SYNTACTIC CONSTANCY OF THE SUBJECT COMPLEMENT
PART 2: A COMPARISON BETWEEN ENGLISH AND CZECH

Libuše Dušková (Prague)

0. This part deals with the constancy of the subject complement in the English-Czech direction. The treatment proceeds along the same lines as in Part 1, which approaches the point from the Czech side (Dušková, 2004a). That is, two English novels and their Czech translations (see Sources) were compared for syntactically divergent counterparts of the subject complement, which were excerpted until their number reached fifty in each translation. The measure of constancy was provided by the number of identical syntactic counterparts found in the same stretches of text as the two sets of fifty divergent instances.

1. As in Part 1, the first point to be considered concerned instances rendered in Czech by structures that as a whole perform the subject complement function, but whose internal arrangement differs, mostly in presenting the lexical counterpart of the English subject complement as a modifier of an added head noun. In Part 1 these instances were included among identical counterparts on semantic grounds.

Obviously, in the present study the same solution had to be adopted, even though the point appears in a somewhat different light. The greatest difference is found in the respective frequency of occurrence: in the English-Czech direction these instances are almost five times less frequent than in the opposite direction (6 from English to Czech against 28 from Czech to English, cf. Tables 1 and 2 below, and in Part 1). The point is thus shown to play a minor role, insofar as the small number of examples provides no ground for either confirmation, or disproval of the tendency ascertained in the Czech-English direction.[1] Although in two English-Czech examples a general head in the English subject complement (C_s) is left out in Czech (cf. (1) a. and b.), in the other examples a head noun is added (cf. (2) a. and b.).

(1) a. She was the first person to see the bones … (F, 44) Byla první, kdo spatřil kosti …
   (Ž, 42)
   [She-was first who saw bones …]
 b. For a moment the Cadaver Club was a less agreeable place (J, 26)
   Na chvíli₁ se₂ klub₃ stal₄ o něco₅ méně příjemným₅ (R, 34)
   [For while₁ reflexive particle₂ club₃ became₄ somewhat₅ less agreeable₆][2]
(2) a. The ill was familiar (F, 43)
   Její nevolnost nebyla nic mimořádného (Ž, 41)
   [Her indisposition was-not nothing extraordinary]

1

b. the fact that it was <u>Lyme Regis</u> had made his premarital obligations delightfully easy to support. F, 43

právě$_1$ <u>pobyt$_2$ v Lyme Regis$_3$</u> činil$_4$ z jeho předmanželské povinnosti$_5$ věc$_6$ přímo$_7$ rozkošně$_8$ snadnou$_9$. Ž, 41

[precisely$_1$ stay$_2$ in Lyme Regis$_3$ made$_4$ from his premarital duty$_5$ thing$_6$ directly$_7$ delightfully$_8$ easy$_9$.]

However, examples (2) a. and b. can hardly be regarded as counterexamples, being of a diffent kind: the added heads do not explicitly express a semantic feature already contained in the subject noun.

The type represented by the remaining two examples appears in Part 1 as well (see Part 1, (6) a. and b.). An adjective and a noun constituting the subject or C_s in one language are split between the two functions in the other language or vice versa, cf. (3):

(3) he supposed the <u>word</u> was <u>appropriate</u> enough J, 23

předpokládal, že je to <u>vhodné slovo</u> R, 30

[he-supposed that is it appropriate word]

2. Following the presentation in Part 1, Tables 1 and 2 below show the frequency of occurrence of syntactically identical and divergent counterparts of the English subject complement with the C_s modifiers included first among identical counterparts (Table 1) and then among divergent counterparts (Table 2).

Table 1

| | English subject complement | | | | | |
| | Fowles (F) | | James (J) | | total | |
Czech counterparts	abs.	%	abs.	%	abs.	%
subject complement	79	61.2	86	63.2	165	62.2
divergent	50	38.8	50	36.8	100	37.8
total	129	100.0	136	100.0	265	100.0

Table 2

| | English subject complement | | | | | |
| | Fowles (F) | | James (J) | | total | |
Czech counterparts	abs.	%	abs.	%	abs.	%
subject complement	76	58.9	83	61.1	159	60.0
divergent	53	41.1	53	38.9	106	40.0
total	129	100.0	136	100.0	265	100.0

Compared with the corresponding Tables in Part 1, these Tables display two noticeable points. The first concerns the fallacy of percentage comparisons without considering the respective absolute figures. In the Czech-English direction inclusion of subject complement modifiers among identical counterparts raised the number of identical counterparts, and hence the syntactic constancy by 5.2%, while from English to Czech this percentage amounts to 2.2, which obscures the actual difference in the representation of the pattern $C_s>ModC_s$ in the two directions, noted above, viz. 28 and 6, respectively.

