

# A side view of syntactic constancy of adverbials between English and Czech

Libuše Dušková

*Faculty of Arts, Charles University, Prague*

0. This paper is part of a long-term inquiry into interlingual constancy of clause elements, investigated on the basis of parallel English and Czech texts. The study was undertaken on the assumption that syntactic structure is subordinate to the FSP structure, whose major principle is final placement of the focal element, i.e. the principle of end focus (cf. Quirk et al. 1985:18.3), or the basic distribution of communicative dynamism, in domestic terms.<sup>2</sup> However, in different languages this principle applies in a different degree, depending on the character of the respective language system, in particular on the type of word order connected with it. For English as a language with fixed word order it was accordingly assumed that if the principle of end focus is to be complied with, the syntactic function of a clause element must be consistent with its regular sentence position. This constraint does not apply to Czech, which has free word order, and is hence largely free to order sentence elements according to their FSP function, irrespective of their function in the syntactic structure of the sentence. Sentences with basic distribution of communicative dynamism in both languages could thus be expected to display the same ordering of semantic elements, but syntactically divergent where the sentence position of an element is inconsistent with a particular syntactic function in English. However, this assumption is not to be overestimated insofar as the final or postverbal position in English sentences appears to be occupied, not infrequently, by thematic elements as well (cf. Dušková 1999b:253-55). The fact that English, in consequence of its fixed word order, is less disposed to comply with the principle of end focus than languages with free word order passes unnoticed in works by English writers, and it is due to Jan Firbas that instances of noncompliance with the principle of end focus, or basic distribution of communicative dynamism, have been identified and explained from the viewpoint of functional sentence perspective. Nevertheless, the aim of this paper is to provide evidence in support of the first tendency, i.e. the observation of the principle of end focus in English, even though it holds at the same time that in a noticeable number of instances thematic elements are found at the end.

1. The study of syntactic constancy of clause elements between English and Czech started with the subject.

1.1 This first step was motivated by notable differences between English and Czech in the syntactic and FSP features of this clause element. The English subject, in contrast to the subject in Czech, largely occupies initial or preverbal position and mostly has thematic function (cf. Dušková 1986). It could therefore be expected 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 (Dušková 2002).

1.2 In the case of English adverbials the situation is different. Being to a large extent mobile, they are disposed to occupy positions according to their degree of communicative dynamism. However, this applies only to adverbials of certain semantic roles, while others, notably temporal and partly locative, tend to favour customary word order arrangements subsuitable 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) (Firbas 1992:10-11, 51, 180).

2. Syntactic constancy of adverbials is treated in Dušková (in press). The present paper follows up some of the points made there with a view to verifying or modifying them on the basis of additional material. The approach adopted and the results obtained in the previous study are briefly summarized in what follows.

2.1 The study of syntactic constancy of adverbials is confined to adverbials realized by adverbs, noun phrases and prepositional phrases in the syntactic function of adjuncts since only these are constituents of clause structure. The method employed was the same as in the study of the subject in order that the results could be compared. Eight parallel texts, two English and two Czech originals + their translations in the other language (see Sources) were excerpted for divergent adverbials until each of the original texts provided 50 adverbials with nonadverbial counterparts in the translations. The number of adverbials with adverbial counterparts in the other language which were needed to obtain 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. The data for the Czech-English part were collected in two seminar papers supervised by the present writer (see Koubová and Komárková). Despite the pitfalls involved in this methodology, the research carried out so far has shown that if instances of free translation are excluded and the data are based only on examples whose lexical elements have corresponding counterparts in the other language, the findings are fairly reliable.

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

Table 1  
English counterparts of Czech adverbials

English counterparts	Czech 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 adverbials

Czech counterparts	English 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

Table 3  
Divergent syntactic counterparts of Czech adverbials

English counterparts	Czech 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

Table 4  
Divergent syntactic counterparts of English adverbials

Czech counterparts	English 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	100	100.0

2.2 Confining ourselves to the types represented by more than five instances we find three correspondence types in the Czech-English direction and four in the opposite direction.

