dining habits.

My motivation to choose such a topic was simple. I´ve been constantly asked, not only by my friends and family but also by my students, how to correctly translate “svíčková”, “moravský vrabec” and others. The second reason was just my curiosity, how the restaurateurs coped with the translation. To be honest, in a moment when the foreign visitors come and see specialities such as “Drowned man”, “Moravian sparrow” or “Spanish bird” they are at least scared, some of them might be even disgusted by these absurd translations, because they have no idea what they get.

If we think of a fact, that restaurant menu is one of the first things a guest sees when he enters a restaurant and that it creates the whole image of the place, restaurateurs should be more careful and more conscientious with the translation. Not only that, the menus should also be well organized and comprehensible.

Restaurant menu is a specific type of text with a lot of specific features. With this on mind we have to adopt a cautious approach to translating.

The thesis aims to carry out a lexical analysis of English translations of typical Czech dishes. Samples of Czech restaurants menus and their translations into English were collected. In the theoretical part of this thesis, the different methods of translation are mentioned, but also different sense relations and approaches for studying them are examined.

2 What is translation?

Newmark explains that translation can be defined as the communication of the information in a form of the text from the source language (SL) into the target language (TL), in a way where the original meaning is maintained as much as possible. “a translation that makes no sense without recourse to the original is not a translation” [Bellos 2011, pp. 109]. The reader of the translated work always has to count with slight differences. The word-for-word translation is not a real translation, because there is no transfer of the message or the meaning from the source language into the target one.

While speaking of translating there should be mentioned one more terminological difference which must be considered. The difference between translating and interpreting. The last mentioned is the transfer of oral or sign language, whereas translation is a transfer of a certain text.

First thing that should be done before translating is to read the source text, because the translator should know the content and he should understand it, but also after reading the text, the translator should choose the most suitable translation method. [Newmark 1988, 11] The translator should also adapt the target text according to his knowledge of who the readers will be, because there is always specific intention of the text which should be maintained. We can simply reach this by concentrating and using the proper vocabulary and grammar structures. The translator has to understand the tone of the text as well. Was the text intended to be ironical, or serious? This is the other reason why the translator should be familiar with the text and should understand it so that he can transfer it correctly. If not, the whole purpose or message might be lost.

2.1 Methods of translation

According to Jakobson there are three main types of translation. Intralingual translation, which is repeating or interpreting of what has already been said, but by using other signs in the particular language. Second type is interlingual translation, that is again interpreting of what has been said but this time the translator uses the signs and expressions of other language. [Knittlová, Grygová and Zehnalová 2010, pp. 15] Finally, the last type of translation by Jakobson is intersemiotic, which deals with “interpretation of verbal signs by means of signs of nonverbal sign systems.” [online source: Roman Jakobson]

There are more types and many methods of translations that could be named. Nevertheless Knittlová (p.14) states seven basic translation procedures of techniques, that can be used,

when the direct equivalent is insufficient in the TL, which is the main focus of this thesis. The seven translation procedures mentioned are following:

- **Transcription** - it is more or less adapted to the usage of the target language. It is used when there is no direct expression in the TL. How do this procedure deal with the translation then? The word from the SL is simply transcribed according to spelling of the TL. One more phenomenon should be mentioned in relation to transcription and it is *transliteration*. It is basically the transcription with another alphabet, where sound distortion occurs. Typically, transliteration is used for transcribing Chinese names. [Knittlová 2000, pp. 14]
- For instance from our topic of Czech dishes: “guláš” in Czech and “goulash” in English.
- **Calque** - in this translation procedure we use word-for-word translation or in other words literal translation. As the name suggests, translating occurs with or without conveying the sense of the original text. [Knittlová 2000, pp. 14]
- For instance Czech “španělský ptáček” is often translated as “Spanish bird”.
- **Substitution** – an expression from the SL is transferred into the TL thanks to the use of different linguistics means. For example, a noun that is used in the SL is substituted by a pronoun in the TL and vice versa [Knittlová 2000, pp. 14]
- **Transposition** – focuses on grammatical changes, from that we can consider this technique as a grammatical one. [Knittlová 2000, pp. 14]
- **Modulation** – can be explained as a change of perspective. Sometimes we cannot use the same perspective in the TL, which was used in the SL, because of impoliteness and other aspects of a given language. [Knittlová 2000, pp. 14]
- **Equivalence** – this term describes the procedure where the use of stylistic and structural means is different from the original ones, usually in the field of expressivity. [Knittlová 2000, pp. 14]
- **Adaptation** – this term represents a procedure where a situation described in the SL is substituted by another one in the TL which is, of course,

adequate to the original one. [Knittlová 2000, pp. 14] Where is this type of translating procedure used? The most often in situations where there is no equivalent in the TL. For instance, proverbs or puns. To this type of translation Newmark also states that it is the freest form that we can use while translating [Newmark 1988, pp. 47]

These seven translating methods or procedures are inspired by Vinaye and Darbelnet and are cited from the easiest one to the most difficult one. [Knittlová 2000, pp. 14] As it was mentioned before, these procedures are often used, when equivalents in TL language are insufficient. In these cases, we may talk about the notion of untranslatability.

2.1.1 The notion of untranslatability

While dealing with the translation of the typical Czech dishes, one of the first things that comes to mind is the question, whether we can really translate this type of content and if so, how we can do it. Is this concept translatable or not. In this case we can talk about untranslatability of culturally tinted expressions. This type of untranslatability might be regarded as the most difficult one, because the translator deals with cultural concepts. As a cultural concept is considered a fact, or knowledge that is shared throughout one culture while for another culture is this concept completely unknown. In these cases, translators usually resort to descriptions or explanations. Especially while speaking about English and Czech because these two languages have completely different social, cultural and historical background. This is also the reason why we cannot find the exact equivalent that could be eventually used. [Knittlová, Grygová and Zehnalová 2010, 41].

2.2 Culturally specific items

Newmark states: *“I distinguish 'cultural' from 'universal' and 'personal' language. 'Die, 'live, 'star', 'swim' and even almost virtually ubiquitous artefacts like 'mirror' and 'table' are universals - usually there is no translation problem there. 'Monsoon', 'steppe', 'dacha', 'tagliatelle' are cultural words - there will be a translation problem unless there is cultural overlap between the source and the target language (and its readership).”*

Clearly there is a big difference between universal words that function universally and words, or expressions, culturally influenced. People often tend to express themselves in a personal way, they have got their own personal language, and this is the type of language that can hardly be translated correctly. On the other hand, the translator has to respect these specifics because they are unavoidable. “where there is cultural focus,

there is a translation problem due to the cultural 'gap' or 'distance' between the source and target languages.” [Newmark 1988, pp. 94]

Newmark also categorises these culture specifics into following five groups: *ecology*, where he comprises flora, fauna, winds, plains, hills; the following one is called *material culture*, where can be found food, clothes, houses and town, and transport. *Social culture* is not as divided in detail as the previous ones and contains only work and leisure. The fourth category is *organisations, customs, activities, procedures, concepts*, where there is political and administrative, religious and artistic. The last category he mentions is *gestures and habits*.

2.2.1 Material culture - food

People usually consider food as one of the most important and distinctive expressions of the culture. While travelling the first thing they want to do is to get to know to the new culture thanks to the gastronomic experience. In each of the existing cultures we may find sometimes almost ritualistic approach to the food. The citation from Bell and Valentine used in the work of Catherine Palmer [Palmer, online source]:

“the history of any nation’s diet is the history of the nation itself, with food fashion, fads and fancies mapping episodes of colonialism and migration, trade and exploration, cultural exchange and boundary-marking”

It is true, that not only the food each nation chooses or consumes reflects cultural traditions but also religion and the nation’s believes. As we can see, this all persists until now. For instance, not eating pork in Islamic cultures, eating kosher in Jewish culture, avoiding beef or meat in general in Hindu culture to minimize hurting or killing of other living creatures. Throughout the time, there were many new traditions emerging, national cuisines were forming and later with the invention of the letterpress and printed books the first cookbooks appeared. From this moment food was more and more tied with the culture. Our choice of food is influenced by our status in society, our preferences, but also by climate or environment of the place where we live. [Palmer, online source]

3 Meaning

Meaning is not easy to define. [Lipka 1992, pp. 46] states that we can find 22 definitions of meaning in Ogden/Richards's book *The Meaning of Meaning*. But while translating it is one of the most important parts that should stay unchanged. Alan Cruse in his book

Meaning in Language suggest, that meaning should be studied in sentences, so that we could observe the different interactions among the particular elements of the given sentence. Cruse studies two main types of meaning.

3.1 Descriptive meaning

The only approach for classifying types of meaning does not exist. There have always been few names used for meaning typology. Various linguists came with various theories, but also with various names for their theory. [Cruse 2011, pp. 195] mentions some of them, such as ideational, descriptive, referential, logical or propositional. They are characterized by different scholars in different ways, but there is one name which has been adopted in this thesis and it is descriptive meaning. We shall now slowly move to the theoretical background and features of the descriptive meaning.

It is sometimes labelled propositional or logical, because it can show whether one proposition is true or false. From another point of view, we can use the name referential meaning due to its ability to guide the listener to identify the referent intended by the speaker. It is labelled objective because it shows the distance between the speaker and particular thing he says. It is displaced, because it not tied to the current situation (which means here-and-now current situation). It is conceptualized which means it offers the possibility to sort the different aspects of experience and categorise them into various conceptual categories, therefore we use the label descriptive meaning. The label exposed can be explained by the fact that we can question or negate the descriptive aspects. [Cruse 2011, pp. 196]

Cruse introduces some of the parameters of descriptive meaning in which it may vary.

3.1.1 General features of descriptive meaning

- Quality – it is the most obvious and the most important dimension while dealing with the descriptive meaning. Only when different items are equal from the point of view of intensity and specificity, we can observe the differences of quality. How can we easily check on difference of quality? We may use this phrase: *not Y but X and not X but Y*. If we can say this phrase without any oddness, then we can confirm, that there is a difference of quality of the two mentioned items. For instance, *Her dress is not red, it's green. Her dress is not green, it's red.* [Cruse 2011, pp. 197-8]

This is also how we can distinguish semantic difference from the descriptive one. *That's not my father, that's my Dad.* [Cruse 2011, pp. 198]

- Intensity – only the items that have got the same quality may differ in intensity. We can take a look at the examples that Cruse states in his book. Two words *huge* and *large* have the same quality, but they differ in intensity. Intensity differences might be checked by the following test: *It wasn't just X, it was Y. I wouldn't go so far as to say it was Y, but it was X.* → *It wasn't just large, it was huge. I wouldn't go so far as to say it was huge, but it was large.* [Cruse 2011, pp. 198]. From that we can conclude that the word *huge* abounds with intensity more than the second word, *large*. It is important to say that variation in intensity is not limited by gradable adjectives, they were used just to clearly show the notion on intensity. An example from another area might be: *It wasn't just a mist, it was a fog. I wouldn't go so far as to say it was fog, but it was mist.* [Cruse 2011, pp. 199]
- Specificity – two senses that relate in quality may somehow differ in specificity. Generally speaking, we can explain their relationship, that one of the items is more specific, while the other one is more general. There are three types of specificity. The first mentioned is type specificity which is characteristic by the hyponymic relation. It means that one term, the more specific one (or subordinate), is a hyponym of the other one, which is more general (or superordinate). For example, *animal* is more general than *dog*, *sheep*, *cat*, etc. The word *animal* simply includes various kinds of animals in it. Secondly, there is part specificity, where one term is a meronym of the other one. *John injured his finger.* and *John injured his hand.* Of course, *finger* is more specific than *hand* and the part-whole relation is following: *finger* is a part of a *hand*. Thirdly, intensity specificity, is demonstrated by the following example: adjective *large* includes ranges with meaning “greater than the average size”, it means that one range of degrees includes another range of degrees of some property. *It's huge* entails *It's large*, but *It's large* does not entail *It's huge*. [Cruse 2011, pp. 199]

- Vagueness – we can say meaning is vague, when we are not able to precisely state the criteria for the use of an expression. Vagueness is divided into two different subtypes. The first one is ill-definedness and it can be well pointed up by examples that name some value on a scale. A good example could be the adjective *middle-aged*, because it indicates several years on the scale of age, but it cannot be stated in what age or period of life a person is not young anymore and begins to be middle-aged, as well as it cannot be stated in what age a person ceases to be middle-aged and becomes old. [Cruse 2011, pp. 200] Quite similar is the example of a word *dawn*, where we ask exactly the same question “when”: “When does the dawn start?” “When does the dawn end?” Another example is the English word *red*. It also shows us, that English words can be vaguer than the Czech ones, because in this case in English language *red* stands for all shades of red colour, human hair as well as the colour of revolutionary flag, whereas in Czech the following words are available: *červený, rudý, ryšavý* or *rusý*. ” On the other hand, English is more distinguishing at the end of the blue part of the spectrum. [Peprník 2006, pp. 13]
- The second subtype is laxness. “For some terms, their essence is easily defined, but they are habitually applied in a loose way” [Cruse 2011, pp. 200] For example the word *circle*. The clear mathematical definition of this term exists, but this word is also used very loosely. *The mourners stood in a circle round the grave*. In this case, clearly, no one expects an exact circle as it is defined in terms of geometry. This circle is probably some irregular shape, but we keep using the term *circle*.