Of more importance, however, is the other point emerging from a comparison of Tables 1 and 2 in the two parts, viz. the difference in the syntactic constancy of the subject complement between Czech and English on the one hand, and English and Czech on the other. In the case of the other clause elements investigated so far (subject: Cz>E 95.65%, E>Cz 96.15%, cf. Dušková, 2003; object: Cz>E 88.9%, E>Cz 85.7%, cf. Valehrachová, 2003; and adverbial: Cz>E 93.95%, E>Cz 93.3%, see Dušková, 2004b) the difference in the constancy of the respective clause element between the two directions was small (less than 3% in the case of object) or even negligible (less than 1% in the case of subject and adverbial). As regards the subject complement, the difference in syntactic constancy between the Czech-English and the English-Czech direction amounts to almost 20% (respectively, 81.6% and 62.2%). This involves another major difference, viz. while the syntactic constancy of C_s in the Czech-English direction, though ranking lowest of the four hitherto treated clause elements, does not appear to be separated from the nearest lowest element (the object) by a strikingly larger interval than the object from the adverbial (the latter by 5%, the former by 7.3%), the syntactic constancy of C_s from English to Czech displays a jump of 20%. The subject complement consequently appears to be the least constant syntactic element especially in the English-Czech direction.

3. An explanation will again be sought in the distribution of the divergent syntactic counterparts (see Table 3), and a qualitative analysis of each type of noncorrespondence.

3.1 As shown in Table 3, the most frequent Czech divergent counterpart of the English subject complement is not a separate clause element, but the notional component of a verb whose inflectional suffixes (in some instances in conjunction with derivational prefixes) convey the categorial features expressed by the English copula. This type of noncorrespondence also ranks highest in the opposite direction (cf. Table 3 in Part 1) with almost equal representation: 29 Cz>E instances

against 33 E>Cz. While in the former direction this finding was surprising insofar as it showed English to favour verbal structure where Czech uses the verbonominal, from English to Czech this is what may be expected in consequence of the synthetic nature of Czech.

Instances of this group are illustrated by the following examples:

(4) a. he <u>had been in search</u> of information J, 25
        <u>sháněl</u> tady informace R, 33
        [he-sought here information]
    b. And who <u>is</u> actually <u>in charge</u> now? J, 29
        Kdo to tam vlastně teď <u>vede</u>? R, 37
        [Who it there actually now directs?]
    c. Linnaeus himself finally <u>went mad</u>. F, 47
        Linné se nakonec <u>zbláznil</u>. Ž, 45
        [Linné reflexive particle finally went-mad]

Table 3

Czech divergent counterparts	English subject complement					
	Fowles (F)		James (J)		total	
	abs.	%	abs.	%	abs.	%
English copula + C_s =Czech verb	12	24	21	42	33	33
adverbial	7	14	11	22	18	18
complement of *seem*, *look* = Czech adverbial	5	10	6	12	11	11
object	10	20	5	10	15	15
subject	11	22	5	10	16	16
modifier of subject	1	2	–	–	1	1
verb	1	2	2	4	3	3
object complement	2	4	–	–	2	2
apposition	1	2	–	–	1	1
total	50	100	50	100	100	100

3.1.1 A large majority of the examples contained the copula *be*, the resulting copula being represented by *get* (2 instances), *go* and *come* (1 instance each). It is noteworthy that in some cases, such as (4) c., English has no univerbal verb to express the concept. Other instances of this kind from this group are *be silent* 'mlčet', 'zmlknout' and *get used to* 'zvyknout si'. Here the English lexical system provides only analytical forms of expression. More frequently instances of copular

4

predicates in the group under discussion are a matter of stylistic (or other) choice, cf. *be aware* (with 4 occurrences; the only other recurrent predicative adjective in this group was *dead*: 3 instances) / *realize, be enough / suffice, be convenient / suit, be amusing / amuse, be afraid / fear*, etc.

Gaps in the lexical system calling for an analytical form of expression can presumably be found even in Czech, even though for each example of this group in Part 1 (Cz>E) there exists a univerbal synonymous verb. A noticeable point in connection with resulting copulas appeared in a few examples containing *be* in English, but a perfective verb in Czech, cf. (5).

(5) a. As soon as they <u>were</u> finally <u>alone</u> he said: J, 28
    Když konečně <u>osaměli</u>, řekl: R, 36
    [When finally they-became-alone, he-said]
  b. I thought he <u>was dead</u>. J, 28
    Já myslel, že už <u>zemřel</u>. R, 36
    [I thought that already he-died.]
  c. as she read the words she faltered and <u>was silent</u>. F, 54
    a když ta slova četla, zachvěl$_1$ se$_2$ jí$_3$ hlas$_4$ a$_5$ <u>zmlkla$_6$</u>· Ž, 53
    [... faltered$_1$ reflexive particle$_2$ to-her$_3$ voice$_4$ and$_5$ she-became-silent$_6$]

While in (5) a. and b. *be* + adjective denotes a resultant state, a meaning this construction expresses apart from denoting current state or quality (the Czech equivalent is thus derivable from the meaning of the construction alone), in (5) c. what is involved is change in a state, which is the semantic domain of the resulting copula. Here without the context of the sentence, the natural Czech equivalent would be imperfective *mlčela* 'was-silent'. The example is of interest in that it shows that even an inherently imperfective verb can be rendered perfective by context, cf. *I <u>knew</u> him* '<u>znal</u> jsem ho' x *I <u>knew</u> him at once* '<u>Poznal</u> jsem ho ihned'.

