

## SYNTACTIC CONSTANCY OF ADVERBIALS BETWEEN ENGLISH AND CZECH

Libuše Dušková

0. The present paper is a contribution to a more extensive study concerned with interlingual constancy of clause elements.<sup>1</sup> The study was undertaken on the assumption that syntactic structure is hierarchically subordinate to the information structure (functional sentence perspective, FSP henceforth) insofar as the latter is governed by the principle of end focus, which is assigned universal validity. The languages under study, English and Czech, qualify as suitable samples on the ground of representing different language types, analytic vs. synthetic inflecting, respectively, with different hierarchies of the word order principles: whereas English word order primarily serves to indicate grammatical functions, the primary word order principle in Czech is compliance with the basic distribution of communicative dynamism, i.e. presenting the information structure according to the gradual increase in the information load (communicative dynamism) with the focal element (the rheme) at the end.<sup>2</sup> Given the general validity of the principle of end focus (final position of the rheme), the two languages may thus be expected to display some instances of the same ordering of corresponding lexical items (semantic elements), but construed in different syntactic structures where mere reordering of the sentence components is not feasible in English. The limitation to some instances has to be made with respect to the fairly common occurrence in English of thematic elements after the rheme (cf. Dušková 1999b).

0.1 The first clause element studied with a view to ascertaining its degree of interlingual constancy was the subject (cf. Dušková 2003). Commencing the study with this clause element was motivated by notable differences between the two languages as regards its syntactic and FSP features. While the English subject, as a result of the grammatical function of word order, is largely confined to initial or preverbal position, and is hence prevalently thematic, the beginning of the sentence being the position of the theme, the Czech subject can occur at any place in the sentence according to its

---

<sup>1</sup> For interlingual constancy on the level of word classes, see KLÉGR (1996). One of the aspects dealt with in his monograph, which addresses the noun, concerns the non-correspondences between Czech nouns and their English equivalents in syntactic function, among them the syntactic correlates of the Czech adverbial (pp. 106–114).

<sup>2</sup> For the FSP concepts employed in the present study, see FIRBAS (1992).

degree of communicative dynamism, not excepting the final position. Consequently, rhematic subjects are more frequent in Czech than in English (cf. Dušková 1986). The initial study was thus prompted by the assumption that Czech rhematic subjects in final position might correspond to English final rhematic elements syntactically consistent with the postverbal position, viz. objects, adverbials or other complements of the verb, and this assumption was largely confirmed.

0.2 In the case of adverbials the situation is different. Being largely mobile also in English, they are disposed to occupy positions according to their degree of communicative dynamism in both languages. However, as regards English, this applies only to adverbials of certain semantic roles, while others, notably temporal and partly locative, tend to favour customary word order arrangements subsumable under grammatical ordering, which may deviate from the gradual increase in communicative dynamism. Moreover, linearity alone does not constitute the functional sentence perspective, but has to be considered in connection with the other FSP factors, semantic structure, contextual boundness (context dependence) and intonation (in speech). All this suggests a different, more intricate pattern of correspondences and divergences involving additional factors and perhaps excluding some which play a role in the case of the subject.

1. The present study is confined to adverbials realized by adverbs, noun phrases and prepositional phrases. Clausal and nonfinite verb forms of realization were excluded on the ground of presenting essentially different problems calling for separate treatment. The only exception was made in the case of the rare occurrence of these forms as translation counterparts of adverbials realized by adverbs, nouns or prepositional phrases in the original texts. Furthermore, the aim of the present study ruled out the inclusion of sentence modifiers as elements standing outside the syntactic relations established within the sentence. Accordingly, the adverbials under study comprise only elements integrated into the syntactic structure of the sentence (referred to as adjuncts and subjuncts in Quirk et al. 1985: 504–612; circumstance adverbials and adverbs modifying adjectives and other adverbs in Biber et al. 1999: 544–556; cf. also Huddleston and Pullum 2002, Chapter 8).

The procedure adopted was the same as in the study of the subject so that comparable results might be obtained. Eight parallel texts, two English and two Czech originals + their translations in the other language (see Sources) were excerpted for both corresponding and divergent adverbials until the number of divergent adverbials in each of the original texts reached fifty. The number of corresponding adverbials needed for the fifty divergent instances served as the measure of constancy. In this way a sample of 200 examples was obtained, 100 divergent instances in the English-Czech direction and 100 in the Czech-English.<sup>3</sup> With a view to the aim of the study, care was taken to base the data only on examples whose lexical elements had equivalent counterparts in the other language, i.e. instances of free translation were left out of account.

---

<sup>3</sup> The data for the Czech-English part were collected in two seminar papers supervised by the present writer: VLADIMÍRA KOUBOVÁ, "Větněčlenská konstantnost příslovečného určení mezi češtinou a angličtinou" (Syntactic constancy of adverbials between English and Czech), Department of English and American Studies, Charles University, Prague 2002; JANA KOMÁRKOVÁ, "Constancy of Syntactic Function", Department of English and American Studies, Charles University, Prague 2000.

