

Univerzita Karlova v Praze

Filozofická Fakulta

Ústav anglického jazyka a didaktiky

English postmodifiers in translation to Czech

Překladové protějšky anglických postmodifikátorů

DIPLOMOVÁ PRÁCE - ERRATA

Dagmar Scholzová

4. Analysis of the findings

This section compares the English postmodifiers against their translation counterparts, providing quantitative data in tables to illustrate the findings and support the conclusions. The most general conclusions based on the general postmodifier counts are presented in section 4.1 below, while the rest of the analytical part is presented in sections and subsections corresponding to the basic realization forms of English postmodifiers. The most relevant findings are then summarized in part 4.9.

4.1 General overview of postmodifiers used in both texts

Table 1 below shows all English postmodifiers present in the four texts, as well as their Czech translations. We can notice that more than a half of the English postmodifiers is realized by a prepositional phrase (and out of these, as seen in the data further in 4.2, by the preposition *of*), followed by finite relative clauses and participles.

The Czech text shows the same preference – however, since PPPs do not constitute a category of their own in Czech, the highest numbers of Czech equivalents are found among respectively noun phrase postmodifiers, finite relative clauses, and adjective phrases. The constructions containing an initial preposition largely appear among Czech adverbial phrases: hence their fourth place in the number of occurrences in Czech, but not in English. Nominal postmodifiers, both with and without an initial preposition (in which case, a case ending assumes the place of the original English preposition) are almost entirely equivalents of the English PPPs, hence their quantitative dominance which is however not as striking as in English (as we must bear in mind that the above-mentioned Czech AdvP category contains a part of the equivalents of English PPPs). The earlier-mentioned adjective phrases, third in the number of occurrences in the Czech text, roughly correspond to the English participles as the approach this thesis chose to follow is to consider Czech present and past participles adjectives, even in postposition.

The category (realization form) with the lowest numbers of occurrences shared by both languages is infinitival postmodification. Considering the known tendency of English to condense text through the use of participles and infinitives, much more so than in Czech, this is somewhat surprising.

The striking differences in the numbers of the least represented English postmodifier realization forms are seen as negligible, as the two least represented categories in English – Noun phrase and Adverbial phrase – receive a number of translation equivalents in Czech from the category of PPPs, treated as ‘nonexistent’ for Czech in this paper.

The number of non-equivalents seen in the ‘total’ bottom line of Table 1 is also of interest, though not entirely unexpected: out of the original 200 postmodifiers, almost a quarter is translated using means other than postmodifiers. Section 4.8 will attempt to determine to what degree this is caused by linguistic differences between English and Czech (i.e. to what extent a literal equivalent is possible to form, which would imply its non-existence in the target language is no more than a translator’s personal preference).

Generally, it may be also observed that out of the two languages, Czech is the one with a lesser variety in postmodifier realizations. Two Czech categories contain no postmodifiers due to either formal nonexistence of category (PPP) or reclassification of its potential members as belonging to another category (Czech participles which are as a rule subsumed into the adjective phrase category). The extremely low number of infinitival postmodifiers in Czech is caused by two factors at the same time- the low number of the source text postmodifiers, and the frequency of non-postmodifying equivalents.

| Type of postmodifier | Occurrences in EngT | Percentage in EngT | Occurrences in CzT | Percentage in CzT |
|--------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Prepositional phrase | 103 | 51,5 % | - | - |
| Finite relative clause | 54 | 27 % | 51 | 33,33 % |
| Non-finite clause - participle | 19 | 9,5 % | 0 | 0 % |
| Non-finite clause - infinitive | 3 | 1,5 % | 1 | 0,65 % |
| Noun phrase | 2 | 1 % | 62 | 40,53 % |
| Adjective phrase | 17 | 8,5 % | 27 | 17,65 % |
| Adverbial phrase | 2 | 1 % | 12 | 7,84 % |
| Postmodifiers in total | 200 | 100 % | 153 | 100 % |

Table 1: Postmodifier types in the English and the Czech excerpt

4.2 Prepositional Phrase Postmodifiers

The category of prepositional phrase postmodifiers (PPPs) does not exist in Czech terminology, therefore the equivalents of English prepositional postmodifiers were expected to occur as either adverbial or nominal phrases, both of which can occur with initial prepositions in Czech. Dušková (2010) too notes that a number of English modifiers are translated as adverbials in Czech (however, it has to be taken into account that her study deals with all modifiers, not with postmodifiers specifically).

This hypothesis proved correct, as seen in Table 2 below:

| Type of equivalent | Occurrences in numbers | Occurrences in percentage |
|---|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Nominal, Adverbial | 67 | 65,05 % |
| Adjective phrase, relative clause, Non-postmodifier | 36 | 34,95 % |
| Total | 103 | 100 % |

Table 2: Czech equivalents of English prepositional phrase postmodifiers

In the English version, we can notice a large number of occurrences of the genitival preposition *of*, which comprises 68 % of all occurrences of PPPs. The other prepositions are all basic and for the most part monosyllabic, none are complex (such as *in place of*).