3.1.2 In both directions this group also included modal predicative adjectives: Cz>E 5 (*být schopen* 'be able', *lze* 'be possible' / *can*; *je nutno, třeba* 'is necessary / have* or *need*), E>Cz 1 (*be able / dovést* 'can'). The larger number of Cz>E examples is due to one source (JI 4, HA 1),[3] which may be a specific feature of the author's language. In any case, owing to the small number of examples these findings are inconclusive.

3.1.3 From the viewpoint of functional sentence perspective this type of syntactic noncorrespondence does not appear to play a role in that neither the linear arrangement, nor the distribution of the FSP functions is affected. As noted in Part 1, the subject complement overwhelmingly favours the FSP function of rheme (over 90%). This is the case of English subject complements in postverbal position,

as shown by all adduced examples except (4) a. Here the only difference between English and Czech consists in the realization of temporal and/or modal exponents of the verb (TMEs), which operate as transition proper, and of the verb's notional component, which in the absence of complementing elements, if context independent, constitutes the rheme. In English the TMEs and the notional component of the predicate are decomposed into the copula and the C_s, while in Czech both are implemented by the verb alone, the former by the verb's inflections and the latter by its lexical component. Whatever the form of realization, in both languages the TMEs constitute the transition, and the notional element of the predicate (the lexical component of the verb / the C_s) implements the rheme.

Where the subject complement is expanded by further elements, as in (4) a., the rheme is constituted by the expanding element(s) while the English C_s / notional part of the verb in Czech implements the most dynamic component of the transition. In the case of a modal predicative adjective rendered by a modal verb in Czech (3.1.2), the modal element, whatever its form of realization operates within the transition proper. In both cases, if context independent, the transition is part of the non-theme, i.e. the rheme (cf. Firbas, 1992, 71–72).

In English the element following the subject complement may also be part of the theme. This is illustrated by (4) b., which contains a scene-setting thematic temporal adverbial at the end; compare its nonfinal position in the Czech translation. Temporal and locative adverbials acquire the FSP function of rheme only where they appear as specifications (cf. Firbas, 1992, 49–53), which is reflected in their carrying the main stress. The preceding context of (4) b., however, indicates that *now* operates here as a scene-setting element (cf. Firbas's setting, *ibid.*).

3.2 The group of English subject complements rendered by Czech objects comprises 15 instances (see Table 3; in the opposite direction there were 19 instances of this type of divergence, see Table 3 in Part 1). As in the Cz>E direction, the divergence results from the use of a full verb in place of the copula, cf. (6).

(6) a. I realize how <u>busy</u> you <u>are</u> now. J, 24
  Dovedu$_1$ si$_2$ představit$_3$, co$_4$ <u>máš</u>$_5$ ted$_6$ <u>práce</u>$_7$. R, 32
  [I-can$_1$ to-myself$_2$ imagine$_3$, how-much$_4$ you-have$_5$ now$_6$ work$_6$]
 b. So I should not have <u>been too inclined to laugh</u> ... F, 46
  Takže$_1$ bych$_2$ sotva$_3$ <u>měl</u>$_4$ <u>chuť</u>$_5$ <u>smát</u>$_6$ <u>se</u>$_7$ ... Ž, 44
  [So-that$_1$ I-should$_2$ hardly$_3$ have$_4$ inclination$_5$ to-laugh$_6$ reflexive particle$_7$]

3.2.1 A recurrent verb was *mít* 'have' (5 instances, i.e. 33% of this group, cf. (6) a. and b.), which in general often alternates with existential or copular *být* 'be'.

An instance of this kind occurred in the Cz>E direction (cf. (10) a. in Part 1: ... *že je neobvykle nadaný* [... that he-is unusually gifted], rendered as *that he has an unusual talent*. Here both languages allow alternative expression with the other verb, *have* and *be* respectively: ... *že má neobyčejný talent* [... that he-has unusual talent]; ... *that he is unusually gifted*. In the particular instances of the E>Cz group under discussion, however, copular expression was either altogether lacking (*be lucky* 'mít štěstí' [have luck] x *být šťastný* [be happy]), or blocked by stylistic and/or contextual factors (*be very busy* 'mít hodně práce' [have much work] (neutral) x 'být velmi zaměstnán' [be very busy] (formal; moreover, *zaměstnán* without an intensifier also means 'be employed as an employee').