2.2.1 The rendition of Czech adverbials as English objects (44 per cent) largely reflects a change in verbal government, due to different verb valency: 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 Prague*, *nasednout do vlaku* > *board the train*, and the like.

- (1) Stoupali jsme po úzkém schodišti. K1, p. 14  
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, nor does it have any effect on FSP. The two syntactic structures display analogous distribution of communicative dynamism, viz. the basic distribution, with the theme at the beginning and the rheme at the end.

Among instances of this kind we also find word order arrangements with a thematic element following the rhematic object, due to the grammatical 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 ex (2).

- (2) Byla jsem u něho celou hodinu. K1, p. 28  
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, or in the overall FSP structure: 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 per cent), i.e. it is by more than a half less frequent than

in the opposite direction. The emerging two patterns account for only a half of the examples. One of the correspondence types again represents differences in verbal government, cf. ex (3):

- (3) 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

The other 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 (4).

- (4) But now, with luck, it was promising to be quite an exciting holiday. J, p. 18  
když bude mít štěstí, zažije dovolenou pěkně vzrušující. N, p. 221

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.

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 same word order in ex (3) with the order of elements in (5):

- (5) Miss Sarah was present at this conversation F, p. 52  
Slečna Sarah byla tě rozmluvě přítomna Ž, p. 52

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.

2.2.2 Counterparts of adverbials construed as premodifiers rank second in the Czech-English direction (23 per cent, see Table 3) and third in the English-Czech direction (15 per cent, see Table 4) on the frequency scale. The correspondence between a Czech adverbial and an English premodifier predominantly displays the following pattern:

- (6) Pak jsme si chvíli povídali. K1, p. 15  
Then we had a short chat. H1, p. 5

The Czech structure contains an adverbial modifying the verb, whereas the English construction is verbonominal: the lexical component of the verbal meaning is expressed by a corresponding action noun, construed as the object. As a result, the modifier assumes the form and function consistent with a noun head. In ex 6 the FSP is the same in both languages and the construction may indeed be regarded as an FSP device. However, the Czech adverbial also occurs initially or finally, and then the FSP differs, cf. the noncorresponding final rhematic elements in ex (7).

- (7) A mírně pootočila křeslo. K1, p. 17  
She gave the chair a gentle turn. H1, p. 8

As shown by the two examples, the motivation of this syntactic change can be attributed to FSP only partly, the verbonominal construction primarily serving as a means of *aktionsart*, besides facilitating modification and quantification where the verb does not lend itself to these processes easily.

In the English-Czech direction the correspondence between adverbials and premodifiers is less frequent (15 per cent). It again displays one predominant distinct pattern due to a different headword. The correspondence is illustrated by ex (8).

- (8) Maurice was always very odd and secretive, of course J, p. 30  
Maurice byl vždycky velký podivín a tajnůstkář N, p. 23

In all instances of this type the syntactic divergence involves only the internal structure of a clause element, not 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.

2.2.3 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 (9).

- (9) a. V těch pauzách byla celá hrůza, která ... K2, p. 70  
Those pauses contained all the horror that ... H2, p. 71  
 b. Na dvou židličích seděli mužové K1, p. 16  
 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 9 a.). Ex (9) b. illustrates this correspondence with a concomitant change in voice. In general, the syntactic divergence results in a sentence structure consistent not only with the basic distribution of communicative dynamism but also 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 Czech 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 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 ex (10).

- (10) the air was torn by the scream of engines. J, p. 10  
 vzduch rozdrásalo ječení motorů. N, p. 212

The remaining instances, illustrated by (11) 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.

- (11) 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

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. 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. Some of the other examples, as (11), show a difference in verbal government.

2.2.4 The last group of adverbials whose rendering in the other language is represented by a sufficient number of examples to display a distinctive pattern 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 (five instances), ranks first (29 instances) from English to Czech (see Tables 3 and 4). The notable difference between English and Czech in this respect is to be ascribed to the analytic character of English as against the synthetic character of Czech.

The five instances of this correspondence from Czech to English show that Czech occasionally displays analytic and English synthetic features, cf. ex (12).