3.2 Non-descriptive meaning

This type of meaning may be referred to as non-conceptual or non-denotative meaning. [Lipka 1992, pp. 60] The name of this type of meaning is self-explanatory. It’s the type of meaning which does not bring any new or specific characteristic of the item. Only the specific feelings of the speaker or his dialect might be recognizable. Nevertheless, it does not change the description of the item.

3.2.1 Expressive meaning

Expressive meaning “does not present a conceptual category to the hearer.” [Cruse 2011, pp. 201] Conversely, it expresses a current emotional state of the speaker, the same way as a cat expresses its feeling by purring or a little child by chuckling or crying. Since we speak about current state of the speaker, the utterance cannot be rendered in the past tense. The speaker does not express any proposition so the hearer cannot reply. The expression *Gosh!* is a suitable example, having only expressive meaning. The reaction such as *Are you?* or *That's a lie!* is then an unsuitable response. [Cruse 2011, pp. 201]

The words called expletives only possess expressive meaning, there is no propositional or descriptive meaning. These words do not contribute to propositional content. One example is mentioned by Cruse: It's freezing – shut the *bloody* window! The expression *bloody* represents the word with expressive meaning. It does not tell us anything special about the window, because *bloody* window is not a kind of window. There would be no change, if the word *bloody* was omitted. Expletives are mostly words such as *wow*, *ouch*, *oops*, or some adjectives or adverbs such as the previously mentioned *bloody*. [Cruse 2011, pp. 201]

There are however some words, that have both descriptive and expressive meaning, for example the verb *blubber*. The descriptive meaning is *to cry*, while the expressive meaning describes speaker's attitude or evaluation, which would be in this case rather negative and disapproving. [Cruse 2011, pp. 201]

3.2.2 Evoked meaning

Evoked meaning includes the dialect variation of language and register variation. The first mentioned is connected to the speaker and his region, while the other one displays variations within the utterance of a single community according to situation in which they are in a particular time. [Cruse 2011, pp. 202] Thanks to the usage of these variations, dialect or register, their home context can be evoked. Evoked meaning also has no propositional meaning.

There are three subtypes of dialect that can be distinguished: geographical, temporal and social. The first subtype varies according to the region of origin of the speaker, the second one is connected with the age of the speaker and the last one refers to the speaker's social class. [Cruse 2011, pp. 203]

Register can be divided into three subtypes as well. According to Cruse the division is: field, mode and style. Field refers to a particular area of discourse. In any area of the professional field, the specific language is used. The specialists often use technical terms despite the fact that the things have everyday names. For example, in the discussion between doctors, who use medical terms rather than basic names used by laic public, the word *pyrexia* would be natural and common. On the other hand, a person speaking ordinary language would use a word *fever* or *temperature*. Mode refers to the channel, spoken or written, which distributes the utterance. Style refers to the formality or informality of an utterance. For instance, *pass away*, *die* and *kick the bucket*. Meaning remains the same, while the formality of these three expressions is different. Pass away belongs to a higher register, which is more formal than die. *Die* may be labelled as a neutral expression, whereas *kick the bucket* would belong to a lower register. [Cruse 2011 pp. 203]

3.2.3 Extensions of meaning

The vocabulary of a language is widening in two different ways. According to Peprník one of these two manners is absorbing new words, while the other one is giving a new, additional meaning to the existing lexical forms. In some cases, the original meaning can be replaced either partly or completely. The most frequent is a situation when the old and the new meaning coexist side by side and the word becomes polysemic.

[Peprník 2006, pp. 39] There are several options how the meaning can be changed, for instance, widening, narrowing, branching, transfer and others. Three types of transfer can be distinguished, metaphor, metonymy and synecdoche.

3.2.3.1 Metaphor

The metaphor is a transfer of meaning on the basis of exterior features which are similar. The similarity involves different features such as colour, shape, location, function, extent. Some examples would be: *foot* as a part of our body or foot of a hill or *head* part of a human body a leader at work. (Peprník 2006, pp. 45)

3.2.3.2 Metonymy

Peprník says that metonymy is a figure of speech in which we use the name of an attribute of a thing instead of the thing itself. Cruse adds that it is a major strategy for extending meaning, which is also responsible for a great deal of cases of so-called regular polysemy.

Several patterns of metonymy can be distinguished. We shall look at the examples stated in Cruse. [Cruse 2011, pp. 257] Firstly, it is a “container for contained” → “I drank this glass.”

In this case we do not mean that we literally drank the glass, we mean its liquid content. Secondly, we have “possessor for possessed/attribute” → We can imagine a situation when we are with friends and suddenly someone’s phone rings. One of them knows its his or her phone, so he or she says: “Oh, that’s me.” We obviously know it is not him, who is ringing, but it is his phone. Thirdly, there is “represented entity for representative”. → The Czech Republic won the world championship. By this we do not mean the whole Czech Republic, because the whole Czech Republic did not play, but just players. It is very common to say “We won” even though we did not actually play, but the Czech national team did. Fourthly, well known pattern of metonymy “whole for part”. → “My car broke down yesterday evening.” Actually, the engine broke down, not the whole car. Fifth pattern is the opposite to the previous one, “part for whole” → “We need some new blood in here.” We do not need only blood, but new people are needed around there. Sixth and from Cruse’s list the last patter is “place for institution”. → “The White House said...” It was the President, who said it.

3.2.3.3 Synecdoche

Peprník mentions synecdoche as third and last type of the language transfer. It is a figure of speech where a part is used to mean the whole and vice versa (note that Cruse included this notion into the metonymy), the species stand for the genus and the genus stand for the species, or the name of the material equals the thing made.

3.3 Structural aspects of lexical senses

Necessity and expectedness

The process of dividing logical relations or meaning into two logical relationships: necessary and contingent. To found out whether a feature is necessary or contingent, we use entailment. For instance, “we could say that “being an animal" is a necessary feature of *dog*, whereas "ability to bark" is not:

X is a dog entails X is an animal.

X is a dog does not entail X can bark.” [Cruse 2011, pp. 204]

Nevertheless, the distinction is not always as clear as it might seem. There exists a scale of necessity where we can measure the degree of necessity from necessary through expected and unexpected, ending with impossible. The measuring of degree of necessity is performed thanks to *but* test.

“It's a dog, but it's an animal. (tautology)

It's a dog, but it's not an animal. (contradiction)

"is an animal" is a necessary feature of dog

It's a dog, but it barks. (odd-tautology)

It's a dog, but it doesn't bark. (normal)

"barks" is an expected feature of dog (...)"

Sufficiency

A sufficient feature is a feature that helps us to distinguish one entity from others. Each entity possess a set of features which are more or less characteristic for it. From this set of features only one is chosen, it is the one which is considered to be the most diagnostic, or sufficient.

To be more specific, one of the features of *bird* might be *breathes* or *two-legged*. Nevertheless, both of these features are not very diagnostic, because not only birds breathe, other living creatures breathe two. The feature two-legged is better, but still not sufficient because it can be applied to humans as well. If we think about other features of birds that they do not have in common with other creatures, it would be *feathered*. No other creature has feathers. This is the most diagnostic feature for *bird*. [Cruse 2011, pp. 205]

Saliency

Things that we mark as salient are somehow distinct and attract our attention. There are two types of saliency. One way how to interpret saliency is the ease of access of information. [Cruse 2011, pp. 206] This basically means, that information that are easy to reach play more important role in semantic processing.

Other way how to deal with the saliency is degree of foregrounding or backgrounding. Unlike ease of access, this can be manipulated by speakers.

4 Lexification

“The claim that a particular word sequence should be considered a single lexical item usually hinges on its manifesting holistic properties of some sort.” [Cruse 2011, pp. 82]

It is still very important to be clear about what we mean by holistic properties. We shall

take a look at properties which in some sense might be called holistic, but which do not qualify a sequence for lexical status.

4.1 Selectional preferences

For one way in which words may be said to go naturally together is responsible a need for semantic coherence. This means that each word has a limit range of possible syntagmatic partners which are not unusual in some way. “It is sometimes said that meaning entails choice; it is equally true that meaning entails a limitation in the choice of accompanying items.” [Cruse 2011, pp. 82]

4.2 Collocations

While speaking about collocations it is important to underline certain degree of phrasal unity, in cases where one or even more words select non-default senses of their partners. Cruse mentions following example in the notion *high speed*, *speed* has default sense, while *high* has a non-default sense. We can observe the non-default sense of *high* in many phrases, for instance, *high cost*, *high wind*, *high temperature*. “In *high command*, neither word has its default sense, while in *foot the bill*, *foot* has a sense unique to a particular collocation.” [Cruse 2011, pp. 83]

These phrases are called idioms of encoding. They have to be studied as a lexical unity. We cannot study sense of particular items.

5 Concept

As we shall see in this chapter, not only meaning is important for translation. The translator has to be aware of the fact, that concepts to which the text in SL refers must remain as close to the original text as possible. He cannot change the concept in TL.

“A concept is a mental construct that stands in a relation of correspondence to a coherent category of things in some world, prototypically the real world, but potentially also imaginary, fictional, or virtual worlds” [Cruse 2011, pp. 53]

As Peprnik says concept is in fact basis for the correct understanding of the lexical meaning. As our knowledge of the world changes throughout the time, the concept changes as well. The understanding of one specific concept differs according to our age or education. Thus, it might be difficult to understand the exact meaning of the given concept even in one language.

This problem becomes even more complex in a situation when translating from one language into another because, obviously in different languages, the same thing is expressed by different lexical systems. It means that a translator has to carefully choose between these different systems the one, which is the most suitable and relevant to the TL. [Knittlová, Grygová and Zehnalová 2010, 219]

On the other hand, it is important to say, that in its essential the concept does not change. For instance, *water* remains the same thing, and is understood in the same way, for a child as well as for a scientist. The concept in fact represents a term from psychology and it is also more subjective, meaning on the other hand is a term from linguistics and it is not so subjectively coloured (it is objective). “Words do not name (“nepojmenovávají”, in other words, do not signify (“neznamenají”) the objects, they only refer (“odkazují”) to them. (Peprník 2006, pp.7)

In lexicology there are few different types of theoretical approaches to concepts.

5.1 The classical approach

The classical approach is one of the theoretical approaches to concepts. It goes back to Aristotle. This approach deals with the membership in a way where we look for a set of necessary and sufficient criteria. For better understanding we can perform the following example: we have got some *X* and we are looking for the criteria to qualify inclusion in the category of *BOY*:

X is human

X is male

X is young

But when any of these criteria is not satisfied, then we have to say that *X* is not a boy.

