

**Univerzita Karlova**

**Filozofická fakulta**

Ústav anglického jazyka a didaktiky



Bakalářská práce

**ENGLISH POSTMODIFYING INFINITIVES AND THEIR CZECH  
COUNTERPARTS**

**ANGLICKÝ POSTMODIFIKAČNÍ INFINITIV A JEHO ČESKÉ PROTĚJŠKY**

Anna Králová

Praha, 2025

Vedoucí práce: PhDr. Pavlína Šaldová, Ph.D.

**Čestné prohlášení:**

*Prohlašuji, že jsem bakalářskou práci vypracovala samostatně, že jsem řádně citovala všechny použité prameny a literaturu a že práce nebyla využita v rámci jiného vysokoškolského studia či k získání jiného nebo stejného titulu.*

*V Praze dne 14.1.2025*

*Anna Králová*

**AI prohlášení**

*In preparation of my bachelor's thesis, I have used ChatGPT for the purposes of crosschecking of applied analytical tests. The structure, phrasing and content of the thesis is mine, or of the authors properly cited. After using this tool, I have reviewed and edited the content as needed and take full responsibility for the content of the text.*

### Poděkování:

Chtěla bych především poděkovat doktorce Šaldové, jež mě prováděla celým procesem psaní této práce, od tématu po odevzdání, a nenechala mě propadnout ani zoufalství ani laxnosti. Za tuto pevnou ruku děkuji. Dále děkuji své rodině za to, že poslední půlrok s pochopením obětovali společné chvíle. A nakonec bych ráda poděkovala všem kantorům z Ústavu lingvistiky, kteří ve mně za poslední čtyři roky opět probudili lásku k lingvistice.

## Abstract

This thesis focuses on postnominal infinitives used as postmodifiers to a noun phrase and their Czech translation counterparts. Following the theoretical approach presented in academic grammars of English and outlining a critical difference between the types of postnominal infinitives, this work excludes infinitives which function as noun complements and focuses purely on infinitives in postmodifying function. The data for analysis was gathered in the parallel corpus *InterCorp (v16)* – English and Czech, from originally English texts.

This thesis postulates that the postmodifying infinitive is in fact a construction restricted to the English language and has no direct equivalent in Czech, the postnominal infinitives of which always fulfil the function of a noun complement. The goal is to uncover the ways in which the postmodifying infinitive is translated into Czech. Among one hundred examples only active and passive present infinitives appeared. All the translation types outlined in previous research were recorded, except for an appositive clause which relates to noun complement. The most common way of translation turned out to be, contrary to onset predictions, the use of the original infinitive in a different syntactical function, usually the predicate, while the presumed most common translation counterpart, the dependent relative clause, proved to be employed the least often

**Keywords:** infinitive, postmodifying infinitive, attributive infinitive, noun complement, postmodification, modality, translation equivalents

## Abstrakt

Tato bakalářská práce se soustředí na postnominální infinitivy v postmodifikační funkci a jejich české překladové protějšky. Na základě teoretického přístupu v akademických gramatikách angličtiny a z nich vyplívajících rozdílů mezi různými typy postnominálního infinitivu tato práce nezahrnuje s ty infinitivy, které plní funkci jmenného doplnění (noun complement), a soustředí se pouze na infinitivy v postmodifikační funkci. Data pro analýzu byla získána z původně anglických textů v paralelním korpusu *InterCorp (v16)* – angličtina a čeština.

Tato práce předpokládá, že postmodifikační infinitiv je prvek objevující se pouze v angličtině a tudíž nemá přímý překladový protějšek v češtině, jelikož postnominální infinitivy v češtině jsou klasifikovatelné vždy jako jmenné doplnění. Záměrem této práce je odhalit způsoby překladu postmodifikačního infinitivu do češtiny. Na vzorku sta příkladů se objevil pouze aktivní a pasivní infinitiv přítomný. Vzorek zaznamenal všechny překladové typy získané z předešlého výzkumu s výjimkou apoziční klauze, neboť ta je limitována na jmenné doplnění. Nejčastějším způsobem překladu se ukázal být, navzdory prvotním předpokladům, infinitiv v jiné syntaktické funkci, zejména jako součást predikátu, zatímco překladový protějšek, o kterém se soudilo, že bude nejhojnější, se ukázal jako nejméně častý.

**Klíčová slova:** infinitiv, postmodifikační infinitiv, infinitiv v přívlastku, jmenné doplnění, postmodifikace, modalita, překladové protějšky

# Table of Contents

Introduction.....	9
1. Theoretical background .....	10
1.1. The infinitive.....	10
1.1.1. Non-predicate functions.....	11
1.1.2. English infinitive.....	12
1.1.3. Czech infinitive.....	12
1.2. Postmodification .....	13
1.2.1. Postmodification of English Noun.....	14
1.2.2. Postmodification of Czech noun phrase – attributive infinitive .....	22
2. Methodology.....	26
2.2. Material.....	26
2.3. Method.....	27
3. Analysis .....	29
3.1. Translation Counterparts.....	32
3.2. Active Present Infinitive .....	35
3.2.1. Infinitive in different function .....	36
3.2.2. Relative clause .....	38
3.2.3. Different solutions .....	39
3.2.4. Not translated.....	43
3.3. Passive Present Infinitive.....	45
3.3.1. Infinitive in different function .....	45
3.3.2. Relative clause .....	46
3.3.3. Different solutions .....	46
3.3.4. Not translated.....	47
4. Conclusion .....	48
Bibliography .....	i
Resumé.....	iii
Appendix.....	v

# List of Abbreviations

**CamGEL** The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language

**CGEL** A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language

**GSWE** Grammar of Spoken and Written English

**PMČ** Příruční mluvnice češtiny

**CzechEncy** Nový encyklopedický slovník češtiny

**NP** Noun phrase

**InfP** Infinitive Phrase

**TC** Translation Counterpart

**DS** different solutions

## List of Tables

Table 1: Frequency of infinitival types .....	29
Table 2: Pronominal Head Nouns .....	29
Table 3: Proportion of TC types.....	32
Table 4: Types and numbers of TCs with the use of semantically close or equal noun.....	33
Table 5: Types of adjective DS TCs.....	34

# Introduction

This bachelor thesis focuses on the comparison of English infinitive in postmodifying function and its Czech counterparts. The motivation being that the postmodifying infinitive is a linguistic construction used much more widely, as well as offering a wider variety of forms, in the English language than in the Czech language, and so a systematic comparison of the two languages is to be sought, and, considering that English is one the major languages to require translation nowadays, the issue of translation counterparts arises as well.

The two languages favour different types of expression, and the corresponding linguistic approaches differ as well. The infinitive as such is viewed mostly as a means of complex condensation within the Czech linguistic tradition; its attributive use stands as a peripheral topic of the non-finite verb form research, which might reflect the rather low frequency of its use within the language. In contrast, many works have been written about the postmodifying infinitive in English, as “the method of complex condensation is one of the foundation stones in the structure of the English sentence” (Hladký 1961, 114).

On the scale of a hundred examples of the infinitive as a postmodifier within a noun phrase, throughout this thesis a complex comparative analysis will be carried out of the correspondences and discrepancies between the usage and/or forms of different types of the postmodifying infinitive. This thesis strives to classify the translation counterparts and common translation trends, looking at changes involving syntax, semantics, as well as modality. Instances of borderline cases, false results and easily interchangeable, non-postmodifying infinitives are presented as well. This thesis hopes to conclude with remarks for further research based on the results of the analysis.

# 1. Theoretical background

This section introduces and compares English (1.1.2.) and Czech infinitives (1.1.3), their forms and syntactic functions, as well as means of postmodification in each language and the infinitive's features in that function (1.2.).

## 1.1. The infinitive

The infinitive is one of the three non-finite verb forms of the English language, the other two being the participle and the gerund; the Czech language is poorer in that it does not have a gerund and the transgressive is highly obsolete. Another major difference between the two systems is the richer paradigm of the English infinitive (Dušková 2012, 265). Unlike finite verbs, infinitives can only express voice and, by means of the auxiliaries *have* and *be*, also aspect and tense, which allows for eight possible combinations (Quirk et al. 1985, 153), however, Dušková (2012, 267) lists only six forms, pointing out the progressive passive forms are not used:

	<i>active</i>	<i>passive</i>
<i>present simple</i>	to examine	to be examined
<i>past simple</i>	to have examined	to have been examined
<i>present continuous</i>	to be examining	to be being examined
<i>past continuous</i>	to have been examining	to have been being examined

The temporal system of non-finite verb forms is, however, only relational, i.e., expressing simultaneous, anterior, or posterior happening to the main verb (Dušková 2012, 266).

The Czech infinitive paradigm, on the other hand, expresses only voice and aspect, and, in some cases, also grammatical gender and number, resulting in a poorer paradigm:

<i>active (to examine)</i>	<i>passive (to be examined)</i>
zkoumat	být zkoumán/ zkoumána/ zkoumáno (sg.)
	být zkoumáni/ zkoumány/ zkoumána (pl.)

The team behind *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language* (CamGEL) considers non-finite clauses to be less explicit on account of their limited grammatical categories, leading to the pragmatic inferring of information from the larger context (2002, 89).

As modal auxiliaries have no non-finite forms, they cannot occur in non-finite phrases (CGEL 1985, 153).

The English infinitive has two basic forms, the *to-infinitive* and a *bare infinitive*; the former used as an independent part of speech, the latter as part of complex verb phrases. The Czech infinitive has no such distinction and translates both forms in the same way: *to speak* mluvit, *speak* mluvit (Dušková 2012, 266). The active infinitive has, like all active forms, wider use than the passive, the function of which it sometimes takes on, e.g. *The house is to let* dům je k pronajmutí, *nobody is to blame* není to ničí vina, *he is not a man to trifle with* není radno s ním žertovat (Dušková 2012, 268)<sup>1</sup>.

According to *The Grammar of Written and Spoken English* (GSWE), the infinitive can fulfil a number of syntactic functions: subject, extraposed subject, subject predicative (subject complement), direct object, object predicative (object complement), adverbial, part of noun phrase (postmodifier, noun complement), part of adjective phrase; except for subject and adverbial roles, the above listed are complement clauses, however, in the case of modifying a noun it can assume either noun complement or postmodifier role (2021, 200), compare:

- (1) *He is the third man to be murdered on the corner of the Donegal Road and the Falls Road in the past two years.* (postmodifier)  
*They say that failure to take precautions against injuring other is negligent.* (complement)

### 1.1.1. Non-predicate functions

The non-predicate, also called secondary, functions of the infinitive – the subject, object, adverbial, postmodifier, noun complement, complement of adjective phrase – are considered instances of syntactic condensation. Two terms are used in this discourse. *The New Encyclopaedic Dictionary of Czech* (*CzechEncy*) defines “nominalisation” is defined as “an operation transforming a clause with a finite verb into a syntactic group the core of which is a form funded by the very verb and which retains specific morphosyntactic qualities of the verb but lacks the finite morphology, gaining a different one.” (*CzechEncy*: Nominalizace) It is a process of deactualisation, i.e. the loss of actualising features – tense, mood – and along with it also the categories of person and number, the finite suffix expressing all of these. “Condensation”, then, is an equal term used in stylistics and referring to something smaller than a clause, contradicting the Anglo-Saxon tradition of non-finite clauses, nevertheless, certain theories recognise the non-finite clause even in the Czech environment, since these structures

---

<sup>1</sup> Translation mine

have both a subject and a predicate, expressed by the infinitive, which can be temporally independent (*Pavel včera nutil Petra [PRO omluvit se už zítra]*) (*CzechEncy: Obsahové věty*).

“[N]on-finite verb phrases are frequently used in English, being one of its distinguishing features, at least when compared to Czech, and their frequency even seems to be increasing” (Šimůnková 2017, 135). The reason behind this could be the decreasing dynamism of the English finite verb and the ability of non-finite forms to convey, at least partially, the setting in time of the actions or processes involved, while in the other language one of the non-finite forms, the transgressive, falls out of use, giving in to the dynamically strong finite verb (Hladký 1961, 105).

### 1.1.2. English infinitive

The English infinitive boasts a considerably larger paradigm than its Czech counterpart, however, the frequency of use of individual forms is not equal. The progressive passive and perfect progressive in particular are considered very rare, perhaps on account of the stacking of auxiliaries (Brinton & Brinton 2010, 273):

- (2) *To be being asked stupid questions all the time bothers him.*
- (3) *?To have been being asked stupid questions all the time bothered him.*

“The effective part played by English condensers in imparting to the English sentence some amount of dynamism is greatly facilitated by the fact that, thanks to the reduced importance of the finite verb in English, the attention of the listener or reader is attracted rather by the condensers than by the more or less formal predicative verb. It should also be noted that after having acquired grammatical features originally typical only of verbal forms (such as tense and voice) the English condensers, so to speak, necessarily overstep the limits originally imposed on them by their nominal character” (Vachek 1961, 43). Which of course indicates a collision with the Czech infinitive, capable of expressing fewer, or different, categories.

### 1.1.3. Czech infinitive

*CzechEncy* defines the infinitive as “a non-finite verb form not expressing in its innate structure the features of person, number, mode or tense” (*CzechEncy: Infinitiv*). Primarily a part of the predicate, secondarily the infinitive can take on the roles of the subject (*Být správně informován je součástí mého povolání*), the object (*To mě láká vykoupat se*), the attribute (*Její zvyk předčítat knihy nesnáším*), and the verbless adverbial clause after certain verb types (*Vidím ho přicházet*) (*CzechEncy: Infinitiv*).

According to newer concepts of valency, the infinitive retains its subject valency without the ability to realise it lexically. Such empty subject is interpretable through a co-referent which is independent of the infinitive itself. This is due to what the transformative generative grammar terms “control” – a mechanism which decides an antecedent for this empty subject, this role is generally fulfilled by either a finite verb, deverbative noun etc., traditionally expressed as PRO. In this way the infinitive, if in the passive voice, can express also the category of grammatical gender (*CzechEncy*: Kontrola).

The approach to the infinitive in the Czech linguistic environment is typically that of syntactic or stylistic condensation. Hošnová (1994, 197-198) proposes that syntactic condensation is the result of two processes: morphological and word-forming, i.e., the loss of grammatical categories leading up to word-class change; the former resulting in the infinitive construction. However, the latter process would result in condensation in attributive, verbless adverbial or, rarely, non-restrictive attribute, including the infinitive. Both processes lead to a certain degree of deactualisation (Valečková 2017, 19).