- (12) Znovu se oženil. K1, p. 13  
He had remarried. H1, p. 3

The 29 instances of this correspondence from English to Czech are illustrated by (13) a. and b.

- (13) a. the dinghy ... swung slowly round J, p. 10  
lod'ka ... zvolna se otáčela N, p. 212  
b. Alice Kerrison ... bounced down from her seat J, p. 19  
Alice Kerrisonová ... seskočila z kozlíku N, p. 221

Being incorporated in the verb, the adverbial also shares its FSP function. Thus in b. 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 constituted by the verb *se otáčela*.

2.3 In the observations on FSP as a factor involved in the different types of syntactic noncorrespondence the particular syntactic divergences have been generally found to accord with the basic distribution of communicative dynamism (CD), i.e. the element affected by the syntactic noncorrespondence 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 FSP 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. 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 (5). There are also instances in which the syntactic divergence results in a different FSP structure, as in ex (7). However, such instances are rare.

In general, what has been observed as the outcome of the syntactic noncorrespondence 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 universal character of the principle of end focus and to the subordinate status of syntactic structure. On the other hand, the ascertained types of noncorrespondence 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, and partly derive from the synthetic character of Czech as opposed to the analytic character of English.

3. When collecting examples of syntactic noncorrespondence in the English-Czech direction I noticed many adverbials which occurred in the Czech translations as counterparts of English nonadverbial elements. These should basically present the same picture as the English

counterparts of Czech adverbials, listed in Table 3. With a view to providing more examples and thus making the results more conclusive, these instances were excerpted and analysed in the same way as the material discussed so far.

3.1 The data obtained are presented in the following Table.

Table 5

nonadverbial element in English texts J and F	adverbial element in Czech translations			
	N	Ž	Total	
			abs.	%
premodifier	32	21	53	21.6
determiner	3	1	4	1.6
postmodifier	11	4	15	6.1
subject	18	11	29	12.0
object	15	20	35	14.2
subject complement	14	15	29	12.0
object complement	2	2	4	1.6
prefix/component of a compound	5	8	13	5.3
semantic feature of a verb (of another word class)	19 (+3)	15 (+6)	43	17.5
verb	5	6	11	4.5
cleft and pseudo-cleft sentence	1	5	6	2.4
disjunct clause	2	-	2	0.8
apposition	1	-	1	0.4
total abs.	131	114	245	
%	53.5	46.5	100.0	100.0

The first striking point brought up by the data in Table 5 is the substantially larger number of registered noncorrespondences. In comparison with Table 3 (nonadverbial English counterparts of Czech adverbials) instances of syntactic noncorrespondence are more than twice as numerous (245 against 100). It may be argued that the source texts are different, and hence incomparable (English sources with Czech counterparts in Table 5 against Czech sources and English counterparts in Table 3). However, one measure remains constant: the same two texts (J and F), which yielded each 50 instances of nonadverbial counterparts of adverbials in the translations, displayed, respectively, 131 and 114 such instances when the adverbials in the translations were considered with respect to whether or not they reflected nonadverbial elements in the originals. In the following discussion an attempt will be made to find an explanation of this great difference. What suggests itself at this point is Mathesius' observation concerning the rarer occurrence of adverbials in English as compared with Czech and German (1975:143-44). In the present context, evidence in support of this observation would also have to take into account adverbials in the English translations that reflect

nonadverbial elements in Czech. However, this could not be done at the present stage for technical reasons (see 2.1).

3.2 As shown by Table 5, most of the types of syntactic noncorrespondence are represented by more than ten occurrences. Starting with those that also appear in Table 3, we find among the best-represented the subject, object and premodifier. However, while in Table 3 the object is almost twice as frequent (44 occurrences) as the next element on the frequency scale, the premodifier (23 occurrences), here its representation is not much higher than that of the subject and the subject complement (35, 29 and 29 occurrences, respectively). Moreover, in Table 3 the subject complement appears at the bottom end of the frequency scale, being represented only by five occurrences. Another quantitative difference between Tables 3 and 5 is found in the relative positions occupied by the two most frequent elements, the object and the premodifier, which are reversed, the premodifier being almost twice as frequent as the object in Table 5.