Words such as *boy*, *girl*, *man*, *woman* can be very easily “defined by means of a set of necessary and sufficient features”. However there also many words where a set of necessary and sufficient features is completely insufficient. Another problem mentioned by Cruse is the fuzziness of boundaries between different concepts, for example between two colours such as red and orange, or blue and purple. The last problem mentioned within the theoretical approach is “internal structure of categories”. This simply expresses the opinion that we, language users, have got good intuition to decide which members

within a category are better or more representative examples than others. For instance, talking about different kinds of fruit, we can state that apple or strawberry is a better example of a fruit than is a date, or an olive. From that we can see, that different categories have their own internal structure. There are members, which are in centre – we can call them central members. From this type, central member we go down on this notional scale. Thus, we continue with less central members, and borderline members. [Cruse 2011, pp. 6]

5.2 Prototype approach

This theory helps us to find the best example of a specific category. According to Eleanor Rosch “natural conceptual categories are structured around the 'best' examples, or prototypes of the categories, and that other items are assimilated to a category according to whether they sufficiently resemble the prototype or not.” [Cruse 2011, pp. 57] This approach helps us to understand and find out what a proper representative of the concept looks like. We can easily compare other concepts with the proper one and then we can make a decision whether the examined item belongs to the same concept or not.

Eleanor Rosch came with a technique a prototypicality of an element can be tested. The technique is called “Goodness-of-Exemplar ratings” or GOE ratings which is nothing more than surveying of the best example of the given category. There is a rating scale that has seven different degrees and goes from “very good example” or prototype, which carries number one, to very bad example or not an example at all, which is represented by number 7. There are two more expressions that come with this technique, the principle of centre and periphery. Logically, we find prototype and items closet to it in the centre whilst there are bad examples or not examples at all on the periphery. For instance, when talking about the category “vegetable”, there would be a carrot or potato in the centre, representing the prototype whereas we would find lemon or rhubarb on the periphery. Cruse also states that GOE ratings depend on the culture in which we are doing our research. There might be huge differences among British, American or Czech context.

Cruse also mentions Wittgenstein’s description of the relationship between members of a category. He described it as a family, because there is a resemblance among the family members, they resemble one another. On the other hand, there is not a specific set of features, they all have in common. There is more probability to find some features shared with some members and other features shared with others. [Cruse 2011, pp. 60]

5.2.1 Prototype effects

As Cruse states there are sometimes situations that prototypicality may correlate greatly with crucial aspects of cognitive behaviour. These correlations are called prototype effects and the main ones are:

- *Order of mention.* In practice, while making a list of the members of a category, we tend to put the prototypical member at the beginning of the list. This effect is even more apparent, if the person, who is making the list is put under time pressure. The register correlates with GOE ratings. [Cruse 2011, pp. 58]
- *Overall frequency.* The frequency of mention on the aforementioned list also correlates with GOE ratings. [Cruse 2011, pp. 58]
- *Order of acquisition.* Prototypical members are very often acquired first and again, order of acquisition correlates with GOE score. [Cruse 2011, pp. 58]
- *Vocabulary learning.* At later stages of language learning where we can influence the process of vocabulary acquisition by explicit teaching, children learn new words more easily, when we provide them with the definitions that focus on prototypical features. Contrarily, it is much more demanding for them to learn new vocabulary properly while they are provided with abstract definitions. Even though the abstract definition shows the exact word's meaning. [Cruse 2011, pp. 58]
- *Speed of verification.* There were psycholinguistic experiments conducted. In these experiments, subjects must respond as fast as they can. Subjects usually watch a screen, where different sets of words are shown. There are also two buttons, that they have to press. One is labelled *Yes* and the other one is labelled *No*. The sets of words are for instance, FRUIT: BANANA, FRUIT: APPLE, FRUIT: DATE. If the second item belongs to the category indicated by the first word, they press *Yes*. If not, they press *No*. The results of this experiment show that the reaction was faster when the second item was the prototypical one and vice versa. [Cruse 2011, pp. 58]

- *Priming*. In this technique, subjects see words (both existing and non-existing) on the screen. Their task is to respond *Yes* or *No*. *Yes* when the word really exist in the language in which the experiment is conducted and *No* when the word does not exist in a given language. It was ascertained that if a semantically related word precedes the other word, response to it is quicker. For example, the word *doctor* will be more quickly recognized and marked *Yes*, when the word *nurse* was the previous one showed. It means that when we move further from the centre of the category the reaction slows down. [Cruse 2011, pp. 59]

5.2.2 The mental representation of concepts

The original idea of the mental representations was to create some sort of image of the prototype. This would serve for comparing the others with this prototypical member. However, this idea is no longer supported.

Recently, new approach has appeared. It is based on representing a prototype structure by a set of features. These, however, do not comprise necessary and sufficient criteria.

The general idea is presented on the category VEHICLE. The following features were not empirically tested, they are based on intuitions and the list is not exhaustive.

- “(I) a. Designed to go on roads
- b. Has own propulsive power
- c. Can go faster than unaided human
- d. Can carry persons/goods in addition to driver
- e. Has 4 wheels
- f. Metallic construction
- g. Persons/goods enclosed
- h. Manoeuvrable” [Cruse 2011, pp. 60]

The central example, which is obviously CAR, has probably all these features. As we are moving away from the centre of this category, there are features, which were not mentioned. For instance, TRAIN is not designed to go on roads, it is designed to go on rails and also, we cannot say that train is manoeuvrable. [Cruse 2011, pp. 61]

5.2.3 Three different levels of categorization

In this chapter we shall discuss three different types of specificity that Cruse mentions. The fundamental one is aptly called basic or generic level, two others are called superordinate level and subordinate level.

- Basic-level categories. Firstly, “It is the most inclusive level at which there are characteristic patterns of behavioural interaction.” [Cruse 2011, pp. 61] For better understanding, imagine that you have to mime how one would behave with an animal. This task seems very difficult, if you were not said whether the animal is, for instance, a shark or a mouse. On the other hand, it would be rather easy to do it, if you knew it involves a dog, pig, or table.

Secondly, “It is the most inclusive level for which a clear visual image can be formed.” [Cruse 2011, pp. 61] The principal is basically the same as in the previous example. It is easier to imagine a *car* or a *spoon*, than a *vehicle* or *cutlery*. The more specific the item is, the easier is to visualize it.

Thirdly, part-whole information and relations between its parts are relevant. Mostly in the case of categories such as *cutlery*, *tool* or *animal*.

Also, fourthly, the categorization on this level is the most rapid and more rapid than membership of categories which are further from basic level. For instance, we can decide more easily and rapidly, that *Dachshund* belongs to the category *dog* than that it belongs to the category *animal*.

Fifthly, words belonging to this level, we use normally, for everyday life, neutral reference. These words are very often considered to be the real names of the referents. For better understanding let us take a look at the following situation: Two people sitting. One of them hears a noise and asks: “What’s that?” The second one looks out of the window and sees a *Dachshund* in the garden. How does he reply? “It’s an animal.” “It’s a dog.” “It’s a *Dachshund*.” Normally, he would probably reply “It’s a dog.”, because for the two remaining answers, there are special contextual conditions required.

Sixthly, the items of this level are usually morphologically simple. As an example, Cruse states *spoon*, which is basic-level word. All the items, which are more specific have more complex names such as: *teaspoon*, *tablespoon*, *soup spoon*, *coffee spoon*, etc.

Seventhly, the last characteristic of this level, it “(...) is the level at which the best categories are created. Good categories are those which maximize the following characteristics:

- a. distinctness from neighbouring categories
- b. internal homogeneity
- c. informativness.” [Cruse 2011, pp. 62]

Superordinate-level categories. More inclusive categories than those comprised in basic-level categories. How can we characterize them?

Firstly, they are easy to distinct from sister categories such as *animal*, *bird* or *insect*.

Secondly, they possess fewer defining attributes, so their family resemblance relations are less marked.

Subordinate-level categories. Member of this category highly resemble one another, but they possess low distinctiveness from items of sister categories.

They do not add any specific piece of information to what has been characterized by the basic-level category. Contrarily to basic-level items, these names are morphologically complex. [Cruse 2011, pp. 62]

5.3 Componential approach

There is a long history of searching for the smallest units of meaning, thanks to which we can build other meanings. It can be said that each time, we try to elucidate a rich word-meaning, we finish by decomposition into simpler semantic components. It seems to be no other way to do it. What is then the motivation for the lexical decomposition? There are few of them.

5.3.1 Motivation for lexical decomposition

5.3.1.1 Similarities

The first motivation for componential analysis is a fact that a pair of words might be partially similar in meaning, but also partially different. As an obvious example Cruse states the following: *mare* and *stallion*. As we can tell, they are both horses, so this is

their similarity. They both share the component [HORSE]. The partial difference in this case is a fact, that *mare* has a component [FEMALE] which is not shared by *stallion* and then, of course, *stallion* has a component [MALE]. [Cruse 2011, pp. 220]

5.3.1.2 Correlations

Correlations are the most convincing evidence for lexical decomposition. Look at the following examples by Cruse:

	[MALE]	[FEMALE]
[SHEEP]	ram	ewe
[HORSE]	stallion	mare

Both [MALE] and [FEMALE] are very often cover in the vocabulary. For instance, component [FEMALE] can be seen in: mother, daughter, girl, lady, niece, bitch, hen, doe, and many others, component “[HORSE] occurs in *horse, mustang, foal, gelding*, and probably also forms part of the definition of *stable, neigh, fetlock*, etc.” [Cruse 2011, pp. 220]

5.3.2 Different approaches to componential analysis

5.3.2.1 Louis Hjelmslev’s approach

This approach represents classical structuralism. The pioneer of it within modern linguistics is Louis Hjelmslev who represents early European structuralism. He inspired himself from Saussure’s theory of the linguistic sign. According to him, linguistic sign is a slice through the two planes where one of them is called “content plan” (all possible meanings) and the second one is called “expression plan” (all possible human linguistic sounds).

Basis for this method of analysis is commutation, which was used to justify phonemic analysis. “A phonemic difference was said to exist between two distinct elements of the expression plane when substitution of one for the other entails a change in the content plane.” [Cruse 2011, pp. 223]

Componential analysis works on the basis of comparing and contrasting words within a semantic field. By noting and comparing markers (or features) of the compared components we summarize the similarities and contrasts in the most economical way possible. [Benjamins, online source]

Let us look closely at one of the analysis. Meaning of *mare* is analysed into [HORSE] and [FEMALE]. This is justified by the fact, that a change from [FEMALE] into [MALE] entails a change of the expression into *stallion*. These two features [MALE] and [FEMALE] form a binary pair and in this pair, we need to mark just one of them by + or -. Positive sign is usually carried by marked items and negative sign is carried by unmarked item. [Cruse 2011, pp. 225]

5.3.2.1.1 Marked and unmarked term of binary contrast

In a pair “male”/“female”, “female” is the one which is marked. But why is “female” marked? How was decided which one of the components is marked and which one is unmarked? Cruse mentions following reasons.

One of the reasons is a fact, that when we want to form a female word, it is usually formed by taking a word referring to the corresponding male and adding a morphological mark in the form of affix. For example: lion/lioness; waiter/waitress; prince/princess and many others. The opposite cases, where the word referring to a male is derived from the word referring to a female are very rare. [Cruse 2011, pp. 225]

There is another indication of the markedness of [FEMALE]. The reason is that only the term referring to males can have a generic use. So, for instance, the term *actors* can designate a group of both together, males and females, whereas *actresses* has no such function. This works even for groups, where the items are not morphologically related. For example, the term *dogs* works again for both, but not the expression *bitches*. [Cruse 2011, pp. 225]

5.3.2.2 Bernard Pottier’s approach

Pottier’s main aim is to explain lexical contrasts and similarities within the lexicon of a language. “ (...) all components have to be justified by actual lexical contrasts; (...) the

closer two word meanings are, the more components they should have in common.”
[Cruse 2011, pp. 226]

Let us put the previous theory into practice with a word *chair*. Our aim is to discern the item *chair* from every other word in English, and of course to show and describe its semantic distance from other words. Logical start would be with the most distant word, moving slowly closer.