3.2.2 Another recurrent type of the pattern English C_s > Czech object was found in the cleft sentence (3 inverted *wh*-clefts and 1 *it*-cleft). In the former the nominal relative clause constitutes the subject and contains the propositional verb which is transitive; its right-hand participant is reflected in the C_s complementing the copula in the matrix clause. In Czech the proposition is construed as a single clause; hence the complement of the propositional verb appears as object, cf. (7) a. The same pattern is found in the *it*-cleft: the propositional verb appears in the subordinate clause, its complement constitutes the C_s in the copular matrix clause, and Czech displays a single-clause counterpart with the C_s construed as the object, cf. (7) b.

> (7) a. He might perhaps have seen a very contemporary social symbolism ... ;
> but what he did see <u>was a kind of edificiality</u> of time. F, 47
> Snad by byl mohl spatřovat velmi současný sociální symbol ... . On_1 $však_2$ $\underline{viděl_3}$ $\underline{jakousi_4}$ $\underline{velebnou_5}$ $\underline{budovu_6}$ $\underline{času_7}$. Ž, 46
> [He_1 $however_2$ saw_3 $some_4$ $majestic_5$ $edifice_6$ $of\text{-}time_7$]
>
> b. It<u>'s his ghost</u> that people claim to see, still scrubbing away at the stain. J, 32
> $Prý_1$ tu_2 $lidé_3$ $dodnes_4$ $\underline{vídají_5}$ $\underline{jeho\ ducha_6}$, jak_7 se_8 $snaží_9$ $skvrnu_{10}$ $odstranit_{11}$. R, 41
> [$it\text{-}is\text{-}said_1$ $here_2$ $people_3$ $till\text{-}today_4$ $often\text{-}see_5$ $his\ ghost_6$ as_7 reflexive $particle_8$ $he\text{-}tries_9$ $stain_{10}$ $to\text{-}remove_{11}$]

Bi-clausal realization of one proposition[4] was moreover found in an instance which contained the propositional verb in the matrix clause and its complement as C_s in a nominal relative clause which denominated the right-hand participant of the propositional verb and syntactically operated as the object, cf. (8).

> (8) Charles had already visited what <u>was</u> perhaps <u>the most famous shop</u> in the Lyme of those days – F, 44
> $Charles_1$ $už_5$ $také_3$ $\underline{navštívil_4}$ $tehdy_5$ $patrně_6$ $\underline{nejslavnější_7}$ $\underline{obchod_8}$ v $Lyme_9$ Ž, 42
> [$Charles_1$ $already_2$ $also_3$ $visited_4$ $then_5$ $probably_6$ $most\text{-}famous_7$ $shop_8$ in $Lyme_9$]

As regards functional sentence perspective, apart from instances with bi-clausal realization of one proposition, the syntactic divergence has no effect. This is due to the FSP nature of the two verbal complements involved: both the subject complement and the object are postverbal elements which develop the semantic structure of the verb, and hence if context independent, inherently operate as the rheme (the rheme proper if not complemented by further elements; part of the rheme where their semantic structure is further developed). The latter case is illustrated by (6) b., while in (6) a. the C_s / object operates as the rheme proper. Incidentally, this example illustrates the difference in the primary word order principle between English and Czech. In English the grammatical principle requires the entire *wh*-element constituting the rhematic C_s to be moved to initial position; hence the subordinate clause violates the principle of end focus, presenting the rheme at the beginning. In Czech the FSP word order principle overrides the grammatical to the extent that only the quantifier of the rhematic object (*co* 'what' = how much) is moved to the beginning, while the head noun (*práce* 'work'), the most dynamic element within the communicative subfield, retains the regular position of the focal element at the end.

In the five instances illustrated by (7) and (8) the situation is different. In English the bi-clausal realization of the propositional content produces two communicative subfields, which allows more explicit indication of the connection of the particular sentences with the preceding context. This is especially the case in the cleft sentences: in (7) *a kind of edificiality* is explicitly placed in contrast with the preceding part of the sentence *He might perhaps have seen a very temporary social symbolism* ... In Czech, although the object is also rhematic and appears at the end, the contrast is expressed only by the conjunction (*však* 'however'), which is present in English as well (*but*). Hence the connection with the context remains to be inferred.

Although structural counterparts of both *it*-clefts and *wh*-clefts exist in Czech, the English constructions are mostly rendered by single clauses, without clefting. In the renditions of *wh*-clefts the information structure is mostly indicated by word order alone. Even in speech the final rhematic element carries the nuclear tone without extrastrong stress. In one-clausal renditions of *it*-clefts the focus is prosodically highlighted (as in (7) b.) or reinforced by a focalizer (see (11 below). Among the identical counterparts drawn from my sources there was only one instance of an *it*-cleft with parallel structure in Czech, cf. (9).

(9) ... it was the Ca' Foscari which his architect had been instructed to build J, 33
   byl_1 to_2 Casa $Foscari_3$, $podle_4$ $něhož_5$ $měl_6$ $architekt_7$ $vystavět_8$ $dům_9$ R, 42
   [was_1 it_2 Casa $Foscari_3$ according-to_4 $which_5$ was_6 $architekt_7$ to-$build_8$ $house_9$]

3.3 English subject complements reflected in Czech adverbials (18 instances + 11 complements of *seem* and *look*, see Table 3) present a similar picture as the type of divergence described in 3.2 from both the syntactic and the FSP points of view.