The counting of instances with adverbial function in both languages raised a number of questions whose solution had to be applied consistently in order to ensure identical treatment of analogous data. To begin with, only those adverbials were counted which had a counterpart in the other language, i.e. untranslated adverbials, as well as adverbials added in the translations were disregarded. Integrated adverbials included in the count comprised not only those functioning as clause elements but also those occurring within the structure of phrases as modifiers or intensifiers, e.g. *gratuitously spiteful*, *very odd*. Coordinated adverbials were counted as one instance, e.g. *with the permission and advice*. In general, the corresponding adverbials included in the count had the same semantic role, except a few instances, e.g. *She now asked a question*. (F, p. 52) *Jenom se na něco zeptala* (Ž, p. 52). In the case of borderline instances between adverbials and other clause elements, notably objects and postmodification, the usual criteria were applied (the question test, passivization, word order rearrangement). Even so, some instances remained indeterminate. For the procedure adopted in the case of adverbs homonymous with particles constituting components of phrasal verbs, see 2.4.

A special problem was presented by clusters of adverbial expressions in regard to whether each adverbial should be counted separately or not. This was the case in sentences containing more than one temporal and/or locative expression, such as *It fell about her knees to the ground* (J, p. 29), counted as two adverbials (*about her knees* direction, *to the ground* ultimate location). On the other hand, the temporal expressions in instances like *It was beached as usual at the bottom of Tanner's Lane at five o'clock yesterday afternoon* (J, p. 32) were regarded as one adverbial since the time *when* is successively specified by all three components, in a way resembling restrictive modification.

The results of the count are presented in the Tables below.

Table 1 English counterparts of Czech integrated adverbials

	Kundera Žert (K1)		Kundera NLB (K2)		total	
	abs.	%	abs.	%	abs.	%
adverbials	579	92.1	1129	95.8	1708	93.95
non-adverbial counterparts	50	7.9	50	4.2	100	6.05
total	629	100.0	1179	100.0	1808	100.00

Table 2 Czech counterparts of English integrated adverbials

	Fowles (F)		P.D. James (J)		total	
	abs.	%	abs.	%	abs.	%
adverbials	644	92.8	754	93.8	1398	93.3
non-adverbial counterparts	50	7.2	50	6.2	100	6.7
total	694	100.0	804	100.0	1498	100.0

Three of the four samples show a comparable degree of adverbial constancy, two in the English-Czech direction (92.8 and 93.8) and one (K1) in the Czech-English direction (92.1). The higher adverbial constancy in sample K2 (95.8) is probably due to differences in the analytic procedures, texts K1 and K2 having been analysed by two different students (see Note 3). Significant differences in the author's language and/or the translating procedure are not likely because the two texts were written by the same author and translated by the same translator.

As compared with the constancy of the subject, adverbial constancy appears to be lower: 93.95% in the Czech-English direction and 93.3% in the English-Czech direction, whereas the constancy of the subject was found to be 95.65% and 96.15%, respectively (cf. Dušková 2003).<sup>4</sup> Although this difference plays a role with respect to the two clause elements in question, it appears insignificant in view of the typological distinctions between English and Czech, since both the constancy of the subject and that of the adverbial are found to be very high. This is to be attributed to the appurtenance of both languages to the Indo-European language family, which conduces to a basically identical word class system and syntactic structure.

2. The lower degree of adverbial constancy as compared with the subject appears to reject the assumption that the greater freedom in the placement of English adverbials may counteract syntactic divergence. However, an explanation will follow from the discussion of Tables 3 and 4, which list and classify the divergent counterparts.

*Table 3* Divergent syntactic counterparts of Czech integrated adverbials

	K1		K2		total	
	abs.	%	abs.	%	abs.	%
subject	6	12.0	12	24.0	18	18.0
object	25	50.0	19	38.0	44	44.0
premodifier	8	16.0	15	30.0	23	23.0
postmodifier	2	4.0	–	–	2	2.0
inclusion in the verb	3	6.0	2	4.0	5	5.0
verb	1	2.0	–	–	1	1.0
subject complement	4	8.0	1	2.0	5	5.0
other	1	2.0	1	2.0	2	2.0
total	50	100.0	50	100.0	100	100.0

When compared with analogous data obtained for the subject (presented in Dušková 2003), Tables 3 and 4 suggest that the factors contributing to the lower syntactic constancy of the adverbial are to be sought in the representation of the premodifier in the Czech-English direction (Table 3) and in the group 'inclusion in the verb' in the

<sup>4</sup> KLEGR's data for syntactic constancy between Czech adverbials and their English counterparts (1996, p. 107), which are based on realization forms containing a noun, show an even lower percentage, viz. 82.4.

Table 4 Divergent syntactic counterparts of English integrated adverbials

	Fowles		P.D.James		total	
	abs.	%	abs.	%	abs.	%
subject	8	16.0	18	36.0	26	26.0
object	11	22.0	9	18.0	20	20.0
premodifier	5	10.0	10	20.0	15	15.0
postmodifier	3	6.0	–	–	3	3.0
inclusion in the verb	18	36.0	11	22.0	29	29.0
verb	3	6.0	1	2.0	4	4.0
other	2	4.0	1	2.0	3	3.0
total	50	100.0	50	100.0	50	100.0

English-Czech direction (Table 4). Whereas here these two categories rank high on the frequency scale (the premodifier as the second with 23% and inclusion in verbal meaning as the first with 29%), in the case of the subject these correspondences are lacking. More insight into the causes of the differences will be gained from a discussion of the particular divergent counterparts.

