

FROM SYNTAX TO TEXT

THE JANUS FACE OF FUNCTIONAL SENTENCE PERSPECTIVE

LIBUŠE **DUŠKOVÁ**

KAROLINUM

**From Syntax to Text:
the Janus Face of Functional Sentence Perspective**

An intra- and interlingual study of English

Libuše Dušková

Reviewed by:

Prof. PhDr. Ludmila Urbanová, CSc.

Prof. PhDr. Jarmila Tárníková, CSc.

Published by Charles University in Prague, Karolinum Press

Edited by Alena Jirsová

Layout by Jan Šerých

Typeset by Karolinum Press

First English Edition

© Charles University in Prague, 2015

© Libuše Dušková, 2015

ISBN 978-80-246-2879-0

ISBN 978-80-246-2917-9 (pdf)



Charles University in Prague
Karolinum Press 2015

www.karolinum.cz
ebooks@karolinum.cz

CONTENTS

Preface ---- 7

I. SYNTACTIC CONSTANCY ---- 13

1. Constancy of the syntactic and FSP function of the subject ---- 14
2. Syntactic constancy of adverbials between English and Czech ---- 30
3. A side view of syntactic constancy of adverbials between English and Czech ---- 46
4. Syntactic constancy of the subject complement. Part 1: A comparison between Czech and English ---- 57
5. Syntactic constancy of the subject complement. Part 2: A comparison between English and Czech ---- 70
6. Syntactic constancy of clause elements between English and Czech ---- 84
7. Syntactic constancy of the verb between English and Czech ---- 107
8. Noun modification in English and Czech: a contrastive view ---- 135

II. SYNTAX FSP INTERFACE ---- 161

9. From the heritage of Vilém Mathesius and Jan Firbas: Syntax in the service of FSP ---- 162
10. Basic distribution of communicative dynamism vs. nonlinear indication of functional sentence perspective ---- 182
11. Synonymy vs. differentiation of variant syntactic realizations of FSP functions ---- 193
12. Syntactic forms of the presentation scale and their differentiation ---- 202
13. Systemic possibilities of variable word order and their realization in text ---- 209
14. Note on a potential textual feature of putative *should* ---- 221
15. On Bohumil Trnka's concept of neutralization and its nature on the higher language levels ---- 227
16. Some thoughts on potentiality in syntactic and FSP structure ---- 241

III. FSP AND SEMANTICS ---- 255

17. The relations between semantics and FSP as seen by Anglicist members of the Prague Linguistic Circle ---- 256
18. Expressing indefiniteness in English ---- 269

IV. SYNTAX, FSP, TEXT ---- 287

- 19. Theme movement in academic discourse ---- 288
- 20. Theme development in academic and narrative text ---- 309
- 21. Syntactic construction, information structure and textual role:
 An interface view of the cleft sentence ---- 320
- 22. A textual view of noun modification ---- 335

V. STYLE ---- 351

- 23. Textual links as indicators of different functional styles ---- 352
- 24. Noun modification in fiction and academic prose ---- 362

References ---- 384

PREFACE

This volume assembles my articles and treatises written since the turn of the century when my *Studies in the English Language* came out (1999). Two of the articles included among the chapters of the volume, “Syntactic forms of the presentation scale and their differentiation” (12), and “Textual links as indicators of different functional styles” (23), had in fact been written before 1999, but by the time they were issued the manuscript of the *Studies* had been submitted to the printers.

The twenty-four chapters making up the volume are divided into five parts that reveal the gradual progress from syntax to text. The evolvement of the subject matter reflects the two facets of functional sentence perspective: on the one hand syntactic structures as realization forms of the carriers of FSP functions and of communicative fields, and on the other the connection of FSP with the level of text, in particular the role of certain configurations of syntactic and FSP structures in the text build-up. That in the elaboration of the latter only a start has so far been made is evident from the unequal share of the two FSP facets in the content of the book: while the treatment of the relations between syntax and FSP accounts for a major section, viz. Parts I and II (*Syntactic Constancy* and *Syntax FSP Interface*), the studies devoted to the textual aspects, Part IV (*Syntax, FSP, Text*) and Part V (*Style*) take up much less space. Apparently, so does the modest extent of Part III (*FSP and Semantics*), to which only two chapters have been allocated owing to their primary semantic concern. In fact, this is not the only place where semantics is treated. Besides Part III, semantic aspects of FSP are taken into account if relevant to the treatment of other points of FSP dealt with elsewhere. Part V has been mediated through the textual level, to illustrate its differentiation into functional styles, even though an explicit link to FSP is here missing. Studies of the relations between syntax, FSP and style have already started and like the relations between syntax, FSP and text appear to offer further lines of FSP development.

As regards the relations between syntax and FSP, the idea of investigating interlingual syntactic constancy was instigated by the study “Basic distribution of communicative dynamism vs. nonlinear indication of functional sentence perspective,” included in Part II (10). It examines in English the validity of the principle of end focus,

whose operation with respect to the final sentence position coincides with the FSP concept of the basic distribution of communicative dynamism: the end of the sentence is in both approaches occupied by the informationally most important element, viz. the rheme in FSP terms. Since the principle of end focus is generally regarded as a universal principle of the organization of information structure, it can be expected to operate even in English in spite of its analytic character, and hence the primary grammatical function of English word order. Nevertheless, the two principles are often brought into conflict. Where this happens, another syntactic structure may come into play so that agreement between the two principles can be achieved. The study of the basic distribution of communicative dynamism vs. nonlinear indication of FSP has shown that in English the principle of end focus applies to a large extent even in the basic, non-transformed syntactic structures (in over 60% of all instances) and when the transformed structures (the passive, *wh*-clefts, existential construction and others) are added, this percentage considerably increases. A viable procedure for further investigation of this question that suggested itself was a comparison of English with Czech, an inflecting language whose word order is primarily governed by the FSP principle. The ensuing studies forming Part I were undertaken on the assumption that identical content can be interlingually presented in the same linear order, even though by different means: word order in Czech, against a different syntactic structure in English.

Accordingly, the aspects under study were the relations between syntactic function, FSP function and the linear arrangement of sentence elements. The choice of the material - samples of fiction in the original and their translations in the other language, was due to the fact that this is the only way to obtain rendition of identical content in two different languages. To mitigate the fallacies of translated texts, care was taken to include only instances in which all lexical items had counterparts in the other language, i.e. free translations have been excluded. Systemic relations between the two languages were primarily sought where the syntactic counterparts of original structures displayed distinct patterns recurrent in more than one source.