3.3.1 In two-thirds of the examples the divergence is due to the rendition of the English copula by a full verb in Czech, as in (10).

(10) a. [Miss Sarah ...] had established that the girl <u>was</u> indeed not <u>well</u> F, 53
... zjistila, že děvče$_1$ se$_2$ skutečně$_3$ <u>necítí$_4$</u> <u>dobře$_5$</u> Ž, 52
[... girl$_1$ reflexive particle$_2$ indeed$_3$ not-feels$_4$ well$_{[adverb]5}$]
b. ... a room which ... <u>was</u> surprisingly <u>restful</u>. J, 28
... po místnosti, která$_1$ ... <u>působila$_2$</u> překvapivě$_3$ <u>klidně$_4$</u> R, 36
[... which$_1$ ... impressed$_2$ surprisingly$_3$ restfully$_4$]

3.3.2 There were four cleft sentences, all rendered by a single clause in Czech. It is presumably not accidental that one of the *it*-clefts in this type of divergence represents what has been called by Prince (1978) an informative-presupposition *it*-cleft. This type contains new information in the subordinate clause, even though presented as presupposed, and a highlighted element that would otherwise be thematic, mostly a thematic subject or a scene-setting adverbial, in the matrix clause (cf. Dušková, 1999a, 318–332, esp. pp. 326–327). The sentence thus displays two information peaks (cf. divided focus in Quirk et al., 1985, 1384), a minor one in the matrix clause (the underlying thematic element highlighted by the construction) and the main focus on the new element in the subordinate clause, as in (11) a.

(11) a. it was in these more intimate ceremonies that Sarah's voice was heard at its best and most effective. F, 54
A právě při těchto důvěrnějších sezeních zněl Sařin hlas nejlépe a nejpůsobivěji. Ž, 53
[And precisely in these more-intimate sessions sounded Sara's voice best$_{adverb}$ and most-effectively]
b. It was not concern for his only daughter that made him send her to boarding-school, but obsession with his own ancestry. F, 51
Neposlal$_1$ svou dceru$_2$ do internátu$_3$ z přílišné péče o ni$_4$, ale$_5$ proto$_6$, že$_7$ byl$_8$ posedlý$_9$ myšlenkou$_{10}$ na vlastní předky$_{11}$. Ž, 50
[He-not-sent$_1$ his daughter$_2$ to boarding-school$_3$ from$_4$ excessive care for her$_4$, but$_5$ therefore$_6$ that$_7$ he-was$_8$ obsessed$_9$ with-idea$_{10}$ of own ancestors$_{11}$]

The second *it*-cleft (11) b., illustrating the more common type with given information in the subordinate clause, explicitly states what the highlighted element in the matrix clause is contrasted with: the subject complement is a coordinated structure, with the second, discontinuous conjoint placed finally after the subor-

dinate clause, so that the rheme proper is indicated not only by the syntactic structure, but also by sentence-final position. The *wh*-clefts focusing adverbials again represent the inverted type as those focusing objects (3.2.2). Note the use of a focalizer in the Czech counterpart of (12) b. (*právě* 'just') to give the rhematic part more prominence. In the Czech renditions of *wh*-clefts this is much rarer than in the counterparts of *it*-clefts.

(12) a. That's what he wanted to see me about. J, 28

Kvůli$_1$ tomu$_2$ si$_3$ dal$_4$ se$_5$ mnou$_6$ schůzku$_7$. R, 37

[Because-of$_1$ it$_2$ reflexive particle$_3$ he-arranged$_4$ with$_5$ me$_6$ meeting$_7$]

b. that's where it would all begin J, 23

začalo$_1$ by$_2$ to$_3$ všechno$_4$ právě$_5$ tady$_6$ R, 31

[began$_1$ conditional particle$_2$ it$_3$ all$_4$ just$_5$ here$_6$]

It may be argued that where the focused element is an underlying adverbial, the matrix clause of the cleft sentence does not contain copular but lexical *be* ('happen'). If this view is accepted, *it*-clefts would display another anomaly in addition to that of eschewing assignment to any established type of complex sentence, viz. they would lack a constitutive feature of the syntactic and semantic structure of the matrix clause, which would then fail to contain a copular equative predication. It is on these grounds, the constitutive status of copular *be* in cleft constructions, that adverbials are here subsumed under subject complements.[5]

3.3.3 In two instances the English C_s realized by a modal adjective was reflected in a modal sentence modifier (epistemic disjunct) which replaced the entire copular clause, as in (13).

(13) it was possible that the suicide story had also been embellished or untrue J, 33

historka o sebevraždě byla možná přikrášlena nebo nepravdivá R, 41

[story of suicide was maybe embellished or untrue].