## 1.2. Postmodification

CGEL defines modification as “a largely optional function performed, for- instance, by adjectives in the noun phrase, and by intensifying adverbs in the adverb phrase. Premodifiers precede the head, and postmodifiers follow it” (1985, 65); modifiers add descriptive, often restricting information to the head, thus paralleling adverbials in a clause (CGEL 1985, 65). The grammar distinguishes two types of infinitive postmodification: appositive infinitive and postmodifying infinitive. However, *GSWE* and in *CamGEL* propose a different terminology. Both collectives differentiate between an infinitive in postmodifying function and an infinitive serving as noun complement. *GSWE* (2021, 644-645) proposes the term noun complement since its “primary function [is] to complete the meaning or the content of their head noun”. Quirk et al. themselves admit that the “difference between complementation and modification is a syntactic one” (CGEL 1985, 66). Head nouns which take *to*-clauses commonly represent human goals, opportunities, or actions; for example, *chance*, *attempt*, *effort*, *ability*, *opportunity*, *decision*, *plan*, *bid*; many of these nouns are nominalised equivalents of verbs or adjectives which take *to*-complement clauses as complement, (*GSWE* 2021, 647), while others as subject (*likely*, *probable*, etc.) (*CamGEL* 2022, 965). Through the process of word-formation and/or conversion these nouns retain the original verb’s valency, thus requiring a noun complement in the form of a *to*-clause. Postmodifier, on the other hand, is always a free modifier which is, by

definition, excluded from a verb's valency. *To*-infinitives functioning as a complement will thus be excluded from this research.

Another reason for following the postmodifier/noun complement distinction has to do with the nature of apposition. While it is true that some nouns and their "appositive infinitives" could be identified with one another using this restructuring:

(4) *He told me of his [fear that he might lose his job.]*

(5) *His fear was that he might lose his job.*

it is simply not viable in all scenarios:

(6) *Their [insistence that the meetings should be held at lunch-time] angered the staff.*

(7) \**Their insistence was that the meetings should be held at lunch-time.* (CamGEL 2002, 1017)

Even though this *be*-construction might be acceptable, it is not often possible to completely omit the noun with the pre-head dependents, as genuine apposition construction should be capable of (CamGEL 2002, 1017). Bělohubá (2010, 25) rightfully points out that "[f]irstly, an appositive clause presents a complete content of the head noun ... [and s]econdly, the appositive clause is introduced by that which is not a clausal element but it is a conjunction, i.e. a subordinator, which cannot be omitted". To illustrate:

(8) *Kim Jones, the bank manager, is to be congratulated on this initiative.*  
*The bank manager is be congratulated on this initiative.*

(9) *His fear that he might lose his job was increasing.*  
*That he might lose his job was increasing.* (CamGEL 2002, 1017)

This thesis will therefore follow the terminology established in *GSWE* and *CamGEL*.

### 1.2.1. Postmodification of English Noun

"There are three major types of non-finite postmodifying clauses: ing-clauses, ed-clauses, and to-clauses [...] also termed an infinitive clause or a to-infinitive relative" (Biber et al. 2021, 624). "Attributive infinitive appears in both English and Czech, however, it is more common in English and creates much more varied types, some of which have no Czech equivalent" (Dušková 2012, 564). In English, postmodifying infinitive clauses allow correspondences with finite relative clauses, lack tense markers and usually also overt relativisers (Breivik 1997, 109); "if an infinitive can be paraphrased with a finite relative, it is a relative clause" (Simonin 2013, 5). Since they function as adjectival modifiers, they are mostly restrictive but are capable of

functioning non-restrictively as well: ...*trading places is a way to support the adolescent quest for identity, s[PRO to have status]* (Brinton & Brinton 2010, 281-2).

Lexicalised postmodifying infinitive, of course, exists: *in years to come, he has nothing to do with it*, very rarely we can encounter a premodifying infinitive: *a never-to-be-forgotten event* (Dušková 2012, 564).

#### 1.2.1.1. Gaps

Due to the condensed nature of an infinitive, a syntactic gap emerges when an infinitive is used in the function of a relative clause. Breivik (1997, 110) classifies them thus:

- a. Subject gap with a transitive verb: *a person to help you*  
Subject gap with an intransitive verb: *the first person to come out*
- b. Object gap with an active infinitive: *a thing to consider*  
Object gap with a passive infinitive: *an equation to be solved*
- c. Adverbial gap (place): *a place to live in*  
Adverbial gap (time): *the time to discuss this*  
Adverbial gap (manner): *the way to solve this*  
Adverbial gap (instrument): *funds with which to support it*
- d. Prepositional complement gap: *a thing to be proud of*

As pointed out in *GSWE*, prepositional or adverbial gaps allow for the *to*-clause to be introduced by a preposition and a relative pronoun:

(10) *Engineers have a good helping of functional grey matter with which to devise theories.*

(11) *They also need the conditions in which to test them.* (GSWE 2021, 627)

Types (a-c) prove to be relatively common. Another common trend is for the *to*-clauses to not contain an overt subject, instead *to*-clauses are preferred when the subject can be inferred from the context. Although there is not a specific group of head nouns which would license a *to*-clause with a subject gap, object gap clauses tend to have head nouns generalised in meaning:

(12) *Well I mean this is a horrible thing to say, but <...>*

(13) *I've got stuff to sort out anyway.*

(14) *Friday evening I didn't have a lot to drink.* (GSWE 2021, 628)

Lastly, adverbial gaps cover time, place and manner:

(15) *There's not enough time to get it out and defrost it.*

(16) *But it's certainly a nice place to live.*

(17) *That's no way to talk to Sean!* (GSWE 2021, 628)

Ojea López (2022, 67) also points out that non-subject gap clauses tend to have antecedents which are either indefinite determiner phrases or definite determiner phrases with some explicit or implicit evaluative modification which prevents it to have a specific reading:

(18) *I am looking for something / a book / \*the book to read during this break.*

(19) *I am looking for the ideal/best book to read during this break.*

Brinton & Brinton (2010, 281) also point out that cases of subject *and* object gap are possible: *There are more mouths to feed*, i.e., *There are more mouths* [S gap] *to feed* [Oi gap], *mouth* being the direct object.

The importance of discussing the kinds of gaps the *to*-infinitive clause permits lies in what was found out by Hralová (2011, 36): “If there is an object interpretation [of the antecedent], then there is a corresponding finite relative clause alternative. The postmodifying infinitive also corresponds to a relative clause if the antecedent is a concrete noun with an interpretation different from the object.” To illustrate:

(20) *‘Had he anything to suggest about your problem?’*

*Had he anything which he could suggest about your problem?*

(21) *‘What a lovely place to live.’*

*What a lovely place where one can live.*

This proves very interesting to our research as a corresponding finite structure existing within English questions similar parallels in Czech, and, by extension, elucidates possible finite translations of non-finite clauses.

#### 1.2.1.2. Subject

In most cases, the subject of the infinitive is not overtly expressed, it is, nevertheless, quite easily inferred from the context (GSWE 2021, 627). When covert, it can be identical with the subject of the main verb, or the object of the main verb; in case of a transitive verb, both the main verb and the infinitive have the same subject and object, expressed only once: *One needs someone to lean on in grief*, and it can even be general, in the sense that it must include the speaker and/or listener: *the obstacles to be overcome are formidable* (Dušková 2012, 568).

“The term control is used to refer to the relation between the cognitive subject of a relative infinitive and its referent” (Breivik 1997, 111). Either pragmatics or semantics determine the referent, the term introduced by generative grammar but adapted others as well is PRO (Breivik 1997, 111). In cases when the PRO of the infinitival verb is different from that of the main verb,

occasionally it is not even the head noun, the lexical subject can be expressed in the accusative case within the relative clause:

(22) *The man for you to see is Mr. Johnson.* (Ojea López 2022, 71)

(23) *There's nothing for you to cry about.* (Dušková 2012, 568)

But, as is apparent in example (24), the lexical subject in the accusative appears not only in the clause itself but also without:

(24) *They gave me instructions to evacuate the building.* (CamGEL 2002, 1260)

In subjectless constructions, the operator may be found within the NP as a genitive determiner or within a PP complement:

(25) *your/Kim's promise to help me with my tax return*

(26) *a proposal by the government to introduce a goods-and-services tax*

(27) *the willingness of the other members to agree to the proposal*

(28) *an instruction to the secretary to call an extraordinary meeting* (CamGEL 2002, 1260)

or perhaps has no antecedent in the sentence at all:

(29) *They were discussing a proposal to introduce a summer semester.* (CamGEL 2002, 1260)

Among the structures in which the referent lacks a controller is the *there*-existential:

(30) *There is no lack of sensations for these organs to be occupied with but there is no significance in what they experience.*

(31) *In addition there were theological and philosophical works to be read and then problems to be discussed with anyone who would listen.* (Breivik 1997, 113)

However, that in the case of a covert subject, transitive ambiguity may arise in the verb, with no semantic restriction to either subject or object interpretation (CGEL 1985, 1267):

(32) *He is the best man to choose.*

### 1.2.1.3. Syntactic ambiguity

A postmodifying infinitive can be mistaken for other construction, the closest in form and function being the noun complement (viz 1.1.). We have stated our reasons for strictly differentiating it from the postmodifying infinitive above. There are several distinguishing features, and correlating tests, to differentiate the two.

The easiest one is the “concrete vs. abstract noun” distinction. *CamGEL* specifies these head nouns as “derived from (or homonymous with) verbs of matching senses that take the same complementation” while allowing for a group of head nouns with which the

complementation is not predictable (2002, 1259). *GSWE* (2021, 643-647) defines such head nouns as a. nominalised equivalents of verbs or adjectives, which can take *that*-complement or *to*-complement clauses, b. typically singular in number with a definite reference, and c. representing human goals, opportunities, or actions. The infinitival complement thus often corresponds to the object of the funding verb or adjective (Dušková 2012, 565), therefore, a part of the noun's valency. Brinton & Brinton (2010, 283), too, compare the relationship of the complement to the abstract noun to that of a direct object to a verb. *GSWE* (2021, 646) lists these as most common nouns taking *to*-complement:

*Chance, attempt, effort, ability, opportunity, desire, decision, plan, power, right, tendency, failure, inability, capacity, bid, permission, commitment, determination, intention, refusal, willingness, battle, proposal, scheme, agreement, authority, confidence, deal, duty, freedom, incentive, inclination, invitation, obligation, plot, potential, promise, readiness, reluctance, responsibility, temptation, threat, wish*

However, some abstract nouns may take both a complement and a modifier, which makes the first distinction alone insufficient. The second test relies on the fact that *to*-infinitive noun complement cannot be replaced by a relative clause:

(33) *Boggs should have heeded Buckley's suggestion to keep his rhetoric less extreme.*  
 \**suggestion which he keep his rhetoric less extreme* (Brinton & Brinton 2010, 283).

The PRO is in fact not controlled by the head noun:

(34) *Boggs should have heeded Buckley's suggestion [PRO to keep his rhetoric less extreme].*  
*the suggestion [\*the suggestion keep his rhetoric less extreme]* (Brinton & Brinton 2010, 283)

Contrary to the postmodifier, which can have a relative clause alternative, and PRO is controlled by the head noun: *someone [someone hold down her sofa]* (Brinton & Brinton 2010, 283).

Besides the noun complement, the postmodifying infinitive can be easily confused with the adjunct, especially of purpose. Understandably so, as relative infinitives often express purpose of various degrees of salience, e.g., *He's the man to do the job* (Simonin 2013, 6). In these cases, it alternates with a prepositional gerund or *for*-noun construction: *I have no time to discuss it – I have no time for discussing it* (Dušková 2012, 567). The overlap is especially prominent when the infinitive is a part of a noun phrase which functions as object or preposition complement:

- (35) *He found a video [for the kids to watch].* [relative]  
 (36) *He got it [for the kids to watch].* [purpose adjunct]  
 (37) *He got a video [for the kids to watch].* [ambiguous] (CamGEL 2002, 1067)

Adjuncts can be distinguished from postmodifiers with the following three tests. Firstly, postmodifiers are syntactically dependent on, and inseparable from, their head nouns, thus, if the infinitive can be moved to an adverbial position via pseudo-clefting or passivisation, it is an adjunct (Simonin 2013, 22), secondly, a non-finite postmodifier necessarily occurs before a finite relative:

- (38) *A pan to fry eggs in that's stainless is in the sink.*  
 \**A pan that's stainless to fry eggs in is in the sink.* (Simonin 2013, 24)

And thirdly, adjuncts of purpose contain a resultative component, thus they can be identified with a *so that* rephrasing (Simonin 2013, 8).

In certain cases, the postmodifying infinitive can be in the same position as an infinitive in secondary predication, which leads to ambiguity:

- (39) *She wants someone to look after her*  
*She wants someone who would look after her.* [postmodification]  
*She wants [that someone would look after her].* [secondary predication]  
 (Dušková 2012, 564)

If the object of the main verb is identical with the object of the infinitive, the infinitive is unambiguously postmodifying:

- (40) *She wants someone to look after* (Dušková 2012, 564)  
*She wants someone [to look after someone].*  
*She wants someone who she could look after.*

The difference between a postmodifying infinitive after the verb *have* differs from the modal *have* in word order only, compare:

- (41) *He has a large family to provide for.*  
*He has to provide for a large family.* (Dušková 2012, 568).