This result is in agreement with which prepositions Biber et al. list as the most common occurring with postmodifiers. Ordered by frequency, they are: *of, in, for, on, to, with* (Biber, 1999:635). According to Biber's research, these introduce 90 % of all English PPPs. According to the statistical data provided by Biber, *of* introduces over 60% of all instances of PPP. These findings are confirmed by the PPPs in the source text in Table 3:

| EngT Preposition | Occurrences in numbers | Occurrences in percentage |
|------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| <i>of</i> | 70 | 68 % |
| <i>with</i> | 11 | 10,7 % |
| <i>on</i> | 7 | 6,8 % |
| <i>in</i> | 6 | 5,8 % |
| <i>like</i> | 3 | 2,9 % |
| <i>from</i> | 2 | 1,9 % |
| <i>to</i> | 2 | 1,9 % |
| <i>around</i> | 1 | 0,97 % |
| <i>for</i> | 1 | 0,97 % |
| Total | 103 | 100 % |

Table 3: Representation of prepositions in the English excerpts

While Biber's observations were confirmed in this sample analysis, the frequency ordering is different, with *with*, *on*, *in* following *of* as the most frequent prepositions. The occurrences of *like*, *from* and *around* fall into the remaining 1% of other PPP openings in Biber's classification.

Both English and Czech PPPs can be expanded into full clauses with a variety of predicates, though not always easily supplied, and definitely not necessarily identical in translation from English into Czech:

(21) *Then the colours of the bindings:*

A pak barvy vazeb: /DU 17/

The sentence above implies the reading of *the colours which the bindings are* – *barvy, které vazby mají*. On the other hand, the example below-

(22) *a serious obstacle to a sudden exit.*

nebránil v případném úniku. /FI 11/

demonstrates the fact that a preposition may not necessarily be the one used in the corresponding finite form (prepositions being probably the least corresponding category between two languages of different types), and may not even contain a direct link to the clause: a serious obstacle *which would prevent him from exiting suddenly* (the Czech version would contain the same preposition as used by the translator if expanded into a full clause).

Dušková (2010: 121) further mentions the greater translational correspondence between prepositions with more specific meanings, and a low degree of equivalence among those with meanings more general (another matter being the instances of difference in the government structure in English and in Czech). In her study, prepositions such as *with*, *without*, *against* or *from* all had a translational equivalent of the same form and function. Little correspondence was detected between e.g. *o*, *na*, or *of* (Dušková, 2010: 121-2). These findings are supported by Table 4 below:

| CzT equivalent | Noun phrase | Noun phrase with initial preposition | Adverbial | Adjective | RC | Non-postmodifying equivalent |
|--|-------------|--------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|--------|------------------------------|
| Preposition used in the English PPP | | | | | | |
| Of | 38 | 3 | 4 | 1 | - | 25 |
| With | 1 | 9 | - | - | 1 | - |
| On | - | 3 | 2 | - | - | 1 |
| In | - | 2 | 2 | - | 1 | 1 |
| Like | - | - | - | 2 | - | 1 |
| From | - | - | 1 | - | 1 | - |
| To | - | - | - | - | - | 2 |
| Around | - | - | 1 | - | - | - |
| For | - | - | 1 | - | - | - |
| Total | 39 | 17 | 11 | 3 | 3 | 30 |
| Percentage out of the total of 103 equivalents | 37,87 % | 16,5 % | 10,68 % | 2,91 % | 2,91 % | 29,13 % |

Table 4: Czech equivalents of the English PPPs, sorted by the English preposition used

In table 4, we can notice the adverbial equivalents occurring with English PPPs conveying an exact meaning (particularly locative): *around* corresponds to the Czech adverbial phrase opened by *kolem* in /DU 21/, and *from* corresponds to the initial *z* in example /CH 17/, while the greatest divergence of translation equivalents occurred with some of the most general prepositions – *of* and *on*. Thus the prepositions *from*, *with* and *around* show the greatest potential for keeping their function as postmodifier constituent. On the other hand, the postmodifier introduced by the preposition *to* has zero correspondence to the Czech text, resulting in non-equivalence in both cases. All prepositional postmodifiers show a great degree of divergence from their Czech realizations: a single preposition introducing a postmodifier is commonly translated in two or more different ways. The preposition *of* produces the most diverse results (with its membership in four different postmodifying categories; due to this discussion being PPP-centric, Czech noun phrases opened by a preposition are in this exceptional case listed as a category), which is directly related to its greatest vagueness of meaning.

While the absence of adverbial equivalents for *with* may be surprising, the Czech nominal postmodifiers with this initial preposition – e.g. /CA 35/, /CA 48/ were

included in the nominal category on the basis of the relationship between the head and its modifier: *farmář se dvěma dětmi* corresponds to *farmer who has two children*, and likewise *nikdo s problémem* corresponds to *noone who has a problem*. The original role (object) of *děti* and *problém* prevents the inclusion of these two expressions among prepositional adverbials of attendant circumstances (in particular adverbial of company), as they do not imply company but rather possession.