5.3.2.3 Anna Wierzbicka’s approach

Relatively new in the field of reductive analysis of word meaning. She is considered to be the most original of contemporary componentialists. She is inspired by Leibniz and his “alphabet of thought”. The basis of this idea was reducing complex meanings into different combinations of simpler ones. He followed Hjelmslev’s procedure which was to begin with the complex meaning and reduce it into simpler and smaller items, where the process was guided by the meaning of other items. Leibniz thought, that in a moment when one could not go any further, he arrives at the basic units of thought. Wierzbicka’s approach was the opposite. She started with small units that seemed to be essential and she tried to express as many meanings as possible, with these on her list, only by adding items to the list of primary notions in a moment when she was forced to do so. [Cruse 2011, pp. 226]

6 Paradigmatic relations of inclusion and identity

In this part of the thesis, we shall briefly introduce a particular type of sense relation, a semantic relation between two different units or items of meaning. Paradigmatic sense relations will be divided into two classes.

6.1 Synonymy

During our study we have encountered many different naming units, that should have performed the same meaning. In this part we are going to look at this problem more in detail but also, we are going to study whether these used words are really the synonyms or whether they just pretend to be the synonyms.

Synonymy is a sense relation of sameness or similarity. Lipka points out the theory of Lyons who does not deal with “total synonymy” or “complete synonymy”, but in the centre of his attention is “cognitive synonymy”. (Lipka 1992 p.142) Peprnik on the other

hand claims that it is necessary to discuss also differences between “variants” and “synonymys”. “...many lexicologists (...) regard dialectal synonyms (e.g. valley - dale "údolí"), slangy synonyms (girl - bird), and other-than-British-Standard synonyms (American, Australian, Scottish, etc., e.g. Br. vs. Am.: spanner – wrench "šroubový klíč", cutlery - flatware "příbory") as tautonyms, not synonyms. Nevertheless, we should discuss all types of synonymy.

Firstly, there is absolute synonymy and as the name itself may indicate, these synonyms are substitutable in all contexts where they might appear without changes in their meanings. However, this type of synonymy is rare and not very often encountered.

Secondly, propositional synonymy is usually defined in terms of entailment. In Cruse: “Entailment is the relation which holds between the propositions listed under P and the corresponding propositions under Q in the following:

P

Fido is a dog

(...)

Q

Fido is an animal

(...)

To say that proposition P entails proposition Q means that the truth of Q follows logically and inescapably from the truth of P, and the falsity of P follows likewise from the falsity of Q.” [Cruse 2011, pp. 28] Entailment is used to discover and define sense relations between words, thanks to entailment we can easily decide whether two terms are hyponyms or synonyms.

Propositional synonyms are then propositions, that are interchangeable without any change of the content. Nevertheless, there might be a slight change in a style, but the information must be preserved unchanged.

The last type of synonymy is called near synonymy. This type is often recognized thanks to the common sense, sense for language and intuition.

6.2 Hyponymy

Hyponymy is another paradigmatic relation of identity and inclusion. According to Cruse, hyponymy is very important sense relation which structures conceptual fields. [Cruse 2011, pp. 134] Its basis can be explained by the relation between two things, where one of them is considered superordinate on the other hand the second one is subordinate. As Peprník explains a hyponym is a word or lexeme that possess narrower or more specific meaning that undercomes wider or more general meaning. It is a subordinate term. As examples of hyponyms we may mention: daffodil, tulip, rose, carnation, lily, daisy and others where all of them come under the term *flower*. They are called hyponyms of the generic or superordinate term or hyperonym *flower*. We consider for instance various dog breeds as hyponym as well. The term hyponym has been used since 1963 when Lyons started to use it instead of the previous term “archlexeme”. He (Lyons) also “characterizes hyponymy and incompatibility as the most fundamental paradigmatic relations of sense.” (Lipka 1992, pp. 144) According to him, both are widely interdependent and highly important for the structure of the lexicon. In comparison with synonyms, hyponyms cannot simply be excluded without serious consequences.

Another characteristic worth mentioning is the fact, that hyponymy is viewed as a relation between lexical items. However, after taking in consideration the dynamic construal approach we can see, that it is in fact a relation between construals. So it might happen that for a pair of words A and B, some (but usually not all) construals of A may be hyponyms of some, but not all, construals of B. [Cruse 2011, pp. 135] We shall now look at this problem closer and explain it on the example: *Dogs* and other pets. *Dogs* have four legs. *Dogs* are mammals. What is the difference between these construals and what do they actually mean? The first “*dogs*” includes only domestic ones and we do not care about the fact whether they are, or they are not well-formed. The second “*dogs*” includes only dogs which are well-formed without demanding or finding out whether they are or are not domestic. The last “*dogs*” includes all dogs, both wild and domestic, but also well-formed or ill-formed. [Cruse 2011, pp. 136]

6.3 Meronymy

This is another relation of inclusion. Meronymy is based on part-whole relation between individual referents. For instance, *hand:finger*, *tree:branch*, *car:engine* and so on. In all these examples, the second mentioned word (finger, branch and engine) is meronym, sometimes we can also find the term paronym, simply because it is a part of a bigger

whole. The words that are mentioned as first in each of the pair (hand, tree, car) are called holonyms. [Cruse 2011, pp. 137-138]

If we compare hyponymy with meronymy, meronymy is a sense relation which is a much less sharply delimited. We encounter many cases, where informants are very unsure. We shall now introduce several features that contribute to “goodness of exemplar”. Thanks to those we can decide whether we speak about meronymy or not. [Cruse 2011, pp. 138]

- Necessity

First one is necessity. Generally speaking, we can say that some parts are necessary to their whole and on the other hand, there are several parts that are optional. Cruse gives two examples: a beard can be considered as a part of a face, but beard is not necessary feature to face. On the other hand, if think about fingers, they are necessary to hands. This was the example of canonical necessity where a well-formed hand must have fingers. [Cruse 2011, pp. 138]

- Integrality

Second relation is called integrality. This implies that some part are more integral to their whole than others. For instance, *The handle is a part of the door* and *The*

handle is attached to the door, both of the examples sound normal. *The hand is a part of the arm*

and *The hand is attached to the arm* are logical sentences as well. But if we try to reformulate the sentences: *The fingers are attached to the hand* and *The handle is attached to the spoon*, both of the sentences will sound odd. This should show us, that the difference seems to be in the degree of integration of part into whole. [Cruse 2011, pp. 139]

- Discreteness

Following feature explains that “some parts are more clearly divided from their sister parts than others” [Cruse 2011, pp. 139] Of course, if we can detach a particular part without any harm, the division possess no problem. The same thing is with parts, that can move independently of the whole, for example, arm and body. But there some other parts, whose division is not as clear. For instance, the lobe of the ear or the tip of the tongue. [Cruse 2011, pp. 139]

- Motivation

In general, we can state that “good” parts have an important and clear function with respect to their wholes. For instance, door’s handle serves for grasping, opening and shutting the door.

- Congruence

Congruence itself has three more features: range, phase and type. Range: “In many (if not in most) cases, the range of generality of the meronym is not the same as that of the holonym.” [Cruse 2011, pp. 139] Examples: handle – we can we a handle of s knife, handle of s door etc. or leg – a chair has a leg as well as a table. Phase: “Parts and wholes are phase-congruent when, as in prototypical cases they exist at the same time.” [Cruse 2011, pp. 140] Let us take a look at the two examples: *grape juice:wine* or *flour:bread*. It is not completely wrong to say that grape juice is a part of a wine and flour is a part of a bread, on the other hand this does not sound perfectly correct either. In these cases, it is more suitable to talk about ingredients, which will not sound strange at all. Type: “if a part is designated as a mass noun, then the whole should be likewise (? A grain is a part of sand?, ?Wood is part of a table?).” [Cruse 2011, pp. 140] And what about pairs such as vein:hand or nerve:leg. In these cases, we talk about segmental parts (leg or finger) or systemic parts (nerve or vein).

7 Material and methodology

7.1 Material

First, we need to take account of the fact that not only we are trying to translate the specific type of text but also the content is also specific. We are translating typical Czech food, it means that the readers are not familiar with the concept they read.

As we are successively getting to the main point of this diploma thesis, lexical analysis, the most important phenomenon needs to be mentioned. While analysing various types of translations we encountered with various approaches. First approach, for us inapplicable, is simply leaving the name in a source language, which means that we do not find any translation and any explanation of the dish whatsoever. The other approach, selected by restaurant owners or restaurant managers in the Czech hospitality industry, is preserving the Czech name of the dish, but completing it with the explanation. In the

explanation we can find out what type of meat we eat, how was it prepared and sometimes what else is in it, other ingredients. Another approach to the translation is trying to find out the actual name of the dish in English. The last type of translating are literal translations.

The corpus for the thesis is formed by typical Czech dishes which occur on menus throughout the Czech Republic. We did not concentrate on any particular area of our country. Menus were collected randomly from various towns in the Czech Republic (Prague, Brno, Karlovy Vary, Jindřichův Hradec, Zlín, Jihlava, České Budějovice, Pelhřimov, Jičín, Ostrava, Liberec, Olomouc, Český Krumlov, Mariánské lázně). Some of the restaurants were selected on the basis of personal experience others were recommended and the rest of the restaurant menus was discovered on the internet through different search servers. Most of the restaurant specialize in international cuisine, with a few traditional meals on the menu. All of the menus were downloaded from the Internet with the aid of the search engine Google. From these menus the specific naming units were picked for our analysis. We aimed on the following types of typical Czech food.

7.1.1 Soups

When it comes to purely Czech and Moravian soups, they can be divided into two main groups or types according to their consistency. On the one hand, there are broths of various types – we usually prepare chicken, hen, beef or pork broths. On the other hand, there are popular thick, rich soups made from traditional Czech crops. As the typical Czech soups we might consider following: *bramborová polévka*, *zelná polévka*, *česneková polévka*, *dršťková polévka*, *kyselo* and *kulajda*. Unfortunately, the source menus do not offer many translations that we could use in our analysis, nevertheless we are going to take a look at translations which are available.

7.1.2 Main course

Much richer is the offer of Czech main courses and so are the translations, but still it is necessary to mention that the translations are not as common as we might expect. The representatives of typical Czech main courses would be: *svíčková omáčka s knedlíkem*, *hovězí guláš s knedlíkem*, *vepřo-knelo-zelo*, *vepřový řízek*, *smažený sýr*, *plněné ovocné knedlíky*.

7.1.3 Others

There is one specific group which is sometimes included in starters or in a specific section entitled “K pivu”. We can find here meals such as *nakládany hermelín*, *tlačenka* or *utopenec*. There is one more meal, sometimes eaten as a main course, sometimes included in *side dishes*.

7.2 Methodology

The second part of my thesis aims on lexical analysis of English translation of typical Czech dishes. There are all studied restaurants in the table below.

Table 1: The list of analysed restaurants

Abbreviation	Restaurant	Location
BPKV	Becherplatz	Karlovy Vary
BPJH	Bílá paní	Jindřichův Hradec
CHRP	Česká hospůdka na radnici	Plzeň
CLP	Café Louvre	Prague
HSP	Hlučná samota	Prague
UBP	U Bulínů	Prague
UKP	U Klokoně	Prague
SCP	Staré časy	Prague
GRP	Gate restaurant	Prague
UPP	U Pinkasů	Prague
RPDP	Restaurace Profesní dům	Prague
UZKP	U Zlaté konvice	Prague
PP	Provaznice	Prague
DVZ	Dolce Vita	Zlín
LHZ	Lesní hotel	Zlín
RPL	Restaurace Pytloun	Liberec
PL	Plaudit	Liberec
RSL	Restaurace Šnyt	Liberec
MPJ	Mahlerův Penzion	Jihlava
RKCB	Restaurace Kněžínek	České Budějovice
LP	Lucerna	Pelhřimov
MRO	Moravská restaurace	Olomouc
RPO	Restaurace Podkova	Olomouc
RUDO	Restaurace U Dvořáčků	Ostrava
RUPJ	Restaurace U Piráta	Jičín
UVCJ	U všech čertů	Jičín
KDML	Kamenný Dvůr	Mariánské lázně
MMS	Motorest Melikana	Speřice

8 Analysis

Now we can proceed to the analysis itself. As one of the tasks of this diploma thesis is to suggest a correct translation, we shall continue from one dish to another, while performing lexical analysis and comparing different phenomenon of the translation.