The main aim of all the studies of syntactic constancy was to ascertain the degree of syntactic divergence of different clause elements and the factors leading to the respective divergence. In the direction from Czech to English, one of these factors was assumed to be FSP. With a view to capturing all the factors that may be involved, the English-Czech direction was also included, mainly to test whether the divergence-conducive factors are the same in both directions or whether they differ and in which respects if they do. As shown in "Syntactic constancy of clause elements between English and Czech" (6), where the results of the studies of separate clause elements are summarized and compared, syntactic divergence in the Czech-English direction indeed involves FSP as a specific factor. The English sentence largely imitates the word order of the Czech sentence, which as a rule agrees with the basic distribution of communicative dynamism with the thematic element at the beginning and the rheme at the end. This was especially the case where the syntactic divergence involved the subject. In the case of postverbal clause elements, a major factor was found in dif-

ferent valency of the Czech verb and its English counterpart. In the English-Czech direction, with FSP playing no role, specific factors were found in the different status of the passive in the Czech verbal system and in the disposition of Czech to construe semantically adverbial elements in syntactically concordant realization forms, viz. as adverbials. It was partly the comparative and summarizing aspect of the study that led to its inclusion in the volume, albeit reiteration of the main findings of the separate studies could not be avoided. Another, more important reason was the fact that this is the only study in which the syntactic constancy of the object is treated. As shown by the Contents, a separate treatment of this clause element is lacking, because the research into syntactic constancy of the object has not been carried out by myself, but by a doctoral student of mine (cf. Valehrachová 2002, 2003).

The exclusion of the verb and the noun modifier from the summarizing comparative treatment was due not only to their later date, but more relevantly to their different nature. The verb has a specific status in both the sentence and the FSP structure. It is the only word class that in its finite form performs a single syntactic function, that of the predicate. The constitutive predicative function of the verb is reflected in its prototypical FPS function of transition. In both the sentence and FSP structure the verb forms a link, in the former between the subject and the rest of the sentence, in the latter between the other carriers of FSP functions. This largely dispossesses FSP of its capacity to act as a factor of syntactic divergence. On the other hand, specific syntactic aspects arose that had not been encountered in the treatment of other clause elements, such as drawing a line between convergent and divergent counterparts. As regards the noun modifier, it differs from all the other elements included in the study in being neither an immediate constituent of the sentence structure, nor of the clausal communicative field. It operates only within the structure of the noun phrase, whose syntactic and FSP functions are determined at the clausal level. The syntactic aspects of noun modification largely involved its realization forms, while divergent syntactic functions of the noun modifier at the clause level mostly represented concomitant shifts connected with syntactic divergence of the clause element in whose syntactic structure the modifier was included.

Even though the two variables under study in Part I have been the syntactic and FSP structure, the connection with the textual level, more exactly the hierarchically superordinate status of the textual level, emerged at such points as potential variation between the passive and active in the case of rhematic verb and context-dependent nominal elements. In English, the verb here appears in the medial position in both voices, the only effect of the voice alternation being an exchange in the positions of the two context-dependent participants in verbal action. Which of them is placed preverbally and which at the end depends on the position of the sentence in the text, viz. on what precedes and what follows.

Part II, *Syntax FSP Interface*, addresses diverse points of FSP including general ones, such as the hierarchical relationship between syntax and FSP, the question of potentiality, unavoidable in any treatment of FSP, and neutralization, a concept elaborated at the lower language levels but so far not with respect to the FSP structure.

Other points cover different realization forms of FSP structure and functions, word order both generally and in a specific case where the means of ordering elements in agreement with the basic distribution of communicative dynamism, offered by the language system, are confronted with their actual use in text. Inclusion in Part II of the study of the potential textual function of putative *should* (14) may appear, according to its title, inadvertent; however, the concern of the article is not the role of putative *should* in the text build-up, but its capacity to indicate context-dependence of the content of the clause within which it is contained.

The two articles in Part III, *FSP and Semantics*, deal with very different questions, the first (17) with the relationship between static and dynamic semantics, which has so far been elaborated only with respect to the presentation scale. Here the two semantics basically correspond. However, in the case of the quality scale the applicable dynamic semantic functions, specification and setting, cannot cover the variety of semantic roles of verbal complementation; the sentence semantics thus becomes obliterated. Here again a line of further research presents itself. The article on indefiniteness (18) is concerned with the interplay of semantics and FSP function of the indefinite article and other indefinite determiners and quantifiers. Although semantically disposed to operate in the rheme, indefinite determiners and quantifiers do not by themselves endow their head nouns with this FSP function. As in all other cases, the FSP function of nouns with indefinite determiners and quantifiers is determined by the interplay of all the FSP factors.

The studies included in Part IV, *Syntax, FSP, Text*, address two questions: theme development in terms of thematic progressions and the role of syntactic construction with a specific FSP structure in the text build-up. The last topic of this Part, "A textual view of noun modification" (22) draws attention to the capacity of alternative forms of noun modification to indicate the position of the modified noun phrase in the text: the more explicit form of postmodification at the first occurrence vs. the reduced modification structure in premodification as an indicator of context dependence.

In the final Part V, the leitmotif of all the studies collected in the volume, FSP, is not directly evident, since this part is concerned with style, as is indicated by the titles "Textual links as indicators of different functional styles" and "Noun modification in fiction and academic prose". In the latter, FSP is lacking even indirectly; the article has been included because of its subject matter, stylistic differentiation of academic prose and fiction, which links it with the other article "Textual links as indicators of different functional styles." Here, on the other hand, a direct link with FSP is present, even though not explicitly. The study of textual links basically elaborates the FSP factor of context dependence. All grammatical devices of textual cohesion here treated are anaphoric means referring to the left in the text, which presupposes a previous context.

Whether the content of the volume as outlined here will agree with the readers' interpretation of it is up to their judgment; the preface merely explains the author's starting point and conception of the shifts in the subject matter from syntax to text.

I would like to express my sincere thanks to both reviewers, Professors Jarmila Tárnyiková and Ludmila Urbanová, for their valuable comments, and to Lucie Gillová for meticulous assistance with the technical part of the book. I alone am responsible for the shortcomings of the book

I acknowledge with thanks the permission for reprints granted by the following publishers and representatives of the publishing institutions: Petr Valo, Karolinum, Charles University Press (*Prague Studies in English*, cf. 2, 7, 8, 18, 23; *Užívání a prožívání jazyka*, cf. 20); Karel Oliva, Institute of the Czech Language (*Linguistica Pragensia*, cf. 4, 5, 12, 14; *Slovo a slovesnost*, cf. 6, 17); John Benjamins, Ms. Patricia LePlae (*Language and Function*, cf. 1; *Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Prague*, n. s. *Prague Linguistic Circle Papers* 3, cf. 10; *Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Prague*, n. s. *Prague Linguistic Circle Papers* 4, cf. 11); V&R unipress GmbH, Ms. Marie-Carolin Vondracek (*The Prague School and Theories of Structure*, cf. 15); Jan Chovanec, Editor of *Theory and Practice in English Studies and Brno Studies in English*, Masaryk University in Brno (cf. 3, 9, 21, 24); Vice-Dean Vojtěch Kolman, Faculty of Arts, Charles University (*Shakespeare between the Middle Ages and Modernity. From Translator's Art to Academic Discourse*, cf. 19); Vice-Dean Marek Otisk, Faculty of Arts, Ostrava University (*New Chapters in Functional Syntax*, cf. 22); Vice-Dean Radka Závodská, Faculty of Education, The University of South Bohemia (*The Dynamics of the Language System, South-Bohemian Anglo-American Studies*, cf. 16); Vice-Dean Viera Žemberová, Faculty of Arts, Prešov University (*Proceedings of 6th Conference of British, American and Canadian Studies, Prešov Part*, cf. 13).