For the preposition *of*, the greatest number of equivalents was realized by a noun with a case ending, which corresponds to its genitival use:

| Type of CzT equivalent for <i>of</i> | Occurrences in numbers | Occurrences in percentage |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Noun phrase | 37 | 52,86 % |
| Noun phrase with initial preposition | 3 | 4,29 % |
| Adverbial | 4 | 5,7 % |
| Adjective | 1 | 1,43 % |
| Relative clause | 0 | 0 % |
| Non-postmodifying equivalent | 25 | 35,72 % |
| Total | 70 | 100 % |

Table 5: Czech equivalents of the preposition of

The second most frequent type of equivalent, due to the preposition's vagueness, were non-postmodifiers. Their number with this particular preposition is significant especially since they constitute the greater part of all non-postmodifying equivalents across all realization forms – 25 occurrences out of the total of 47. These are for the most part a matter of the translator's choice, and of the more natural way of expression, as the equivalent structures exist in Czech, and with varying degrees of frequency are in use. Cf. the following English *of*-postmodifiers, their literal equivalents, and the non-postmodifiers used by the translator:

(23) *the hem of her skirt* – [*lem sukně*] - *zvedla sukni a lemem* /CA 39/

(24) *servants of these Garden District families* – [*sloužící rodin z Garden District*] - *ti, kteří rodinám Zahradní čtvrti sloužili*. /CA 45/

(25) *the name of the deceased* – [*jmeno zesnulého*] – *zesnulý se jmenoval* /CH 12/

(26) *an essential ingredient of life*- [*základní složka života*] – *základní životní potřeba* /DU 2/

However, sometimes only the non-postmodifying anteposition is acceptable as a direct translation equivalent – cf.

(27) *Lived in a corner of it – v jeho jednom rohu* /CH 15/

(28) *No move of any kind – žádný pohyb* /CH 34/

A preposition that only yielded non-postmodifying equivalents, per Table 4, was *to*. However, since both equivalents – a rather low number anyway - underwent a change of the head during the process of translation which prompted the subsequent change in the structure, this phenomenon is not considered significant enough to draw the conclusion that *to* frequently causes non-postmodifying equivalents.

Both the earlier-mentioned

(29) *a serious obstacle to a sudden exit. - aby mu nebránil v případném úniku.* /FI 11/

and

(30) *the additions to his personal property - předmětů, jimiž rozhojnil svůj majetek* /FI 18/

are interesting as examples of verbalization - a phenomenon concerning several other Czech non-postmodifiers - rather than for the preposition involved.

Lastly, we must bear in mind that the English category of prepositional postmodifiers is in Czech split mainly between nominal (whether introduced by a preposition or not) and adverbial (usually introduced by a preposition) postmodifiers. It is therefore not surprising that the majority of equivalents for this category (66 out of 103) were from the Czech categories of nominal postmodifiers and adverbial postmodifiers. It is the non-postmodifying equivalents and adjectival or RC counterparts which are unusual as PPP realizations, and these altogether numbered 37 (almost 30 % of all Czech realizations).

4.3 Relative Clause Postmodifiers

Relative clauses represent the category with the greatest correspondence between English and Czech, per quantitative results given in Table 16 in 4.9. Over 81 % of English RCs are translated as a RC in Czech. Just like with the most text-condensing postmodifiers – PPPs – there was a high frequency of occurrences of RCs in both languages (the second highest). However, while with the English PPPs there was a high percentage of non-correspondence or constancy of realization form in translation, with

RCs proved the most consistent category in translation. Table 6 below shows that apart from a single AdjP and nine non-postmodifiers, the equivalents for all English RCs are Czech RCs. This is caused both by the same means in both languages for expressing this type of postmodification (the congruence of ending in a Czech relativizer does not affect the need for one to be used, unlike with the English PPPs which correspond to a number of nouns with no more than case endings), and by the apparent need to retain the detail in this most explicit form of postmodification.

| CzT equivalent of EngT RC | Occurrences in numbers | Occurrences in percentage |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Relative clause | 44 | 81,48 % |
| Adjective phrase | 1 | 1,85 % |
| Adverbial phrase | 0 | 0 % |
| Noun phrase | 0 | 0 % |
| Non-postmodifier equivalent | 9 | 16,67 % |
| Total | 54 | 100 % |

Table 6: Czech equivalents of English postmodifying relative clauses

As a matter of fact, the single AdjP equivalent of an English RC may be used to demonstrate both the translators' preference to preserve the explicitness in the vast majority of RC equivalents, and to show that the later-discussed Adjective Phrase postmodifiers originate from RCs:

(31) *And, of course, some of the children, who were too young or guileless to conceal their interest.*

-

A samozřejmě některé děti, příliš malé nebo naivní, než aby skrývaly zaujetí. /CA 46/

The Czech translation shows the ellipsis of relativizer and copular verb by which a RC becomes an AdjP. In addition to what has been said, it may be also argued that the choice of an AdjP by the translator is a mere idiosyncrasy, but if so, it is one which preserves (by the 'added commentary' feel of the structure) the non-restrictivity of the original RC ('*children are as a rule young and naïve*', not '*some of the young and naïve kind of children*'). A RC, in Czech always preceded by a comma, would result in a reading in which the non-restrictivity would be much less clear.

While restrictivity is a feature most frequently discussed with RCs, it is not the primary scope of this paper, since a comparison of sample sentences showed that RCs

which are restrictive in English tend to keep their restrictivity in their Czech counterparts, and vice versa. Restrictivity in English is mirrored by restrictivity in the Czech translation, unless the translator chooses a different way of expressing a concept, the reference and delimitation remains the same in both languages. It can however be noted that in both languages, restrictive postmodifying RCs outnumbered the non-restrictive ones.