8.1 Methods of translation

Since methods of translation or translating itself were not the main objects of the thesis, very little attention will be paid to this topic. Nevertheless, we deal with the translation so we should look at some methods that were used. Very often used method of translation is calque, sometimes called word-for-word translation, for instance, Domáci česnečka/Home-made garlic soup, Utopenec/Drowned man, Moravský vrabec/Moravian Sparrow. Equivalence, for example, is not used at all. One of the reasons is that it is hard to translate, another reason would be that in a text such as menu it would not make sense. However, as an example of an equivalence, we have translation in the fields of expressivity. As we can see, there are lot of Czech names, that are tinged, for instance, *gulášek* which was used two times in our collected menus.

Substitution is used in case of *svíčková*, because in Czech it is an adjective. In English adjective is substituted by *sirloin*, which means by a noun.

8.2 Soups and their history

Brief history of Czech soups is summarized on the website metlife.cz, where we can read, besides other things, that the soup was always considered to be the food of the poor and was mostly the only warm meal of the whole day. Most often soups were cooked only from sauerkraut, carrots or legumes without roux and rarely the soups were thickened with flour. The nutritious soup made of sieved cheese or cottage cheese used to be very popular. Meat broths, which were among the traditional meals of sick, were cooked more festively. From the most famous soups, we can mention: kyselica, Vřidelní polévka, zelňačka, bramboračka or čočková. Unfortunately, we cannot find many of these mentioned soups in the menus translated into English.

Table 2: The list of soups

BPJH	Půlnoční česnečka/Midnight garlic soup
CLP	Silný hovězí vývar s játrovým knedlíkem, masem a zeleninou/Strong beef broth with a liver dumpling, meat and vegetables
BPKV	Silný hovězí bujon z hovězího žebra s játrovými knedlíčky, zeleninou a nudlemi Hearty beef broth made with brisket and liver dumplings, vegetables and noodles Pikantní dršťková s pečenou slaninou a čerstvou majoránkou Spicy tripe soup with roast bacon and fresh marjoram Krušnohorská kulajda s lesními houbami a zastřeným vejcem Ore mountain „Kulajda“, wild mushroom and potato soup with wild egg drop
CHRP	Hovězí vývar s tyrolskými knedlíčky a kořenovou zeleninou/Beef soup with Tirolean liver dumplings and root vegetables
DVZ	Slepičí vývar s masem, zeleninou a nudlemi/ Chicken noodle soup with chicken meat, vegetable and noodles

RPL	Hovězí vývar s játrovými knedlíčky a nudlemi/Beef broth with liver dumplings and noodles Gulášová polévka /Goulash soup
MPJ	Hovězí vývar s domácími nudlemi/Beef broth with home-made noodles Domácí česnečka/Home-made garlic soup
LHZ	Hovězí vývar s játrovými knedlíčky, masovou rolkou a zeleninou julienne/ Beef broth with lovage dumplings, meat roll and julienne vegetables
LP	Bujon (čistý vývar se žloutkem)/Bouillon (meat soup with egg yolk) Hovězí vývar s celestýnskými nudlemi/ Beef soup with noodles Česnečka se sýrem a osmaženým chlebem/ Garlic soup with cheese and fried bread
MRO	Silný drůbeží vývar s játrovými knedlíčky, masem a nudlemi/ Chicken broth with liver balls, meat pieces and noodles Moravská zelňačka s klobásou a zakysanou smetanou/ Moravian sauerkraut soup with sausage and sour cream Hanácká česnečka s uzeným masem a křepelčími vejci/ Haná region garlic soup, with smoked meat and quail eggs Dršťková polévka/ Tripe soup
PL	Hovězí polévka s tyrolským knedlíkem, masem a zeleninou - Beef broth with Tyrolean dumpling, meat and vegetables
RPDP	Drůbeží vývar s kuřecím masem a nudlemi/ Poultry bullion with pieces of chicken and noodles Jezuitský sen - Česneková polévka s vejci, jemnou šunkou a opečeným chlebem/ Jesuit dream - Garlic soup with egg, light ham and toast
RPO	Drůbeží vývar s domácími játrovými knedlíčky, nudlemi a zeleninou/ Chicken stock with meat, noodles and vegetables Moravská česnečka/ Moravian garlic soup
UBP	Drůbeží vývar s masem, noky a zeleninou/ Chicken broth with meat, gnocchi and vegetables
UPJ	Lahůdková česnečka/Delicacy garlic soup Hovězí vývar s domácími nudlemi/Beef broth with homemade noodles
UPP	Pinkasova oblíbená dršťková/ Pinkas popular tripe soup Hovězí vývar s játrovými knedlíčky /Beef broth with liver dumplings and fresh vegetables
RSL	Pravá staročeská česnečka s uzeným masem, sýrem a chlebovými krutony/ Original Czech garlic soup with smoked meat, cheese and croutons Poctivě tažený masový vývar se zeleninou, játrovými knedlíčky a nudlemi/ Honest meat broth with vegetables, liver dumplings and noodles
UVCJ	Kuřecí vývar se zeleninou julienne, domácími nudlemi a kuřecím masem/Chicken broth with vegetable julienne, homemade noodles and chicken meat
UZKP	Silný kuřecí vývar s domácími nudlemi a zeleninou /Strong Chicken Broth with Home-made Noodles and Vegetables Staročeská česneková polévka s topinkou/Old Czech Style Garlic Soup with Toast
KDML	Gulášová polévka/ Goulash soup Česnečka se šunkou sýrem a opečeným chlebem /Garlic soup with ham, cheese, and roasted bread Hovězí vývar s babiččinými nudlemi a masem/ Beef bouillon with grandma's noodles & meat
MMS	Hovězí vývar s játrovou rýží/ Beef broth with liver rice Dršťková polévka/ Tripe soup

8.2.1 Prototype theory

If we look at these examples from the point of view of prototype theory, the prototype of the category soup would be *hovězí vývar s nudlemi/játrovou rýží and dršťková polévka*. On a scale of GOE rating we would find these two around number 1 or 2, as a good example of a category *soup*.

8.2.2 Synonymy

For typical Czech *Hovězí vývar s nudlemi a játrovou rýží* we can find some varieties in translation. The expressions we encountered are: broth, bullion/bouillon, soup and stock and in Czech translation we have: *vývar* which is the most common and then once we can see *polévka* or *bujon*. What is then the correct naming unit and what is the difference among these expressions? Is there a difference? Cambridge dictionary characterizes broth as: “a thin soup, often with vegetables or rice in it, usually made with the liquid in which meat bones have been boiled” [Cambridge online dictionary, online source] Online Etymology dictionary says basically the same thing: "liquid in which flesh is boiled," [Etymology dictionary, online source] Stock is: “a liquid used to add flavour to food, made by boiling meat or fish bones or vegetables in water.” [Cambridge online dictionary, online source] The expression *soup* here is not very suitable, because *soup* stands for any type of soup, because in most dictionaries it is characterized as “liquid food”. In this case, problematic units are broth and stock. They seem interchangeable, but they are not. Now we shall try to compare them and find the difference by using componential analysis. Comparison is made with information obtained from thekitchn website. [online source]

8.2.3 Componential analysis

Table 3: Componential analysis of: broth and stock

	liquid	made by simmering	we simmer meat	cooked under 2 hours	always seasoned	finishes as a thin liquid that does not gel when chilled	can be eaten on its own
broth	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
stock	+	+	-	-	-	-	-

The differences are that we do not simmer meat while doing stock, but we simmer a combination of animal bones. Stock is normally cooked from 2 to 6 hours and it is left unseasoned. Sometimes it can gel when chilled and it should not be eaten on its own – it has no taste. It is used for sauces, gravies, braises, stews and soups.

From the table above can be seen clearly the difference. Strictly speaking *broth* is a synonym to Czech expression *vývar* and it is a type of thin soup made by simmering meat and bones, seasoned and usually served with noodles or liver dumplings.

8.2.4 Hyponymy

The relation of broth and soup is hyponymic, where soup is a hyponym and broth hyperonym. Other hyperonyms would be: potato soup, garlic soup, kulajda and others. Stock, in fact, is not a soup, but a soup can be made of stock. Clearly, stock should not be used in a translation. The best way how to translate Czech “*vývar*” is then “*broth*”. Most of the restaurant did well in this case.

There is a second famous Czech soup and it is *dršťková*. As we can see in the list of soups, all the restaurants translated this term as *tripe soup*, so there was not any problem with translating. The same is with *česnečka/česneková polévka* translated as garlic soup without any hesitation.

Krušnohorská kulajda s lesními houbami a zastřeným vejcem is a soup where the translation of an unknown concept for English speakers is solved by non-translating the name, just giving an idea of ingredients. The result is: *Ore mountain „Kulajda“, wild mushroom and potato soup with wild egg drop*

8.3 Main courses

8.3.1 Prototype theory

From the point of view of prototypes when we say “Typical Czech meal” or “Typical Czech cuisine” the first thing that probably comes to everyone’s mind is “*Svíčková s knedlíkem*” or “*Vepřo-knedlo-zelo*”. These would definitely be marked as very good example or prototype. Not a good example or not example at all could be Apple Strudel, because its origin is Austrian not Czech as many people think. Somewhere on the middle of the scale we could find “*Goulash*”. There is not a foreigner who would not like to taste “typical Czech goulash with dumplings and Czech beer”. However, is it true that goulash is typical Czech meal?

8.3.2 Guláš and its history

We shall now investigate this concept from different points of view. Etymologic dictionary says that goulash is “from Hungarian *gulyáshús*, from *gulyás* “herdsman” +

hús "meat." In Hungarian, "beef or lamb soup made by herdsmen while pasturing." On the website Gastro&hotel profi revue we find a shortened history of this meal. According to the web page, the history of goulash dates back to the 9th century when a herdsman „Gulyás“ prepared his favourite thick meaty soup with onion and pepper. The word goulash is derived from the Hungarian “gulya” (herd of bovine animals), from which the Hungarian name gulyás (with the pronunciation /gujáš/) originated, and the Czech name *guláš* originated from it. The first mention of goulash in Czech countries appeared in the book of Maria Anna Neudecker “Die Bayerische Köchin in Böhmen”. Her "Kolaschfleisch" is the first, outside Hungary, published information about goulash. The famous cookbook of M. D. Rettig mentions goulash in the fourth edition of 1843. Czech chefs are also credited with adding caraway seeds to goulash, because neither Hungarian nor Austrian historical recipes use it. [Gastro a hotel, online source]

Table 4: Guláš and offered translations

BPKV	Pikantní hovězí gulášek s klobáskou, vejcem, cibuli a špekovými knedlíky Spicy beef goulash with sausage, egg, onion and bacon dumplings
CLP	Velký hovězí guláš, karlovarské knedlíky Large beef goulash with Carlsbad dumplings
CHRP	Pižeňský guláš z hovězí roštěné sypaný čerstvým strouhaným křenem, variace knedlíků/Pilsner beef goulash made entrecote with fresh horseradish and fresh red onions, variation of dumplings
GRP	Hovězí gulášek s grilovanou klobásou Beef goulash with grilled sausage
HSP	Hovězí postřížinský guláš na černém pivu (...)/Beef goulash on dark beer (...)
MPJ	Staročeský guláš, houskový knedlík Old bohemian goulash, bread dumplings
KCB	Pivovarský hovězí guláš dušený na našem pivě (...)/Brewery goulash with horseradish (...)
MRO	Guláš pro bojovníka (...) “Goulash for a fighter”
PDP	Hovězí guláš formanský sypaný pórkem/ Wagoner-style Beef goulash sprinkled with leek
UBP	Hovězí guláš/Beef goulash
UDO	Beef goulash/Hovězí guláš
UPP	Pinkasův hovězí guláš/Pinkas beef goulash
UZKP	Pikantní hovězí guláš zdobený cibulkou/Piquant Beef Goulash Garnished with Onions
SCP	Pikantní hovězí guláš/ Picant beef goulash
MMS	Vesnický guláš/Village beef goulash

8.3.2.1 Synonymy

We shall now discuss whether Czech *guláš* and Hungarian goulash might be considered as the same concepts or whether they are different. After studying these two notions, there was one more term which seemed interesting to compare with these two.