In structures with nouns indicating a general person, thing, place or time, which are modified by adjectives like *easy*, *hard*, *difficult* etc., the following infinitive only resembles a postmodifying infinitive (Dušková 2012, 566). The infinitive, in actuality, functions as the subject of the underlying structure, merely transformed on the surface (Hralová 2005, 85):

- (42) *That was a tactless thing to say.*  
*To say that was a tactless thing.*

- (43) *You can be self-centred, and that is a marvellous lesson to learn.*  
*...it is marvellous to learn it.*
- (44) *This is not a very easy letter to write.*  
*It is not easy to write this letter. (Hralová 2005, 85)*
- (45) *She is not a safe person to confide in.*  
*It is not safe to confide in her. (Dušková 2012, 566)*

#### 1.2.1.4. Forms

The postmodifier usually stands right behind the head noun it modifies; it can, however, also occur in a chain of modification structures on a second or a third position (Hralová 2005, 120-121), for example:

- (46) *She found a place of good reputation for him to stay.* (example mine)

An infinitive postmodifier can also be preceded by the complementizer *for* when its subject is expressed explicitly, viz 2.2.1.2. (Brinton & Brinton 2010, 277). The infinitive can, as an integrated relative, occur with or without a relative word. There are two restrictions to occurrence with a relative word:

- a. The relative phrase must consist of preposition + NP.
- b. There can be no expressed subject. (CamGEL 2002, 1067)

Sentences like these fulfil these conditions:

- (47) *She found a good place from which to watch the procession.*
- (48) *She found a good place to watch the procession from.* (Huddleston & Pullum 2002, 1066)

While constructions such as these are impermissible:

- (49) *\*The man who to help you is Mr. Johnson.*
- (50) *\*The man who to see is Mr. Johnson.*
- (51) *\*She is not a person whom to rely on.* (Ojea López 2022, 69)

It is considered more formal to retain the relative pronoun with the infinitive: *A good place at which to eat is the pub round the corner*; the relative pronoun can be subject, object, adverbial, or, marginally, complement:

- S: The man to help you is Mr Johnson. ['who can help you']  
 O: The man (*for you*) to see is Mr Johnson [ 'who(m) you should see' ]  
 C: The thing (*for you*) to be these days is a systems analyst. [ 'the thing that people will try to be these days is a systems analyst': cf. pseudo-cleft sentences ]

A: The time (*for you*) *to go* is July. [‘at which you should go’]

A: The place (*for you*) *to stay* is the university guest house. [‘where you should stay’]  
(CGEL 1985, 1265-6)

Postmodifying infinitive also appears in one-constituent sentences:

(52) *What a lovely place to live* (Hralová 2011, 33).

Unsurprisingly, constructions without a relativizer are used more widely, potentially for allowing the subject to be expressed:

(53) *She’s the ideal person [(for you) to confide in].*

(54) *I’ve found something interesting [(for us) to read].*

(55) *A systems analyst wouldn’t be such a bad thing [(for her) to be].*

(56) *That is not a very good way [(for him) to begin].*

(57) *You’re not the first person [to notice the mistake].* (Huddleston & Pullum 2002, 1067)

The voice of the postmodifying infinitive clause can be both active and passive, with some restrictions and/or rules. In certain cases, the two voices can be used interchangeably with little or no change of meaning: *He is the best man to choose/to be chosen*, applying to *there*-existentials too (CGEL 1985, 1267-8). “If the antecedent can be interpreted as the subject, then there is no passive interpretation and on the contrary, it is possible to use passive if the antecedent can be interpreted as the object” (Hralová 2011, 32). The use of passive is also not exactly plausible when the head is a quantifier (*a lot, a large number* etc.) (CGEL 1985, 1268). Sometimes, the choice of voice indicates different modality:

(58) *There was nothing to do.* [nothing worth doing]

(59) *There was nothing to be done.* [nothing which one could do] (Dušková 2012, 566)

“The infinitive often postmodifies a generic noun and a negative or indefinite quantifier, which corresponds to an adjective relative clause or prepositional phrase in Czech: *She is not a girl (She is not one) to care much for a holiday in a quiet, out-of-the-way place.* Není to děvče, které by moc stálo o dovolenou v klidném, nevyhledávaném místě. [...] When postmodifying a noun with unique determination (via article, superlative, *the only*, ordinals etc.), the corresponding Czech equivalent is a relative clause or an appositive construction, marginally also different constructions: *You are the (proper) man to advise me.* Ty jsi ten (pravý), kdo mi poradí. *It’s the only thing to do.* To je jediné, co můžeme udělat. *This is not the way to talk.* Takhle se nemluví.“ (Dušková 2012, 565-66).

### 1.2.1.5. Modality

„Infinitival relatives characteristically have a modal meaning comparable to that expressed in finites by *can* or *should*. *Here's something interesting for you to read*, for example, is comparable to *Here's something interesting that you can/should read*.” (CamGEL 2002, 1068). Although it is possible to read them in a nonmodal sense as well, the modal interpretation is perceived as normal. In fact, if the clause has an object gap, it is the only interpretation possible:

(60) The thing *to do* is...

[‘The thing we should do is...’: *not* = ‘The thing we do is...’ or ‘The thing we are going to do is...’] (CGEL 1985, 1269)

In the case of subject gap, the interpretation may go both ways and to ensure a nonmodal interpretation usually another modifier (e.g., *only*, *next*, *last*) or an ordinal (e.g., *first*, *second*) is included:

(61) *She's obviously the person to finish the job*. [modal]

(62) *She was the first person to finish the job*. [non-modal] (CamGEL 2002, 1068)

Such “nonmodal marker” can also be expressed by adjectives in the superlative, and the infinitive then correlates to a relative clause, e.g., *She was the first person who finished the job* (CGEL 1985, 1269). The type of modality expressed is possibility or obligation; the passive infinitive in particular expresses these types of modality, including future reference (Dušková 2012, 567). Such clauses then have a corresponding finite relative clause alternative (Hralová 2005, 51). Since during the process of passivisation the objects become subjects, CGEL (1985, 1269) deems all passive postmodifying infinitives to have modal meaning. The Czech postnominal infinitive is incapable of carrying such modal meanings are impossible in the Czech context and therefore require syntactic and lexical means to be expressed.

### 1.2.2. Postmodification of Czech noun phrase – attributive infinitive

The Czech tradition does not traditionally work with the term “modification”, instead using the term attribute, which can be anteposed and postposed. Postposed attribute occupies the directly following position after the head noun; if there is an attribute in the genitive case among multiple postposed attributes, it will occupy the first position, in which case the infinitive occupies the second position (Daneš et al. 1988, 167), compare for example, *potřeba pomáhat*, *potřeba policie pomáhat* (example mine). In terms of restriction the two traditions correlate; an attributive infinitive can be both restrictive and non-restrictive. As Czech uses not only of

inflection but also of grammatical gender, attributes are traditionally also defined in the terms of concord. Since the infinitive is incapable of displaying both grammatical case and gender, it is always an incongruous attribute (including the passive infinitive which, although capable of concord in gender, still lacks the ability to express concord in case). Certain postnominal cases correspond to the valency of the funding verb, the same goes for prepositions, adverbials and infinitive structures (*vůle pomáhat bližnímu*) (*CzechEncy*: Nominální skupina). Some attributive infinitives are preceded by a preposition and *to*, which functions as the case denominator: *touha po tom zvítězit* a desire to win (PMČ 1995, 504). This tendency to carry on the funding word's valency is prevalent in Czech, which would classify the Czech postnominal infinitive as a noun complement, rather than postmodifier.

Postnominal infinitives are treated as a condensation of prepositional dependent clauses, that is, a rection complement, which usually follows action nouns formed by nominalisation of verbs, or expressions synonymous with them; the semantics of the funding word determines the conjunction, temporal and modal form of these attributive clauses (Greppl & Králík 1989, 269). Unlike in English, the Czech infinitive is incapable of expressing any temporality or modality, the only feature the nominalisation retains from the finite dependent clause is the valency relationship between the head noun and the attribute.

Despite the rather poor range of expressible information carried by the infinitive, its use as an attribute is quite widespread as it allows for the lightening of the sentence structure and thus requires the addressee to put in less effort during reception, as well as being stylistically neutral, unlike other types of condensers (Vicianová 2016, 20).

#### 1.2.2.1. Subject control

The Czech tradition generally employs PRO for expressing the controller of an infinitive. There are two types of control recognised: subject and object (*CzechEncy*: Kontrola):

(63) *Kyslík má schopnost vytvářet dvojité vazby.* [subject control]  
Oxygen has the capacity to form double bonds.

(64) *Nerad bych vás připravil o pokušení být vtipný na můj účet.* [object control]  
I wouldn't like to deprive you of the pleasure to be witty at my expense.  
(Dušková 2012, 565)

The subject of the attributive infinitive is usually overt but can appear as covert in structures such as: *Snaha pomoci se cení* An effort to help counts. As is clear from the examples, Czech attributive infinitive only allows for subject gaps. This, of course, implies complications in translations from English to Czech.

### 1.2.2.2. Modality

In Czech, modality is predominantly expressed lexically, marginally grammatically, or syntactically – certain constructions carry a modal meaning without explicit modal words, for example the now rather outdated  $S_{\text{dat}} - V - \text{INF}$  *Matce bylo pečovati o dítě* (Greppl & Karlík 1989, 173, 177). The infinitive tends to appear the modal verb, another especially common construction is with the predicative<sup>2</sup>: *je nutno, třeba, možno, záhodno...* or an adjectival copula: *je nezbytné* (Greppl & Karlík 1989, 173). Another copular construction with the infinitive carries a modal meaning: *Už je slyšet muzika* (Greppl & Karlík 1989, 181). While the infinitive functions in constructions expressing modality, it is not the infinitive itself which carries the modal meaning.

So, while attributive infinitive itself does not express any kind of modality, the head nouns it follows do. Their semantics express a certain im/possibility, effort, tendency, obligation etc. However, they can, of course, follow nouns which have no modal colouring (Valečková 2017, 26). For example: *možnost ubytovat se* a possibility to get accommodation, *právo vydávat knihy* the right to publish books (Vicianová 2016, 20). Thus, it can be expected that all Czech translation counterparts will have to employ finite modals to express the modality entrenched in the English postmodifying infinitive.

The only infinitive expressing any kind of modality appears in modal existential clauses. These sentences typically have the verb *mít* (have) or *být* (be) and an infinitive phrase with a *k*-word<sup>3</sup>, and can be paraphrased as seen in examples (65) and (66):

(65) *Je kam jít*  
Existuje možnost někam jít

(66) *Petr má kam jít*  
Petr má možnost někam jít (*CzechEncy*: Modální existenciální věta)

Such structures also include sentences like *Není co pít* There's nothing to drink. Seeing these two TCs, one would assume that the English postmodifying infinitive is translatable one-to-one to Czech. However, this assumption focuses merely on the surface. The syntactic analysis of the Czech *Není co pít* shows a. that the whole *k*-InfP<sup>4</sup> is a complement to the verb and b. that the infinitive is not dependent on the interrogative but, in fact, the other way round, ergo it is

---

<sup>2</sup> In Czech „predikativum“; adverb used only as a part of the predicate, „modal predicative“ refers to those carrying a modal meaning (*CzechEncy*: Adverbium)

<sup>3</sup> an interrogative pronoun *who* *kdo* or *what* *co*; named thus based on the analogy with the English *wh*-word and because the typical stem of interrogative pronouns, of significant number of relative and indefinite pronouns, and interrogative adverbs is *k*-

<sup>4</sup> named thus for the inclusion of a *k*-word

not a case of an existential construction. Such analysis is backed by the fact that “for some idiolects it is acceptable that it stay in the position in which it is generated: *Není/Nemám* [<sub>κ</sub>-<sub>infP</sub> *přemýšlet o čem*] (*CzechEncy*: Modální existenciální věta).

Based on this information gathered about both the English and Czech postnominal infinitive in postmodifying function, it can be inferred that a one-to-one, infinitive-to-infinitive translation from English to Czech is impossible. Mainly based on the fact that a postmodifying infinitive as such does not exist in Czech. The disagreement of paradigms also suggests that, while some postmodifying infinitives might be translated using an infinitive in a different function, most will be translated using different parts of speech.

## 2. Methodology

### 2.2. Material

The data gathered for this thesis were retrieved from the parallel corpus *InterCorp v16* – English and Czech, using the Core collection, aligned to gather translation counterparts from texts originally written in English. Examples were retrieved from the results to the query question used to target all infinitival forms:

```
[tag="N.*" & word!="order"] [word="to"] [tag="VB.*"] [tag="VBN.*" | tag="VBG.*" | tag=".*"]
```

Out of a total of 82 487 concordance lines, 100 examples (viz Appendix) were selected manually, which required manual extraction from 840 responses to the query which intentionally ignores the functional distinction of the infinitive, for distinguishing between noun complement and postmodifier functions is sometimes nuanced. For this reason the infinitive functions were evaluated manually. 18 examples of borderline infinitives and infinitives with multiple possible interpretations were extracted as well and, based on the aforementioned accounts and tests, not included in the final sample of 100 examples of true postmodifying infinitives. For the purposes of broader coverage of the phenomenon under investigation, below we shall mention these examples to better illustrate the application of our cornerstone theories.

Due to the lack of surface structure distinctions, the most common borderline examples found in our data (noun complement excluded) are those straddling the line between postmodifier and adverbial of purpose. Some instances were more prone to both interpretations than others; for example the following sentence could be, not unfoundedly, interpreted both ways: *Casting spells to summon fairies!* Both “spells which summon fairies” and “Casting spells in order to summon fairies” are valid interpretations. Similarly:

*But with an economic crisis to tackle and what I suspected might be **a limited window to get my agenda through a Democratically controlled Congress**, I was convinced that his pile-driver style was exactly what I needed.*

While the adverbial interpretation remains more salient, “a limited window in which I could get...” is a perfectly acceptable rephrasing, which only highlights the necessity of applying all of the tests.

They proved especially important in the cases of infinitives following the noun *time* or *way*: *No time to lose!, There’s a right way and a wrong way to do things.* Such examples even Biber

et al. in *Grammar of Spoken and Written English* (2021) consider to be postmodifiers, with which assessment we have to disagree. If the abovementioned tests (viz 1.2.1.3.) are applied, the noun complement theory becomes more salient than the postmodifier one. Firstly, restructuring into a relative clause creates sentences which border acceptability: *No time which we can lose!*, *There's a right way in which to do things*. Moreover, the PRO is not controlled by the head noun: *time* [*\*time lose*], *way* [*\*way do things*].

A similar but different case is the sentence: *But they both knew that her leave of absence had only six more **weeks to run***. The relative clause variant is not salient: *...only six more weeks \*which would run/\*in which it would run*. And the PRO might seemingly be *weeks*: [*weeks run*], referring to metaphorical running of time, but the thing which is progressing is actually the “leave of absence”, not the timeframe of six weeks.

Examples of surface structures reminiscent of the postmodifying infinitive as mentioned by Dušková (2012, 566) appeared as well: *a grown-up thing to do*. Applying the restructuring shows that the deep structure indeed is *It was grown-up to do it*. Another potentially hidden structure which proved to be rather tricky to decipher appears in the following example:

*It was difficult enough to keep up with immediate needs - the coal to be brought in for the kitchen stove, **the sitting-room fire to keep going in winter**, semi-clean school clothes to be found for the children.*

The PRO might be the head noun and the rephrasing “the fire which had to keep going” plausible, but what happens here is a continuation of the previous clause structure: “the need to keep the sitting-room fire going”. It is therefore another variation on surface similarity.