2.1 Starting with the most frequent divergent syntactic counterpart in the Czech-English direction, the object (44%), we largely find what appears to be a purely superficial change consisting in different verbal government, but in fact reflects the basically different character of the Czech and the English verb: whereas Czech has an intransitive verb followed by an adverbial, English displays a transitive verb with object complementation. The change is illustrated by example (1), other instances of this kind being *odejít z Prahy* [leave from Prague] > *leave Prague*, *odejít od někoho* [leave from somebody] > *leave somebody*, *vstoupila do mlhy* [she-entered into mist] > *she entered a mist*, *hladit (někoho) po hlavě* [stroke (somebody) on head] > *stroke (somebody's) head*, *nasednout do vlaku* [board into train] > *board the train*, *telefonovat do nemocnice* [telephone into hospital] > *ring up the hospital*, *být/potulovat se na ulici* [be/roam in street] > *roam the streets*, *chytit (někoho) za ruku* [seize (somebody) by hand] > *seize (somebody's) hand*, and the like.

1. Stoupali jsme po úzkém schodišti. K1, p. 14

[We-climbed on narrow staircase]<sup>5</sup>

We climbed a narrow staircase. H1, p. 4

As shown by the example, both the Czech adverbial and the English object occur in final position, with the FSP function of rheme. The syntactic divergence is not due to FSP, but neither does it have any effect on FSP, the two syntactic structures displaying analogous (basic) distribution of communicative dynamism with the theme at the beginning and the rheme at the end.

Among instances of this kind we also find word order arrangements, fairly common in English, with a thematic element following the rhematic object, due to the grammatical

<sup>5</sup> Czech examples are provided with word-for-word translations for the sake of readers unfamiliar with Czech.

principle; here the FSP function of the last element is indicated by its anaphoric nature signalling context dependence. Compare the Czech and English word order in exx (2) and (3).

2. A pak jsem se k němu otočil zády. K1, p. 11

[And then /auxiliary/ /reflexive particle/ to him turned back<sub>instrumental</sub>]

... turning my back on it. H1, p. 2

3. Byla jsem u něho celou hodinu. K1, p. 28

[I-was /auxiliary/ with him whole hour]

I spent a full hour with him. H1, p. 18.

However, these instances do not affect the correspondence in FSP between the Czech adverbial and the English object: they merely demonstrate the primary function of the grammatical principle in English.

In the English-Czech direction the correspondence between adverbials and objects ranks third on the frequency scale (20%), i.e. it is by more than a half less frequent than in the opposite direction. The emerging patterns are less clearcut, some of the examples being individual solutions allowing no generalizations. The correspondence was also more difficult to determine since the borderline between objects and adverbials is sometimes indeterminate.

Two types of correspondence between English adverbials and Czech objects account for a half of the examples. The first again represents differences in verbal government, cf. ex (4):

4. not a single servant had been sent on his, or her (...) way. F, p. 52

ani jeden sluha nebo služka nedostal nebo nedostala (...) výpověď. Ž, p. 51

[not-even one man-servant or maid-servant got ... notice]

The second type involves different expression of the possessive relationship: a prepositional phrase introduced by *with* in English against the Czech verb *mít* 'have' with object complementation, cf. ex (5).

5. But now, with luck, it was promising to be quite an exciting holiday. J, p. 18

kdýž bude mít štěstí, zažije dovolenou pěkně vzrušující. N, p. 221

[when he-will have luck ...]

The correspondences found in the remaining examples of this group derive from a more or less inexact lexical equivalent of the headword and occur only once or twice. Compare ex (6):

6. along the half-mile that runs round a gentle bay to the Cobb proper. F, p.58

po stezce dlouhé asi půl míle, která sleduje mělkou zátoku až k Valu. Ž, p. 57

[... which follows shallow bay as-far-as to Cobb]

As regards the functional sentence perspective, the divergent syntactic counterparts have the same FSP function as the adverbials in the original, but again the linear order may differ in the placement of another element (a thematic element at the end in English). Compare the analogous word order in the foregoing examples (4)-(6) with the order of elements in (7):

7. Miss Sarah was present at this conversation. F, p. 52

Slečna Sarah byla té rozmluvě přítomna. Ž, p. 52

[Miss Sarah was that<sub>dative</sub> conversation<sub>dative</sub> present]

Evidently what has been said about the role of FSP in the case of the correspondence adverbial > object in the Czech-English direction applies here as well.