3.2.1 Czech adverbial counterparts of objects in the English originals display two distinct patterns one of which is identical with that described in 2.2.1, according to expectation. English transitive verbs with objects are reflected in Czech intransitive verbs modified by adverbials, as in (14).

- (14) Alice Kerrison drove the buggy behind the fringe of trees J, p. 19  
Alice Kerrisonová zajela s bryčkou za hradbu stromů N, p. 221

This type accounts for about a half of the examples of this group. The other type, somewhat less frequent, also involves different government, in this case the government of transitive verbs. Compare ex. (15).

- (15) seeing those around her as fictional characters F, p. 50  
V osobách kolem sebe spatřovala osoby z románů Ž, p. 49

This type is also found among the Czech object counterparts of English adverbials (listed in Table 3), but owing to the choice of lexical equivalents the examples are not so illustrative as in the data shown in Table 5. Ex (16) is one of the more clear-cut ones.

- (16) the situation of her cottage ... gave her every opportunity of keeping an eye on things. J, p. 15  
místo, kde stojí její vilka, ... jí dává dokonalou příležitost mít pořád všechno na očích. N, p. 218

These two types account for a large majority of Czech adverbials rendering English nonadverbial elements. From the contrastive point of view, the former type is of more interest in that it shows the neutral nature of the English verb with respect to syntactic transitivity/intransitivity. Semantically intransitive verbs freely take objects which are semantically similar to adverbials. In inflectional Czech, on the other hand, the relationship between semantic and syntactic structure is much closer.

3.2.2 The correspondence between English modifiers and Czech adverbials, represented by 23 instances in Table 3, appears to be the most frequent type among the Czech adverbial counterparts of English nonadverbial elements (53 occurrences). The type described in 2.2.2 as the largely predominant one is here represented by three examples only, cf. (17).

- (17) for the first time since her arrival, she gave the faintest smile F, p. 59  
poprvé od svého příchodu se slabounce usmála Ž, p. 59

The verbal meaning, which is decomposed into the categorial component (the verb) and the notional component (the object action noun) is expressed by a semantically corresponding verb in Czech, the English premodifier of the object action noun being concomitantly reflected in the adverbial modifier of the verb in Czech.

Most instances of this group display a different pattern, illustrated by the examples listed under (18).

- (18) a. at almost the precise moment J, p. 11  
přesně ve chvíli N, p. 213  
 b. the legal, certified next of kin J, p. 11  
úředně potvrzená nejbližší příbuzná N, p. 213  
 c. there was also a daily service - F, p. 53  
 také se konala denně ranní pobožnost Ž, p. 52

In a. the modifier of the noun, reflected in the adverbial, is the only noun premodifier, in b. the first of two premodifiers, and in c. the difference is connected with the use of a full verb in Czech as the counterpart of *be* in English. Examples of this kind account for over a half of all instances of Czech adverbials reflecting English modifiers. Examples of the c. subtype show the more verbal character of Czech; the b. examples suggest a preference for subordination in multiple premodification at the cost of multiple coordination. Somewhat surprisingly, among English premodifiers reflecting Czech adverbials (Table 3) this pattern is marginal. For illustration, cf. ex (19).

- (19) Když některá udělala dřep špatně K2, p. 22  
 If one of us did a bad kneebend H2, p. 18

Interestingly, we find type b. among Czech premodifiers reflecting English adverbials (Table 4), cf. (20).

- (20) 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 dovovalo odbyvat večerní modlitby v kuchyni za lhostejného dozoru paní Fairleyové a při zvuku jejího úsečného neohebného hlasu. Ž, p. 53

However, this is rare. Most instances are here connected with a difference in the word class of the headword, as in ex (8) in 2.2.2. Compare also (21).