Lastly, we shall mention the case of a secondary predication, which became easy to misinterpret as a postmodification due to the elliptical nature of the clause: *I'd wanted moral advice, **someone to reconcile my calling as a wife and mother with the call I heard of something else***. The wish is not for the existence of someone “who would reconcile...” but for a potential someone “to do the reconciling”. The first reading is influenced by the blending of two structures *I want someone* and *someone postmodifying infinitive*, e.g., viz 1.2.1.3.

As stated above, instances of this type were not included in the final sample. The complete dataset of our examples is included in the Appendix and numbered thus: /1/.

### 2.3. Method

The presumption of this thesis is the fact that the infinitive is not only a much more common means of postmodification in the English language, but also, in fact, limited to said language,

as the attributive infinitive found in Czech falls into what Biber et al. (2021) would classify as noun complement. Thus, the expected findings of our analysis are translation counterparts completely divergent in syntactic structure. However, as one of the main features of the English infinitive in postmodifying function is the ability to be paraphrased via a finite clause and, considering the tendency of Czech to favour finite expressions, relative clauses can be expected to be the most common form of translation. Another expected outcome is a change of word-class membership. The type and frequency of individual translation realisations will be analysed and recorded in tables.

A similar study to ours has been conducted by R. Šimůnková (2017) focusing on all functions of the infinitival verb phrase and their translations into Czech; relevant for our thesis are the results of infinitive as postmodifier of a noun. Her sample includes, unlike in our work, both the postmodifying and noun complement functions; therefore, the translation types include such types which cannot and do not appear in our data; namely, the subordinate appositive clause. Hence, her findings serve merely as a frame of reference for anticipating our results. The most common modes of translation in her study of the infinitive as a postmodifier were, in order of quantity, infinitive, subordinate relative clause, different solution, not translated, and subordinate appositive clause. For the sake of completeness, we shall include the category of subordinate appositive clause in our tables as well. More commentary on her classification and our approach to it is contained in Analysis (2.).

Further, the term “translation counterpart” (TC) will be used throughout the analysis, as “translation equivalent” implies identity, which is presumed impossible. The analysis deals with each English infinitive form and their TCs individually; the summary of the nature of Czech TCs is discussed in the introduction to the Analysis.

### 3. Analysis

Among the 100 examples, only active and passive present simple infinitive forms were found, with the active form making up more than three quarters of the total amount of examples.

Table 1: Frequency of infinitival types

Type	Number of occurrences	Percentage
Present simple active	82	82%
Present simple passive	18	18%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100%</b>

Among the 100 head nouns, 27 NP heads are of pronominal nature:

Table 2: Pronominal Head Nouns

Pronoun	Number of occurrences	Percentage
	<i>-one</i>	
anyone	1	4%
someone	3	11%
everyone	0	0%
no one/no-one	0	0%
	<i>-thing</i>	
anything	5	19%
something	7	26%
everything	0	0%
nothing	8	29%
thing(s)	3	11%
<b>Total</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100%</b>

Note that no instances of *-body* were recorded as well as no instances of pronouns with *every-*. It is rather surprising to see the negative indefinite pronoun *nothing* is the most represented one while there were no instances of *no one/no-one* recorded. We use the term “pronominal nature” as three heads are in fact instances of the noun “thing”, which, although not a pronoun, is

semantically empty in these instances, and in our data thus functions as a placeholder word. Moreover, note that when appearing in a sentence with negative polarity, it essentially becomes a rephrase of *nothing*:

- (1) I have not a thing to say! /78/  
I have *nothing* to say!

As for the remaining 73 instances, only two nouns appeared as the head: *place* (3x), *tool* (2x); no trends were recorded as to which nouns are more likely to licence a passive postmodifying infinitive.

The syntactic structure of the sentence was found to influence the possibility of voice change; 6 out of 10 passive forms which could be exchanged for active form with little to no change occurred in *there*-existential constructions, for example:

- (2) ...there are preliminary negotiations to be overcome... /63/  
...*there are preliminary negotiations to overcome*...

*There*-constructions appeared seven times among 18 passive form postmodifying infinitives, 17 times with active infinitive – 24 times in total. Five of these instances were negative in polarity, either by negating the verb *be* or via negative quantifier:

- (3) A few minutes later there was not a rabbit to be seen. /65/

Seven instances were negated by the usage of *nothing*, for example:

- (4) There is nothing to be afraid of.” /92/

If the head (pro)noun is the object (formal subject of the passive infinitive), the postmodifying infinitive carries a modal meaning (4). Polarity, it seems, does not influence modality.

The syntactic gap, however, seems to influence implied modality to some degree. Out of the overall 14 infinitives with subject gaps, six carry a modal meaning, mostly of expectation and ability, respectively:

- (5) *Not a night to linger on the road.* /6/  
Not a night when one *would* linger on the road.

- (6) *There's nothing to take it up!* /79/  
There is nothing that *can* take it up.

Example (5) has two possible interpretations as to its modality. Firstly, it could be interpreted as desirability, “Not a night when one should linger on the road”, secondly, epistemic modality, expectation, “Not a night when one would linger on the road”. The second reading is, apparently,

supported by the TC: „*Joe by byl poslední člověk na světě, kterého bych podezříval, že tam tu bombu dal,*” *vybuchl Harley rozčileně.*

In case of the prepositional complement gap, each postmodifying infinitive proved to carry and implied modal meaning, to illustrate:

- (7) 'Pon my word, it is a great thing for me to have someone to talk to, for my own thoughts are not over-pleasant. /94/  
*...someone I can talk to...*

Seven infinitives have adverbial gaps; if the adverbial is an instrument, it does not carry a modal meaning per se, but the modality of predisposition to the action of the instrument is reflected in the Czech TC, for example:

- (8) Right, Doctor Spivey, if it don't work, we've still got the key to lock it back up.  
*„Správné, doktore Spivey, když se to neosvědčí, pořád máme klíč, kterým se koupelna může zamknout.* /7/

No connection of semantic role of the head noun to the modality of the postmodifying infinitive has been found.

On the other hand, deep syntax seems to play a role in which object gap infinitives allow for voice change with little or no semantic change. As mentioned above (viz 1.2.1.4), if the antecedent corresponds to the object of the infinitive, the voices can be used interchangeably. However, upon deeper inspection of the objects in our data, more variables arise. We would like to amend Hralová's (2005) statement to say that if the antecedent can be interpreted not only as the direct object but specifically as the patient then the voice change is possible, compare (9), patient, and (10), location:

- (9) ...I prerecorded a five-minute parody of the hit movie Forrest Gump to play at the end of the show. /8/  
*...parody [...] to be played at the end of the show.*

- (10) It looked a hell of a country to hunt. /57/  
*\*It looked like a hell of a country to be hunted.*

The interchangeability of voices is, of course, also dependent on the matrix structure and contents. In (11) the change is impossible because of the explicit agent in the matrix, which makes the de-agenising passive unacceptable, while a different matrix verb, without the agent, might permit it:

- (11) I wrapped my hands around the bin's top wall, knowing this would give me a ledge to grasp when the bin was vertical. /5/

\*...*knowing this would give me a ledge to be grasped*...  
 ?...*knowing this would present a ledge to be grasped*...

If the matrix contains *have (got) + head noun + infinitive* construction, the voice change is impossible:

(12) “I beg your pardon, sir,” said Childermass,” but I have a question to put to you.  
 /44/  
 \**I have a question to be put to you.*

No influence of control on voice change plausibility has been found.

### 3.1. Translation Counterparts

As mentioned in the methodology section, this thesis will take over Šimůnková’s (2017) classification of TCs to the infinitive in postmodifying function. It should, however, be noted that, given her analysis of both postmodifiers and noun complements, Šimůnková’s definition of “infinitive” TC is divergent from ours. The definition of an infinitival TC in our case would be “translation via the infinitive in a different syntactic function”. The term “different solution” (further DS), as chosen by our predecessor, is a conveniently vague, all-encompassing term, which of course needs to be discussed further. Its vagueness is useful in that it allows for cleaner classification, as well as allowing for the fact that such TCs are not always qualifiable by one single term, as many changes can take place at the same time. We shall try to outline types of “different solution” TCs based on our data in Table 3, along with the terms outlined by Šimůnková (2017, 142). Each type will be discussed and explained in a dedicated section further.

Table 3: Proportion of TC types

Type of TCs	Overall occurrences	TC of active infinitive	TC of passive infinitive
Infinitive	32	23	9
Subordinate relative clause	17	15	2
Different solution	28	23	5
Semantically close infinitive	3	3	0
Finite verb	8	5	3

Adverbial	2	2	0
Noun	11	10	1
Adjective	2	1	1
In-clause switch	1	1	0
Not translated	23	21	2
Subordinate appositive clause	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>18</b>

An observant reader will note that the numbers of individual types of DS TCs do not match with the total number of DS TC. The reason behind this discrepancy is example (13), which is very hard to classify as the TC added a whole dependent clause and transformed the infinitive into a content clause dependent on it, and while such translation could technically be included in Table 3, we feel that this particular case is employing more than mere finiteness change:

- (13) “The last person on earth to put a bomb on any aircraft would be Joe,” he said explosively.  
*“Joe by byl poslední člověk na světě, kterého bych podezříval, že tam tu bombu dal,” vybuchl Harley rozčileně. /55/*

For this reason, example (13) was left out of Table 2, although it is indubitably one of the examples of “different solution”.

TC with the use of semantically close or equal noun can be further classified as shows in Table 4:

Table 4: Types and numbers of TCs with the use of semantically close or equal noun

Type	Number	Active	Passive
Deverbal noun of the same verb	4	3	1
Deverbal noun of a semantically close verb	1	1	0
<i>K</i> -deverbal noun construction <sup>5</sup>	5	5	0
A noun semantically merging the head noun and the infinitive	1	1	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1</b>

<sup>5</sup> *K*-deverbal noun construction refers to constructions expressing intended usage or desired action connected to the head noun, e.g., „něco k jídlu“ *something that the speaker wishes to eat*, „korálky k zavěšení“ *beads which are meant to be hung*.

To illustrate, in order:

(14) ...there is no Psipsina catching mice, **no goat to bleat** in the dawn and wake me...

...žádná Psipsina tu nechytá myši, **kozel mě svým mečením ráno nevzbudí...**/24/

(15) “Then you're the perfect **guy to walk away.**”

„Tak to jsi na **útěk jako stvořený.**” /56/

(16) ‘I don’t suppose there’s **anything to eat** around here?’

„Předpokládám, že tady těžko najdeme **něco k jídlu, co?**” /74/

(17) It looked a hell of a **country to hunt.**

*Zdalo se, že to bude nemožné **loviště.*** /57/

TCs which employ the use of adjectives can, too, be categorised further:

Table 5: Types of adjective DS TCs

Type	Number	Active	Passive
Deverbal adjective of the verb	1	0	1
Deverbal adjective of semantically close verb	1	1	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>

Deeper analysis will be delivered in the corresponding sub-chapter, but to briefly illustrate our categorisation, in order:

(18) ...the power required to send a signal across a gulf of space and time increases exponentially with **the distance to be travelled.**

...závisí energie nutná na vyslání signálu časem a prostorem exponenciálně na **překonané vzdálenosti.** /64/

(19) Why did she cry so much, this very first member of **the race to come,**

*Pročpak tak křičel ten vůbec první příslušník **vznikající rasy*** /53/

Most of DS TCs come with syntactic restructuring as well as changes on the level of semantics, coexisting with one another, which makes it almost impossible trying to disentangle them and determine just one. Naturally, the other TCs licence some syntactic changes of their own; however, they do not modify the sentence structure to such extent and allow for some easily recognisable correlation between the original and the translation.

The generalisation and analysis of the influence of head nouns on translation form proved to be difficult as a wide variety of nouns appeared. Two trends were recorded: firstly,

head nouns followed by any “expected” infinitive with an object gap (e.g. *errand to do*) usually resulted in deletion of the verb; secondly, in cases where the head noun position is occupied by a pronoun, the resulting TC tends to be de-agented into a subjectless sentence<sup>6</sup> and the negative aspect of the pronoun “nothing“ is moved onto the Czech verb, e.g.:

(20) „There’s **nothing to tell**,” she said.  
„*Není o čem mluvit*,” řekla. /88/

As mentioned above, several factors influence the modality of the postmodifying infinitival structure. Firstly, *there*-existential constructions often licenced modal reading, and subsequently, the usage of explicit modal words in the TC:

(21) There are three **hypotheses to consider**.  
*Je třeba zvážit tři hypotézy.* /50/

Secondly, with *have (got) + head noun* constructions in which the head noun is the object of the infinitive and its subject is the subject of the matrix verb, the construction carries a modal meaning:

(22) You have your **studies to think of**.  
*Měl by ses soustředit na vlastní studium.* /4/

Thirdly, perception verbs, in our data only *to see*, carry intrinsic modality:

(23) There aint **nothin to see**.  
*Není co vidět.* /81/

Fourthly, the passive infinitive in postmodifying function carries modal meaning always. Compare:

(24) **Bills to be paid**.  
*Musím platit účty.* /70/

(25) And with the splendid second **volume to be checked?**  
*A přitom je třeba ověřovat ten skvělý druhý díl.* /72/

## 3.2. Active Present Infinitive

Out of the 82 postmodifiers expressed by the active infinitive form, the most common means of translation are “different solution” TCs, with 23 occurrences, which makes up 28% of the

---

<sup>6</sup> In Czech linguistics „subjectless sentence“ refers constructions containing a verb which has no explicit nor implicit subject to form basic concord with; typically the verb in the predicate will take on the 3rd person singular form.

overall active infinitive TCs, and the infinitive in a different function, also 23 occurrences. The second most common TC is no translation, with 21 occurrences (26%). And lastly, the previously most anticipated translation via a relative clause appears only in 15 instances, mere 18%. The following section will take a closer look at the individual TCs and will showcase their specifics on individual examples.