Somewhat surprising is the single occurrence of an English RC with a **preposition in final position**. All the more so that it is used in a clause without a relativizer, in which there is no option of anteposing the preposition as one can do when a relativizer is present:

(32) *Dalrymple started at this repetition of a phrase he had thought of so much lately.*

- *Dalrymple sebou trhl, když uslyšel větu, kterou se ještě nedávno tak intenzivně zaobíral.* /FI 36/

This form of postmodification (i.e. preposition in final position) is ungrammatical in Czech, as Czech prepositions, dictating the following noun's ending as they are, are obligatory in initial position. Therefore even if the example above had been translated literally – as is possible to do with most structural divergences from the original, encountered in the target text – the preposition would open the entire postmodifier: *větu, na kterou v poslední době tolik myslel.*

A possible explanation for only one occurrence of a preposition-final RC may be the considerable length of the descriptive parts chosen for this paper (spoken parts may show a greater tendency for final prepositions, but a comparative study would need to be made). On the other hand, it is necessary to say that there were altogether only 4 instances of RC with preposition in initial position, which is altogether not a large sample. (Surprisingly, Czech RCs are opened by a preposition in 11 samples, and this occurs due to different ways of expression in the two languages -cf. e.g. *parts which I thought applicable* - *pasáže, o kterých jsem si myslel* in /DU 48/ - or due to a RC+prep. combination used as equivalent for an adverbial relativizer – *where- do niž* in /FI 10/, mentioned further below in more detail. Some occurrences are a simple matter of the translator's preference: *whom she had described as* - *o kterém prohlašovala* /FI 32/.)

This is also the place to mention the syntactic discontinuities which occurred in the samples only within English relative clauses. As was noted earlier, the separation of the

head from its RC modifier is not used in Czech, and neither is it used in the only two discontinuous examples found, both in the same text:

(33) *The night came that drew him out upon his second venture, and as he walked the dark street he felt in himself a great resemblance to a cat –*

- *Nadešla noc, kdy vyrazil za svým druhým dobrodružstvím, a cestou po ztemnělé ulici v sobě pocítil cosi, co mu silně připomínalo kočku - /FI 1/*

(34) *Then with astounding suddenness, something happened that changed his plans and put an end to his burglaries.*

- *A pak se zcela znenadání přihodilo něco, co změnilo jeho plány a učinilo jeho loupežným výpravám přítrž. /FI 33/*

The English discontinuities emerge as a way of “reconciling the conflict between the grammatical word order principle and the principle of FSP (the principle of end focus)”, and as a means of fronting the rhematic subject (Dušková, 2010; 137). Their nonexistence in Czech can be attributed to the free word order, which allows for the verb to precede the entire noun phrase, as can be seen in the examples above.

The source text RCs are in this analysis differentiated into those containing a relativizer, and the specifically English group of zero relativizer RCs.

4.3.1 Relative clauses with a relativizer

A noteworthy feature about these are the relative expressions (**relativizers**, also called **relatives**), in both languages consisting of either pronouns and adverbs. Table 7 below shows the relativizers most popular across the English text:

| EngT Relativizer | Occurrences in numbers | Occurrences in Percentage |
|-----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Wh- relative pronouns | 30 | 55,55 % |
| Wh- adverbials | 7 | 12,96 % |
| That | 10 | 18,52 % |
| Zero relativizer | 7 | 12,97 % |
| Total | 54 | 100 % |

Table 7: Representation of relativizers in the English text

As was expected, the least frequent relativizers are adverbials (to a degree interchangeable with pronominal relativizers, cf. example 32 below), and zero relativizers (restricted in their usage) which will be discussed in their own subsection.

Among the adverbial postmodifiers, the analyzed samples contain 6 occurrences of the relative adverbial *where* in English (all 7 if one counts the somewhat elevated *whence* with one occurrence). *When* is also a frequently used relative adverbial, but it does not occur in any of the four English samples (though it is used on one occasion as the Czech equivalent of the original *where*). The postmodifying nature of adverbs such as *where* and *when* can be seen in the easy substitution of the construction by a preposition + relative pronoun combination. A relativizer such as the one in

(32): *It was to these midday meals, where the table was covered with [...] /CA 9/*
can be replaced by *at which / during which the table was covered with [...]*.

The paraphrase above presents a partial explanation for the low degree of total correspondence (that is, the use of the same type of adverbial, i.e. temporal or locative) as well as of realization form identity) between the adverbial relativizers in English and Czech: although only a single case resulted in a non-postmodifying equivalent (discussed in more detail further below due to the use of an unusual Czech relativizer), only 3 of the 7 occurrences were translated using a locative adverb (*odkud* for *whence* being one of these in /CH 20/). The other three relative adverbs show the weakened semantic link of these to actual adverbs, resulting in one temporal adverbial (/CA 9/), and two relative pronouns- members of the paradigm of *jenž* preceded by a preposition (/CA 2/ – *u nichž*, and /FI 10/ - *do níž*). It should be mentioned that with the exception of different concept usage in the Czech translation of /CA 9/ in which the head's premodifier *midday* influences the realization form of the relativizer (*midday meals where* vs. *polední jídla, kdy*), these instances are considered translatorial idiosyncrasies, as there is no language phenomenon in Czech, or a contextual constraint, that would block the formation of e.g. *kde se za minutu octl* as an adequate equivalent for *the dining-room where in a minute he found himself* (/FI 10/), in place of the translator's choice *z jídelny, do níž za minutu vnikl*.