Prague, October 2014

Libuše Dušková

I. SYNTACTIC CONSTANCY

1. CONSTANCY OF THE SYNTACTIC AND FSP FUNCTION OF THE SUBJECT

First published under the title “Constancy of syntactic function across languages” in Josef Hladký (ed.), *Language and Function. To the Memory of Jan Firbas. Studies in Functional and Structural Linguistics* 49, 2003, 127–145.

● In this and the following chapters constancy of syntactic function is understood as identical syntactic rendition of a lexical item and its lexical equivalent in parallel texts taken from two (or more) different languages. Syntactic constancy conceived in this way is examined between English and Czech on the basis of original English texts and their Czech translations, and vice versa. Both instances of syntactic correspondence and instances of syntactic divergence are taken into account.

The following analysis is based on the assumption that syntactic structure is hierarchically subordinate to the information structure (functional sentence perspective, FSP henceforth); that is, given the universal validity of the principle of end focus, a translated text is assumed to present (or at least to show a tendency to present) the meaning content in the same perspective as the original, with changes in the syntactic structure, if need be, according to the respective grammatical rules. Accordingly, attention is focused on instances of syntactic divergence, which are examined with a view to ascertaining the underlying factors of the divergence.

The two languages on which this assumption is tested provide suitable ground insofar as the typological distinctions between English and Czech involve different hierarchies of the operating word order principles: owing to its analytic character, English employs word order primarily to indicate grammatical functions; on the other hand in inflectional Czech the grammatical principle plays a secondary role, syntactic relations being indicated by grammatical endings. Hence Czech word order is free to perform other functions among which indication of the FSP functions of the clause elements ranks highest. Considering these distinctions, similar linear arrangement of corresponding lexical items may be expected to involve differences in syntactic structure.

1. This chapter pursues some aspects of this assumption, taking as a starting point the findings of a diploma dissertation that investigated the constancy of the subject (Čermáková 1999). Commencing the investigation with the subject was motivated by the syntactic features of the subject in English, which in turn largely determine its role in FSP. Owing to the grammatical function of English word order, the English subject mostly occurs in initial position (78.5%, cf. Dušková 1975), which is as a rule the position of the theme. In Czech, on the other hand, the initial thematic position is often occupied by other clause elements, adverbials being nearly as frequent as the subject (29.3% and 33.5%, respectively, cf. Dušková 1975), while the subject fairly often assumes the function of the rheme, and stands at the end (22.4%, cf. Dušková 1986a; according to Uhlířová (1974), rhematic subjects account for one third of occurrences). The thematic nature of the English subject was first pointed out by Mathesius (1947a), whose ideas were further developed in later studies (Dušková 1975, 1986a). In Čermáková's (1999) treatise constancy of substantival and pronominal subjects is investigated in eight parallel texts, two English and two Czech contemporary novels, and their translations into the other language. Identical subjects (i.e. corresponding lexical items construed as the subject in both languages) were counted until the number of nonidentical counterparts of the subject in the other language reached the number 50. In this way the author obtained 100 instances of noncorrespondence in the English-Czech direction, and 100 instances of noncorrespondence in the Czech-English direction. In both directions, instances of correspondence overwhelmingly predominate: 2642 (96.15%) and 2378 (95.65%) as against 100 (3.85%) and 100 (4.35%), respectively (Čermáková 1999: 89, 96).

These results are directly comparable with the findings of another diploma dissertation based on the same methodology, investigating the constancy of the subject between English and German (Nekvapilová 1998). Allowing for language-specific features, German was assumed to behave in a similar way as Czech because it is also an inflecting language with a fairly free word order, at least as far as nominal and adverbial elements are concerned. In the German-English direction identical subjects accounted for 1994 (95.2%) instances, as against 100 (4.8%) instances of noncorrespondence, the respective figures for the English-German direction being 3086 (96.8%) and 100 (3.2%) (Nekvapilová 1998: 112, 119). A considerably lower degree of constancy between Czech subjects and their English counterparts was found by Klégr (1996: 92), viz. 446 (77.3%) instances of correspondence as compared with 131 (22.7%) instances of noncorrespondence. The difference is presumably due to the fact that Klégr's monograph, being concerned with the degree of interlingual constancy of the noun as a word class, covers only subjects realized by nouns, whereas the two diploma dissertations also include pronominal subjects.

In any case, the degree of interlingual constancy of syntactic function appears to be very high, and might thus seem to refute the initial assumption of the relation between syntactic and FSP structure. It should be noted, however, that despite typological distinctions, all three languages are members of the Indo-European family with a basically identical word class system and syntactic structure. Moreover, even the fixed grammatical structure of English (S—V—O, S—V—C_s, etc.) largely coincides with the princi-

ple of end focus. In Dušková (1999b) agreement between the grammatical word order principle and final placement of the focus in English was found in 62.2% of instances.

2. Turning attention to instances of noncorrespondence, let us first summarize the principal findings of Čermáková (1999).

2.1 The most frequent Czech counterpart of the English subject appeared to be direct object: 54 instances (absolute figures and percentages are the same). Next come integrated adverbials (16) and indirect object (13). All other clause elements have a frequency of occurrence below 10 (1 to 6) (Čermáková 1999: 91). Of these, the prepositional object (3 occurrences) should be included to complete the picture of the object complementation.¹

The syntactic change of the English subject into the Czech object mostly involved a syntactic change in another clause element, and in 35 instances replacement of the English passive by the Czech active voice, cf.

(1) At dawn she was awakened by the sound of rain (BB, 56)

Za svítání ji probudil déšť (BH, 62)
[at dawn her_{ACC} awakened rain_{NOM}]

Instances without a change in the voice mostly display, besides changes in non-verbal elements, replacement of the English *have* by a full lexical verb, or of *be* by *mít* 'have', cf. (2) and (3):

(2) she had toothache that morning (BB, 10)

bolely ji to ráno zuby (BH, 13)
[ached her that morning teeth]

(3) Her face was pale and long. (J, 27)

Tvář měla bledou a podlouhlou. (S, 435)
[face_{ACC} she.had pale and long.]