In Czech language there is no synonym for Czech *guláš*, it is true, that there are many variations of this dish, usually according to region and different ingredients, but these new names such as *vesnický* (MMS), *Pinkas* (UPP), *Pilsner* (CHRP) or *for a fighter* (MRO) do not change the original name.

Table 5: Componential analysis of Czech *guláš*, Hungarian goulash and porkölt

	Usually beef	stewed	always with dried red pepper	a lot of onion	thick sauce	served with dumplings	caraway seeds added	thicken with onion or flour or both
Czech <i>guláš</i>	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Hungarian goulash	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-
perkelt or porkölt	-	+	+	+	+	-	-	-

Hungarian goulash is rather soup, then sauce, because it contains neither flour for thickening nor onion. Caraway seeds addition was actually Czech invention. Hungarian goulash does not contain any caraway seeds.

One more Hungarian dish was added to the table with the componential analysis, porkölt. In some aspects of the preparation it seems even closer to Czech goulash than Hungarian goulash. It seems, that expressions *guláš* or *goulash* are only, from the linguistic point of view, false friends of Hungarian *gulyásleves*. Because of the popularity of this dish changing the name would not be very convenient. Nevertheless, there should be drawn a line between these two with explanation so that there are not many misconceptions.

8.3.3 *Svíčková* na smetaně s knedlíkem and its history

Svíčková is also a hard nut to crack for translators. Even in our brief corpus of menus we do not see one common way of translating. Fortunately, we cannot see expressions such as “candle sauce” anymore. It is a well-known fact, that the name of this famous Czech meal is derived from the piece of meat from which the sauce is made. Is this theory true? *Svíčková* is mentioned in the famous book and the first cookbook in our

country “Domáci kuchařka” published in 1826, written by Magdalena Dobromila Rettigová.

8.3.3.1 Synonymy

From the point of view of synonymy, in Czech language there is no synonym for *Svíčková na smetaně*. In our menus we can see a big variety of translations. We should not use *Roast beef* for Czech *svíčková*. These two have nothing in common except for beef which is used in both dishes. Some people might have objections to it, but Czech *svíčková* is rather braised than roasted. We shall discover the differences by using componential analysis of these two types of food preparation.

Table 6: Componential analysis of roasting and braising

	in the oven	used with vegetables	used with meat	used with fish	higher temperature	caramelized at the end	start by searing	liquid added
roast	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-
braise	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+

The biggest difference between roasting and braising is addition of liquid. Also, the result is not the same, because by roasting we get caramelized meat or vegetables which is characterized by browned areas on the surface. On the other hand, braised meat might be seared at the beginning before the braising liquid (usually wine, stock or broth) is added.

8.3.3.2 Metonymy

The most frequent translation *sirloin in/on/with cream sauce* seems valid, because English expression *sirloin* perfectly correspond with Czech *svíčková* as a type of meat. The language is constantly evolving, changing, and only after stabilization it is codified. It is also possible to say that Czech *svíčková* is nothing more than metonymy. This would underline the theory that the original *svíčková* was made from part of beef called *svíčková*, the most expensive part of the cow. The extension of meaning would be then carried out from the part of the meat to the whole meal.

However, almost no one use beef sirloin to prepare *svíčková*, moreover even the original recipe did not contain sirloin as well. In fact, the recipe from M. D. Rettig did not even

contain cream or vegetables. Let us say that Rettig presented a kind of early version of our classics, and time took care of its current form.

It remains to be explained why *sirloin* or *svíčková* is the name for this part of the meat. One option is its pointy shape. Another possibility is that it is located in places where there is a lot of tallow, the raw material from which candles were made. A far more elegant explanation will probably be elsewhere. It is said that in the Middle Ages, one of the butcher's master duties was to prepare dinner for journeymen once a year. Dinner took place after the summer holidays when the journeymen returned to the school. The dinner was eaten by candlelight and served regularly with roast beef from under the back. So roast by candlelight, or sirloin roast. [ekniha, online source]

To sum up, it should not have been tried to translate *svíčková*, because it will never be reached the right effect. It is another concept, that does not exist abroad, so it would be considerable to keep its name which will be added with more information about ingredients, serving, eventually type of preparation.

Table 7: Svičková na smetaně s knedlíkem and offered translations

BPKV	Svíčková na smetaně s brusinkovým kompotem a houskovými knedlíky. Beef sirloin in cream sauce with cranberry compote and bread dumplings
CLP	Svíčková na smetaně, brusinkový terč, houskové knedlíky Roast beef on cream, cranberry target, roll dumplings
CHRP	Domáci špikovaná svičková na smetaně s brusinkovým terčem, domácí karlovarský knedlík Homemade larder beef sirloin with cream sauce and cranberries, bun and bread dumplings
GRP	Svíčková na smetaně s brusinkami a houskými knedlíky Beef sirloin in cream sauce with cranberries and bread dumplings
HSP	Hovězí svičková na smetaně s žemlovým knedlíkem podávaná s brusinkovým terčem Traditional marinated beef tenderloin with dumplings
RPL	Svíčková na smetaně s brusinkami a šlehanou smetanou, domácí houskový knedlík Fillet of beef with cream sauce with cranberries and whipped cream, homemade dumplings
PP	Svíčková na smetaně... s brusinkami a houským knedlíkem /Tenderloin with cream sauce... served with cranberries and bread dumplings
MPJ	Domáci svičková na smetaně, houskový knedlík Homemade sirloin on cream, bread dumplings
MRO	Svíčková na smetaně s citronem a brusinkami, houskové a hrnkové knedlíky Beef sirloin in cream with lemon and cranberries, bread and "cup" dumplings
PDP	Hovězí svičková na smetaně, houskové knedlíky, brusinky, citrón Beef sirloin with cream sauce, bread dumplings, cranberries, lemon
UBP	Svíčková na smetaně s brusinkami, karlovarské knedlíky Braised beef in cream sauce, with cranberries, carlsbad dumplings
UDO	Svíčková na smetaně, houskový knedlík Roasted sirloin of beef with traditional Czech cream sauce, bread dumplings and cranberries
UPP	Staročeská svičková s brusinkami, houským a karlovarským knedlíkem Old Bohemian beef in cream sauce with cranberries and bread dumplings
UVCJ	Svíčková ze špikované jelení kýty s domácími houskými knedlíky a s terčem z citronu, šlehačky a brusinek

	Deer haunch with creamy vegetable sauce served with homemade dumplings, decorated with slice of lemon, cream and cranberries
UZKP	Svíčková na smetaně s brusinkami a houskovým knedlíkem Beef Sirloin in Cream Sauce with Cranberries and White-bread Dumplings
SCP	Svíčková hovězí pečeně na smetaně s brusinkovým terčem a houskovým knedlíkem Beef in cream-vegetables sauce, cranberries, bread dumplings
KDML	Svíčková na smetaně, houskový knedlík Sirloin in sourcream sauce, bread dumplings
MMS	Svíčková na smetaně Sirloin in cream sauce

8.3.3.3 Czech knedlík

In the table above we can see 17 different names for Czech *svíčková*. Obviously even in the Czech Republic the name or the description of this dish is not united. Despite the fact that we get the same thing each time we ask for *svíčková*, different restaurants choose different translations. Now, we shall look at the typical Czech side dish *knedlík*. Traditionally, *svíčková* is served with *knedlík*, *plátek citrónu* (slice of lemon) and *brusinkový kompot* (canned cranberries). Czech dumpling has become very well-known phenomenon of Czech cuisine, nevertheless the expression dumpling is definitely not the same thing as Czech *knedlík*.

Cambridge dictionary says about *dumpling*, that it is: “a small ball of dough (= flour and water mixed together), cooked, and eaten with meat and vegetables” This description does not correspond very much with our (Czech) concept of dumpling, but rather to what we know as *Italian gnocchi*. It is good to specify what kind of dumpling we get. Czech restaurateurs choose to take one part of it and use it in a name, such as *bread dumplings* (used five times) or *white-bread dumplings*, *roll dumplings* (used once), *bun and bread dumplings* (used once).

8.3.3.3.1 Hyponymy

In the Czech language we may find hyponymic relations between the previous mentioned notions. We shall now look at these relations in detail.

Knedlík is a hyperonym for the following hyponyms. *houskový knedlík*, *bramborový knedlík*, *ovocný knedlík*, *karlovarský (hrníčkový knedlík)*, *špekový knedlík*. *Knedlík* does

not represent a specific type of this side dish. It is only a generic term, which comprises all the mentioned notions.

The following division is just to have an idea, it should not be taken too seriously, because as we could see *Czech knedlík* is not the same thing as *dumpling*, but let us look at the following hyponymic relation anyway. Basically the relations are the same as for the Czech terms. *Dumpling* is a hyperonym for hyponyms *bread dumplings*, *white-bread dumplings*, *roll dumplings*, *bun* and *bread dumplings*.

The expression *homemade dumplings* does not belong to the group of hyperonyms, because the notion “homemade” does not say anything about the type of dumpling, it just says that it was prepared at home and it is actually another problem.

For Czech “domáci” we should not use English “home-made” (or “homemade”), because it implies that it was made at home, but it is not true. The chef definitely did not cook the dumpling at home, he did it in the restaurant. A correct expression would be “home-style”.

In case of Czech *knedlík*, which is an unknown concept abroad, we could recommend usage of Czech term *knedlík*, with additional explanation → it is a boiled flour side dish (with bread). We should avoid using terms *roll* or *bun*, because it would not be very helpful, on the contrary it might cause even more confusion on the ground of using two more unknown concepts.

8.3.4 Moravský vrabec and its history

Another typical Czech dish, which really comes from our country is Moravský vrabec. Its history dates back to the 19th century. Nevertheless, the origin of its name is rather unclear, and its history is not easy to find. There is one reference on the web site of Metro newspaper. It says that etymologist Rejzek believes that this food was somehow more typical of Moravia, such as Moravian smoked meat. Often there is a word *brabec* on the menus instead of *vrabec*. "Its designation *Moravský* is not related to the initial B. As the Czech language atlas states, the appearance of *Brabec* shows the greatest territorial expansion: it occupies the whole of Bohemia and West Moravia with enclaves in Olomouc and Kromeriz." says etymologist Valčáková. And *vrabec* (in English *sparrow*) because small pieces resemble small birds. Sometimes in the Czech Republic the dish was called *dráčci* (in English *little dragons*). [Metro, online source]

The synonymy of Czech names is here a little richer than in previous cases. In Czech language we can say Moravský vrabec, vepřo-knedlo-zelo/knedlo-vepřo-zelo (order is not important) or vepřové výpečky s knedlíkem a zelím. All these naming units represent one famous Czech dish.