2.2 Counterparts of adverbials construed as premodifiers rank second in the Czech-English direction (23%, see Table 3) and fourth in the English-Czech direction (15%, see Table 4) on the frequency scale. The 5 instances of postmodification will also be considered to complete the picture. The correspondence between a Czech adverbial and an English premodifier predominantly displays the following pattern:

8. a) A mírně pootočila křeslo. K1, p. 17

[And gently she-turned chair]

She gave the chair a gentle turn. H1, p. 8

b) Pak jsme si chvíli povídali. K1, p. 15

[Then /auxiliary/ /reflexive particle/ while<sub>noun</sub> we-chatted]

Then we had a short chat. H1, p. 5

c) Pohlédl na mne dotčeně. K1, p. 13

[He-looked at me affrontedly]

He gave me an irritated look. H1, p. 3

The Czech structure contains an adverbial modifying the verb, whereas the English construction is verbonominal: the verb is dissociated into the categorial and notional component, with the latter, an action noun, construed as the object. As a result, the modifier assumes the form and function consistent with a noun head. From the FSP point of view, the three examples listed under (8) are illustrative in showing the inflexibility of the English construction in comparison with the variability in Czech. Admittedly, even English can achieve parallel indication of the FSP structure by resorting to the verbal construction, but either the translator is not aware of the subtle distinctions signalled by the variations in the Czech word order, or the verbonominal construction is such an obvious counterpart as to be employed almost automatically.

All three examples listed under (8) display the usual Czech FSP structure with the rheme at the end. From the aspect of the order of the other elements, a perfectly fitting counterpart is provided in (8) b. In (8) a. the FSP of the English sentence differs from the Czech original: in the latter the rheme is the *chair*, in the former a *gentle turn*. In (8) c. a more common linear arrangement in Czech would be *Dotčeně na mne pohlédl* [Affrontedly at me he-looked]. However, wherever the manner adjunct is placed, thanks to its almost general context-independence it is more dynamic than the verb (cf. Firbas 1992: 53), hence both Czech configurations basically display the same FSP structure, even though a manner adverbial in the final position is more dynamic than at the beginning. The FSP structure of the English verbonominal constructions is remarkably similar in that the lexical counterparts of the Czech verb and adverbial, the English object action noun and its adjectival modifier, occur at the end with the FSP function of rheme, within which the modifier is more dynamic than the head noun (see Firbas 1992: 84 for the FSP of the noun phrase). Nevertheless, the motivation of this syntactic divergence can be attributed to FSP only partly as the verbonominal construction primarily serves as a means of *aktionsart* (singling out one act of verbal

action as against its unsegmented presentation by the verbal predication) and of facilitating modification and quantification where the verb does not lend itself to these processes easily.

Other examples of this correspondence obtained from the two sources, with different positions of the Czech adverbial, are *Hlasitě se rozesmála* [loudly /reflexive particle/ she-began-laugh] > *She burst into loud laughter, lekla se najednou* [she-scared /reflexive particle/ suddenly] > *she had a sudden scare, odcházela často na záchod* [she-left often to toilet] > *she made frequent trips to the toilet, smály se úplně stejným smíchem* [they-laughed /reflexive particle/ completely same<sub>instrumental</sub> laugh<sub>instrumental</sub>] > *they laughed the same laugh, některá udělala dřep špatně* [one did kneebend badly] > *one of us did a bad kneebend, několikrát telefonoval* [several-times he-called] > *he made several telephone calls* and the like.

In the English-Czech direction the correspondence between adverbials and premodifiers is less frequent (15%). It again displays one predominant distinct pattern due to a different headword. The correspondence is illustrated by ex (9).

9. Maurice was always very odd and secretive, of course. J, p. 30

Maurice byl vždycky velký podivín a tajnůstkář. N, p. 232

[Maurice was always great eccentric<sub>noun</sub> and secretive<sub>noun</sub>]

Unlike the original, in which the adverbial intensifies predicative adjectives, the translation employs copular predication with predicative nouns modified by an adjectival modifier, i.e. the lexical content of the subject complement is preserved, albeit in a different surface form.

English adverbials reflected in Czech adjectival premodifiers were found as components of different syntactic functions, cf. exx (10) and (11).

10. The servants were permitted to hold evening prayers in the kitchen, under Mrs Fairley's eye and briskly wooden voice. F, p. 54

Služebnictvu se dovolovalo obdývat večerní modlitby v kuchyni za lhostejného dozoru paní Fairleyové a při zvuku jejího úsečného neohebného hlasu. Ž, p.53

[... by sound {her brisk wooden voice}<sub>genitive</sub>]

11. But alas, what she had thus taught herself had been very largely vitiated by what she had been taught. F, 50

Ale naneštěstí to, co se sama naučila bylo do značné míry pokaženo tím, co ji učili. Ž, p. 49

[... was to large extent vitiated ...]

Other examples of this type are *we are very worried* > *mám velkou starost* [I-have great worry], *the style is completely bogus* > *ten styl, to je vyslovený humbug* [that style, it is utter humbug], *its highly fossiliferous nature* > *jeho mimořádná vhodnost k uchování otisků* [its extraordinary suitability to preservation imprints<sub>genitive</sub>] and others.

In all these instances the syntactic divergence involves only the internal structure of a clause element, not a divergence in a clause element as such. As regards the FSP, the FSP function of both the English and the Czech construction is subject to the FSP function of the headword, within whose distributional subfield the component



adverbial+adjective in English / adjective+noun in Czech displays parallel distribution of communicative dynamism.