Examples (4) and (5) illustrate the correspondence between the English subject and, respectively, an adverbial and the indirect object in Czech:

(4) her mouth opened to emit a sound (BB, 36)

z pootvěřených úst jí unikl zvuk (BH, 41)
[from half-opened mouth her_{DAT} escaped sound_{NOM}]

(5) Bernie hadn't after all owned the little house (J, 24)

domek Berniemu vlastně nepatřil (S, 432)
[little.house Bernie_{DAT} after.all not.belonged]

¹ The other Czech counterparts of the English subject with frequencies of occurrence below 10 were the verb (6 instances), no explicit syntactic counterpart (5), modifier (1), subject complement (1) and possessive determiner (1).

2.2 As regards the English counterparts of Czech subjects, the most frequent correspondence was again found between Czech subjects and direct objects in English (28 instances), largely with a concomitant change in another clause element, e.g.

- (6) v každém muži je kus sobce (K, 23)
 [in every man is piece egoist_{GEN}]
 every man has a selfish streak in him (H, 14)

The next most frequent correspondence involves instances of Czech subjects without an explicit English counterpart (19 examples), cf. (7).

- (7) že náš zpěv nikdo nezaslechne (K, 22)
 [that our singing_{ACC} nobody_{NOM} will.not.hear]
 our singing would go unheard (H, 13)

The correspondence ranking third on the frequency scale concerns Czech subjects reflected in possessive determiners in English (16 instances), cf. (8).

- (8) v tom mám nejlepší postavu (K, 25)
 [in it I.have best figure]
 they show off my figure best (H, 15)

In 10 instances the Czech subject corresponds to a prepositional object, e.g.

- (9) Ale jeho, bohužel, nepotkalo [štěstí] (F, 22)
 [but him unfortunately it.not.met]
 But he hadn't met with it [luck], alas (U, 20)

Indirect object as a counterpart of the Czech subject was found in three instances, cf. (10).

- (10) měla jsem aspoň záminku mu zatelefonovat (K, 28)
 [I.had at.least excuse him_{DAT} phone]
 it gave me an excuse to phone him (H, 18)

Of the other instances with frequencies of occurrence below ten,² the correspondence between the Czech subject and an adverbial in English needs to be mentioned insofar as the assumption of the superordinate role of the information structure applies to the correspondence between the English subject and a Czech adverbial, as in (4) (16 instances, see above), but not to the correspondence in the opposite direction. Of

2 The remaining correspondences with low frequencies of occurrence involved the subject in English counterparts of Czech subjectless sentences (9 occurrences), verb (4), and subject complement (2).

the nine attested instances, however, four represent passive counterparts of Czech active sentences whose subject appears as the *by*-agent in English, cf. (11).

- (11) dveře mi otevřel předseda výboru (K, 40)
 [door_{ACC} me_{DAT} opened chairman_{NOM} committee_{GEN}]
 I was let in by the chairman of the Party University Committee (H, 27)

In two of the other examples the adverbial construction of the Czech subject results from the introduction of a personal subject in English, which is lacking in the original. Cf. (12).

- (12) Tudy vedla cestička vroubená ... (K, 33)
 [here led little.path flanked]
 I walked along the bank on a narrow path flanked by ... (H, 22)

Analyzing the factors motivating the attested syntactic changes, Čermáková points out the major role of functional sentence perspective, especially where the correspondence involves the subject in English vs. Czech direct object or adverbial. Generally, both English subject and Czech object or adverbial were contextually bound and represented the theme, whereas the postverbal elements in English (object or adverbial) represented the rheme and corresponded to the Czech verb or subject in final position (1999: 112). Among other distinct tendencies Čermáková points out the differences in the expression of the possessive relationship, and in verbal as against verbonominal expression of an action (1999: 112–113). Correspondences in the opposite direction moreover suggest the tendency of English to suppress the agent (1999: 114). The differences in the results between the English-Czech and the Czech-English approach are largely accounted for by the structural differences between the two languages (differences in the use of the passive, existential construction in English, subjectless sentences in Czech) (1999: 116). Of these findings, all of which call for further research, in what follows I shall attempt to expound the role of FSP from a different starting point, viz. the FSP function of the subject.

3. The concept of FSP adopted throughout is based on Jan Firbas's theory of functional sentence perspective, elaborated in a large number of studies, and synthesized in his *Functional Sentence Perspective in Written and Spoken Communication* (Firbas 1992). The FSP structure of the examples under consideration is determined on the basis of the interplay of the FSP factors, semantic, contextual, and linear modification (cf. Firbas 1992: 10–11, 115). Intonation, which constitutes an additional factor in the spoken language, plays a subsidiary role in written texts insofar as the position of the intonation centre (the nucleus) results from the interplay of the other three factors. For this reason, no capitals are used to indicate the nucleus bearer: the intonation centre is assumed to fall on whichever element is assigned the FSP function of rheme.

The starting point of the following discussion is the subject with the FSP function of rheme, treated with respect to: (a) its degree of interlingual constancy as compared

with that of subjects examined only as syntactic functions; (b) the sentence position of rhematic subjects in the two languages and its effect on the syntactic and/or FSP structure in the other language; (c) the extent to which the syntactic changes contribute to the basic distribution of communicative dynamism (the order theme—transition—rheme, cf. Firbas 1992: 7–8, 10, 104–105, 118).

3.1 Given that rhematic subjects are more common in Czech than in English (the respective figures being 22.4% and 12.4%, cf. Dušková 1986a, Table 2), the degree of syntactic constancy among rhematic subjects may be supposed to be lower than among subjects counted without respect to their FSP role. To test this assumption, I collected 50 rhematic subjects from each original of Čermáková's sources and examined their syntactic counterparts in the other language.³

In both directions the percentage of constant subjects was considerably lower, and that of syntactically divergent subjects correspondingly higher, than in Čermáková's study: in the English-Czech direction constancy of the subject function was found in 78 instances (out of 100), in the opposite direction in 80 instances (out of 100). That is, nonidentical syntactic counterparts appeared in 22% of rhematic subjects in the English-Czech direction, and in 20% in the Czech-English direction.

Owing to being based on longer stretches of text (cf. note 3), Čermáková's list of examples contains a larger number of rhematic subjects. Her English source B provides 4 additional examples, while Source J is the only shorter text as compared with mine; the number of additional examples from her Czech sources amounts to 9. Accordingly, the following discussion of rhematic subjects with nonidentical syntactic counterparts takes into account 26 English and 29 Czech examples, of which 22 and 20, respectively, are identical in the two lists.