- (21) they were very worried J, p.27  
 mají velkou starost N, p. 229

In the type under discussion in this section, connection with a difference in the headword was observed in the small group illustrated by ex (17). A partly similar case is found where a premodified action noun in the English original is reflected in the corresponding verb + adverbial in the Czech translation, as in (22).

- (22) without an accompanying lecture on my inefficient housekeeping J, p. 22  
 aniž ji doprovodí kázáním, jak neschopně hospodařím N, p. 224

In connection with English instances of premodification reflected in Czech adverbials mention should also be made of postmodification, which is marginal in Table 3, but represented by 15 examples in Table 5. Czech and English show a difference in this point in that a prepositional phrase following an object in English is often indeterminate between

postmodification and adverbial function.<sup>3</sup> This is rare in Czech because an adverbial is as a rule indicated as such by its noncontiguous position. Compare ex (23).

- (23) he likes to do research for his books in the Club Library J, p. 228  
pro své knihy si rád dělá rešerše v klubové knihovně N, p. 228

3.2.3 Adverbials in the Czech translations reflecting the subject in the English originals are all found in the same pattern: the English subject stands in initial (or preverbal) position, is semantically equivalent to the Czech adverbial, and has the FSP function of the theme. Initial position and thematic function also characterize the Czech adverbials so that the original element and its translation counterpart differ only in the syntactic function. This is in agreement with what has been found in the Czech-English direction (see 2.2.). However, all examples discussed in this section represent the subtype with active verb in both languages (as in ex (9) a.). Besides providing evidence in support of previous findings, they throw more light on the representation of semantic roles.

- (24) Cambridge had not changed her. J, p. 23  
v Cambridgi se s ní neudála žádná změna. N, p. 225

Among instances of this group we even find the textbook example (25):

- (25) His bed hadn't been slept in J, p. 27  
V jeho posteli nikdo nespál N, p. 229

The semantic role of most subjects/adverbials is locative, as in (24) and (25). Other semantic roles (means, reason, manner, time, and others, cf. (26) a. and b.) are represented by one or two instances.

- (26) a. Once again Sarah's simplicity took all the wind from her swelling spite. F,  
p. 59  
Zase jednou jí Sarah svou prostotou vzala všechn vtr ze vzdutých plachet. Ž,  
p. 58  
b. and never once had it made him want to change his job J, p. 25  
ani jednou se mu kvůli němu nezachtělo změnit povolání N, p. 227

Examples of this kind show the perspicacy of Mathesius' observation, made many decades ago,<sup>4</sup> on the thematic character of the English subject (1947:278). In Czech, on the other hand, there is a closer relationship between syntactic function and semantic role. Semantic roles characteristic of adverbials do not as rule appear in the subject construction.

3.2.4 The next clause element to be discussed on account of its frequency of occurrence is the subject complement (29 occurrences as in the case of the subject, see Table 5). In the Czech-English direction it ranks low on the frequency scale, being represented by five instances (see Table 3), which appear to be individual solutions allowing no generalizations.

On the other hand the examples listed under subject complement in Table 5 clearly fall into two groups. In the first an English copula is reflected in a Czech full verb, with the concomitant correspondence subject complement : adverbial. The second group of examples demonstrates the different status of copulas in English and Czech: whereas English copulas constitute a fairly clearcut category, defined by both formal and semantic features, and represented by several subtypes, Czech copulas are virtually limited to *být* 'be' and *stát se* 'become', but even these lack clear structural characteristics. The two groups are illustrated, respectively, by exx (27) a. and b.

- (27) a. How can you be so sure? J, p. 28

Jak to můžete vědět tak jistě? N, p. 230

b. Most of her listeners looked stunned. J, p. 29

Většina jejich posluchačů vypadala udiveně. N, p. 231

Both the status of the copulas and examples of the a. type show the more verbal character of Czech, as compared with English.

3.2.5 Adverbials in the Czech translations as counterparts of verbs in the English originals account for 11 instances (see Table 5), as compared with one occurrence in Table 3. Leaving aside modal verbs reflected in Czech modal adverbials functioning as sentence modifiers, we find verbs modifying the main verbs, as in (28) a. and b., and verbs in adverbial clauses reflected in action nouns forming constituents of Czech adverbial prepositional phrases, as in (28) c.