As regards adverbials reflected in postmodification (2 instances in the Czech-English direction and 3 in the opposite direction), the correspondence was difficult to determine owing to the ambiguity of certain syntactic positions, in particular the position after the object, which may be occupied, besides postmodifying structures with the object as head, by two separate clause elements, adverbial or object complement. Here the boundary especially between adverbials and postmodification sometimes remains indeterminate as a result of their gradient nature. Cf. ex (12), which allows two or more interpretations, largely depending on extralinguistic factors.

12. she seemed to forget Mrs Poulteney's presence, as if she saw Christ on the Cross before her. F, p. 54

...jako by viděla Krista před sebou na kříži. Ž, p. 53

[... as if she-saw Christ before her on cross]

The most likely interpretation of the first prepositional phrase is postmodification, the unity of the concept being indicated by the capital C of the cross. However, from the structural point of view adverbial interpretation is not ruled out. The second prepositional phrase may modify the cross or have the function of locative adverbial with equal plausibility. Occasionally the problem is solved in the translation by a change in the word order, as is the case here. The reordering of the two prepositional phrases is partly justified by the thematic function of the PrepP *before her*. On the other hand, adverbial interpretation of the first PrepP leaves room for doubt.

The 5 adverbials with postmodifiers as counterparts, included in the number of divergent instances, are illustrated by exx (13) and (14).

13. It was, in short, a bargain struck between two obsessions. F, p. 59

Byla to zkrátka dohoda mezi dvěma posedlostmi. Ž, p. 59

[Was it in-short bargain between two obsessions]

In the original the PrepP complements a verb, which is left out in the translation, hence the PrepP becomes directly dependent on the noun.

Similarly in the opposite direction, cf. ex (14)

14. Rozplakala jsem se štěstím. K1, p. 24

[I-began-cry /auxiliary/ /reflexive particle/ joy<sub>instrumental</sub>]

I cried tears of joy. H1, p. 14

2.3 The next correspondence according to the frequency of occurrence concerns adverbials rendered as subjects (18 Czech-English instances, and 26 English-Czech). In the former direction, this correspondence is the third most frequent, in the latter it ranks even higher as the second. In both directions a large majority of all instances displays a clearcut pattern illustrated by the examples listed under (15).

15. a) V těch pauzách byla celá hrůza, která ... K2, p. 70

[In those pauses was all horror which befell ...]

Those pauses contained all the horror that ... H2, p. 71

- b) Z hadic tryskala rozprašovaná voda na trávník. K2, p. 77  
 [From hosepipes jetted sprinkled water on lawn]  
The sprinklers were spouting jets of water over the lawn. H2, p. 79
- c) Na dvou židlích seděli mužové. K1, p. 16  
 [On two chairs sat men]  
Two chairs were occupied by men. H1, p. 6

Here Czech thematic adverbials in initial position have English counterparts that preserve both the initial position and the thematic function, but diverge syntactically in being construed as subjects. Czech intransitive verbs are largely replaced by English transitive counterparts allowing the subject construction of the Czech adverbial. Ex (15) c. illustrates this correspondence with a concomitant change in voice. In general, the syntactic divergence results in a sentence structure which also complies with the grammatical rules of English word order. Here the role of FSP as the motivating factor of the syntactic divergence is self-evident.

As regards the Czech subject equivalents of English adverbials, again a distinctive pattern emerges, which is found in more than two-thirds of the examples. In all these instances the English adverbial, mostly a *by*-agent or quasi-agent, complements a passive verb, stands in postverbal position and constitutes the rheme or a component of the rheme. The structure is rendered by the active voice in Czech with the adverbial reflected in the subject, which preserves both the final position and the rhematic function. Compare the examples presented under (16).

16. a) He found himself greeted only by that lady. F, p. 43  
Uvítala ho pouze tato dáma. Ž, p. 41  
 [greeted him only this lady]
- b) the air was torn by the scream of engines J, p. 10  
 vzduch rozdrásalo ječení motorů N, p. 212  
 [air<sub>accusative</sub> tore scream<sub>nominative</sub> engines<sub>genitive</sub>]
- c) the salt tang borne to him on the wind J, p. 14  
 slaná příchut' vzduchu, kteřou k němu přinášel vítr, N, p. 217  
 [salt tang air<sub>genitive</sub> which<sub>accusative</sub> to him brought wind<sub>nominative</sub>]

The remaining instances, illustrated by (17) a. and b., present the same pattern without a change in voice, i.e. a final or postverbal rhematic adverbial in English vs. an intransitive verb followed by rhematic subject at the end.

17. a) Mrs Poulteney ... realized Sarah's face was streaming with tears. F, p. 54  
 Paní Poulteneyová ... spatřila, že po Sařině obličej tečou proudem slzy.  
 Ž, p. 53  
 [on Sarah's face streamed tears]
- b) Such an effect ... sprang from a profound difference between the two women. F, p. 54  
 Tento důsledek ... působil rozdíl mezi oběma ženami. Ž, p. 53  
 [This effect<sub>accusative</sub> caused difference<sub>nominative</sub> between both women]

There were two instances of thematic adverbials, one in final and the other in initial position, which were both reflected in initial thematic subjects in Czech, cf. exx (18) a. and b.