3.1.1 In the English-Czech direction, the relatively high degree of nonconstancy ascertained in 3.1 is surprising since Czech as a language with free word order, primarily governed by the principle of FSP, is able to place the rheme finally, whatever its syntactic function. That is, the syntactic structure of the original can be imitated, and the linear arrangement modified according to the FSP. Examining the 26 English examples (including Čermáková's additional 4) in this light, we find that 18 are accounted for by the existential construction. Here the problem of finding a Czech counterpart does not even involve a different linear arrangement since the notional subject in the existential construction occupies the postverbal position just as a rhematic subject does in Czech. The construction can be translated literally, as is often the case, cf.

3 The length of the texts used in my count, as compared with Čermáková's, proved to be somewhat shorter. In the case of the English originals 100 rhematic subjects were collected from 76 pages (BB, 33; J, 43), as against Čermáková's 93 pages needed for collecting 100 syntactically divergent subjects (BB, 52; J, 41), i.e. the difference was about 18%. However, it was largely due to one text (BB), the length of the other text being comparable in the two counts. As for the Czech originals, the difference was even greater, viz. 32%: 36 pages (F, 13; K, 23) as against Čermáková's 54 (F, 27; K, 27); again, largely on account of one text (F). Frequent use of final rhematic subjects appears to be a specific feature of Fuks's narrative style. As a result, the number of sentences needed for obtaining 100 rhematic subjects in English may be estimated at 2250 (Čermáková's figure 2742 minus 18%), the respective figure for Czech being 1680 sentences (Čermáková's figure 2478 minus 32%).

- (13) There were lots of flowers. (BB, 21)
 Bylo tam plno kyttek. (HB, 24)
 [was there lots flowers_{GEN}]

However, there is a tendency (also ascertained by Čermáková, see 2.) to use a transitive verb (often *mít* 'have') with rhematic object, which preserves the linear arrangement but changes the syntactic structure, cf. (14). Of the 18 examples with the existential construction the English rhematic subject corresponds to the object in Czech in 15 instances (83.3%).

- (14) And there were other sources of income. (J, 22–23)
 A má ještě jiný zdroj příjmů. (S, 431)
 [and he.has still other source incomes_{GEN}]

The three existential constructions in which the subject has a counterpart other than the object are rare instances of correspondence between the English subject and the Czech subject complement or verb.

The remaining examples represent other forms of the presentation scale (cf. Firbas 1992: 66–69, 109–110, 134–140; Firbas 1966; and Chapter 12). In 5 instances the rhematic subject occupies initial position, its rhematic nature being indicated by the interplay of the other FSP factors, context independence and semantic structure, involving a verb of existence or appearance on the scene. As shown by (15), these factors here act counter to the linear arrangement. In Czech, examples like (15) can have parallel syntactic structure with the rhematic subject at the end.

- (15) But now a heavy silence lay over it (J, 36)
 Ale v této chvíli byl ponořen do tíživého ticha (S, 442)
 [But in this moment was submerged in heavy silence]

The last three rhematic subjects appear in the structure Adv—V—S, which can in Czech be rendered literally including parallel word order, but the translator chose a transitive verb with an agentive subject, hence the English subject is again reflected in the final object.

3.1.2 On the other hand, as regards the 29 (20 + the additional 9 from Čermáková's list) syntactically divergent counterparts of Czech rhematic subjects, in agreement with the initial assumption the syntactic changes serve to preserve the linear arrangement of the original, i.e. final or late placement of the rhematic element. This is achieved by several means: a Czech intransitive verb followed by rhematic subject is replaced by a transitive verb followed by rhematic object (12 instances), as in (16); the rhematic subject appears as the *by-* or quasi-agent after a passive verb (4 instances), cf. (17); or the choice of a verb whose construction allows the Czech subject to be transposed into the object or another postverbal element in English (9 instances), cf. (18) and (19).

- (16) proto, že z ní na mne číšel chlad (K, 33)
 [because from it on me blew cold_{NOM}]
 because it gave me the shivers (H, 22)
- (17) a na dvou z nich seděli mužové se zakloněnými hlavami (K, 16)
 [and on two of them sat men with bent heads]
 Two of the chairs were occupied by men with heads bent back (H, 16)
- (18) dr Proppera ranila mrtvice (F, 8)
 [dr Propper_{ACC} struck stroke_{NOM}]
 Dr. Propper's had a stroke (U, 2)
- (19) všechno zavinil můj neblahý sklon k hloupým žertům (K, 35)
 [all_{ACC} caused my fatal penchant_{NOM} to silly jokes]
 it all goes back to my fatal predilection for silly jokes (H, 22)

Final or late placement of the rhematic element resulting from a different syntactic structure is also found in the remaining pairs of examples, but again the particular correspondences are rare and produce no pattern (verb 1, C_s 3 instances), cf. (20) and (21).

- (20) kdy venku padal sněh. (F, 15)
 [when outside fell snow]
 when it was snowing outside. (U, 11)
- (21) Za necelé dva měsíce měla být chanuka (F, 12)
 [in not-whole two months was.to be Hanukkah]
 In less than two months it would be Hanukkah (U, 8)

3.2 The second point to be considered is the sentence position of rhematic subjects with respect to its potential influence on the syntactic and/or FSP structure in the other language.

3.2.1 In my list of 100 English rhematic subjects (with syntactically both identical and divergent counterparts) the subject occurs in three positions: final (60 instances), medial (18), and initial (22). The final position is largely accounted for by the existential construction (45 instances), where either the subject is the last word, as in (25), or what follows constitutes postmodification, as in (13) and (14). The other 15 final subjects are found in the pattern Adv—V—S, cf. (22).

- (22) behind the desk sat a man (J, 37)
 za ním seděl muž (S, 442)
 [behind it sat man]

The medial position of the subject is again accounted for by the existential construction in which the notional subject is followed by a scene-setting thematic adverbial (cf. Firbas's setting, 1992: 49–59, 61–62, 66–71), as in (23).

- (23) There's a note on your desk. (J, 10)
 Na stole máte nějaký dopis. (S, 422)
 [on desk you.have some letter]

Initial rhematic subjects (including preverbal, preceded by a thematic adverbial) are found either in the presentation scale, as in (24) and (15), or with a focalizer, cf. (28).

- (24) A memory came to her. (BB, 26)
 Přepadla ji vzpomínka. (BH, 30)
 [invaded her memory_{NOM}]

The additional 4 rhematic subjects from Čermáková's list occur in initial position (2 instances), medially (1) and at the end (1) as in (22).