### 3.2.1. Infinitive in different function

Using the infinitive in a different syntactic function, mostly as a part of the predicate, is the third most represented way to translate the postmodifying infinitive from English to Czech. Most of the infinitives imply a modal meaning and so the Czech TCs contain some sort of an explicit modal word, be it a verb or a predicative, although the former is much more prevalent. An interesting change is attested in two examples (26) and (27), both including the infinitive in the predicate with not exactly modal, but also not true lexical verbs:

(26) Giving participants meaningful **roles to play** (“teacher,” “learner”) that carry with them previously learned positive values and automatically activate response scripts.

*Nechat účastníky hrát nějaké smysluplné role („učitel”, „student”), které s sebou nesou dříve osvojené pozitivní hodnoty a automaticky aktivují scénáře odpovědí. /9/*

(27) Mother gave him **ice cubes to suck on**, hoping to hydrate him...

*Dala mu cucat kostky ledu, aby nebyl... /51/*

The first use of *give* is less literal than the second one, which reflects in the different TCs. *Nechat* ‘to let someone do something’ expresses permission which *giving a role to play* does not; the original *to play* carries more of an ability or weak obligation. Example (27) is as close to 1:1 translation as is possible, however, this case is rather ambiguous, reminiscent of (35 in 1.2.1.3.):

- a. ...ice cubes on which he was supposed to suck (postmodifier)
- b. ...ice cube so that he could suck on them (adverbial of purpose)

Interpretation b. is rather less salient than a. in our opinion, as the purpose of the action is not that the child suck on the ice cubes, but rather that the ice cubes serve a purpose of cooling down, hence they should be sucked on. The TC diverges from this structure. *Dát + Odir + inf* is a trickier, minority construction in Czech which expresses similar meaning to *order to, tell to*. In this way it takes the desirability the postmodifying infinitive carries in English and transforms it into obligation carried by the main verb.

Another modality change is visible on example (28) where obligation, licenced by the *have+head noun+ infinitive* construction, changes to ability/permission in the TC, which in this case could be judged as a translation shortcoming:

- (28) He isn't going to stake everything on an expedition to the Galaxy's rim when he **has** fifty hostile neighbors and an emperor **to rebel against**.  
*Nevsadí všechno na expedici ke kraji galaxie, když je sám obklopen padesáti nepřátelsky naladěnými sousedy a když **může povstat** proti císaři.*  
/49/

A very interesting modality expression, almost imperceptible, happens in (29):

- (29) There were some **papers to sign**, and some of the other members of Fritz's Act wished to have a look at their future home.  
*Zbývalo podepsat nějaké **papíry** a několik dalších členů Fritzova čísla si přálo prohlédnout si svůj příští domov.* /54/

The verb *zbývat* is particularly interesting when used with an infinitive for it conveys both that there are papers *left* but also that it is *desirable they be signed*; it also implies the action of signing is the last in a series of actions which creates a sequence absent in the original, therefore unfortunately creating slight discord in information carried in both languages.

Infinitives postmodifying a pronoun are sequestered at the end of both the analysis and the list of data for a particular reason – firstly, the head is a pronoun and not a noun, secondly, they are often semi-phrasal, in either language, and, thirdly, they are freely exchangeable among themselves, i.e., compatible with any verb.

In total, infinitives postmodifying a pronominal head noun appear in 27 examples, almost a third. Among 27 results, 13 TCs employ the infinitive in a different function. Out of which only three use true modal words in the TCs, while seven use *není* or *nedá se* subjectless constructions which carry modal meaning while not being modals. The TC *Nedá se nic dělat* has somewhat reached a collocation status, if not yet quite phrasal. It is a common way to express de-agented impossibility of action, i.e., removing responsibility. This correlates with the English *There's nothing to be done* /77/, the only exception to the postmodifying infinitive voice change rule as set by Hralová (2005) (viz 1.2.1.4.).

The collocation “something to do” can apparently be translated in many ways, some more phrasal in Czech than others:

- (30) 'Gives you **something to do**,' he replied, with that new brutal indifference, without even looking at her.  
*„Aspoň **máš co dělat**,” odpověděl s onou novou surovou lhostejností a ani na ni nepohlédl.* /80/

(31) It gives me **something to do**, and it affords me some private pleasure.

*Zaměstnává mne to a mám z toho trochu tichého uspokojení. /75/*

(32) Scientists exult in mystery for a different reason: it gives them **something to do**.

*Vědci si v záhadách libují také, ale z jiného důvodu: díky nim mají co na práci. /86/*

Close to this phrase can come “to have things to do”, which in example (33) resulted in the same TC:

(33) (“I have better **things to do** at night,” he ’d say.)

*(„V noci mám na práci něco jinšího,” tvrdil.) /45/*

This points toward a degree of semantic emptying, thus leaving “things”, in plural form, to assume a de facto pronominal function. It is therefore interesting to look at the choice of Czech “práce” as a TC. We believe this choice – especially in translation of “something to do”, where other translations could be used, viz above – lies in the partial semantic emptying of “práce” and its related pro-form function as well as the vagueness of “to do”, which allows for a myriad of different translations (again, viz above). Regardless of whether the head is a pronoun of the emptied “things”, the TC is a change of the postmodifier into a verb while, most interestingly, retaining the head.

### 3.2.2. Relative clause

Contrary to our expectations, the relative clause proved to be the least represented means of translation with only 15 instances. The examples from our data are relatively uniform, making use of relative pronouns.

(34) A burned **man to care for**, some sheets to wash in a fountain, a room painted like a garden.

*Popálený muž, o kterého je třeba se starat, trocha ložního prádla, které se musí vyprat ve fontáně, místnost vymalovaná coby zahrada. /40/*

Two interesting instances of relative pronominal adverb appear as well. Example (35) discards the original head noun for the adverb has no need for it, as it already contains the semantics of place, and the following clause once again employs a modal verb to express the modality of the original infinitive explicitly:

(35) Left alone, Ginnie looked around, without getting up, for a good **place to throw out** or hide the sandwich.

*Když Ginnie osaměla, tak sice nevstala, ale rozhlédla se, kam by mohla zahodit nebo schovat sendvič: /36/*

Contrarily, (36) retains the original head noun because the copular construction does not permit its deletion:

(36) Not a **night to linger** on the road.  
*Nebyla to noc, kdy by se člověk cestou zdržoval. /6/*

An interesting translation of “to come” appears in (37):

(37) We were to learn in the **days to come** when it was too late ... interesting translation of “to come”  
*Teprve ve dnech, které byly před námi, v době, kdy už bylo příliš pozdě, jsme se měli dovědět... /43/*

It is a lengthy, and a rather surprising, translation, when convenient adjectives like “následující” or “budoucí” are available, as demonstrated on (38):

(38) Why did she cry so much, this very first member of **the race to come**, our race, the human race...  
*Pročpak tak křičel ten vůbec první příslušník vznikající rasy, naší rasy, lidské rasy... /53/*

The difference between the TCs highlights the discord between the two languages – while the English “to come” postmodifier is very versatile, expressing simple existence in the future, Czech cannot apply any of the possible TCs of (39) here, requiring a much choicer word. Last example showcases the different pronoun reference of the two languages:

(39) He flipped through the Yellow Pages and made a **short list of numbers to try**.  
*Prolistoval Zlaté stránky a napsal si seznam, co všechno má zkusit. /17/*

The pronoun “co” does not refer to “seznam” list but the implied contents of it, i.e., “seznam toho, co”, which, based on knowledge of what *the Yellow Pages* are, would be numbers. Thus, while the infinitive is retained, part of the original head noun is not.

### 3.2.3. Different solutions

A somewhat common DS TC (13% of all DS TCs) is the use of a semantically close infinitive, usually of a more pointed meaning in Czech, consider:

(40) Figure 13.1 sketches the status of the five string theories before and after Witten's discovery, and is a good summary **image to keep in mind**.

*Obrázek 13.1 je skicou stavu pěti teorií před Wittenovým objevem a po něm a je vhodným shrnujícím **obrázkem**, jež byste si měli **vštípit** do paměti. /20/*

Despite the whole clause beginning with *ježž* being the TC of the original infinitive, the slight semantic change adding on the idea of “remembering” leads us to include it among DS TCs rather than relative clauses TCs.

A twice more common TC is the use of the infinitive in its finite form. A case blending the previous approach and this one is (41) where a finite form of a semantically close verb is used, alongside which change an interesting switch of subject-object occurs:

- (41) ...and if there was **anyone to take the matter up with** it would have to be a federal agency.  
*...a jestli se s náma má kdo co bavít, tak jediné federální úřad. /89/*

A more straightforward example would be re-agenting the sentence via the finite verb, compare:

- (42) It was a big **hurdle to clear**, a case of politics as the art of the possible.  
*Tím jsme **překonali** velkou **překážku** – v ukázkovém příkladu politiky jako umění možného. /58/*

If the original is passive in form, the Czech TC will be active, with either the narrator/speaker as the subject, or the TC will be subjectless sentence, compare:

- (43) ...but before we get on to that, there's some standard college **business to be attended to...**  
*...ale než se k tomu dostaneme, **musíme vyřídit** jednu typickou univerzitní **záležitost**...” /68/*

- (44) ...and not **a cloud to be seen**.  
*...a nikde **nebylo vidět mráček**. /59/*

However, if the original is not the impersonal *there*-construction, a different means of DS TC will be employed (45). If the agent is stated in the original as a *by*-agent, it will become the subject of the active-form Czech TC:

- (45) Documents dated 673–85 are concerned with **the trade regulations to be observed by the men of Kent** when they barter in Lundenwic.  
*Dokumenty z let 673 - 85 se zabývají **obchodními pravidly, která musí dodržovat muži z Kentu**, když v Lundenwiku provozují výměnný obchod. /67/*

The following examples is the one change recorded in our data which we consider unmotivated as the finite verb form is the only way to translate this particular construction, hence the highlighting of the main verb as it forms a part of the collocation:

(46) ...academic or empirical knowledge in a professional field clearly **have** an important **part to play** in the reception and understanding of texts in a foreign language relating to those fields.

*...akademické či empirické znalosti v profesní sféře zcela určitě **hrají** důležitou **úlohu** ve vnímání a chápání cizojazyčných textů, které se těchto sfér týkají. /10/*

Last reason for employing the finite form is intra-clause temporality. Due to the falling out of use of the transgressive, a different solution must be found for expressing simultaneity. In the case of (47), the participle is transformed into a main verb, the original main verb is deleted, and the infinitive becomes a finite verb:

(47) More horrible grins had probably been seen, but only on the sort of grinner that is orange with black stripes, has a long tail and hangs around in jungles **looking** for victims **to grin at**.

*Jsou to děsiví, černooranžově pruhovaní tvorové s dlouhým ocasem, kteří **číhají** v korunách stromů nad stezkami v džungli na své **oběti** a potom se na **ně** nečekaně **šklebí** ze zálohy. /41/*

Two infinitives were translated using an adverbial (48), or a subordinate adverbial clause (49):

(48) “But he’s right, Harry,” said Hermione, “you have still got two **tasks to do**.

*„Ale on má pravdu, Harry,” prohlásila Hermiona, “ještě máš **před sebou dva úkoly**. /21/*

(49) “Here comes a new **experience to write about**, Lilly,” I joked with her, holding her hand as we walked back to the lobby.

*„Čeká nás nový **zážitek, abys měla o čem psát**, Lilly, „žertoval jsem a držel ji za ruku, když jsme scházeli zase do haly. /25/*

The former simply condenses the futurity the original infinitive conveys, the latter changes the modality. The original infinitive expresses either ability or weak obligation, “an experience worthy of being written about”, while the TC adverbial clause expresses reason instead.

A less offensive change happens in (50) where the adverb switches with the infinitive, thus emphasising the “thought” rather than the “frown”:

(50) He unfolded it anyway in order to have **something to frown thoughtfully at** for a moment or two.

*Přesto ji rozevřel, aby se měl na moment **nad čím se svráštěným čelem zamyslet**. /91/*

This switch could be motivated by the preference of the adverb to stand before the infinitive in Czech; the placement of the adverb after the infinitive in English allows for the principle of end

weight to overpower the importance of the verb in favour of the adverb. In order to respect this highlighting of the adverb, the TC switches word classes to allow for an end placement.

The placement is switched when the TC is an adjective as well, as adjectives in Czech tend to be premodifiers. Two types of adjectives were found in the data: deverbal adjectives of semantically close verbs (7), and deverbal adjectives of the same verb, ergo a postmodifier into a premodifier, a rare case of maintaining the syntactic function (6).

The indubitably most common DS TC is one using an NP. Most often represented is the *k*-deverbal noun construction (45%), found for example in (51), showcasing that this construction is not limited to instances like (52) concerned with eating or drinking:

(51) A deep-buttoned leather **sofa to recline on**.  
*Prošívaná kožená pohovka k polehávání.* /42/

(52) He wanted **something to drink**.  
*Měl chuť na něco k pití.* /97/

Another popular approach is the use of a deverbal noun of the same verb. It is difficult to speak of the examples together, as each employs slightly different strategies. (53) makes use of the *být na něco* construction, (54) makes the original infinitive into a noun in the instrumental case to express cause and effect, (55) employs an adverb which requires a noun complement to express the futurity of the act expressed by the infinitive:

(53) Like I said, they wasn't people to write.  
*Jak jsem vám řekl, voni na psaní nebyli.* /23/

(54) ...there is no Psipsina catching mice, **no goat to bleat** in the dawn and wake me...  
*... kozel mě svým mečením ráno nevzbudí...* /24/

(55) But there is still **a mountain to climb**.  
*...ale pořád ještě má před sebou výstup na hodně vysokou horu.* /46/

The modality is once again expressed explicitly by adding a word, in this case an adjective, carrying the sense of inclination to something.