3.3.4 The Czech counterparts of the verbs *seem* and *look* demonstrate the much narrower range of the category of copulas in Czech, there being only two copular verbs, *být* 'be' and *stát se* 'become'. The verb *zdát se* 'seem' in the sense 'appear' is intransitive, as shown by its capacity to be used without any right-hand complement. Hence its adjectival complement is syntactically classed as an adverbial. In the case of *vypadat* 'look' a complement expressed univerbally usually takes the form of an adverb, so that its status of a full verb is supported formally, cf. (14).

(14) a. it seems highly appropriate F, 47

zdá se zcela pochopitelné Ž, 45

[it-seems refexive particle quite understandable]

b. It should have looked incongruous J, 33
   Měl by vypadat nepatřičně R, 42
   [It-should conditional particle look incongruously]

As regards the FSP structure, the difference in the syntactic behaviour of the verb does not affect the rhematic function of the final element.

3.4 The 16 instances of the divergence English C_s > Czech subject (see Table 3; the same number of this noncorrespondence was also found in the opposite direction, cf. Table 3 in Part 1) display two distinct patterns accounting together for three-quarters of all examples of this group.

3.4.1 In both subtypes the divergence involves, apart from the subject complement, also the subject in English. In the first subtype the English subject is reflected in a Czech adverbial. The linear arrangement in the original conforms to the basic distribution of communicative dynamism (CD), with the thematic subject at the beginning and the rhematic C_s at the end. In Czech the divergent syntactic counterparts retain the same sentence position as the underlying clause elements in the original. Accordingly, specifically with respect to the basic distribution of CD, there is no change in the FSP structure. Compare (15).

(15) The room had obviously once been the kitchen J, 27
   V Koutku$_1$ byla$_2$ předtím$_3$ očividně$_4$ kuchyň$_5$ R, 34
   [In Corner(room)$_1$ was$_2$ before$_3$ obviously$_4$ kitchen$_5$]

To these may be added two instances with a Czech rhematic subject rendering an English rhematic C_s, both in final position, without an adverbial element. In (16) the initial thematic subject is reflected in the pronominal dative; the other instance has an empty *it* in the subject with no counterpart in Czech.

(16) He was in no danger of ... F, 48
   Nehrozilo mu nebezpečí, že ... Ž, 46
   [Not-threatened him danger that]

It is to be noted that in this case English displays closer agreement with the basic distribution of CD than Czech, in which unstressed pronouns cannot occur initially.

Since the FSP structure again remains unchanged and the syntactic structure may be imitated, the actual Czech renditions are a matter of choice. It may thus be wondered why it was the divergent and not the parallel alternative that has been chosen. An explanation may be found in the tendency of Czech to construe elements with adverbial semantics as syntactic adverbials (cf. the locative meaning of the English subject).

In the other recurrent pattern of this group the subject and the C_s exchange their functions: the English initial thematic subject appears as initial thematic C_s in Czech, and the English final rhematic C_s is reflected in the Czech final rhematic subject, cf. (17).

(17) These last hundred years or more the commonest animal on its shores has been man – F, 44

Za posledních sto let_1 byl_2 $nejčastěji_3$ se_4 $vyskytujícím_5$ $živočichem_6$ na tomto $břehu_7$ $člověk_8$ – Ž, 42

[In last hundred $years_1$ was_2 $oftenest_3$ reflexive $particle_4$ $appearing_5$ $animal_{6(instrumental)}$ on this $shore_7$ $man_{8(nominative)}$]

In this type of divergence, the relations between the two languages are far from clear-cut. In (17) Czech displays a thematic C_s, which is in general rare; here it is presumably due to viewing the semantic structure of the sentence in a way that reverses the roles of quality bearer and quality. While in English the sentence structure assigns the former to the initial thematic subject, and the latter to the final rhematic C_s, in Czech the role of quality, the intrinsic role of the subject complement, is ascribed to the initial element, as shown by its form in the instrumental case. The role of quality bearer is then assigned to the context independent final rhematic element which consequently appears as the subject.

Secondly, among the identical counterparts one English example displayed exactly the same structure as the Czech rendition of (17), cf. (18).

(18) but worst of all was the shrieking horror on the doomed creature's pallid face F, 49

Ale nejhorší ze všeho jsou k hrůznému výkřiku otevřená ústa v smrtelně bledém obličeji té ztracené duše Ž, 48

[But worst of all is to horrid shriek open mouth in deathly pale face of-that doomed soul]

This structure is deviant in two features: it is a deviation from grammatical word order (see Dušková, 1999b), as well as from the usual rhematic function of the C_s; the latter feature being common to both English and Czech. These examples call for a more detailed study of the interaction between syntactic, semantic and FSP structure in both languages, taking into account instances of parallel syntactic and linear structure with the usual distribution of FSP functions, thematic subject and rhematic C_s.

3.4.2 The only other recurrent pattern in this type was again the *it*-cleft (2 instances), rendered by a single clause without a focalizer. The rhematic function of the subject is indicated by its final position, and its contrastive nature by stress, cf. (19).