(28) a. I do realize that. J, p. 24

To si moc dobře uvědomuju. N, p. 226

b. If her neighbours were so ill-advised as not to keep her informed J, p. 15

Když její sousedé jednají tak neuváženě, že ji průběžně neinformují o ... N, p. 217

c. as he gazed up at the lias strata F, p. 47

při pohledu na vrstvy liasu Ž, p. 46

As shown by the c. example, it is sometimes Czech that displays nominal expression as a counterpart of a finite clause in English, although the general tendency operates in the opposite direction (see Mathesius 1975:146-52, Vachek 1961:31-44 and Hladký 1961).

3.2.6 In the last two large groups of adverbials in the Czech translations which correspond to nonadverbial elements in the English originals a separate element as a source of the Czech counterpart is missing in English. Here what appears as a Czech adverbial partly reflects a morpheme of a derived or a compound word, and partly corresponds to a semantic feature of a word, not expressed by a separate morpheme. The latter type is represented by considerably more examples (43 against 13, see Table 5, semantic feature of a verb or of another word class, and prefix/component of a compound). In the Czech-English direction (Table 3) this type is listed under inclusion in the verb and appears to be marginal (five occurrences). However, it is the most numerous group in the opposite direction: here inclusion of a Czech adverbial into the make-up of an English verb ranks highest (cf. Table 4 and 2.2.4). This is what might be expected, considering the analytical character of English and the synthetic character of Czech. The data in Table 5, however, modify previous findings.

Czech adverbials corresponding to prefixes or components of compounds in English are illustrated by ex (29).

(29) a. but out of the superimposed strata of flint F, p. 45

ale ve vrstvách křemene ležících nad ním Ž, p. 43

a fore-doomed attempt F, p. 47

předem odsouzený pokus Ž, p. 45

b. framed by shoulder-length black hair J, p. 23

orámovaný černými vlasy, spadajícími až k ramenům N, p. 225

Adverbials explicitly expressing a semantic feature of an English verb or of another word class occur in instances like (30).

(30) a. He glimpsed a dark head J, p. 15

Letmo zahlédl tmavou hlavu N, p. 217

She may be bringing her niece. J, p. 21

Celia k nám asi veze svou neteř. N, p. 223-224

b. There was also a sleek lawn J, p. 16

Byl tam take pečlivě upravený trávník N, p. 218

the mossy banks of the little brook F, p. 62

mechem porostlé břehy potůčku Ž, p. 62

Since this point is demonstrated in both translations, produced by different authors, it is presumably not a feature of the translator's technique, but reflects a more general aspect. Whether this is really the case remains to be investigated.

3.2.7 The only remaining point to be briefly commented upon is the cleft and pseudo-cleft sentence (6 occurrences, see Table 5). In the Czech-English direction, as a counterpart of a Czech adverbial, it occurred only once and was listed under the subject complement, cf. (31).

(31) Ne z nenávisťi k nim. K1, p. 26

It wasn't hate that made me do what I did. H1, p. 17

The Czech counterparts of English cleft and pseudo-cleft sentences display the focalizer *právě* 'precisely', a device usually resorted to in Czech translations, cf. (32)

(32) a. It was this place, ... that Charles had entered F, 62

A právě v tato místa, ... vstoupil Charles Ž, p. 62

b. This latter reason was why Ernestina had never met her at Marlborough House.  
F, p. 56

Právě proto se s ní Ernestina v Marlborough House nikdy nesetkala. Ž, p. 56

The use of a focalizer as a counterpart of the English construction, although Czech possesses a structural parallel, may be a reflex of learnt translating procedures, but even so it testifies to the basically synthetic nature of Czech.