Coming onto examples which border the use of an NP DS TC and an adjective DS TC, (56) uses a deverbal noun of a semantically close verb, which is modified by an adjective in masculine form, as the head noun is deleted:

(56) „Then you 're the perfect **guy to walk away**.”  
*„Tak to jsi na útěk jako stvořený.”* /56/

(57) could be taken for a quasi-deletion which merges the semantics of the English head noun and the postmodifying infinitive:

(57) It looked a hell of a country to hunt. /57/  
*\*It looked like a hell of a country to be hunted.*

### 3.2.4. Not translated

Most of the deletions of the postmodifying infinitive, i.e., not translating it, rely on the fact that the head nouns imply the action behind them. Nurses usually tend to patients /3/, errands are done /13/, lessons are learned /16/, rice is eaten /34/ etc. Some depend on context, without which the Czech TC is unclear, illustrated perfectly on example (58):

(58) It seemed like a duty and I had only **a cushion to kill her with**.  
*Připadlo mi, že nemám na vybranou, a měl jsem po ruce jen **polštář**.* /18/

Some of the deletions are a little perplexing, as entire passages are deleted, making it difficult to cite the two previous principles. Compare:

(59) You fool, you - you had no sooner got the bagpipes than you changed them for the gloves, which were not worth one-quarter of the money ; and when you had got the gloves, you changed them for a poor miserable stick ; and now for your forty guineas, cow, bagpipes, and gloves, you have **nothing to show** but that poor miserable stick, which you might have cut in any hedge. ”  
*Vy hlupoto sama - jen co jste k těm dudům přišel, vyměnil jste je za rukavice, co by ani za čtvrtku těch dud nestály, a jak jste rukavice koupil, chtěl jste radši jeden bídný klacek, co byste si na každém mlázi nařezat mohl.* ” /82/

Much more interesting TCs are those clearly motivated, like the usage of a slang word and complete syntactic reconstruction in (60):

(60) We ain't got **the tools to make it easy**.  
*Nemáme na to **verky**, půjde to hůř.* /22/

One could argue this example should be included in the previous section; nevertheless, this TC does delete the infinitive completely, and instead uses the word “verky”, tools made specifically for a certain use, and a clause with opposite meaning, ergo nothing of the original infinitive remains. Similarly, in (61) the TC “podnájem” semantically does include a notion of “a place where one stays”; however, it adds information which the original does not carry, and is not semantically close enough to the original infinitive to consider it a TC, equally in (62):

(61) I couldn't very well abandon the girl, so I tried to find her **a place to stay**.  
*Nemohl jsem ji přece nechat na holičkách, a tak jsem jí hledal **podnájem**.* /11/

(62) De Selby has some interesting **things to say** on the subject of houses.  
*De Selby má několik zajímavých **tezí** k tématu domů.* /90/

(63) borders "different solutions" similarly:

(63) Not having **friends to eat with**, he reads over lunch.  
*A protože nemá s kým jít na oběd, čte si i u jídla.* /48/

While it may seem like "u jídla" is a TC of "to eat with," a word-class and syntactic function change DS TC, it is actually "s kým jít na oběd" based on both the preposition "with" and the maintenance of the syntactic function. A semantic switch within the complex sentence between "eat" and "lunch" takes place as well and further proves this is not a case of simple deletion.

Other borderline deletions, (64) and (65), are omitted and substituted with words of completely divergent meaning:

(64) One Ring to rule them all, One Ring **to find them**...  
*Jeden prsten vládne všem, Jeden jim všem káže...* /11/

(65) There's **nothing to take it up!**  
*Ale teď právě nemáme místo, kam bychom je uložili.* /79/

Another very radical deletion, or in this case perhaps condensation, happens in (), where an entire clause is represented by a single word in the TC:

(66) The voice was male and electronically disguised, **the first caller to employ such a device**.  
*Mužský hlas byl poprvé za dobu falešných telefonátů elektronicky modifikován.* /31/

An extreme example of which would be (67), which takes the entire sentence, reforms it into a single verb and adds a whole complex sentence around it; the original infinitive is not kept:

(67) And if he had **anything to say about it**, he wouldn't let her.  
*A i když víc matce neprozradil, v nitru s tímto řešením nesouhlasil.* /84/

Much more functional is (68) where the entire infinitival phrase is deleted in favour of a verbless clause directly translating only one element of the original sentence, operating on the line of associations:

(68) 'Spot of **good news to take home with me for the week-end**.'  
*„**Dobré zprávy na neděli**.”* /26/

Deletions have proven to be particularly popular despite the dubious motivations of many of them. Surprisingly, omission in favour of nominal expression was registered.

### 3.3. Passive Present Infinitive

The most common TC was an infinitive in a different syntactic function, with 9 occurrences, which constitutes a whole 50% of all passive infinitive occurrences. Unlike with the active present infinitive, the differences in number between individual TC types are stark here. The most common TC has 9 occurrences, the second only 5, which is 28%. Relative clause and no translation TC register 2 occurrences (11%) each.

Even in the case of the passive, the relative clause seems to be a rather uncommon tool for translation of the postmodifying infinitive. As it appears, Czech TCs prefer transforming the postmodifier into a completely different clause/phrase constituent rather than retaining its position as postmodifier and making use of the relative clause.

#### 3.3.1. Infinitive in different function

Stemming from the modal nature/reading of passive postmodifying infinitive, and the inability to convey the same in Czech, naturally all TCs reflect it via a modal verb predicate or a construction of modal meaning. The verb “*muset*” *to have to/to must* appears twice, more popular choice is the subject-less sentence. This, arguably, in reaction to the original’s passive voice, to maintain the de-personalised, de-agented nature of the infinitive. Three types of such constructions appeared: *nebýt + infinitive*, *být třeba*, *nedá se + infinitive*. The foremost and the lattermost are often interchangeable with no repercussions. Two examples specifically come seemingly very close to the passive in their use of *nebýt + infinitive*, mainly for the use of *být* as an auxiliary, but, of course, are grammatically nowhere near an actual passive, (3) and (69):

(69) In short, the whole place left **nothing to be desired**.

*Zkrátka, v tom pokoji nebylo co víc si přát. /95/*

This construction conveys intrinsic modality of ability, while the use of *muset* modality of obligation. The use of *je třeba* (for predicatives viz 1.2.2.2.) conveys desirability. Thus, it is necessary to distinguish the type of modality the original postmodifying infinitive carries in order to choose an appropriate modal structure for the TC.

### 3.3.2. Relative clause

The two relative clause TCs found in our data are both fairly straightforward, using the modal verb *muset* + infinitive and directly postmodifying the head noun, thus maintaining the original position and syntactic function:

- (70) ...the future seemed just **a tunnel to be crawled through**.  
...*Budoucnost mu připadala jako tunel, kterým se musí proplazit.* /71/

### 3.3.3. Different solutions

It is no surprise that the Czech TCs abandon the passive voice in favour of the active. Out of the six different solution TCs, two made use re-agentisation via a finite verb:

- (71) There was not a single **Spaniard to be seen**.  
*Neviděl jsem jediného Španěla.* /60/
- (72) There was **nothing to be gained** by thinking now...  
*Přemýšlením teď nic nezíská...* /69/

The question of tense arises; in example (71) the temporal reference correlates with that of the main verb, in (72) the infinitive relates to a future, which in turn influences the tense of the finite verb TC.

Another type of finite verb TC is the usage of semantically close verb, which can be seen on (73):

- (73) ...besides, there was **no money to be made** by honest people.  
...*a jinak slušný člověk k penězům nepřijde.* /66/

We must unfortunately raise a little argument against this TC, as the translation does not quite capture the true meaning of the sentence. Despite that, identical process as before was employed, with a semantically close finite verb used for stylistic reasons.

One TC employed a deverbal adjective of the original infinitive, one the notorious *k*-noun construction. The by far most interesting DS TC would be the one employed in example (74), which uses not only a deverbal noun but also an adjective premodifier to express the meaning of the original infinitive:

- (74) ...it wouldn't be good, because she shouldn't have been in a **position to be influenced** very much.  
...*stejně by mě to provokovalo, protože ve stavu přístupném ovlivnění by se moje manželka nacházet neměla.* /61/

This TC technically makes use of a deverbal noun of the original infinitive in a postmodifying function, however, the modality of the original influences the use of an extra adjective *přístupnému* to convey the ability or possibility. While not a modal construction in a traditional sense, this addition once again proves the need to express the hidden modality in the English postmodifying infinitive explicitly in Czech.

#### 3.3.4. Not translated

Two of the present passive infinitives were completely excluded from the TC, interestingly enough, both of the same verb – *to be found*. Presumably because of its close semantics to the existential *be* the translator opted to lighten the sentence:

- (75) Matsuda's house, not as large or full of eccentricity as my own, is typical of the sort of solid, respectable **house to be found** in Arakawa.  
*Dům Čišua Macudy, i když menší a méně extravagantní než můj, zapadá mezi solidní, úctyhodné domy Arakawy. /62/*

A periphrastic, and rather lengthy, *k nalezení v Arakawě* could certainly be used, however, the employment of the genitive is a much more natural means of expressing placement on top of its smaller demand on the reader. The same could be said for example (58):

- (76) ...they mark the end of the line - the last of nature's matryoshka dolls to be found in the microscopic makeup of matter.  
*...představují poslední článek řetězu, poslední přírodní matrjošku v mikroskopickém uspořádání kosmu. /73/*

Whether or not the original *to be found* is therefore stylistically obsolete and can be regarded as a lax approach of the text's editor we leave up to better equipped judges, however, the Czech TCs clearly speak in favour of one side of the argument.

## 4. Conclusion

To conclude our research, let us briefly recapitulate the major findings. The hypothesis outlined at the beginning of this thesis has been proven true, that is, that there is no true postmodifying infinitive in the Czech language and therefore there is no direct translation counterpart to its English source. Nevertheless, our presumption that instead of a one-to-one translation a relative clause will be employed does not correlate with our data, where translation via the infinitive in a different function dominates, and the relative clause itself is in fact the least used translation technique.

A surprisingly common means of translation proved to be the deletion of the original postmodifying infinitive. It is an interesting reversal of general trends in both languages, and one we have seen demonstrated in our data – that Czech needs to utilize more words to express what English, which favours nominal expression, manages in less. Many deletions seem to stem from the desire to ease the demands of the text on the reader or to create structures more natural for the Czech language. Unfortunately, certain deletions seem doubtfully motivated. A comparison among styles would be beneficial to determine the most common motivations, as the style influences Czech in considerable amounts, chiefly the number of condensations and de-verbalisation in scientific text in particular.

On the other hand, predictions as to the expansion of the clause on account of the inherent modality of the postmodifying infinitive were confirmed. Many different varieties of syntactic modal forms were found and further research into which modality types and/or postmodifying infinitives licence which structure would be a good topic for further research. The structure which stood out in particular is the *k*-deverbal noun construction which appeared often as a translation counterpart to infinitives carrying modality of weak obligation, as it expresses the designated function of an object. Almost equally common translation counterpart, the use of deverbal noun of the same infinitive, recorded no such unifying trend. Research into influences on different solution translation counterparts is needed.

Along with further analysis of syntactic gaps and their influence on modal readings of the postmodifying infinitive, additional research into deep syntactic structures seems necessary as not only have our predecessors already outlined constructions which remind of the postmodifying infinitive on the surface only, but we have also presented claims as to the how the semantic role of the head noun influences the possibility of voice change with little or no change in meaning. We are certain semantic roles can play a role in the resulting translation form as well.

We have further classified a category of translation counterparts outlined by our predecessors and acknowledge that such classifications require a bigger dataset to properly support, we therefore invite other scholars to confirm, adapt or dispute our classification of “different solution” translation counterpart types. Seeing as the attributive infinitive is an almost distressingly understudied topic in Czech linguistics, we also urge Czech linguists to focus on its individual research and characterisation from a non-stylistic point of view in the future.

# Bibliography

- Bělohová, E. (2010). The clausal postmodification of a noun phrase in the written and spoken language (MA thesis, University of Pardubice).
- Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. (2021). *Grammar of spoken and written English*. John Benjamins.
- Breivik, L. E. (1997). Relative infinitives in English. *Studia Neophilologica*, 69(1), 109-115.
- Brinton, D. M., & Brinton, L. J. (2010). Finite and non-finite clauses. In *Linguistic Structure of Modern English* (pp. 243-293). John Benjamins Publishing Company.  
<https://doi.org/10.1075/z.156.09fin>
- Daneš, F., Hlavsa, Z., & Grepl, M. (1988). *Mluvnice češtiny. Svazek 3: Skladba* (1st ed.). Praha: Academia.
- Dušková, L. et al. (2012). *Mluvnice současné angličtiny na pozadí češtiny*. Praha: Academia.
- Elsness, J. (2014). Clausal modifiers in noun phrases: A comparison of English and Norwegian based on the Oslo Multilingual Corpus. *Corpus-based Studies in Contrastive Linguistics*, (1).
- Grepl, M., & Karlík, P. (1989). *Skladba spisovné češtiny* (1st ed.). Praha: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství.
- Hladký, J. (1961). Remarks on complex condensation phenomena in some English and Czech contexts. *BSE*, 3, 105–116.
- Hošnová, E. (1993/1994). Několik poznámek k syntaktické kondenzaci. *ČJL*, 44, 196–201.
- Hralová, S. (2005). *Infinitive in postmodifying function* (Doctoral dissertation, FF UK).
- Hralová, S. (2011). Postmodifying Infinitive. *LOGOS POLYTECHNIKOS aneb "Slovo, jež mnohé obratně a dovedně odkrývá a zprostředkuje"* (Několik vysvětlujících marginálií k názvu časopisu), 2(2).
- Huddleston, R., & Pullum, G. K. (2002). *The Cambridge grammar of the English language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Janovský, S. (2023). Clausal Postmodification of Noun Phrases in Political Discourse. Kolektiv autorů. (1995). *Průruční mluvnice češtiny* (1st ed.). Brno: NLN.
- Karlík, P., & Biskup, P. (2017): ADVERBIUM. In: Petr Karlík, Marek Nekula, Jana Pleskalová (eds.), *CzechEncy - Nový encyklopedický slovník češtiny*. URL: <https://www.czechency.org/slovník/ADVERBIUM> (poslední přístup: 10. 1. 2025)