Somewhat surprising is the low frequency of the relative pronoun *that* which only appeared with 10 English postmodifiers (about 18 % to the *wh*-pronouns' 55 %). Biber et al. however note that *that* is generally more restricted in use with postmodifiers as

unlike the *wh*-relative expressions it cannot follow a preposition and rarely opens a non-restrictive clause. In addition, part of the reason for the preference of *which* or *who* seems to be their greater precision in distinguishing human antecedents from other antecedents, and no homomorphy (which occurs with *that* as it also functions as a conjunction). In addition, a number of *that*-postmodifiers was excluded from this study on the grounds that their role was viewed as closer to that of appositives: the example given by Dušková (2010: 122) and classified as a postmodifier - *Později jsem dospěl k přesvědčení, že se tím prostě baví.* – *Later I arrived at the conviction that he simply enjoyed it* - would be considered an appositive in this thesis, as the relationship between the head and the modifier is one of identification.

Among the translation equivalents of relative expressions, Czech showed a greater diversity of form due to both declension word forms (tokens) of the two major pronominal relativizers, and the use of a greater range of pronominal relativizers in general: the counterparts for *which*, *who/m*, and *that* are four pronouns – *který, jenž, kdo* and *co*.

All relevant data are provided by Table 8 below:

| EngT Relativizer | Který | | Kdo | | Jenž | | Adverbi al relativizer | | Co | | Other | | Non-postmodifier | | Numbers of EngT Relativizers | |
|------------------|--------|---------|-----|--------|------|---------|------------------------|---------|----|---------|-------|---------|------------------|---------|------------------------------|-------|
| Which | 7 | 53,85 % | - | 0% | 3 | 23,08 % | - | 0% | - | 0% | - | 0% | 3 | 23,08 % | 13 | 100 % |
| Who/m | 1 2 | 70,59 % | 1 | 5,88 % | 1 | 5,88 % | - | 0% | - | 0% | 1 | 5,88 % | 2 | 11,76 % | 17 | 100 % |
| That | 5 | 50 % | - | 0% | - | 0% | 1 | 10 % | 2 | 20 % | - | 0% | 2 | 20 % | 10 | 100 % |
| Wh-adverbial | - | 0% | - | 0% | 2 | 28,57 % | 4 | 57,14 % | - | 0% | - | 0% | 1 | 14,29 % | 7 | 100 % |
| Zero relativizer | 1 | 14,29 % | - | 0% | 2 | 28,57 % | - | 0% | 2 | 28,57 % | 1 | 14,29 % | 1 | 14,29 % | 7 | 100 % |

Table 6: Czech equivalents of the English relativizers – distribution of Czech equivalents with individual English relativizers

Comparing Tables 7 and 8 above to Table 9 below, we can notice that the English *wh*-pronouns (about 55 %) are almost as popular as the Czech most frequent and most stylistically neutral relative pronoun *který* (about 46 %). If it were not for the presence of non-postmodifiers among the equivalents, the percentage might have been even higher in favour of *který*. The much lower representation of *that* (10 occurrences vs. 30 for *wh*-pronouns) is mirrored in Czech by the lower popularity of the two stylistically marked pronouns *jenž* and *co* (25 vs. 12).

| EngT Relativizer | Který | Kdo | Jenž | Adverbial relativizer | Co | Other | Non-postmodifier |
|--|--------|--------|---------|-----------------------|--------|----------|------------------|
| Which | 7 | - | 3 | - | - | - | 3 |
| Who/m | 12 | 1 | 1 | - | - | 1 (adj) | 2 |
| That | 5 | - | - | 1 | 2 | - | 2 |
| Wh- adverbial | - | - | 2 | 4 | - | - | 1 |
| Zero relativizer | 1 | - | 2 | - | 2 | 1 (jaký) | 1 |
| Total | 25 | 1 | 8 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 9 |
| Percentage out of the total of 54 (100 %) equivalents | 46,3 % | 1,85 % | 14,81 % | 9,26 % | 7,41 % | 3,71 % | 16,66 % |

Table 7: Czech equivalents of the English relativizers – proportion of Czech relativizers compared to one another

The discrepancy in the grammatical understanding of *who* and its literal equivalent *kdo* is reflected by the 17 occurrences in English, and only 1 in Czech. The English pronoun marks the human quality of its nominal head (exclusively so, unlike *that*), whereas in Czech, all four relative pronouns are used to refer to both human and non-human nominal heads. The low frequency of the equivalent *kdo* also reflects that there are few postmodifying contexts in which only *kdo* is acceptable. Its occurrence is practically limited to pronominal heads of masculine gender in contexts where the initial pronoun may be ellipitd: *one who is fearless – (ten), kdo má pro strach uděláno* (vs. contexts preferring *ten, který*, as in *ten, který stojí u dveří – the one by the door*), and as shown by the only instance of *kdo* in the texts examined, its presence is obligatory after indefinite pronouns:

- (33) *Now, anyone who studies, keeps or, most important, breeds, rare animals*
 - *Každý, kdo se zajímá o vzácná zvířata, a hlavně ten, kdo je chová, /DU 32/*

(The other use of *kdo* in the example above does not come into the scope of this study, due to the fact that its emergence was due to a split of the original *who*-postmodifier into two separate equivalent postmodifiers.)