(19) But it's Gerard who runs the firm. J, 30
     Ale firmu vede Gerard. (R, 38)
     [But firm$_{accusative}$ runs Gerard$_{nominative}$]

3.5 The remaining Czech divergent counterparts of English subject complement
are represented by 1 to 3 occurrences: apposition and subject modifer (1 instance
each, cf. (20) a. and b.), object complement (2 instances: (20) c.), and verb (3 in-
stances: (20) d.).

(20) a. the one subject that cost her agonies to master was mathematics F, 50
        Sarah prodělala muka při zvládání jednoho předmětu, a to matematiky. Ž, 49
        [Sarah suffered agonies in mastering one subject, and that (=namely) mathematics]
     b. this stone is not attractive F, 44
        není na tom kameni nic přitažlivého Ž, 41–42
        [not-is on that stone nothing attractive]
     c. if mere morality had been her touchstone F, 50
        kdyby považovala morálku za nejvyšší měřítko Ž, 49
        [if she-regarded morality as highest yardstick]
     d. Little seemed to have changed. J, 25
        Téměř$_1$ nic$_2$ se$_3$ tu$_4$ nezměnilo$_5$. R, 33
        [Almost$_1$ nothing$_2$ reflexive particle$_3$ here$_4$ changed$_5$]

As regards the divergence $C_s > C_O$, in contrast to the English-Czech direction, in
which this pattern operated as a sentence condenser, here it results from the repla-
cement of the copula by a full, complex transitive verb. The divergence English C_s >
Czech verb is in all three instances due to the omission of a counterpart of *seem*.

4. When compared with the picture presented by the opposite Cz>E direction,
the foregoing discussion of Czech divergent counterparts of English subject com-
plements yields similar, as well as different results. Starting with the latter, the
problem of classifying English subject complements reflected in C_s modifiers as
identical or divergent counterparts hardly arose, as there were only six instances
of this kind. The tendency of English to use qualification by nongenuine classifi-
cation rather than straightforward qualification could not be confirmed, there be-
ing only two instances of this kind.

The greatest, and presumably most important difference between the Czech-Eng-
lish and English-Czech directions appeared in the measure of constancy of this
clause element. While in the latter the constancy, although the lowest of all clause
elements investigated so far (81.6%) displayed a gradual decrease from the next
element with lowest constancy (Czech counterparts of English objects 85.7%), in
the English-Czech direction the decrease is very pronounced (62.2%). This high

degree of syntactic nonconstancy is largely due to three of the four divergent counterparts represented by more than ten occurrences: fusion of the copula and the subject complement in a lexical verb (the most frequent counterpart as in the opposite direction), adverbial, and object; together they account for 77% of all divergent instances. The divergence here results from the use of a full verb in place of the copula. The high percentage of this noncorrespondence manifests unequivocally the more verbal character of Czech. Full verbs rendering copulas were registered as the most frequent type of divergence in the Czech-English direction as well, but the overall percentage of the same three divergence types (fusion of the copula and C_s in lexical verb, object, adverbial) was lower: 54 (see Table 3 in Part 1). It is to be noted that in both languages the use of verbal or verbonominal form of expression is largely a matter of choice, and rarely a consequence of a systemic gap.

Other differences between the Czech>English and English>Czech direction are found in the diversity and relative frequency of the divergent counterparts. In the former direction, the divergent syntactic counterparts are more numerous, and of those that appear in both directions, the object complement shows a higher, and the adverbial a lower frequency of occurrence (see Table 3 in Part 1). On the other hand, apart from these two elements, the divergent counterparts ranking highest on the frequency scale, fusion of the copula and C_s in a lexical verb, object and subject, are identical in both directions.

A point specific to the English-Czech direction is the cleft-construction (both *it*-cleft and *wh*-cleft), found in ten instances. The fact that the construction did not occur among English counterparts of Czech subject complements is of course due to the nature of the subject complement: it can be focused neither by the *it*-cleft, nor by the *wh*-cleft. The underlying syntactic functions of the focused elements in the English-Czech part are the object, adverbial and subject. A Czech C_s rendered by an English C_s may here occur only where both languages display a 'focusing emphatic paraphrase',[6] and then it would be included among identical counterparts.

As regards the role of functional sentence perspective, in the case of counterparts constituted by postverbal elements the FSP appears as a concomitant feature of two syntactic structures, the original C_s and the divergent counterpart, which display the same FSP function and linear arrangement when content independent. Accordingly, the motivation of the syntactic divergence has to be sought elsewhere. Czech in general has no need to resort to syntactic divergence to achieve a different linear arrangement. The motivating factor here appears to be the more verbal character of

Czech, one of the features of synthetic structure. The synthetic structure of Czech also asserts itself where English cleft constructions are rendered by one clause. In this case, however, there is a difference in the FSP. The decomposition of one propositional content into two clauses which constitute the cleft construction allows more explicit indication of the position of the sentence in the surrounding context, in particular the highlighting of a contrast. In the Czech rendition by one clause where no focalizer is present, this remains to be inferred from the context insofar as the rhematic element is indicated in the same way as noncontrasted rhemes (intonation playing a role primarily in speech).