- Karlík P., Taraldsen Medová L. (2017): KONTROLA. In: Petr Karlík, Marek Nekula, Jana Pleskalová (eds.), CzechEncy - Nový encyklopedický slovník češtiny.  
URL: <https://www.czechency.org/slovník/KONTROLA> (poslední přístup: 19. 12. 2024)
- Karlík, Petr (2017): MODÁLNÍ EXISTENCIÁLNÍ VĚTA. In: Petr Karlík, Marek Nekula, Jana Pleskalová (eds.), CzechEncy - Nový encyklopedický slovník češtiny.  
URL: [https://www.czechency.org/slovník/MODÁLNÍ EXISTENCIÁLNÍ VĚTA](https://www.czechency.org/slovník/MODÁLNÍ_EXISTENCIÁLNÍ_VĚTA) (poslední přístup: 19. 12. 2024)
- Karlík, Petr (2017): NOMINALIZACE. In: Petr Karlík, Marek Nekula, Jana Pleskalová (eds.), CzechEncy - Nový encyklopedický slovník češtiny.  
URL: <https://www.czechency.org/slovník/NOMINALIZACE> (poslední přístup: 19. 12. 2024)
- Karlík, Petr (2017): OBSAHOVÁ VĚTA. In: Petr Karlík, Marek Nekula, Jana Pleskalová (eds.), CzechEncy - Nový encyklopedický slovník češtiny.  
URL: [https://www.czechency.org/slovník/OBSAHOVÁ VĚTA](https://www.czechency.org/slovník/OBSAHOVÁ_VĚTA) (poslední přístup: 24. 10. 2024)
- Ojea López, A. I. (2022). Infinitival relative clauses in English: A syntactic puzzle. *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics*.
- Quirk, R., S. Greenbaum, G. Leech & J. Svartvik (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- Simonin, O. (2013). Adverbial and relative to-infinitives. *Journal of English Linguistics*, 41(1), 4-32.
- Šimůnková, R. (2017). Infinitival verb phrases in English and their translations to Czech – A contrastive study of non-finite verb phrases in English and Czech fiction. *ACC Journal*, 23(3), 134-148. <https://doi.org/10.15240/tul/004/2017-3-011>
- Vachek, J. (1961). Some less familiar aspects of the analytical trend of English. *Brno studies in English*, 3(1), 9-74.
- Valečková, K. (2017). Prostředky syntaktické kondenzace v textech současné publicistiky.
- Veselovská, Ludmila (2017): INFINITIV. In: Petr Karlík, Marek Nekula, Jana Pleskalová (eds.), CzechEncy - Nový encyklopedický slovník češtiny.  
URL: <https://www.czechency.org/slovník/INFINITIV> (poslední přístup: 19. 12. 2024)
- Veselovská, Ludmila (2017): NOMINÁLNÍ SKUPINA. In: Petr Karlík, Marek Nekula, Jana Pleskalová (eds.), CzechEncy - Nový encyklopedický slovník češtiny.  
URL: [https://www.czechency.org/slovník/NOMINÁLNÍ SKUPINA](https://www.czechency.org/slovník/NOMINÁLNÍ_SKUPINA) (poslední přístup: 19. 12. 2024)
- Vicianová, T. (2016). Přívlastkové konstrukce, jejich frekvence a vyjadřování v komunikátech odborného stylu.

# Resumé

Teoretická část představuje a porovnává anglický a český infinitiv, jejich formy, syntaktické funkce a rysy ve funkci postmodifikátoru. Rozlišujeme mezi infinitivem v roli postmodifikátoru a jmenného doplnění, které je součástí valence řídicího podstatného jména, jelikož ty jsou nominalizované ekvivalenty sloves či adjektiv, které ve své valenci mají infinitivní doplnění. Všechny české postnominální infinitivy mohou být považovány za jmenná doplnění, jelikož následují pouze po takovýchto podstatných jménech. Hypotéza této bakalářské práce je, že anglický postmodifikační infinitiv nelze přeložit do češtiny jedna ku jedné a že nejčastějším způsobem překladu je vedlejší věta vztavná, která zachovává syntaktickou funkci modifikátoru.

Data k této práci pocházejí z původně anglických textů v kolekci *Core* paralelního korpusu *InterCorp (v16)* – angličtina a čeština. 100 příkladů bylo vybráno manuálně z 840 odpovědí na dotaz, který záměrně nezahrnoval syntaktickou funkci, jelikož rozdíly mezi infinitivem ve funkci postmodifikátoru a ve funkci jmenného doplnění jsou leckdy těžce určitelné. Pouze aktivní (82%) a pasivní (18%) infinitiv přítomný se objevil v sebraných datech. Přechodové příklady jsou komentovány v Metodologii.

V 27% procentech případů bylo řídicím členem zájmeno. Nebyla nalezena korelace mezi typem řídicího slova a slovesným rodem infinitivu. Ačkoliv jsme nezaznamenali vliv větné polaritě na modální čtení, mezi syntaktickými mezerami (*syntactic gap*) a modalitním čtením korelace zaznamenána byla. Sémantická role se neprokázala mít vliv na modalitu postmodifikačního infinitivu. Syntaktické konstrukce a obsah maticové věty však vliv zaznamenávají. Data dokazují, že překlad jedna ku jedné není možný. Naproti očekávání se vztavná věta ukázala jako nejméně používaný způsob překladu (17%). Nejčastěji se postmodifikační infinitiv překládá tímž infinitivem v jiné syntaktické funkci (32%), dále pak „jiným způsobem“ (28%) a nakonec žádným překladem (23%). Dále rozlišujeme „jiný způsob“ na sémanticky blízký infinitiv (11%), finitní sloveso (30%), příslovečné určení (7,5%), podstatné jméno (40%), adjektivum (7,5%) a vnitrovětné prohození (4%).

Nalézt vztah mezi řídicím jménem a formou překladu se ukázalo být náročné. Avšak řídicí členy následované „očekávaným“ infinitivem s předmětnou mezerou (e.g. *errand to do*) většinou skončily vymazáním infinitivu v překladu; zadruhé, v případě řídicího zájmena se překladové protějšky projevovaly jako bezpodmětné věty. Dále, existenciální konstrukce často přinášely modální čtení, stejně jako konstrukce *have (got) + head noun*, ve kterých byl řídicí člen předmětem postmodifikačního infinitivu a jeho kontrolorem podmět maticového slovesa.

Slovesa smyslového vnímání nesla modální význam vždy. Konstrukce *k* + deverbální podstatné jméno se často objevila jako překlad nesoucí modalitu záhodnosti. Jiné překladové protějšky nelze předvídat.

# Appendix

/1/

I couldn't very well abandon the girl, so I tried to find her a place to stay.

Nemohl jsem ji přece nechat na holičkách, a tak jsem jí hledal podnájem.

/2/

The mice knew there was the owl to worry about, and the fox.

Myši věděly, že se musí bát sovy a lišek.

/3/

Grandfather already had a registered nurse to tend him in the day.

Navíc již delší dobu docházela za Dědečkem ošetřovatelka.

/4/

You have your studies to think of.”

Měl by ses soustředit na vlastní studium.”

/5/

I wrapped my hands around the bin's top wall, knowing this would give me a ledge to grasp when the bin was vertical.

Zapřela jsem se rukama o horní stěnu, protože jediné tak jsem mohla mít šanci se udržet.

/6/

Not a night to linger on the road.

Nebyla to noc, kdy by se člověk cestou zdržoval.

/7/

“Right, Doctor Spivey, if it don't work, we've still got the key to lock it back up.

„Správné, doktore Spivey, když se to neosvědčí, pořád máme klíč, kterým se koupelna může zamknout.

/8/

It was another Gridiron dinner, but this time I couldn't be there because I was traveling in South Asia, so I prerecorded a five-minute parody of the hit movie Forrest Gump to play at the end of the show.

To se událo na další večeři Gridironu, již jsem tentokrát musela oželeť, neboť jsem cestovala po Indickém poloostrovu. Tak jsem předem natočila na video pětiminutovou parodii nejnovějšího filmového hitu Forrest Gump, kterou měli promítnout na závěr show.

/9/

Giving participants meaningful roles to play (“teacher,” “learner”) that carry with them previously learned positive values and automatically activate response scripts.

Nechat účastníky hrát nějaké smysluplné role („učitel“, „student“), které s sebou nesou dříve osvojené pozitivní hodnoty a automaticky aktivují scénáře odpovědí.

/10/

Academic knowledge in a scientific or technical educational field, and academic or empirical knowledge in a professional field clearly have an important part to play in the reception and understanding of texts in a foreign language relating to those fields.

Akademické znalosti ve vědecké či technické vzdělávací sféře a akademické či empirické znalosti v profesní sféře zcela určitě hrají důležitou úlohu ve vnímání a chápání cizojazyčných textů, které se těchto sfér týkají.

/11/

One Ring to rule them all, One Ring to find them

Jeden prsten vládne všem, Jeden jim všem káže,

/12/

But there were clients involved, and a reputation to protect.

Ale byli tu klienti a bylo třeba chránit reputaci.

/13/

She just wanted to have an errand to do, someplace to go.

Chtěla mít jenom nějakou pochůzku, cíl, kam by šla.

/14/

but there are other things to follow, and things that are thousand times more difficult in that them we do not know.

Jenže člověk se musí řídit ještě mnoha jinými věcmi a tyhle věci jsou tisíckrát nesnadnější tím, že o nich nic nevíme.

/15/

Harold was the best advocate to have in your corner during a fight.

Harold byl ten nejlepší advokát, jakého byste si v bitevní vřavě přáli mít na své straně.

/16/

She didn't know why this had happened to her, but perhaps there was a lesson to learn, a blessing to be shared, a moment in time that need not be wasted.

Nevěděla, proč se to stalo právě jí, ale možná, že je to určitá lekce, boží dar, pomíjivá chvíle, která by neměla být promarněna.

/17/

He flipped through the Yellow Pages and made a short list of numbers to try.

Prolistoval Zlaté stránky a napsal si seznam, co všechno má zkusit.

/18/

It seemed like a duty and I had only a cushion to kill her with.

Připadlo mi, že nemám na vybranou, a měl jsem po ruce jen polštář.

/19/

She was taller than Alice, and narrower, but she still managed to borrow her fair share of sweaters and accessories to wear with her favorite pair of jeans.

Byla sice vyšší a štíhlejší než matka, ale ke svým oblíbeným džínům mohla nosit některé matčiny svetry a další doplňky.

/20/

Figure 13.1 sketches the status of the five string theories before and after Witten's discovery, and is a good summary image to keep in mind.

Obrázek 13. 1 je skicou stavu pěti teorií před Wittenovým objevem a po něm a je vhodným shrnujícím obrázkem, jež byste si měli vštípit do paměti.

/21/

“But he's right, Harry,” said Hermione, “you have still got two tasks to do.

„Ale on má pravdu, Harry,” prohlásila Hermiona, „ještě máš před sebou dva úkoly.

/22/

We ain't got the tools to make it easy.

Nemáme na to verky, půjde to hůř.

/23/

Like I said, they wasn't people to write.

Jak jsem vám řek, voni na psaní nebyli.

/24/

There is no table where the boys of La Scala sing, there is no Psipsina catching mice, no goat to bleat in the dawn and wake me, there is no Antonio seducing my heart with his flowers and mandolin, there is do Papas returning from the kapheneion and saying, 'Kokolios said the most ridiculous thing...'

Není tu stůl, u nějž by kluci z La Scaly zpívali, žádná Psipsina tu nechytá myši, kozel mě svým mečením ráno nevzbudí a není tu Antonio, který by mě sváděl květinami a hrou na mandolínu, ani Papas už se nevrátí a nepoví mi: „Kokolios řekl v kafenionu takovou absurdní pitomost...”

/25/

“Here comes a new experience to write about, Lilly,” I joked with her, holding her hand as we walked back to the lobby.

„Čeká nás nový zážitek, abys měla o čem psát, Lilly,” žertoval jsem a držel ji za ruku, když jsme scházeli zase do haly.

/26/

'Spot of good news to take home with me for the week-end.'

„Dobré zprávy na neděli.”

/27/

But in among all this terrible poverty there were just a few great big beautiful houses that were lived in by rich men who had as many as thirty servants to look after them.

Ale uprostřed této strašné chudoby bylo několik velkých nádherných domů, ve kterých žili bohatí, a ti měli až třicet sluhů, kteří se o ně starali.

/28/

You're young, you still have a lot of living to do, a lot of your crazy commercials to put

together, a lot of deals to make, a lot of buses to catch, phone calls to make, planes to miss, parties to go to...'

Jsi mladá a máš život před sebou, máš před sebou spoustu nových projektů, musíš dohonit moře autobusů, vymyslet hrůzu bláznivých reklam, musíš ještě jít na hromadu večírků...”

/29/

“Well,” said Lord Portishead, “at the request of Lord Liverpool he has been working on some magic to help guard against Napoleon Buonaparte ever escaping again – and he has been studying the Discourses upon the Kingdom of Light and the Kingdom of Darkness.

„Inu,“ začal lord Portishead, „na žádost lorda Liverpoola pracoval na kouzle, které by Napoleonu Bonapartovi nadobro zabránilo v jakémkoli útěku – a studoval Rozpravy o Království světla a Království tmy.

/30/

A creature we cannot see because we don't have the tools to peer into the cells, so she hides from us, laughing at us, and now killing us.

Stvoření, které nevidíme, protože nemáme přístroje, kterými bychom nahlédli do buněk, takže se před námi ukrývá, vysmívá se nám a teď nás zabíjí.

/31/

The voice was male and electronically disguised, the first caller to employ such a device.

Mužský hlas byl poprvé za dobu falešných telefonátů elektronicky modifikován.

/32/

There were a lot of documents to organize.

Musel jsem uspořádat spoustu dokumentů.

/33/

‘Of course,’ Dr. Shaw went on, ‘you can't allow people to go popping off into eternity if they 've got any serious work to do.

„Samozřejmě,“ pokračoval dr. Shaw, „nemůžete lidem dovolit, aby jen tak beze všeho natáhli bačkory a odebrali se na věčnost, mají - li vykonat nějakou důležitou práci.

/34/

It was enough to make a man eat his heart out to have to stand the kick and the cuff of

every petty jack-in-office, to have rice to eat and water to drink, when that gorgeous fortune was ready for him outside, just waiting to be picked up.

Stačilo to, aby člověk zešílel, když se musel nechat kopat a komandovat od každého nadutého dozorce jen proto, aby dostal trochu rýže a vody - zatímco venku pro něho bylo připraveno nesmírné bohatství, čekající jen na chvíli, kdy je vyzvedne.

/35/

They have rituals and routines, favorite places, friends on the streets, things to do.

Mají svoje rituály a zvyky, svoje oblíbená místa, přátele na ulici, mají tam dokonce i nějakou práci, kterou musí vyřídit.

/36/

Left alone, Ginnie looked around, without getting up, for a good place to throw out or hide the sandwich.

Když Ginnie osaměla, tak sice nevstala, ale rozhlédla se, kam by mohla zahodit nebo schovat sendvič:

/37/

Garp and his boys had a boys' gym to play in, and Helen had an occasional bright graduate student to relieve her of the monotony of younger people;

Garp s chlapci měli tedy možnost povyrážet se v chlapecké tělocvičně a Helena se mohla zabavit s nějakým nadaným studentem z vyššího ročníku, což ji přece jen při té monotónní práci s mladými lidmi trochu povzneslo;

/38/

Emma amused herself by protesting that it was very extraordinary, indeed, and that she had not a syllable to say for him.