The high number of occurrences of *jenž* (third most frequent after *který* and non-postmodifiers) is slightly surprising, as it is considered eloquent and in some forms archaic (such as *jediní, již* in example /CA 43/). Bauer and Grepl observe that it is more frequent when following a preposition than when standing alone - which proved but partly true in the excerpts examined. All 5 instances of prepositional opening of a relative clause in the CA translation sample used *jenž* as relative expression, but all three other translations used *který* just as frequently after a preposition, and even *co* (obligatory use in *něčeho, na čem* for *something that* in /FI 44/, a frequent source of Czech speakers' mistakes in placing the literal equivalent *what* instead of other relativizers after what is in Czech an indefinite neuter pronoun: *something/nothing *what*). As a matter of fact, *který* and *jenž* seem to be used interchangeably, regardless of the perceived stylistic elevation of the latter. Cf.

(34) *another woman dressed in neat black who stood apart from the rest, and whom I took to be the housekeeper;*
- *potom ještě další žena v případném černém oblečení, jež stála stranou od ostatních a kterou jsem si zařadil jako hospodyni.* /CH 26/

The use of alternately *který* and *jenž* in the clause above does not reflect the residual case ending in *whom* that seems stylistically elevated in a similar way as *jenž* is: in the clause above, the more common and neutral relative pronoun *který* is used as its equivalent. Perhaps the alternation of *který* and *jenž* then marks no more than a desire for variation of expression.

The stylistically lowered (in most cases) *co* appeared four times, and a connection to colloquial language was felt as the main reason for its infrequency. In addition to the example discussed above, example /CA 32/ again allows no other option (*vše, co bylo v jeho silách*), and the same holds true for *něco světlého a blýskavého* in /CH 45/, whereas in *Ze všech těch, co jsme kdy nakrmili* (/CA 10/), the only sentence to use this pronoun to refer to human agents, *co* follows a deictic pronoun, which frequently occurs in informal language in place of *který*. This observation is supported (viz Table 9) by the

fact that none of the *wh*-relativizers have *co* as their equivalent. The scarcity of the informal (non-obligatory) *co* in written discourse, mentioned by some grammarians, has been confirmed by this excerpt.

Among the expressions opening the relative clauses, there is a single occurrence of the **unusual relativizer *ten***, which is in Czech more frequently used as a pro-form functioning as a subject or as an object, rather than as a means of linking clauses. For the latter function, the combination of *ten* and a relativizer (either pronominal or adverbial – *ten, který*; *ten, kde* etc.) is used as a rule. For this reason, *ten* does not seem to be a suitable equivalent of the original *which* in the sentence below, even if it stresses its non-restrictive nature in this context:

(35) *Here was the red-brick Sterner residence which marked the beginning of the avenue;*

- *Tady je cihlový dům Sternerových, ten stojí na kraji ulice; /FI 5/*

The original postmodifier now reads more like a separate sentence or added comment linked *asyndetically* to the previous statement. The original subordination of the *stojí na kraji ulice* unit is lost. It is for this reason that this example is listed among NPEs.

4.3.2 Relative clauses with zero relativizer

Among these, the ellipped expression is *that* or *which*, in one instance *that/who/whom*, and in one instance the temporal relative *when*, present in no other postmodifier in the English samples (though used in Czech in place of the locative relative adverb *where*).

It is this last ellipped adverbial alone that produces the only non-postmodifying equivalent in this category, due to a structural difference:

(36) *Then there was the time we entertained a convict*

- *Pak jsme jednoho krásného dne hostili trestance /CA 22/*

With zero relativizer RCs, we can again see the constancy of realization form that holds true for the entire category of RCs. All English RC postmodifiers of this category are rendered as RCs in Czech, though in all cases (save the one adduced above), Czech requires a relative expression. These were – per data in Table 9 – two occurrences of *jenž*, two of *co*, one of *jaký*, and one of *který*. The reversed count of Czech relativizer

counts as opposed to the category of equivalents for English RCs with initial relativizer, is of interest, though the samples provide no clue as to why *který*, by far the most popular equivalent for standard English RCs, should be less represented than *co* and *jenž* in this subcategory.

As is the rule with zero-relativizer RCs, all seven of them were restrictive, such as the examples below:

(37) *a series of volumes I had long wanted to acquire.*

- *řada svazků, jež jsem si už dlouho přál získat. /DU 27/*

(38) *[...] with an enthusiasm even greater than that he gave to his classes.*

- *[...] s nadšením dokonce větším, než s jakým se zabýval svými kriminálními případy.*
/CH 3/

The latter postmodifier features an unusual use of *that* not this time as relativizer but as pro-form and also head, not followed by the relativizer proper (*which*), which alternates with another pro-form *the one*. Its infrequency (i.e. only one occurrence of the uncomplemented *that* in all four fiction samples) indicates that its polysemy (conjunction and relativizer) plays a role in the choice of pro-form, and that other English pro-forms are usually preferred. This type of postmodification is mirrored by the Czech postmodifier with the ellipited relative pronoun *ten*: *než [to], s jakým se zabýval svými kriminálními případy*. The ellipsis then occurs the other way round in Czech: the head is missing while the prepositional relativizer is present.

The use of *jaký* as relativizer in this sentence is singular among the equivalents, although this relativizer is by no means rare in Czech. For its evaluative aspect, *jaký* would normally be used as equivalent for such postmodifier openings as *the likes of which* or *such as*. Bauer and Grepl (1980; 293) observe that the relativizer *jaký* introduces postmodifying clauses dealing with quality or quantity (in the case above, the quality of the emotion is compared to one experienced during another activity).