Table 8: Moravský vrabec, its variations and English translations

BPKV	Pivovarští vepřoví vrabčáci s dušeným špenátem, bramborovou roládou a cibulkou Brewer's fried pork mince with stewed spinach, potato roll and onion
BPJH	Staročeská vepřová pečeně, bramborový knedlík, kysané zelí Old Bohemian roast pork served with potato dumplings, cabbage
MPJ	Moravský vrabec (houskový/bramborový knedlík, zelí/špenát) Moravian parrot (bread-, potatoe dumplings, cabbage, spinach)
KCB	Pečené vepřové maso, zelí, variace knedlíků Roasted pork neck, sauerkraut, various kinds of dumplings
PL	Staročeská vepřová pečeně, houskové knedlíky, dušené zelí Old Czech roast pork, bread dumplings, steamed cabbage
UDO	Vepřový vrabec, zelí, bramborový knedlík Roasted pork pieces, cabbage and potato dumplings
PP	Vepřo, knedlo, zelo... roku 1993 prohlášeno za gastronomickou a kulturní památku "Vepřo, knedlo, zelo" Roast pork with potato dumplings, sauerkraut
UPP	Pečený vepřový vrabec s dvoubarevným zelím a variací knedlíků Baked pork with two-color cabbage and Bohemian dumpling variety
SCP	Vepřová pečínka s bramborovým knedlíkem a zelím Roasted pork, potatoe dumplings, cabbage
MMS	Moravský vrabec, houskový knedlík, dušené zelí Moravian sparrow, bread dumplings, cabbage stewed

Literal translation appeared in two restaurants first is MPJ, where there is also a spelling mistake, so the name of the dish is completely incomprehensible, and the second restaurant is MMS. This type of word-for-word translation is unsuitable because translating unknown concept into another foreign language makes it perhaps even more obscure.

Five restaurants (BPJH, KCB, PL, UDO and SCP) opted for an option *roast pork* or *roasted pork*, one restaurant (UPP) opted for *baked pork* and one (BPKV) for *fried pork*. To see the difference and to decide which of the options is the best one, we shall again use the componential analysis, where we are going to analyse these three types of preparing food: roasting, baking and frying.

Table 9: Componential analysis of roasting, baking and frying

	roasting	baking	frying
occurs in the oven	+	+	-
dry-heat method	+	+	-
fry or deep fry	-	-	+
hot oil	-	-	+
vegetables	+	-	+
meat	+	-	+
pies, cookies, cakes	-	+	-
maintains its structure	+	-	+
new food is produced	-	+	-
items are coated in breadcrumbs	-	-	+

There are several important differences in the table above. For instance, frying is the only process that is done on top of the cooker or in an electric fryer, whereas both baking and roasting are done in the oven. Another big difference is, that while we are baking, we are producing a new food. We mix several ingredients together and put it in the oven, after the process is done, are getting a new food, a new structure. On the other hand, while roasting or frying, the structure is maintained.

It is now obvious from the above table, using terms such as *baked* or *fried* does not correspond to the type of preparation of *Moravský vrabec*, because we neither bake it nor fry it. The only possibility is then roast or roasted pork. *Knedlíky* will not be discussed at this part, because they have already been discussed. However, there is one more thing that can cause problems when translating this dish and it is *zeli*. For this

expression we have got two translations offered, one of them is *cabbage*, which was used seven times and *sauerkraut*, which was used once. According to Cambridge dictionary cabbage is: “a large, round vegetable with large green, white, or purple leaves that can be eaten cooked or uncooked” on the other hand sauerkraut is: “cabbage that has been cut into small pieces and preserved in salt”. Sauerkraut can be then stewed together with onion and caraway seeds. We can say that *cabbage* is a part of a side dish *sauerkraut*.

Based on the previous analysis, the translation that should be used for this Czech dish is *roasted pork with sauerkraut*. This translation seems to be the most suitable and understandable from the point of view of SL and TL.

8.3.5 Czech řízek

The next item which will be discussed is *kuřecí* or *vepřový* – *chicken* or *pork* – the meat is not very important, *řízek*. A simple combination of meat, flour, egg and breadcrumbs almost conquered the world. What is its history? Not only website risky.cz, but also many other websites tell a short story about a prominent Austrian-Hungarian commander, Marshal Josef Václav Hradecký who was that time in Venetian hotel, where he tasted *řízek* for the first time. The cutlet was coated in a mixture of beaten eggs, breadcrumbs and parmesan. J. V. Hradecký was so enthusiastic about the food that he immediately sent a courier with a recipe to the chief cook of František Josef I. However, the cook found no parmesan in the imperial kitchen, so he decided to coat the slice of meat only in breadcrumbs. Nevertheless, the emperor enjoyed it and the cutlet has been on all festive tables ever since.

Table 10: Smažený řízek and translations offered in English

BPJH	Čerstvý kapr smažený v bylinkové strouhance, bramborový salát/Carp schnitzel with culinary herbs, potato salad Smažené vepřové řízečky, bramborový salát/Pork schnitzel, potato salad
CHNRP	Smažený řízek z vepřové krkovičky v pikantní strouhance/Fried pork neck schnitzel coated in spicy breadcrumbs
DVZ	Řízky z kuřecích prsou/Chicken breast schnitzel Řízky z vepřové panenky/Pork tenderloin schnitzel
HSP	Řízečky z vepřové panenky s brusinkami a lehkým bramborovým salátem/ Fried pork schnitzel with typical potatoe salad

RPL	Smažený vepřový řízek z krkovičky s domácím bramborovým salátem/Fried pork cutlet of pork with homemade potato salad Smažený kuřecí řízek s bramborovou kaší a okurkovým salátem/Chicken fried steak with mashed potatoes and cucumber salad Smažený vepřový řízek z kotlety s vařeným petrželkovým bramborem/Wiener schintzel, parsley potatoes
MPJ	Smažený kuřecí řízek/Fried chicken steak Smažený vepřový řízek/Fried pork schnitzel
KCB	Kuřecí řízek, bramborová kaše, kečup/Chicken schnitzel, mashed potatoes, ketchup
LP	Smažený kuřecí řízek/Fried chicken steak
MRO	Smažené řízečky z vepřové panenky, bramborová kaše, okurkový salát/Fried pork schnitzel, potatoe mashed with cream, cucumber salad
PL	Smažené kuřecí prsíčko se smetanovou bramborovou kaší/Fried chicken breast with creamy mashed potatoes
RPO	Smažené řízečky z vepřové krkovičky/Fried Sirloin Schnitzels
UPP	Smažený kuřecí řízek se šťouchanými brambory/Fried chicken breast served with mashed potatoes
UPJ	Smažený řízek (kuřecí, vepřový)/Fried steak (chicken or pork)
RSL	Smažený řízek z kuřecího nebo vepřového masa v trojobalu, zdobený citrónem/Chicken fried steak or pork, garnished with lemon
UKP	Smažené kuřecí prso/Fried chicken breast
UZKP	Smažený vepřový řízek s bramborovým salátem/Filet of Pork Fried with Potato Salad
KDML	Smažený kuřecí řízek, vařený brambor, obloha/Fried chicken steak, boiled potato, garnish Smažený vepřový řízek, obloha/Fried pork schnitzel, garnish
MMS	Kuřecí prsa smažená/Fried Chicken breast Vepřový řízek smažený/Fried Pork schnitzel Vepřový řízek smažený XL/Pork steak fried XL Vepřový řízek smažený XXL/Pork schnitzel fried XXL Řízečky z vepřové panenky/Pork roast beef

8.3.5.1 Synonymy

In Czech language there are no synonyms for *řízek*. In English menus we shall see some varieties. The translation of the menus offers following possibilities: *schnitzel* is used by eleven out of eighteen restaurants. Schnitzel from the point of view of etymology means: “veal cutlet, 1854, from German Schnitzel "cutlet," literally "a slice," with -el, diminutive suffix + Schnitz "a cut, slice" (+ -el, diminutive suffix)”, Cambridge dictionary says that is is: “a thin slice of meat, usually veal (= young cow) that is

covered in egg and very small pieces of bread before being fried” These two explanations of the meaning seem to be very close to each other. Both of them agrees on basic characteristics of the *schnitzel* or Czech *řízek*. *Řízek* is basically the same thing, but in the Czech Republic, we do not use veal so often. Thus, while using these two terms to substitute each other, we have to be careful about mentioning the type meat from which Czech *řízek* is made of. But in this case, as we can see, there is no problem with defining the meat, because also in the Czech Republic we have to each type specify what kind of *řízek*, from what type of meat, we want.

However, other terms appear in our table, not only *schnitzel*. These other terms are: *Fried steak* is mentioned seven times, *fried breast* five times, *fried cutlet* once and *filet* also once. Even though these expressions might sound synonymous, because all of them represents a slice of meat, we should examine them more in depth.

Table 11: Componential analysis: schnitzel, steak, cutlet, breast, filet

	schnitzel	steak	cutlet	breast	filet
a slice of meat	+	+	+	-	+
refer to a boneless meat	+	+	+	+	+
covered in eggs and breadcrumbs	+	-	-	-	-
fried	+	-	-	+	-
done on the grill	-	+	+	+	+
boiled	-	-	-	+	-
roasted	-	-	-	+	+

These item differe from each other form the very begging. Schnizel is very different from the rest of the items, because it can only be fried and it is always covered in breadcrumbs. For example, breast can be on the other hand prepare by my different types of cooking. It can be boiled, roasted, braised, fried, deep-fried while covered in breadcrumbs and we can make a schnitzel of filets of it, because it is a whole part of

animal flesh. To decide whether a cutlet is covered in breadcrumbs or not was quite difficult, because it is not always covered in breadcrumbs, but usually it is.

We can infer, from what we can see in the table, that the most suitable term for Czech *řízek* is *schnitzel*. All these words have a different relation between them, but not synonymy. *Breast*, *chicken breast* or *fried chicken breast* does not really imply, that the piece of meat was sliced or coated in breadcrumbs. It is a piece of animal flesh which can be sliced, dusted with flour and coated in eggs and in breadcrumbs, but the expression *breast* does not say it itself. *Filet* is just a generic name for a slice of meat. It must have been mentioned as in the previous case, that the filet is dusted with flour and coated in eggs and in breadcrumbs. The notion *fried filet* represents rather a slice of meat put into the pan or deep fryer. Finally, the expression *steak*. As we can see in the table above, steak is never either fried or deep fried, so substitution of Czech *řízek* by *steak* is very unsuitable.

Among these expressions, we can obviously find synonymic relations, but not as it is implied in the menus. *Steak*, *filet* or *cutlet* are not synonyms neither of *schnitzel* nor Czech *řízek*. But we can say, that *steak*, *filet* and *cutlet* are synonymic in a sense of a *slice of meat*.

There is more expression not fitting to any of the mentioned groups. The restaurant MMS translated Czech notion *Řízečky z vepřové panenky* as *Pork roast beef* which is logically impossible. These two elements have opposite meaning, because if something is pork, it cannot be beef at the same time. Also, if the original name is *řízek*, the notion *roast* is certainly not possible either, simply because *řízek* is always fried or deep-fried, but to roasted.

Recommended translation would be *pork schnitzel*, *chicken schnitzel*, *veal schnitzel*. Which means that we used the term *schnitzel* with the type of meat that was used.

8.3.6 Others – tlačenka, utopenec, kynuté knedlíky

The last group of words is kind of a mixture, because its particular elements were not mentioned so often in the menus, so that they would deserve their own group. We can find here two dishes usually marked as starters in Czech restaurants and one main main course.

