



## POSUDEK OPONENTA DIPLOMOVÉ PRÁCE

---

Studijní obor: **Překladařství anglického jazyka – překladařství francouzského jazyka**

Název práce: **The Problem of Translation Equivalence: Analysis of the Czech Translation of the Book *The President is Missing* by Bill Clinton and James Patterson**

Autorka práce: **Mgr. Bc. Sabina Štěpánková**

Vedoucí diplomové práce: **Mgr. Helena Lohrová, Ph.D.**

Oponent diplomové práce: **Mgr. Petr Kos, Ph.D.**

---

### Short characteristics of the thesis

The thesis analyses translation errors in the Czech version of the book *The President is Missing* written by Bill Clinton and James Patterson. The author first provides a theoretical introduction into Translation quality assessment, outlines the methodology used in the thesis, and then discusses individual errors in the translation on the basis of criteria set by Baker (2011).

### Overall assessment

The work is readable, and its structure is clear. It brings an interesting insight into the typology of problems that translators may encounter from which certain types of mistakes arise.

My major reservation concerns the goal the author has set. The work, as such, provides individual examples of mistakes in the given translation on the basis of the given classification. However, I believe that the goal could have been set higher as individual chapters, and examples provided, allow for a more in-depth analysis and finer classification of errors and their causes. In further discussion, I will confine myself mainly to the first two chapters of the analysis, namely Lexical Equivalence and Equivalence above the word level.

These two chapters are further subdivided according to the semantic areas of the errors, specifically whether they deal with terms from politics or not. However, there appears to be little validity in such a division, especially since other criteria go unnoticed, such as errors in translating non-existing concepts (such as *impeachment*) or those based on the lack of knowledge of the source language (for example, false friends, such as *agenda*). Individual chapters thus make an impression of a list of random errors rather than systematic analysis within each section.

The further sub-classification could be based on different criteria, such as

a) the typology of mistakes (e.g., false friends (*agenda*, p. 31), misinterpretation (*girls*, p. 35), inconsistency (*impeachment*, p. 28-30)

b) possible causes of mistakes (e.g., a lack of knowledge of the environment described, a lack of knowledge of SL, a lack of sensitivity in TL, wrongly chosen strategy, inadvertence)

c) the seriousness of the mistakes (some mistakes lead to incomprehensibility of the translated text whereas others are mere stylistic slips).

Of course, such criteria could also be combined.



Such a finer classification could lead to a better understanding of errors made in translations in general, and the work could thus provide a useful manual for future translators on what to pay attention to while translating.

The focus of the work on random individual examples rather than on some emerging tendencies is also apparent from the missing overall evaluation of the typology provided.

The fact that the author provides her own alternative solutions to the mistakes is definitely an asset, and it leads to a better understanding of the phenomena described. However, the alternative solutions are clear in unquestionable mistakes, but in cases when the translator possibly merely used a different translation strategy, such alternative solutions raise further questions. For example, for "lows lower than a snake's belly" (p. 50) the author suggests a solution using the Czech geographical term "Macoča", which could be misleading for a book set in an American context. To provide but one more example, namely the excerpt based on the English idiom "to make a mountain out of a molehill" (p. 49): even though it is not clear from the translator's strategy that it is based on an idiom, the passage appears to be meaningful and perhaps more apt than the suggested solution. It would then be beneficial for the work if the author's translation strategies in providing both the criticism of the original translation and the alternative solution were described and justified.

Despite my comments mentioned above, I believe the work has fulfilled its original goal and meets the criteria for a successful thesis.

Práci doporučuji k obhajobě.

Navrhovaná klasifikace: **velmi dobře**

23. 8. 2021

Datum

Podpis