The Czech counterparts of English rhematic subjects, whether construed as another syntactic element or as the subject, might be expected to occupy the final position. This applies to the nonidentical syntactic counterparts (26 instances, see 3.1.1), but of the remaining 74 instances, which display syntactic correspondence, 13 have the subject in initial or medial position, with the resulting loss of rhematic function. A half of these instances (7) are found in negative existential constructions, which may play a role, negation being semantically disposed to operate within the rheme. Yet the subject here is context independent, and with the verb of existence constitutes the presentation scale, which assigns it the role of rheme. Cf. (25).

- (25) There weren't any mourners—no sons or anything. (BB, 8)
 Žádný truchlící pozůstalý se nevyvořili—synové nebo podobně. (BH, 10)
 [No mourners not.emerged]

The Czech counterpart presents the subject as contextually bound, with the rheme constituted by the verb.

However, in two of these instances the subject does belong to the contextually bound part of the sentence, which is well worth noting, considering the fact that the existential construction is a special device for presenting a rhematic subject not only through its semantic structure, but also by the postverbal position of the subject. Cf. (26).

- (26) There had been no other problem over the plaque (J, 9)
 Jiné problémy s firemním štítkem nenastaly (S, 421)
 [Other problems with plaque not.occurred]

Here the subject is contextually bound (the existence of problems with the plaque is mentioned in the preceding context, which is overtly reflected in the use of *other*), the only context independent element being negation (*no/nenastaly*).

Examples of the second group (5 instances) in which the Czech counterpart of the English rhematic subject does not stand in final position represent the specific English form of the presentation scale with the subject in initial position. Here its rhematic function is indicated by its context independence and the semantics of the verb (appearance/existence on the scene). These signals are easily missed by Czech speakers, who are used to looking for the rheme at the end, cf. (27).

- (27) Distress at her own conciliatory nature rose in her throat (BB, 27)
Rozmrzelost nad vlastní pasivní povahou jí bobtnala v krku (BH,

In imitating the English word order the Czech sentence presents the final element as the rheme, whereas the rheme in the English sentence is constituted by the subject.

The last instance is a rhematic subject in initial position indicated by a focalizer, with parallel structure and word order in both languages, cf. (28).

- (28) to which only she and he had a key (J, 14)
od níž jen oni dva měli klíče (S, 425)

Of special interest is one example of English subject in final position due to inversion, which is not rhematic despite its position and weightiness, these features being overruled by emphatic fronting of the subject complement. The Czech counterpart presents this element as the rheme in final position, cf. (29).

- (29) Gone were the terracotta roofs of the farmhouses they had known, the stone sinks, the primitive wood-burning stoves. (BB, 17)
Terakotové střechy jejich bývalých venkovských domů, kamenné výlevky, primitivní plotny, kde se topilo dřevem, upadly v zapomění. (BH, 19)

3.2.2 In my list of Czech rhematic subjects all subjects except one appear in final position. They are either the last word of the sentence, as in (18), or the words that follow invariably constitute postmodification of the subject, as in (17) and (19). The only exception displays the rhematic subject in initial position, but its rhematic nature is unequivocally indicated by contextual boundness of the verb and the focalizer that precedes it, cf. ex (30).

- (30) tak mluvili i komunisté na svých vlastních schůzích, i Pavel tak mluvil (K, 25)
[even Pavel so talked]
even Communists went around talking like that at their meetings, and Pavel too (H, 15)

The 9 additional rhematic subjects from Čermáková's list are all found in the final position. Syntactic change as a means of achieving final or late placement of

the English counterparts of Czech rhematic subjects accounts for 20 instances in my list of 100 rhematic subjects (cf. 3.1.2). Of the 80 examples whose English counterparts retain the subject function 56 (70%) have the subject in initial or preverbal position, cf. (31) and (32); 19 instances (23.75%) are rendered by the existential construction, cf. (33); and 5 instances (6.25%) display the pattern Adv—V—S, cf. (34).

- (31) ale pak se stal zázrak (K, 22)
 [but then occurred miracle]
 but then a miracle occurred (H, 13)
- (32) A tu ho náhle zachvátí jakási lítost (F, 8)
 [And now him suddenly seizes some pity_{NOM}]
 A wave of sudden pity came over him, (U, 3)
- (33) bylo mnoho projevů a mnoho aplausů (K, 22)
 [was many speeches and many applauses]
 there were all kinds of speeches and applause (H, 12)
- (34) nad vaříčem visí kalendář (F, 13)
 [over burner hangs calendar]
 over the burner hung a calendar (U, 9)

Final or at least postverbal placement of the rhematic subject is thus found only in 30% of instances, the most frequent structure being constituted by rhematic subject in initial position, followed by a verb of existence or appearance on the scene, with the scene-setting thematic adverbial, if any, at the end (cf. Firbas 1966, 1992: 59–65). These findings suggest that in the case of rhematic subjects the principle of end focus is to a large extent overruled by the grammatical principle. Here the initial position of the rhematic element is counteracted by its context independence and the semantics of the verb.

However, since initial position is the regular position of thematic subjects (which are much more frequent, thematic subjects in English accounting for 85.8%, cf. Dušková 1986a, Table 2), we may inquire whether the change in the position (final in Czech vs. initial in English) may not result in a change of the FSP structure. This is the case in 8 instances, cf. (35), with 4 other unclear ones, cf. (36).

- (35) tehdy panovala přísná morálka (K, 23)
 [then ruled strict morals]
 morals were pretty strict in those days (H, 14)

As against the presentation scale in Czech, which ascribes existence to *strict morals*, the English counterpart assigns the feature *strict* to the quality bearer *morals*: of these two elements only the former operates as the rheme, whereas the latter as the theme (cf. Firbas's quality scale, 1992: 66–69, 109–110).

There are some unclear instances, due to the uncertainty which sometimes arises where verbs implying existence or appearance on the scene may also be regarded

as assigning some feature to the subject, and/or where it is not clear whether the subject is contextually bound or not, since the object it refers to is mentioned at some distance in the preceding context or is derivable from it, but in the particular sentence it also allows context-independent interpretation. Thus in (36) the Czech sentence resembles the presentation scale, while in the English counterpart the subject is ascribed a feature.

- (36) Trhne rukou a začne mu tuhnout šíje. (F, 9)
 [he.jerks hand_{INSTR} and begins him_{DAT} stiffen neck]
 He snatched his hand back and his neck felt stiff. (U, 4)

Similarly in (37) the Czech sentence presents the subject as a phenomenon appearing on the scene (constituted by *his face and chest*), whereas in English the subject is conceived as contextually bound and the communication is perspective to what is said about it. This is presumably due to the fact that the lampswitch is mentioned in the preceding context at a distance of ten lines.