18. a) There was nothing new to him in this. J, p. 12  
 Ale to pro něj nebylo nic nového. N, p. 214  
 [But this for him not-was nothing new]
- b) Here had been contrast indeed. J, p. 21  
Tohle byl věru pořádný kontrast. N, p. 223  
 [This was indeed great contrast]

In the English-Czech direction the syntactic divergence cannot be ascribed to FSP. In all instances the preservation of the rhematic function of the adverbial, involving final position, can be achieved by imitating the syntactic structure of the English sentence. Where the FSP function of the English adverbial is thematic, again the syntactic function can be preserved, with one constraint on the position: the theme cannot stand at the end.<sup>6</sup> The largest group of examples, in which the syntactic divergence is accompanied by depassivization, is due to the nature of the Czech passive and its status in the Czech verb system. Noting only features important from the contrastive point of view, the Czech participial passive is much rarer than the English passive, besides being marked as formal, while the reflexive passive as a rule does not allow the expression of the agent. Some of the other examples, as (17) a., show a difference in verbal government (here Czech does not allow the concomitant subject construction of the locative element). The changes in (18) a. and b. may be connected with the use of the verb *být* 'be'.

2.4 The last group of adverbials whose rendering in the other language is represented by a sufficient number of examples to display a distinctive pattern<sup>7</sup> comprises adverbials with no separate counterpart as a component of the sentence structure. The adverbials are expressed only within the morphosemantic structure of the verb into which they are incorporated. This correspondence, rare in the Czech-English direction (5 instances), ranks first (29 instances) from English to Czech (see Tables 3 and 4). As was mentioned in 2., inclusion of the English adverbial into the meaning of the Czech verb accounts for the lower degree of syntactic constancy of adverbials as compared with the subject. The notable difference between English and Czech in this respect is to be ascribed to the analytic vs. synthetic character of the two languages.

Identification of instances of this group involved drawing a line between phrasal verbs and free combinations of verb + adverb. In this procedure the usual tests were employed (semantic criteria and word order tests, cf. Quirk et al. 1985: 1152–55).

The 5 instances of this correspondence from Czech to English show that Czech occasionally displays analytic and English synthetic features, cf. ex (19).

<sup>6</sup> In sentences with objective word order in Mathesius' terms (MATHESIUS 1975: 83–84), i.e. unmarked sentences free of emotive or emphatic features.

<sup>7</sup> The only other sparsely recurrent correspondences were adverbial > subject complement in the Czech-English direction (5 instances), and adverbial > verb from English to Czech (4 instances, see Tables 3 and 4). The former correspondence appears to be due to the choice of a more idiomatic rendition, cf. *Začal se ke mě chovat jako kdysi dávno* (K1, p. 21) [he-began /reflexive particle/ to me behave like once long-ago] — *He was his old self again* (H1, p. 11). An example of the latter is *Up this grassland she might be seen walking, with frequent turns towards the sea* (F, p. 58) — *Bývalo ji vidět, jak jde po travnatém svahu a často se otáčí směrem k moři* (Z, p. 58) [it-was-usual her see as she-walks on grassy slope and often /reflexive particle/ turns towards to sea].

19. Znovu se oženil. K1, p. 13  
 [Again /reflexive particle/ he-married]  
 He had remarried. H1, p. 3
20. Zvedl jsem oči vzhůru. K1, p. 16  
 [I-raised /auxiliary/ eyes upwards]  
 I raised my eyes. H1, p. 7

In (20) the upward direction is also expressed by the verb in Czech, which alone may serve as a counterpart of the English *raise*.

The 29 instances of this correspondence from English to Czech are illustrated by (21) a., b., c., d. Of these, types b. and c. were found to be the most frequent.

21. a) the dinghy ... swung slowly round J, p. 10  
 loďka ... zvolna se otáčela N, p. 212  
 [dinghy ... slowly /reflexive particle/ turned]
- b) ... when his new book comes out. J, p. 30  
 ... až vyjde jeho nová kniha. N, p. 232  
 [... when out<sub>prefix</sub> goes his new book]
- c) Alice Kerrison ... bounced down from her seat J, p. 19  
 Alice Kerrisonová ... seskočila z kozlíku N, p. 221  
 [Alice Kerrisonová down<sub>prefix</sub> jumped from buggyseat]
- d) ... they are always difficult to find. F, p. 44  
 ... bývá velmi obtížné je najít. Ž, p. 42  
 [... it-is-usually<sub>suffix</sub> very difficult them find]

Being incorporated in the verb, the adverbial also shares its FSP function. Thus in d. it is a constituent of the typical FSP function of the verb, the transition, while in a. *round*, the rheme proper of the English sentence, occurs as a component of the rheme proper constituted by the verb *se otáčela*.

2.5 In the observations on FSP as a factor involved in the different types of syntactic noncorrespondences discussed in 2.1–2.4, the particular syntactic divergence has been generally found to accord with the basic distribution of communicative dynamism (CD), i.e. the element affected by the divergence appeared in a position consistent with its degree of CD. This finding appears to confirm the assumption on which the study of interlingual syntactic constancy is based, viz. the subordinate status of syntactic structure with respect to the FSP (information) structure. Strictly speaking, what is involved in the syntactic divergences under discussion is not the FSP as such but the basic distribution of CD, i.e. the order theme — transition — rheme (or in the rheme-oriented terms the principle of end focus). However, for conveying the same FSP structure neither in the original nor in the translated text is the basic distribution of CD necessary. This of course applies primarily to English: here instances of thematic elements in final position were noted in exx (2) and (3) (cf. also ex (7), which shows this difference in linear arrangement in the opposite English-Czech direction). Another instance of deviation from the basic distribution of CD is illustrated by ex (22).