4.4 Non-finite Postmodifiers

Non-finite postmodifiers lack the RCs' wide applicability due to various syntactic and semantic constraints. To name a few, participles cannot be used in combination with other –ing participles, are restricted in their use with the copular verbs (which rather imply adverbial reading), and fail at expressing temporal relations other than simultaneity. The frequency of participles despite the advocated avoidance of the so-called whiz deletion (ellipsis of *who is*) shows a clash of the natural tendency for language economy and the imposed demand for transparency of expression. Šaldová (2005) sums up the advantages and disadvantages of condensation into non-finite structures by contrasting Zipf's principle of least effort, Levinson's maxim of brevity, and Leech's economy principle, against the maxim / principle of clarity and transparency.

Similarly, not every RC can be condensed using an infinitive- in fact, few can. Out of the examples (30-38) discussed in the RC section, not a single one can be condensed using the infinitive; for some, such condensation is downright impossible to form, while others would be read as infinitives of purpose (such as the earlier-mentioned example of *the night came that drew him [...]* from the FI text sample; *the night came to draw him [...]* has a clearly adverbial reading, while *the night that drew him [...]* *came* reads as a rather cumbersome structure, in which the strict grammatical order overrides the FSP and end-weight focus.

Dušková notes that in the case of translating from Czech as the source language into English as the target language, the majority of Czech postmodifying relative and nominal clauses were realized by English non-finite forms – gerunds, participles and infinitives (Dušková, 2010:127). The same trend (RCs and nominal clauses as equivalents for English participles and infinitives; gerunds are entirely outside the scope of this study, as they do not even appear as heads of the 200 English postmodifiers) was expected to occur in this analysis for translation from English into Czech. However, the assumption proved entirely incorrect.

4.4.1 Participial Postmodifiers

19 participles altogether are present in the source text, which places the English participles on the 3rd place as the most represented postmodifier category, after PPPs and RCs. Table 10 below shows the ratio of present to past participial postmodifiers:

| Participle type | Occurrences in numbers | Occurrence in percentage |
|--------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Past participle | 13 | 68,42 % |
| Present participle | 6 | 31,58 % |
| Total | 19 | 100 % |

Table 8: Participial postmodifier subtypes in the English text

Past participles represent more than a half of all occurrences.

Only a single participial postmodifier was classified as unambiguously non-restrictive, as is also shown by the presence of the commas:

(39) *and so many biscuits, dripping with butter and molasses, that I lost count.*

- *a tolik vdolků, z nichž kapalo máslo a marmeláda, až jsem je přestal počítat.* /CA 19/

Only one of the postposed participles was uncomplemented: *a method preconceived in* /FI 14/. This is because the use of postposed one-word participles is a typical feature of academic style, whereas the source texts all represented fiction. This form of participial postmodification does not exist in Czech, even when the modifier itself is further modified by an adverbial (* *postup předem promyšlený*). This example is therefore obligatorily rendered into Czech as a non-postmodifying equivalent, namely as a premodifer.

The translation counterparts of participles show a great constancy of identical realization form, as shown in Table 11:

| | CzT relative clause | CzT adjective phrase | CzT noun phrase with initial preposition | All equivalents of EngT participle |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|--|------------------------------------|
| EngT Participle-numbers | 2 | 14 | 3 | 19 |
| EngT participle-percentage | 10,53 % | 73,68 % | 15,79 % | 100 % |

Table 9: Czech equivalents of English participial postmodifiers

The vast majority (over 73 %) of all realization forms of these postmodifiers were adjective phrases, followed by NPs and RCs. Remarkably, there is only one non-postmodifying equivalent for this category, unlike the RC and PPP categories which, as seen later in Table 13 in the Non-postmodifier section, together yielded the majority of non-postmodifiers.

Although the translation of English past participles as Czech relative clauses is one of the “recurring types of non-correspondence” (of realization form) as adduced by Dušková (2010: 125), RCs proved to be the least represented translation category. They were however equally represented among both subclasses of participles – one RC translation occurred with a past participle (/CA 25/), the other with a present participle (the above-mentioned /CA 19/, sample 39). In either case, a literal translation using an adjective phrase is impossible. *Subject seldom alluded to* in /CA 25/ is rendered in Czech using a relative clause with initial preposition as the preposition + past participle combination does not exist in Czech for this verb, both due to the presence of the preposition which is never postposed in Czech, and due to the word’s semantics (**málokdy narážený na* -> official translation *téma, na něž se [...] naráželo jen zřídka*). *Dripping with butter* in /CA 19/ likewise becomes a RC, due to the nonexistence of an equivalent with the same syntactic properties (a transposition is required, with *butter* as the subject; and the English head as locative adverbial).

The low number of RC equivalents for participles still comes as a surprise. Given the lengthy descriptive parts which are examined in this study, this phenomenon may perhaps be simply influenced by a desire for brevity and condensation of the parts without action.

Only past participles were translated using a noun phrase, and the NP in such cases was always introduced by a preposition: cf.