- (37) na jeho čelo a hrud' dopadlo bledé světlo lampy (F, 7)
 [on his forehead and chest fell pale light lamp_{GEN}]
 the pale lamplight fell on his face and chest (U, 1)

Allowing for some degree of uncertainty in determining the FSP structure, a small number of instances appear to suggest that the initial position of the English subject, owing to its dual role in FSP, may be conducive to a divergent FSP structure in the other language.

3.3 To conclude the discussion of the FSP role of the subject with respect to syntactic change, consideration should also be given to thematic subjects. These have been obtained from Čermáková's (1999) list by determining their respective FSP roles.

3.3.1 In the English texts, thematic subjects account for 74 instances (cf. rhematic subjects in 3.1.1). All except 8 (i.e. 89.2%) appear in initial position, which testifies to the close connection between the English subject and the FSP role of theme. Six stand in preverbal position after an initial adverbial, also a component of the theme, as in (38). The two remaining instances display emphatic fronting of a rhematic adverbial, involving subject-verb inversion, cf. (39).

- (38) The previous year his office had been plagued by an outbreak of obscene letters (J, 35)
 Vlóni jeho kancelář zaplavila hotová průtrž obscénních dopisů (S, 441)
- (39) at no time had Bernie been invited to ... (J, 39)
 a Bernieho nikdy nikdo nepožádal, aby ... (S, 444)

The Czech counterparts of the English thematic subjects occur in two positions, initial (29 instances), or they occupy the medial position after another thematic

element or the verb (35). Where they follow the verb, which primarily functions as transition (cf. Firbas 1992: 70–73), the English word order is more consistent with the basic distribution of communicative dynamism than the Czech. In both these positions the Czech counterparts preserve the FSP role of theme, their syntactic function being mostly direct object (37 instances); the other syntactic functions involve adverbials (13 occurrences), O_i (12), O_{prep} (2), Verb (3), the genitive and possessive determiner (1 occurrence each), and 5 instances without an explicit counterpart. In 5 instances the Czech counterparts of English thematic subjects occur in the final position, with a change in FSP as a result. Compare (40), in which the English thematic subject appears in Czech as the rheme at the end.

- (40) After all the lavatory was mended ... (B, 54)
 Koneckonců opravil záchod ... (BH, 59–60)
 [after all he.repaired lavatory]

Misinterpretation of the original FSP is also found within the rhematic section, as in ex (41), where the rheme is constituted by the final prepositional phrase, whereas in Czech by the counterpart of the direct object.

- (41) [As tall as he] she fanned his face with her breath ... (BB, 59)
 takže mu její dech vanul do tváře ... (BH, 66–65)
 [so.that him_{DAT} her breath blew into face]

In general, however, where the FSP structure of the Czech counterpart corresponds to that of the original, the two languages appear to display parallel linear arrangement to a remarkable extent. The only major difference, due to the grammatical function of word order in English, consists in the occurrence of thematic elements after the rheme.

3.3.2 Thematic subjects in Čermáková's Czech examples account for 61 instances, the remaining 10 sentences being constituted by subjectless verbal clauses (for rhematic subjects, see 3.1 and 3.1.1). In more than a half (35) the subject is expressed by the personal ending of the verb. Unlike English thematic subjects, Czech thematic subjects expressed by a pronoun or a noun occur in all positions in the sentence except at the end, the initial position being the most frequent (17 instances). The other positions are illustrated by (42), in which the subject follows an adverbial, and (43), where the subject is preceded by the verb and the object.

- (42) ... když se ve schránce něco bělá ... (F, 7)
 [when in box something is.white]
 The minute I see something white in the letter box ... (U, 1)
- (43) ... vadit jí to nebude ... (K, 21)
 [matter her_{DAT} it not.will]
 ... she won't mind ... (H, 11)

As regards the English counterparts, in 15 instances no explicit equivalent is found (cf. (43)). The most frequent syntactic counterparts are direct object, as in (44) (15 instances), and the possessive determiner, as in ex (8) (16 instances), other syntactic counterparts being found in Adv, O_{prep}, O_i, Vb and postmodification (with 5-1 occurrences).

- (44) ... ale moje samota zůstává nedotčena. (K, 14)
 [but my solitude remains intact]
 ... but I keep my privacy intact. (H, 4)

Unless the FSP of the Czech sentence is misinterpreted (5 instances, cf. (45)), the English counterparts, whatever their syntactic function, retain the FSP role of theme.

- (45) ... tam měl nejraději opice a slony ... (F, 9)
 [there he.liked best monkeys and elephants]
 ... the monkeys and the elephants were his favorites ... (U, 3)

Whereas in the Czech sentence the subject, indicated by the verbal ending, has the FSP role of theme, the rheme being constituted by the direct object, in the English counterpart it is reflected in the possessive determiner of the subject complement, which constitutes the rheme. Accordingly, the FSP structure is changed. However interesting these deviations may be in contrastive studies, they do not detract from the general finding that the FSP structure in the two languages even in the case of thematic subjects shows a high degree of correspondence.

3.4 The last point to be noted is the effect of syntactic change on the basic distribution of CD as against instances in which the syntactic structure of parallel sentences remains the same. Here a comparison is made only in the Czech-English direction, since Czech applies the principle of end focus as a matter of course. This has been demonstrated in the foregoing discussion by the almost exclusive final position of the rheme in the Czech examples.

Since the examples on which this study is based do not contain counterparts of thematic subjects without syntactic change, directly comparable instances are provided only by rhematic subjects.

In the list of Czech rhematic subjects with syntactically divergent counterparts in English (29 instances, cf. 3.1 and 3.1.2) the percentage of rhematic elements in the final position amounts to 86.2 (25 out of 29). In 4 instances the rheme is followed by a thematic adverbial or object, as in (20).

In the list of thematic subjects with syntactically divergent counterparts (see 3.3.2), including Czech subjectless sentences (i.e. 71 instances), and excluding 4 instances with a misinterpreted FSP (cf. (45)), which leaves a list of 67 sentences, basic distribution of communicative dynamism is found in 52 instances (77.6%). In 13 instances the rheme is followed by a thematic object or adverbial, as in (9) and (46).

- (46) ... že při ofenzívách mají velké ztráty. (F, 35)
 [that during offensives they.have great losses]
 ... there were heavy losses during those big offensives. (U, 35)

The two remaining instances have the rheme at the beginning, one (a dependent exclamative clause) owing to emotive factors, the other representing an interesting case of initial rhematic subject in the presentation scale as a result of syntactic change, cf. (47).