3.3 As regards the FSP aspect, functional sentence perspective appears to play a role mainly in the Czech-English direction insofar as it fully displays the interaction of syntactic structure, FSP structure and word order, in dependence on the character of the language system (see 2.3). Where the target language is Czech, as is the case in the opposite direction, the main point of interest is found in instances in which the word order in the English original differs from that in Czech. As far as Czech itself is concerned, word order is subordinate to the FSP structure while syntactic structure, being indicated by inflections, is largely free of word order constraints. The observations made in this section thus concern the differences in word order, or more exactly deviations from the basic distribution of communicative dynamism in English and their reflections in Czech. Some of these have been noted before, cf. exx (23), (24) and (28) a., in which a thematic element (*for his book, her, that*, respectively) occupies final or postverbal position, whereas in Czech it occurs early in the sentence. Other instances of a different linear ordering but similar FSP structure are illustrated by the examples listed under (33).

(33) a. A distant woodpecker drummed in the branches of some high tree F, p. 62

V dálce, v koruně některého z vysokých stromů, ťukal do větví datel Ž, p. 62

a new species cannot enter the world F, p. 47

na světě se nemůže objevit nový druh Ž, p. 45

there was a charming domestic touch about the gay little equipage J, p. 18

Ta čilá, drobná ekvipáž působila líbezně domácky N, p. 220

b. Strange as it may seem F, p. 62

Jakkoliv to zní podivně Ž, p. 62

The examples listed under a. have the same semantic structure in presenting a phenomenon on the scene, which, if context independent, functions as the rheme. In the existential construction, this is indicated not only by the semantic structure but also by the postverbal position of the notional subject. In the other two examples, the ordering of the sentence elements acts counter to the FSP structure, which, however, is clearly indicated by the semantic structure and context dependence and is reflected in the Czech word order. Similarly the b. example shows the dominance of the grammatical word order principle in English, which is again overruled by context, semantic structure, and in this case by syntactic structure as well, insofar as the subject complement as a rule has the FSP function of rheme.

Instances of this kind form a small minority (some 16 per cent) in comparison with instances which have both a similar ordering of elements and a similar FSP structure in either language. This is shown by most of the adduced examples.

In a few instances a different or even similar ordering of elements displays a different FSP structure in the two languages, cf. ex (34).

- (34) a. As if sensing the strong tug of the on-shore current, it began to move ... J, p. 10  
 Jako kdyby vycítila, že proud přílivu ji pevně potáhne, začala se polybovat N,  
 p. 212
- b. [a third party might well have wondered] what horror could be coming. F,  
 p. 60  
 [Nezúčastněný divák by patrně nedýchal napětím], jaká hrůza tu vyjde najevo.  
 Ž, p. 60

In example a. the rheme proper is the final element in both English and Czech, but owing to divergent ordering, it is a different element. In b. the ordering is the same, but the semantic structure differs: while the English sentence presents horror as a phenomenon appearing on the scene, and hence has a rhematic subject, in the Czech sentence the rheme is the final adverbial complementing the verb. In general, however, these instances are very rare.

A final remark on FSP concerns English verbs one of whose semantic features is expressed by an added adverbial in Czech (see 3.2.6). The adverbial may be expected to share the FSP function of the verb, which means that where the verb is rhematic, the adverbial should function as the rheme proper. The latter case, illustrated by ex (35), is very rare. Normally, the verb has its characteristic FSP function of transition and the adverbial operates within it, as shown by ex (30) a.

- (35) ... not through any desire on Sarah's part to kill the subject, but ... F, p. 56  
 ... ne že by si byla přála sprovodit námět rozhovoru ze světa, ale ... Ž p. 56

The difference between the two FSP functions of the verb + the adverbial is nicely demonstrated by ex (36), in the first sentence of which the verb is the rheme, while the third has a rhematic object, as is reflected in the Czech word order.

- (36) But you must show it. – How am I to show it?  
 By not exhibiting your shame F, p. 59  
 Ale musíte to dát najevo. – Jak to mám dát najevo?  
 Když nebudete stavět na odív svou hanbu Ž, p. 59

4. The findings of the present additional research, apart from providing more material confirming previous results, have brought out several points which appear worth further pursuit. The first point to note is the much lower constancy of adverbials than ascertained in

the previous study. To verify Mathesius' observation on the lower incidence of adverbials in English as compared with Czech, the results of the present study need to be confronted with the occurrence of adverbials in English translations which reflect nonadverbial elements in Czech.

