

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).