Emma se v duchu dobře bavila, když prohlašovala, že je to skutečně velmi zvláštní a že na jeho obranu nemůže uvést ani slůvko.

/39/

"I have a wife and kids to go home to, you know."

„Mám taky doma ženu a děti.“

/40/

A burned man to care for, some sheets to wash in a fountain, a room painted like a garden.

Popálený muž, o kterého je třeba se starat, trocha ložního prádla, které se musí vyprat ve fontáně, místnost vymalovaná coby zahrada.

/41/

More horrible grins had probably been seen, but only on the sort of grinner that is orange with black stripes, has a long tail and hangs around in jungles looking for victims to grin at.

Jsou to děsiví, černooranžově pruhovaní tvorové s dlouhým ocasem, kteří číhají v korunách stromů nad stezkami v džungli na své oběti a potom se na ně nečekaně šklebí ze zálohy.

/42/

A deep-buttoned leather sofa to recline on.

Prošíváná kožená pohovka k polehávání.

/43/

We were to learn in the days to come, when it was too late, that George was a miserable impostor, who could evidently have known nothing whatever about the matter.

Teprve ve dnech, které byly před námi, v době, kdy už bylo příliš pozdě, jsme se měli dovědět, že George je ničemný podvodník, který o té věci neví zřejmě vůbec nic.

/44/

“I beg your pardon, sir,” said Childermass,” but I have a question to put to you.

„Omlouvám se, pane,” pokračoval Childermass, „ale musím vám položit jednu otázku.

/45/

De Selby has some interesting things to say on the subject of houses.

De Selby má několik zajímavých tezí k tématu domů.

/46/

“But there is still a mountain to climb.

„Dvacet čtyři hodin je významný krok,” prohlásila Megan, „ale pořád ještě má před sebou výstup na hodně vysokou horu.”

/47/

Also such whimsical gifts for the apartment as a tiny plastic fan to stick on the

refrigerator, a wind-up toy tractor, a curtain of glass beads to hang in the bathroom window.

Odnesla i takové výstřední bytové dárečky jako maličký plastický ventilátor k připevnění na lednici, traktůrek na klíček, záclonku ze skleněných korálků k zavěšení na okno v koupelně.

/48/

Not having friends to eat with, he reads over lunch.

A protože nemá s kým jít na oběd, čte si i u jídla.

/49/

He isn't going to stake everything on an expedition to the Galaxy's rim when he has fifty hostile neighbors and an emperor to rebel against.

Nevsadí všechno na expedici ke kraji galaxie, když je sám obklopen padesáti nepřátelsky naladěnými sousedy a když může povstat proti císaři.

/50/

There are three hypotheses to consider.

Je třeba zvážit tři hypotézy.

/51/

Mother gave him ice cubes to suck on, hoping to hydrate him, but the inside of his mouth and throat were so badly burned, they absorbed no liquid, and without lips or muscles he couldn't hold the ice in his mouth.

Dala mu cucat kostky ledu, aby nebyl dehydrovaný, ale on měl pusu a krk zevnitř tak silně popálené, že nedokázal tekutinu požít, a bez rtů a svalů neudržel led v puse.

/52/

But other thinkers, philosophers and historians, did not foresee any benefits to contact at all.

Ale jiní myslitelé, především filozofové a historici, nečekali naopak prospěch vůbec žádný.

/53/

Why did she cry so much, this very first member of the race to come, our race, the human race—though the two had not got as far as that thought while suspecting that something new was here, with the New One.

Pročpak tak křičel ten vůbec první příslušník vznikající rasy, naší rasy, lidské rasy — ačkoli ty dvě ve svých myšlenkách nezacházely až tak daleko a pouze tušily, že s Novou přichází něco nového.

/54/

There were some papers to sign, and some of the other members of Fritz's Act wished to have a look at their future home.

Zbývalo podepsat nějaké papíry a několik dalších členů Fritzova čísla si přálo prohlédnout si svůj příští domov.

/55/

“The last person on earth to put a bomb on any aircraft would be Joe,” he said explosively.

„Joe by byl poslední člověk na světě, kterého bych podezříval, že tam tu bombu dal,” vybuchl Harley rozčileně.

/56/

“Then you 're the perfect guy to walk away.”

„Tak to jsi na útěk jako stvořený.”

/57/

It looked a hell of a country to hunt.

Zdalo se, že to bude nemožné loviště.

/58/

It was a big hurdle to clear, a case of politics as the art of the possible.

Tím jsme překonali velkou překážku – v ukázkovém příkladu politiky jako umění možného.

/59/

And people would pass the house, going off in wagonettes and coaches as jolly and merry as could be, the sun shining out, and not a cloud to be seen.

Kolem našeho domu proudili výletníci, v kočárech i omnibusech, všichni v té nejlepší, nejveselejší náladě neboť svítilo sluníčko a nikde nebylo vidět mráček.

/60/

There was not a single Spaniard to be seen.

Neviděl jsem jediného Španěla.

/61/

Don't you see, Horner, if you could convince me that very much of what Rennie did was under your influence, it wouldn't be good, because she shouldn't have been in a position to be influenced very much.

Copak to nechápete, Hornere? I kdybyste mě dokázal přesvědčit, že mnohé z toho, co Rennie učinila, učinila pod vaším vlivem, stejně by mě to provokovalo, protože ve stavu přístupném ovlivnění by se moje manželka nacházet neměla.

/62/

Matsuda's house, not as large or full of eccentricity as my own, is typical of the sort of solid, respectable house to be found in Arakawa.

Dům Čišua Macudy, i když menší a méně extravagantní než můj, zapadá mezi solidní, úctyhodné domy Arakawy.

/63/

When the twenty-seven independent Trading worlds, united only by their distrust of the mother planet of the Foundation, concert an assembly among themselves, and each is big with a pride grown of its smallness, hardened by its own insularity and embittered by eternal danger - there are preliminary negotiations to be overcome of a pettiness sufficiently staggering to heartsicken the most persevering.

Když se dvacet sedm nezávislých Obchodních světů, které spojuje pouze nedůvěra k jejich mateřské planetě, Nadaci, dohodne na společném shromáždění a přitom každý z nich je nadutý pýchou, vyrostlou z vlastní bezvýznamnosti, utvrzovanou vlastní osamoceností a zahořklou díky věčně hrozícímu nebezpečí - je třeba zdárně překonat úskalí předběžných jednání natolik ohromujících svou banalitou, že to dokáže udolat i ty nejvytrvalejší.

/64/

Information theory teaches that, in the presence of a constant amount of noise, the power required to send a signal across a gulf of space and time increases exponentially with the distance to be travelled.

Informační teorie praví, že za konstantní intenzity šumu závisí energie nutná na vyslání signálu časem a prostorem exponenciálně na překonané vzdálenosti.

/65/

A few minutes later there was not a rabbit to be seen.

Pár minut nato už nebylo vidět na stráni ani jediného králíka.

/66/

Politics belonged to those willing to play that game, and besides, there was no money to be made by honest people.

Politika přece patří do ruky těm, kteří mají tuhle hru rádi, a jinak slušný člověk k penězům nepřijde.

/67/

Documents dated 673–85 are concerned with the trade regulations to be observed by the men of Kent when they barter in Lundenwic.

Dokumenty z let 673 - 85 se zabývají obchodními pravidly, která musí dodržovat muži z Kentu, když v Lundenwiku provozují výměnný obchod.

/68/

‘Now,’ said Jack, ‘one of our students, as you see, is with us – she is going to be talking to us about an issue she feels passionate about, as I understand it, and which Professor Kipps touched on earlier – our “discretionary” students, if we can put it that way... but before we get on to that, there’s some standard college business to be attended to...’

„A nyní,” řekl Jack, “se k nám, jak vidíte, připojila jedna z našich studentek – promluví k nám o tématu, které se jí silně dotýká, jak jsem pochopil, a o němž se před chvílkou zmínil profesor Kipps – o našich ‚soukromých‘ studentech, dá - li se to tak říct ... ale než se k tomu dostaneme, musíme vyřídit jednu typickou univerzitní záležitost ...“

/69/

There was nothing to be gained by thinking now, she told herself, there would be plenty of time to think later.

Přemýšlením teď nic nezíská, říkala si, na přemýšlení bude mít ještě dost času.

/70/

Bills to be paid.

Musím platit účty.

/71/

It wasn’t grass he could believe in, the trees seemed pointless, the rolling hills seemed to be rolling to nowhere and the future seemed just a tunnel to be crawled through.

Nedokázal věřit v trávu, a zdálo se mu, že stromy nemají žádný smysl a že táhnoucí se pahorky se netáhnou nikam. Budoucnost mu připadala jako tunel, kterým se musí proplazit.

/72/

And with the splendid second volume to be checked?’

A přitom je třeba ověřovat ten skvělý druhý díl.”

/73/

in this view, therefore, they mark the end of the line - the last of nature’s matryoshka dolls to be found in the microscopic makeup of matter.

v tomto pohledu tedy představují poslední článek řetězu, poslední přírodní matrjošku v mikroskopickém uspořádání kosmu.

/74/

‘I don’t suppose there’s anything to eat around here?’

„Předpokládám, že tady těžko najdeme něco k jídlu, co?”

/75/

It gives me something to do, and it affords me some private pleasure.

Zaměstnává mne to a mám z toho trochu tichého uspokojení.

/76/

Still, it would be nice, she thought, when she got a moment: someone to go to galleries with on the weekends.

Ale zase, napadalo ji, když měla chvíli času, bylo by hezké mít někoho, s kým by chodila o víkendech do galerií.

/77/

There’s nothing to be done.

Nedá se nic dělat.

/78/

I have not a thing to say!

Nevím, co na to říct.

/79/

There's nothing to take it up!'

Ale teď právě nemáme místo, kam bychom je uložili.”

/80/

'Gives you something to do,' he replied, with that new brutal indifference, without even looking at her.

„Aspoň máš co dělat,” odpověděl s onou novou surovou lhostejností a ani na ni nepohlédl.

/81/

There aint nothin to see.

Není co vidět.

/82/

You fool, you - you had no sooner got the bagpipes than you changed them for the gloves, which were not worth one-quarter of the money; and when you had got the gloves, you changed them for a poor miserable stick; and now for your forty guineas, cow, bagpipes, and gloves, you have nothing to show but that poor miserable stick, which you might have cut in any hedge.”

Vy hlupoto sama - jen co jste k těm dudům přišel, vyměnil jste je za rukavice, co by ani za čtvrtku těch dud nestály, a jak jste rukavice koupil, chtěl jste radši jeden bídný klacek, co byste si na každém mlází nařezat mohl.”

/83/

They'll do it, if there's anything to be got by it.”

Udělaljí to, jen když tím můžou něco získat.”

/84/

And if he had anything to say about it, he wouldn't let her.

A i když víc matce neprozradil, v nitru s tímto řešením nesouhlasil.

/85/

I often saw people stop to give him money, or else buy him something to eat, and on those occasions the idiot's face would light up into a smile.

Často jsem viděl, jak se lidé zastavují a dávají mu peníze nebo mu kupují něco k jídlu. V těchto chvílích se bláznova tvář rozzářila úsměvem.

/86/

Scientists exult in mystery for a different reason: it gives them something to do.

Vědci si v záhadách libují také, ale z jiného důvodu: díky nim mají co na práci.

/87/

They unfolded the dark-stained red flannel of the muletas and fixed batons in them to spread the stuff and give the matador something to hold.

Rozvinuli rudé flanelové mulety s temnými skvrnami a nastrčili do nich hůlky, aby se látka mohla nahnout a matador ji měl zač držet.

/88/

“There’s nothing to tell,” she said.

„Není o čem mluvit,” řekla.

/89/

The doctor carried the fight to them by first off telling the cops they didn’t have any jurisdiction over us, as we were a legal, government-sponsored expedition, and if there was anyone to take the matter up with it would have to be a federal agency.

Doktor se pustil do boje a hned zkraje policajtům řekl, že nad náma nemají žádnou pravomoc, že jsme rádná, státem organizovaná výprava, a jestli se s náma má kdo co bavit, tak jediné federální úřad.

/90/

(“I have better things to do at night,” he’d say.)

(„V noci mám na práci něco jinšího,” tvrdil.)

/91/

He unfolded it anyway in order to have something to frown thoughtfully at for a moment or two.

Přesto ji rozevřel, aby se měl na moment nad čím se svraštěným čelem zamyslet.

/92/

There is nothing to be afraid of.”

Není se čeho bát.”

/93/

Do you have anything to add to your testimony before we pronounce judgment?”

Chcete ještě něco dodat ke své výpovědi, než vyslovíme svůj verdikt?”

/94/

’Pon my word, it is a great thing for me to have someone to talk to, for my own thoughts are not over-pleasant.

Věřte mi, že pro mne mnoho znamená, mohu - li si teď s někým promluvit, protože nemám nikterak příjemné myšlenky.

/95/

In short, the whole place left nothing to be desired.

Zkrátka, v tom pokoji nebylo co víc si přát.

/96/

’But there ain’t nothing to talk about,’ said Bailey in a low, resolved tone.

„Ale ono není o čem mluvit,” pronesl Bailey tichým, pevným hlasem.

/97/

He wanted something to drink.

Měl chuť na něco k pití.

/98/

The present was the thing — work to do and someone to love.

Existovala jenom přítomnost - na něčem pracovat a někoho milovat.

/99/

But he had been too busy making money, having to start from scratch (scratch? scratch was euphemism indeed for where he started from) to make money without owning or even hoping for anything to make it with, to have had time to learn or even to discover that he might need to learn anything about women.

Jenže byl příliš zaneprázdněný vyděláváním peněz, vždyť s tím musel začínat od piky - od piky? to byl opravdu eufemismus pro to, odkud vlastně začínal - a přitom neměl nic,

čím by je vydělal, ani naději, že bude kdy něco mít, než aby měl čas si uvědomit nebo dokonce zjistit, že bude možná někdy potřebovat vědět něco o ženských.

/100/

The idea of them making a shared trip has always been a thing to say, part of the game.

Nápad, že by se tam vypravili spolu, byl vždycky něco, o čem se jen mluví, součást hry.