Another point which appears in a different light is the tendency in Czech to verbal expression as against the tendency to nominal expression in English. Given that the tendencies hold in general, there also appear to be areas which show them to be reversed. Confirmation or refutation of this finding is a matter of further study.

The present paper has also brought some findings about the subject complement, which has so far been noted only as a marginal counterpart of other syntactic elements. Since it is the next clause element to be treated in the study of interlingual syntactic constancy, the observations made here may be taken as a starting point.

As regards the basic assumption on which the entire project is based, viz. the superordinate status of FSP structure with respect to syntactic structure, the findings obtained in the English-Czech direction are relevant in showing dissimilar word order arrangements resulting from the difference in the primary word order principle, in connection with semantic structure and similar/dissimilar syntactic structure. FSP is of course only one of the aspects that may play a role where different syntactic and similar FSP structures are observed. Other relevant factors of syntactic differences (verbal government, tendencies to verbal/nominal expression, analytic/synthetic language system) have been ascertained in almost all points under discussion.

## Notes

- <sup>1</sup> For interlingual constancy on the level of words classes, see Klégr 1996. Among instances of non-correspondence between Czech and English nouns in syntactic function, syntactic counterparts of Czech nouns with adverbial function are dealt with on pp. 106-14.
- <sup>2</sup> For the FSP concepts employed in the present study, see Firbas (1992).
- <sup>3</sup> Cf. the discussion of ex (12) in Dušková (in press).
- <sup>4</sup> Mathesius (1947) first appeared in *Časopis pro moderní filologii* 10, 244-48, in 1924.

## Sources

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

## References

- Dušková, L. (1986) 'A Note on the Thematic Character of the Subject in English in Comparison with Czech', *Prague Studies in Mathematical Linguistics* 9, Prague: Academia: 92-105. Reprinted in Dušková 1999a, Chapter 33.
- Dušková, L. (1999a) *Studies in the English Language* 2, Prague: Karolinum – Charles University Press.
- Dušková, L. (1999b) 'Basic Distribution of Communicative Dynamism vs. Nonlinear Indication of Functional Sentence Perspective' in Hajičová E. et al. (eds) *Travaux du Cercle linguistique de Prague* n. s., *Prague Linguistic Circle Papers* 3, Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins: 249-61.
- Dušková, L. (2002) 'Constancy of Syntactic Function Across Languages' in Hladký, J. (ed.) *Language and Function. To the Memory of Jan Firbas. Studies in Functional and Structural Linguistics* 49. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins: 135-53.
- Dušková, L. (in press) 'Syntactic Constancy of Adverbials between English and Czech', *Prague Studies in English* 23.
- Firbas, Jan (1992) *Functional Sentence Perspective in Written and Spoken Communication*, Cambridge: University Press.
- Hladký, J. (1961) 'Remarks on Complex Condensation Phenomena in Some English and Czech Contexts', *Brno Studies in English* 1:105-18.
- Klégr, Aleš (1996) *The Noun in Translation*, Prague: Karolinum – Charles University Press.
- Komárková, J. (2000) 'Constancy of Syntactic Function'. Unpublished seminar paper. Prague: Department of English and American Studies, Charles University.
- Koubová, V. (2002) 'Větněčlenská konstantnost příslovečného určení mezi češtinou a angličtinou' (Syntactic constancy of adverbials between English and Czech). Unpublished seminar paper. Prague: Department of English and American Studies, Charles University.
- Mathesius, V. (1947) 'O funkci podmětu' (On the function of the subject) in *Čeština a obecný jazykozpyt*, Praha: Melantrich: 277-85.
- Mathesius, Vilém (1975) *A Functional Analysis of Present Day English on a General Linguistic Basis*. Prague: Academia.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G. and Svartvik, J. (1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- Vachek, J. (1961) 'Some Less Familiar Aspects of the Analytical Trend of English', *Brno Studies in English* 1:9-78.