Table 12: List of other Czech dishes

BPKV	Utopené špekové buřtíky s cibulí/Pickled bacon sausage with onion Domácí vepřová tlačěnka s cibulí a octem/Home-made brawn „Tlačěnka“ with onion and vinegar
CHRP	Pikantní marinovaní utopeneci s cibulí/Piquant marinated sausage with vinegar and onion
HSP	Domácí tlačěnka od našeho řezníka s octem a cibulí Traditional czech pork sausage terrine (pickled)
RPL	Domácí utopeneci s cibulkou a čerstvou feferonkou/Homemade pickled sausages with onions and fresh chilli
LHZ	Homemade yeast dumplings stuffed with seasonal fruit, coated in a sweet crust, vanilla egg yolk sauce/Domácí kynuté knedlíky plněné sezónním ovocem, obalované ve sladké krustě se žlutkovou vanilkovou omáčkou
LP	Pickled sausage/Utopenci
RSL	Velký domácí bramborák plněný (...)/Large domestic potato pancake stuffed with (...) Velký domácí bramborák s grilovanou zeleninou/Large homemade potato pancake with grilled vegetables
UKP	Tlačěnka s octem a cibulkou/Pudding with vinegar and onion
PP	Utopenec 1 ... než ho to potkalo, chodil k nám na pivo/ “Drowned man”... one piece of pickled sausage Tlačěnka s cibulkou a octem... tlačěnku občas potřebujeme všichni/Czech porkpie served with minced onion and vinegar

8.3.7 Utopenec and its origin

The origin of the famous Czech speciality is unknown. There is a legend about Utopenec’s origin and it says that a landlord and miller Šamánek from Beroun region said that he began to preserve the sausages in an acidic brine a century ago. At the beginning there were only sausages, but over time he added onions and other ingredients. No wonder his pub became renowned. But he ended badly - perhaps drowned while repairing the mill wheel. Czechs are masters of black humor, so they started calling his specialty a drowned man. There is no evidence that the story is true, but it is probably only source of information about this Czech speciality with a strange name. [Chrudimka, online source]

8.3.7.1 Synonymy

The expression *utopenec* can be without any problems replaced by *nakládáné buřty* or even better *buřty s cibulí* or *vuřty s cibulí*. *Vuřt* is a synonym for *buřt*. All three expressions have the similar meaning. Nevertheless, *nakládáné buřty* and *buřty s cibulí* are more descriptive and not

so common. Czech people mostly use the expression *utopenec*. There is one more expression in Czech which could be taken into consideration and it is *špekáček*. However, opinions on the synonymy of *buřt* and *špekáček* differ. On the one hand, Czech slovník cizích slov states that *buřt*, *vuřt* and *špekáček* are synonymous. On the other hand, there is an article in which the owner of a family business warns the consumers to be careful about these two notions. “Although they are experienced as synonyms the legislation does not regulate them in any way”.

Concerning the English translation, there is no specific name for this another typical Czech concept, unknown abroad. Most of the restaurants dealt with the translation by using the term *pickled* which is suitable. However, the following term *sausage*, has not a similar meaning as our Czech *buřt* or *vuřt*. Because sausage is “a thin, tube-like case containing meat that has been cut into very small pieces and mixed with spices” (dictionary.cambridge.org), but *buřt* or *vuřt* is described as a smoked product in a shape of short thick cylinder.

The most acceptable translation would be leaving the Czech name of the dish and adding an explanation. Czech “Utopenec” Pickled sausage with onion and vinegar

8.3.8 Tlačenka s cibulí

Pieces of meat soured in jelly or aspic. The word *tlačenka* itself is derived from the verb *tlačit* (push or press). Chopped or sliced meat was mixed with jelly and pressed into a pork stomach. The name *tlačenka* was not used until the beginning of the 20th century.

8.3.8.1 Synonymy

For Czech *tlačenka*, there are no synonyms available. By contrast, English *brawn* and *pudding* are sometimes considered to be synonyms. In our menus we can see different types of naming units: *brawn “Tlačenka” (BPKV)*, *Traditional czech pork sausage terrine (pickled) (HSP)* which makes no sense at all. We can see words such as pork, sausage and terrine but altogether this translation makes no sense. There is the word *terrine*, which is probably mistaken for Czech *tlačenka*. *Pudding with vinegar and onion (UKP)*, *Czech porkpie (PP)*.

Table 13: Componential analysis: brawn, terrine, pudding, porkpie

	brawn	terrine	pudding	porkpie
meat only from the head of a pig	+	-	-	-
contains pork meat	+	+	+	+
contains vegetable	-	+	-	-

contains fish	-	+	-	-
boiled	+	-	-	-
baked	-	-	+	+
baked in a water bath	-	+	-	-
pressed	+	+	-	-
pastry	-	-	+	+
rectangular shape	-	+	-	-
served cold	+	+	-	+

Neither these four analysed naming units are synonyms. They differ in many various aspects, so they should not be interchanged. For example, brawn contains only meat from a pig's head while the other dishes might contain pork too, but not specifically meat from a head. There are also various types of preparation, for instance, terrine is only prepared in a water bath. Pudding is served hot and is eaten immediately, while the rest is served and eaten cold.

The closest to our Czech *tlačěnka* is probably the expression *brawn*. Nevertheless, we should not interchange these two either, because they are not absolute synonyms.

The most suitable translation would be *Brawn "Tlačěnka" with onion and vinegar*.

8.3.8.2 Hyponymy

From the point of view of hyponymy a hyperonym for *tlačěnka* would be *pig-slaughtering product*, because *tlačěnka* is only made when a pig is slaughtered. It used to be a famous occasion in the Czech Republic, but this tradition is in decline last years.

9 Conclusion

The aim of the diploma thesis was to carry out a lexical analysis of a translation of typical Czech dishes from Czech language into English. The analysis was carried out on the basis of the menus gathered from different restaurant throughout the Czech Republic without any specific requirements about locality or region.

The translations should have been studied from many points of view and from many aspects of English lexicology. The assumption was that restaurants simply take the Czech name and while translating they keep the original name, while applying word-for-word translation. Fortunately, it turned out that this phenomenon is gradually disappearing. One of the reasons could be free accessibility of quite good online translators, another reason could be better education in English language.

In the theoretical part, methods of translation were mentioned, and we also came across the term of untranslatability and translating culturally specific features. Food as part of a particular culture was discussed. As we are dealing with the typical Czech food and its translation into different language, all these points of view are necessary to know and to think of them thoroughly.

From the translations that we could see in previous chapters, the restaurants are trying to find a good balance between the economy of writing on the one side, and transparency on the other side. Nevertheless, the right combination of these two seems to be unachievable. Either they vote for economy and saving space in the menu by translating unknown concepts for foreigner visitors, or they choose a transparency as a best way how to treat their customers. It means, they could keep the original Czech name (translation might be added), but mainly there will be an explanation joining the name of the dish. In case, the additional translation is carried out well, of course.

Through the menus, we can see a wide range of misuse of synonyms that actually are not synonyms, such as *steak*, *filet*, *cutlet* or *schnitzel* in English. We also encountered mistaking concepts of Czech expressions for English ones, thinking the meaning is the same in both languages. For instance, in Czech we can say *péct maso* (**bake meat*), but after carrying out the componential analysis, it turned out, that in English we never use a verb *bake* for *meat*.

One of the most surprising and most confusing notions was *Svíčková na smetaně*. *Svíčková* appeared as an untranslatable expression, because even the Czech sources do

not say with certainty, how the name of this famous dish emerged. There are two theories. First one is not 100% applicable, because *svíčková* is not made of beef sirloin and have never been. Second theory is not very plausible, because we do not possess any credible basis for the story with eating by candles.

At the end of each chapter, the translation suggestion was made. In most of the cases I was inclined to transparency of translating, which means keeping the Czech name and adding the explanation – what the particular dish is composed of. It will be understandable, and it helps to maintain and share our culture too.

To sum up, translating of typical Czech dishes is not recommended, because it does not bring anything to the reader of the menu. In a moment when he is not familiar with the culture and different concepts of a particular country, literal translation without further notes is not acceptable. On the other hand, leaving the Czech name without explanation is not a good way how to deal with this problem either. A good way how to deal with the translation of the menu would be to mention original name of the particular dish, of course, a translation can be added, but one thing we should not omit is explanation in TL.

10 References

Primary sources:

Cruse, Alan. *Meaning in language: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011. Print.

Lipka, Leonhard. *An Outline of English Lexicology: Lexical Structure, Word Semantics and Word-Formation*, 2nd ed. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1992. Print.

Peprník, Jaroslav. *English Lexicology*. 3rd ed. Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého, Filozofická fakulta, 2006. Print.

Secondary sources :

Bellos, David. *Is That a Fish in Your Ear? The Amazing Adventure of Translation*. London: Penguin Books. 2011. Print.

Knittlová, Dagmar. *K teorii i praxi překladau*. Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci, Filozofická fakulta, 2000. Print.

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

Monografie

Online sources:

Newmark, Peter. *A textbook of translation*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press, 1987. [online source]

<https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/92e2/f88b6338e190fe71246b2c468748b880f6d6.pdf>

Palmer, Catherine. *From Theory To Practice: Experiencing the Nation in Everyday Life*. Journal of Material Culture. 1998 [online source]

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/249631596_From_Theory_To_Practice_Experiencing_the_Nation_in_Everyday_Life

Cambridge online dictionary: <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/>

Online etymology dictionary: <https://www.etymonline.com/>

Gastro a hotel: (<https://gastroahotel.cz/rubriky/gastro-travel/historie-gulase/>) [online source]

Jakobson, Roman. *On Linguistic Aspects of Translation* [online source]

<https://archive.org/details/OnLinguisticAspectsOfTranslation>

Benjamins, John. *Towards the Theory of Metonymy* [online source]

https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Guenter_Radden/publication/284894262_Towards_a_Theory_of_Metonymy/links/565ef91908aefe619b27564d/Towards-a-Theory-of-Metonymy

<https://www.thekitchn.com/whats-the-difference-between-stock-and-broth-word-of-mouth-71199>

<http://www.e-kniha.com/proc-se-svickova-nazyva-svickova.html>

<https://www.livestrong.com/article/463506-what-is-the-difference-between-baking-roasting-searing-boiling-braising/>

https://www.metro.cz/kde-se-vzala-jmena-jidel-rusove-sve-vejce-neznaji-spancele-zase-ptacka-lik-praha.aspx?c=A121106_172930_metro-extra_rab

<https://www.chrudimka.cz/domaci-utopenci>

List of the menus:

BPKV https://becherplatz.cz/sites/default/files/becherplatz_jidelni_listek_2018.pdf

BPJH <https://www.hotelbilapani.cz/en/menu/>

CLP <https://www.hotelbilapani.cz/en/menu/>

CHRP <http://www.hospudkanaradnici.cz/new2016-2/jidelni-listek-komplet.pdf>

HSP <http://www.hlucna-samota.cz/nase-menu/>

UBP <http://www.ubulinu.cz/jidelnilistek.php>

UKP http://uklokone.cz/?page_id=1640

SCP <http://www.starecasy-praha.cz/jidelni-listek/en/>

GRP <http://www.gate-restaurant.cz/en/menu-restaurace-gate>

UPP <http://www.upinkasu.com/pe-menu/>

RPDP <https://www.profesnidum.cz/menu-standard.htm?lang=en>

UZKP

https://www.ukonvice.cz/upload/150929_U%20Zlate%20Konvice_menu%20podzim%202015.pdf

PP <https://www.uprovaznice.cz/en/our-menu/cold-delicacies/>

DVZ <http://www.dolcevita-zlin.cz/nase-nabidka/>

LHZ <https://www.lesni-hotel.cz/en/restaurant/daily-menu/>

RPL <http://en.restaurace-pytloun.cz/restaurant>

PL <https://plaudit.eu/getFile/case:show/id:36500??>

RSL http://www.snyt-liberec.cz/menu_en/

MPJ <http://www.mahleruvpenzion.cz/en/menu>

KCB <http://www.knezinek.cz/en/menu/>

LP http://www.penzionlucerna.cz/nabidka/lucerna-stala_nabidka_en.pdf

MRO <http://www.moravskarestaurace.cz/menu>

RPO <http://www.udvoracku.cz/#menucard>

UPJ https://www.upirata-jicin.cz/menu_en/

UVCJ <http://www.uvsehcertu.com/restaurace-jicin-ubytovani-cesky-raj-prachovske-skaly/menu>

KDML http://www.kamennydvur.info/upload/menu_aj-2019.pdf

MMS <https://melikana.cz/en/menu/>