22. Napravo od ní se svažoval k hladině břeh zarostlý travou a plevelem. K1, p. 33  
[On-right from it /reflexive particle/ sloped to level (=of water) bank  
overgrown grass<sub>instrumental</sub> and weed<sub>instrumental</sub>]  
To the right of the path a mixture of grass and weeds sloped down to the level  
of the water. H1, p. 22

Like exx (2) and (3), ex (22) has a contextually bound thematic element at the end (cf. the medial position of this element in the Czech original), but unlike these examples, in which the rheme occurs in the final (postverbal) position, it has the rheme, realized by the subject, in preverbal position. As a result, the basic distribution of CD is reversed: rheme — transition — theme. Apart from the transition, constituted by the verb, the only element occurring in the position consistent with its degree of CD is the initial thematic adverbial, which connects the sentence with the preceding text. The configuration rheme — transition — theme constitutes one of the forms of the presentation scale (cf. Firbas 1992, pp. 66–68; Dušková 1998). An instance of this form of the presentation scale was also found in the English original, cf. ex (23). Its Czech counterpart expectedly displays the basic distribution of CD (Th — Tr — Rh).

23. and dreadful heresies drifted across the poor fellow's brain F, p. 46  
a jeho mozek počaly pokoušet kacířské myšlenky Ž, p. 44  
[and his brain<sub>accusative</sub> began tempt heretic thoughts<sub>nominative</sub>]

Another instance of a different linear arrangement in the two languages is illustrated by (24). Here, however, the FSP appears to be changed. The sentence is given with its foregoing context (in square brackets) to show the interplay of all the factors determining the FSP functions in written language, context dependence, semantic structure and linearity.

24. [Tomáš si tehdy neuvědomoval, že metafory jsou nebezpečná věc.  
S metaforami není radno si hrát.] Láska se může narodit z jedné metafory.  
K2, p. 15  
[Love /reflexive particle/ can be-born from one single metaphor.]  
[Tomas did not realize at the time that metaphors are dangerous. Metaphors are  
not to be trifled with.] A single metaphor can give birth to love. H2, p. 10

As the context shows, *metaphor* is a context-dependent element, while *love*, even if occurring in the more distant context, is less recoverable and hence more dynamic. Nevertheless, the Czech sentence presents it in the theme, the rheme being constituted by the final adverbial consisting of a context-dependent noun and a new element, the rheme proper, in premodification. In the English translation, the FSP of the sentence consistent with unmarked intonation, i.e. with the nucleus (intonation centre) on the last element, presents *metaphor* as the theme and *love* as the rheme. Whether the translator misinterpreted the FSP of the Czech sentence or relied on contrastive stress on the subject for the interpretation, the result is infelicitous: in the former case there is a different focus, while the latter relies on immediate recoverability of *love* from the preceding context. As shown by the preceding context, however, *love* is not mentioned in the immediately preceding sentences.

However, these are rare exceptions. In general, what has been observed as the outcome of the syntactic divergence with respect to FSP is the achievement or preservation of the basic distribution of CD, which is significant mainly in the Czech-English direction. In Czech this is the primary word order principle in general. As far as English is concerned, syntactically divergent translation counterparts resulting in the basic distribution of CD testify to the universality of the principle of end focus and to the subordinate status of syntactic structure.

3. To conclude by summing up the principal findings of the foregoing discussion, the greater mobility of adverbials in English does not appear to dispose them to a higher degree of syntactic constancy as compared with syntactic constancy of the subject. The causes thereof are to be sought in the divergent syntactic counterparts specific to adverbials. In the Czech-English direction it is the noun modifier, predominantly the premodifier, in the opposite direction inclusion of the adverbial into the morphosemantic structure of the verb. These two types of correspondence account respectively, for 23% and 29% of all syntactically divergent instances. As counterparts of the subject, these correspondences have not been found.

As regards the role of FSP as a motivating factor of the syntactic divergence, three variables were considered: syntactic structure, FSP structure and linear arrangement.

Syntactic structure affected by FSP was found in the Czech-English direction in the case of Czech initial thematic adverbials reflected in English initial thematic subjects. Without the syntactic divergence the English sentence structure would deviate either from the grammatical word order or from the basic distribution of CD. As a result of the syntactic divergence it complies with both. In the case of the other syntactically divergent English counterparts of Czech adverbials, the syntactic divergence affects neither the FSP function of the respective element, nor its position, but largely preserves both. In the type of correspondence Czech adverbial > English object the divergence consists in different verb valency reflected in different verbal government. Similarly Czech adverbials corresponding to English premodifiers, mostly found in English verbonominal constructions, again display analogous FSP functions and linear arrangement.