In the case of the subject counterpart, the FSP is of particular interest owing to the different rules governing the behaviour of this clause element in English and Czech. A factor motivating the syntactic divergences from the English C_s appears to be the semantic structure or a different interpretation of the semantic structure. It may thus be concluded that syntactic divergences in the English-Czech direction are to be ascribed largely to two factors, the synthetic nature of Czech and the influence of semantic structure.

Notes

[1] The preference in English of what Mathesius (1975, 114) called qualification by non-genuine classification; it was on this ground that these instances were included among identical counterparts.

[2] Where required, identical subscripts are added to corresponding items in the translator's and the literal versions.

[3] JI = Z. Jirotka, *Saturnin*; HA = V. Havel, *Largo desolato* (cf. sources in Part 1.).

[4] For this point, see Daneš et al. (1987, 443, 536–537); Quirk et al. (1985, 1383–84).

[5] In Quirk et al. (1985, 1174) *be* complemented by adverbials is regarded as a copula in general.

[6] The term used in Daneš et al. (1987, 537).

References

DANEŠ, F. – GREPL, M. and HLAVSA, Z. eds.: *Mluvnice češtiny* 3, *Skladba* (A Grammar of Czech, 3, Syntax). Academia, Praha, 1987.

DUŠKOVÁ, L.: On some syntactic and FSP aspects of the cleft construction in English. In: Dušková, L., *Studies in the English language*, Part 2, Karolinum – Charles University Press, Prague, 1999.

Dušková, L.: Basic distribution of communicative dynamism vs. nonlinear indication of functional sentence perspective. In: Hajičová, E. et al. eds., *Prague Linguistic Circle Papers* 3. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1999b, 249–261.

Dušková, L.: Constancy of syntactic function across languages. In: Hladký, J. ed., *Language and Function. Studies in Functional and Structural Linguistics* 49. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 2003, 127–145.

Dušková, L.: Syntactic constancy of the subject complement. Part 1: A comparison between Czech and English. *Linguistica Pragensia* 14, 2004a, 57–71.

Dušková, L.: Syntactic constancy of adverbials between English and Czech. *Prague Studies in English* XXIII, *Acta Universitatis Carolinae – Philologica* 2, 2002. The Karolinum Press, Prague, 2004b, 111–126.

Firbas, J.: *Functional Sentence Perspective in Written and Spoken Communication.* University Press, Cambridge, 1992.

Mathesius, V.: *A Functional Analysis of Present Day English on a General Linguistic Basis.* Academia, Prague, 1975.

Prince, Ellen, F.: A comparison of *wh*-clefts and *it*-clefts in discourse. *Language* 54, 1978, 883–906.

Quirk, R. – Greenbaum, S. – Leech, G. and Svartvik, J.: *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language.* Longman, London, 1985.

Valehrachová, L.: Syntactic constancy of the object between English and Czech. *Linguistica Pragensia* 13, 2003, 5–15.

Sources

[F] Fowles, J.: *The French Lieutenant's Woman.* Triad, Granada, 1983, 1st ed. 1969.

[Ž] Fowles, J.: *Francouzova milenka.* Translated by Žantovská, H., Edice Máj, Mladá fronta, Smena, Naše vojsko, 1976.

[J] James, P. D.: *Original Sin.* Faber and Faber, London – Boston, 1995, 1st ed. 1994.

[R] Jamesová, P. D.: Vraždy v nakladatelství. Translated by Rovenská, A., MOTTO, Praha, 1999.

Libuše Dušková: SYNTACTIC CONSTANCY OF THE SUBJECT COMPLEMENT II

The paper elaborates the point treated in Part 1 (in *Linguistica Pragensia* 14, 2004, No 2) from the opposite side, viz. syntactic constancy of the subject complement in the English-Czech direction. The greatest difference between the two approaches was found in the measure of constancy, which was almost twenty per cent lower from English to Czech than in the opposite direction. The high degree of nonconstancy appeared to be due to the use

of a full verb as a counterpart of the copula in three types of syntactic divergence (fusion of the copula and the C_s in a lexical verb; adverbial, and object). Other differences were found in the diversity and relative frequency of occurrence of the divergent counterparts. A point specific to the English-Czech direction was revealed in the rendition of the cleft sentence, both *it*- and *wh*-clefts, as a result of expressing by one clause the bi-clausal presentation of one propositional content, which is the constitutive feature of the cleft sentence. In the opposite direction, this type of divergence was precluded by the nature of the subject complement. As regards functional sentence perspective, in the case of divergent counterparts realized by postverbal elements neither the linear order, nor the FSP function was affected. The motivating factor of the divergence was here found to be the more verbal character of Czech. On the other hand, the noncorrespondence English C_s>Czech subject appeared to be due to different relations in English and Czech between the syntactic and the semantic structure.