- (47) ... v šeru dálky zahlédne jakýsi povědomý dům. (F, 35)
 [in dark distance_{GEN} he.sees some familiar house]
 ... in the darkness ahead a familiar house stood out. (U, 35)

The lowest percentage of basic distribution of CD is found in the English counterparts of Czech rhematic subjects without syntactic change (cf. 3.2.2): here rhematic subjects in the final position account only for 22.5% (18 instances). In 56 instances (70%) they occupy the initial position, while postverbal placement of rhematic subjects followed by a thematic adverbial is found in 6 instances (7.5%). The prevalent structure displays the rhematic subject initially in the presentation scale, in which the order theme—transition—rheme is reversed. Accordingly, we find the highest percentage of basic distribution of CD among rhematic subjects with syntactic change, and the lowest percentage among rhematic subjects without syntactic change, whereas thematic subjects with syntactically divergent counterparts occupy an intermediate position.

4. In general, the initial assumption that the degree of interlingual constancy of the subject depends on its function in FSP has been confirmed by the findings of the present study in the Czech-English direction. Whether this relation between the syntactic and FSP structure also applies to other clause elements besides the subject remains to be investigated.

The final position of Czech rhematic subjects has proved to be a major factor conducive to syntactic change, whereas the initial position of English rhematic subjects, as shown by a few examples, may be a potential cause of misinterpreting the FSP structure. Syntactic change connected with the final position of Czech rhematic subjects moreover appears to contribute to the basic distribution of communicative dynamism in the English counterparts. This is due to the fact that without syntactic change final placement of a rhematic subject in English can be achieved only by the existential construction, which covers only some of the Czech rhematic subjects, and by the pattern Adv—V—S, deviant from the grammatical word order, and hence rare.

Syntactic change in the English-Czech direction appears to be due to other than FSP factors. Obviously, a language with free word order does not need syntactic change to achieve a different linear arrangement of sentence elements. Nevertheless, it is approximately as frequent as in the opposite direction. Here the factors involved partly consist

in language specific modes of expression (predications with *mít* 'have' or other transitive verbs of a generally possessive or locative meaning as against predications with *be* in the other language), and partly in a different status of the Czech passive both in the verbal and the grammatical system, reflected in the uses of the passive in discourse.

Verification of the findings of the present study calls for larger corpora including counterparts of thematic subjects without syntactic change, and for a detailed examination of instances which lack the basic distribution of CD in spite of syntactic change.

SOURCES

- [BB] Bainbridge, B. *The Bottle Factory Outing*. Glasgow: Collins, 1977.
- [BH] Bainbridgeová, B. *Podnikový výlet v prodlouženém čase*. Translated by Hana Bělohradská. Prague: Odeon, 1981.
- [J] James, P. D. *An Unsuitable Job for a Woman*. New York: Warner, 1972.
- [S] Jamesová, P. D. *Povolání pro ženu nevhodné*. In 3× *Adam Dalgliesh*. Translated by Josef Schwarz. Prague: Odeon, 1986.
- [F] Fuks, L. *Pan Theodor Mundstock*. Prague: Československý spisovatel, 1963.
- [U] Fuks, L. *Mr. Theodor Mundstock*. Translated by Iris Urwin. New York: Ballantine, 1969.
- [K] Kundera, M. *Žert*. Brno: Atlantis, 1991.
- [H] Kundera, M. *The Joke*. Translated by Michael Henry Heim. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1984.

2. SYNTACTIC CONSTANCY OF ADVERBIALS BETWEEN ENGLISH AND CZECH

First published in *Prague Studies in English* 23, *Acta Universitatis Carolinae, Philologica* 2, 2002 (issued in 2004), 111-126.

O. This chapter continues the study of interlingual constancy of clause elements.¹ The first clause element studied with a view to ascertaining its degree of interlingual constancy was the subject (cf. Chapter 1). 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 degree of communicative dynamism, not excepting the final position. Consequently, rhematic subjects are more frequent in Czech than in English (cf. Dušková 1986a). 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.

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,

1 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 (106-114).

but has to be considered in connection with the other FSP factors, semantic structure, contextual boundness (context dependence) and intonation (in speech).² 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. This treatment 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.³ 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.

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

2 For the FSP concepts, see Firbas (1992).

3 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.

same semantic role, except a few instances, e.g. *She now asked a question.* (F, 52) *Jenom* ['only'] *se na něco zeptala* (Ž, 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, 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, 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. Chapter 1).⁴ 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.

When compared with analogous data obtained for the subject (presented in Chapter 1), 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 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.

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

4 Klégr's data for syntactic constancy between Czech adverbials and their English counterparts (1996, 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

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, 14)
 [We-climbed on narrow staircase]
 We climbed a narrow staircase. (H1, 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 principle; here the FSP function of the last element is indicated by its anaphor-

ic nature signalling context dependence. Compare the Czech and English word order in (2) and (3).

- (2) A pak jsem se k němu otočil zády. (K1, 11)
 [And then ^{auxiliary reflexive particle} to him turned back _{INSTR}]
 ... turning my back on it. (H1, 2)
- (3) Byla jsem u něho celou hodinu. (K1, 28)
 [I-was ^{auxiliary} with him whole hour]
 I spent a full hour with him. (H1, 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. (4):

- (4) not a single servant had been sent on his, or her (...) way. (F, 52)
 ani jeden sluha nebo služka nedostal nebo nedostala (...) výpověď. (Ž, 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. (5).

- (5) But now, with luck, it was promising to be quite an exciting holiday. (J, 18)
 když bude mít štěstí, zažije dovolenou pěkně vzrušující. (N, 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 (6):

- (6) along the half-mile that runs round a gentle bay to the Cobb proper. (F, 58)
 po stezce dlouhé asi půl míle, která sleduje mělkou zátoku až k Valu. (Ž, 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, 52)
 Slečna Sarah byla *té rozmluvě přítomna*. (Ž, 52)
 [Miss Sarah was that_{DAT} conversation_{DAT} 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, 17)
 [And gently she-turned chair]
 She gave the chair a *gentle turn*. (H1, 8)
- b. *Pak jsme si chvíli povídali*. (K1, 15)
 [Then_{auxiliary reflexive particle} while_{noun} we-chatted]
 Then we had a *short chat*. (H1, 5)
- c. *Pohlédl na mne dotčeně*. (K1, 13)
 [He-looked at me affrontedly]
 He gave me an *irritated look*. (H1, 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^{INSTR} laugh^{INSTR}] > *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 (9).

- (9) Maurice was always *very odd* and secretive, of course. (J, 30)
 Maurice byl vždycky *velký podivín* a tajnůstkář. (N, 232)
 [Maurice was always great eccentric_{noun} and secretive_{noun}]

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. (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, 54)
 Služebnictvo se dovovalo odbývat večerní modlitby v kuchyni za lhotejného dozoru paní Fairleyové a při zvuku jejího úsečného neohebného hlasu. (Ž, 53)
 [... by sound {her brisk wooden voice}_{GEN}]

- (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, 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_{GEN}] 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, 54)

... jako by viděla Krista před sebou na kříži. (Ž, 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 (13) and (14).