In the English-Czech direction, syntactic divergence serving to achieve basic distribution of CD is not needed since FSP is the primary word order principle, and sentence elements can be linearly rearranged by mere movement. The ascertained correspondences between English adverbials and their Czech nonadverbial counterparts partly reflect systemic differences between the two languages, notably in the status and employment of the passive, partly derive from the synthetic character of Czech as opposed to the analytic character of English, as shown by incorporation of the meaning expressed by a separate English adverbial into the morphosemantic structure of a Czech verb. Moreover, they reveal minor tendencies favouring structures with nonadverbial components which call for further research.

## Sources

- John FOWLES [F], *The French Lieutenant's Woman*. Triad, Granada 1983 (1st ed. 1969), pp. 43–63.
- John FOWLES [Ž], *Francouzova milenka*. Translated by Hana Žantovská. Edice Máj, Mladá fronta, Smena, Naše vojsko, 1976, pp. 41–63.
- P.D. JAMES [J], *Unnatural Causes*. Sphere Books, London 1984 (1st ed. 1967), pp. 9–30.
- P.D. JAMES [N], *Z příčin nikoli přirozených*. Translated by J.Z. Novák. In *3x Adam Dalgliesh*, Odeon 1986, pp. 211–232.
- Milan KUNDERA [K1], *Žert*. Atlantis, Brno 1966, pp. 11–33.
- Milan KUNDERA [H1], *The Joke*. Translated by Michael Henry Heim. Harper and Row, New York 1984, pp. 1–22.
- Milan KUNDERA [K2], *Nesnesitelná lehkost bytí*. Sixty-Eight Publishers, Toronto 1985, pp. 14–77.
- Milan KUNDERA [H2], *The Unbearable Lightness of Being*. Translated by Michael Henry Heim. Faber and Faber, London 1999, pp. 9–79.

## References

- BIBER, D., S. JOHANSSON, G. LEECH, S. CONRAD, E. FINEGAN (1999), *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. London: Longman.
- DUŠKOVÁ, L. (1986), "A note on the Thematic Character of the Subject in English in Comparison with Czech" in *Prague Studies in Mathematical Linguistics* 9, Prague: Academia, pp. 92–105. Reprinted in Dušková 1999a, Chapter 33.
- (1998), "Syntactic Forms of the Presentation Scale and their Differentiation". *Linguistica Pragensia* 8, pp. 36–43.
- (1999a), *Studies in the English Language*. Part 2. Karolinum, Prague: Charles University Press.
- (1999b), "Basic Distribution of Communicative Dynamism vs. Nonlinear Indication of Functional Sentence Perspective" in E. Hajičová et al. (eds.), *Travaux du Cercle linguistique de Prague* n. s., *Prague Linguistic Circle Papers* 3, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 249–261.
- (2003), "Constancy of Syntactic Function Across Languages" in J. Hladký (ed.), *Language and Function: To the Memory of Jan Firbas*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 127–145.
- FIRBAS, J. (1992), *Functional Sentence Perspective in Written and Spoken Communication*. Cambridge: University Press.
- HUDDLESTON, R. and G.K. PULLUM (2002), *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: University Press.
- KLÉGR, A. (1996), *The Noun in Translation*. Karolinum, Prague: Charles University Press.
- MATHESIUŠ, V. (1975), *A Functional Analysis of Present Day English on a General Linguistic Basis*. Prague: Academia.
- QUIRK, R., S. GREENBAUM, G. LEECH and J. SVARTVIK (1985), *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.

### Syntaktická konstantnost příslovečného určení mezi češtinou a angličtinou

#### Résumé

Článek je příspěvek k výzkumu syntaktické konstantnosti mezi jazyky, zaměřeném v předcházející fázi na konstantnost podmětu. Cílem výzkumu je ověřit předpoklad o nadřazenosti aktuálněčlenské struktury nad strukturou syntaktickou. V případě příslovečného určení nejsou vztahy mezi syntaktickou strukturou,

aktuálním členěním a lineárním řazením v angličtině a češtině tak odlišné jako v případě podmětu, neboť příslovečné určení je v anglické větě do značné míry přemístitelné. Nicméně syntaktická konstantnost příslovečného určení se ukázala být nižší. Příčinou nižší syntaktické konstantnosti příslovečného určení jsou neadverbiální protějšky pro tento větný člen specifické. Ve směru z češtiny do angličtiny je to přívlastek, v opačném směru zahrnutí významu příslovečného určení do morfematiskosémantické struktury slovesa. Aktuální členění větné jako faktor motivující syntaktickou odchylku se uplatňuje ve směru z češtiny do angličtiny v případě korespondence mezi českým tematickým příslovečným určení v počáteční pozici a anglickým podmětem ve stejné pozici a se stejnou aktuálněčlenskou funkcí. Bez syntaktické divergence by se slovosled anglické věty odchyloval buď od gramatického řazení, nebo od základního rozložení výpovědní dynamičnosti. U jiných korespondencí (české příslovečné určení > anglický předmět, české příslovečné určení > anglický přívlastek) syntaktická odchylka k základnímu rozložení výpovědní dynamičnosti nepřispívá, pouze je zachovává. Ve směru z angličtiny do češtiny se jako faktory syntaktické divergence uplatňují především systémové rozdíly mezi oběma jazyky a rozdíly vyplývající z analytického charakteru angličtiny a syntetického charakteru češtiny.