(40) *another woman dressed in neat black [who stood apart from the rest],*
- *potom ještě další žena v případném černém oblečení, /CH 24/*

and another sentence of the same type and translation equivalent form:

(41) *She was a thin, gaunt woman with neat grey hair parted in the middle,*
- *Byla to hubená, šlachovitá žena s upravenými šedými vlasy s pěšinkou uprostřed*
/CH 47/

The examples above are prone to ellipsis of the participle, or its substitution by a shorter prepositional expression, in both Czech and English, as they are so established and context-implied that they may become redundant even in English. However, such shortening did not occur with the examples above, as *with a middle part / parting in her hair* is not only longer but as a nominalized construction also more cumbersome than the original participle; likewise, *another woman in neat black* would imply restrictiveness whereas the original may point toward non-restrictivity (despite the absence of the comma). For the latter, the same issue arises in the Czech translation: the dismissal of *další žena, případně oblečená v černém, [...]* for *další žena v černém* (implying the membership in a group of black-clad women – *another of those women in black*), in which the use of an adjective allows a non-restrictive reading, appears to be another instance of translatorial idiosyncrasy and textual condensation.

The majority of English source text participles are however translated as deverbal adjective phrases. There is dissent on whether this word class classification is correct for words such as *jídlo servírované v šest* (/CA 33/), *dům obklopený neudržovanou zahradou* (/CH 19/), *týkajícím se homosexuality* (/DU 46/), and *namiřené přímo do očí* (/FI 29/). Sedláčková in her comparison study – based on consulting Czech grammars - notes that in Czech, only participles functioning as adjectives can function as modifiers (Sedláčková, 24). Present and past participles are considered adjectives by grammarians such as Daneš (1987), and also Bauer and Grepl (1980). Daneš states this group of adjectives frequently occurs with nouns denoting real-life objects, and demonstrates their adjectival nature by showing them as impossible to reestablish within the verb phrase using the examples of *plocha odrážející světlo* vs.* *plocha, která je odrážející světlo* (Daneš, 1987:149): an ungrammatical structure in Czech, and one that creates a semantic discrepancy in English: the surface reflecting light (a permanent state, a property of the object or substance) vs. the surface which is reflecting light (implication: at the moment).

These are not to be confused with **adjectival passive participle** (such as Daneš's example *zaseté zrno – the sown seed*), which show some characteristics of a true adjective: cf. Daneš, 1987:149. Those can be paraphrased in terms of a full clause (*zrno, které je zaseté – the seed which is sowed*) - unlike present and past participles - although

they cannot be subjected to gradation (which characteristics a number of other peripheral¹ adjectives do not qualify for).

Daneš also uses the term **adjective phrase** for deverbal postmodifiers which are further modified - the type of *žijícím přechodně u příbuzných* in /CA 47/ - to distinguish them from **adjective groups** (coordinated sequences of adjectives the type of *děti, příliš malé nebo naivní* in /CA 46/).

Other approaches (see e.g. Klégr, 1996, or Dušková, 2010) treat deverbal modifiers as verbs unless preposed before the head: “-ing participle (present, perfect) / -ed participle – the criterion chosen for distinguishing between participles with a verbal character [...] and those with an adjectival character [...] is their position relative to the noun. Postmodifying participles are interpreted as ‘non-finite’ clauses and therefore classified as verbs.” (Klégr, 1996:29) Dušková however notes the “affinity between these two categories [i.e. between Czech adjectives and their participial translation counterparts in English]” which have “a fluent boundary between them, the adjectival status of many participles being often fully lexicalized.” (Dušková, 2010:125)

Daneš’s and Grepl’s approach is preferred in this study, mostly on the grounds of impossibility to re-establish a Czech participle as a constituent of the copular verb phrase, unlike the English participial postmodifiers: cf. the added copular verb in a paraphrase of /CA 47/ which produces a grammatical structure in English - *boy temporarily living ~ boy who was temporarily living*, but not in Czech: *chlapcem žijícím přechodně ~ *chlapcem, který byl přechodně žijící*. This study considers the equivalents of English participles adjectives since they behave like ones, while Czech transgressives, which are universally acknowledged as verb forms, of a similar but not identical form assume the functions of non-postmodifying English participles (namely the adverbial syntactic function; this is also why no transgressives were encountered among the postmodifying equivalents): cf. the four pairs showing the adjectival / postmodifying participles mentioned on p. 55, and their transgressive / adverbial participle counterparts: *servírované x servírováno, obklopený x obklopen, týkající se x týkajíc se, namířené x namířena*. The endings in these pairs reflect the different syntactic properties and constraints of either group.

¹ Using the lexical field terminology of center and periphery, the term ‘peripheral’ is used in this thesis to refer to adjectives which cannot be gradated (which is understood as one of the defining terms of adjectivity), although this subsumes a rather large group of Czech and English adjectives.

Two equivalents among the 19 stand out for their choice of lexical item – adjectival in realization form but differing in semantics:

(42) *a dangerous character serving a life sentence for umpteen armed robberies.*

– *nebezpečný jedinec odsouzený za četné ozbrojené loupeže na doživotí.*² /CA 24/

(43) *Japp was an ardent botanist, and discoursed upon minute flowers possessed of unbelievably lengthy Latin names (somewhat strangely pronounced) with an enthusiasm [...]*

- *Když neměl Japp službu, choval se jako zapálený botanik a vykládal o maličkých květinách opatřených neuvěřitelně dlouhými latinskými názvy (jež občas velice zvláště vyslovoval) s nadšením [...]* /CH 1/

The unusual old-fashioned or ironic use of past (passive) participle here corresponds to an equally unusual construction in Czech, which uses a word usually referring to label assigning, not to having a name, whereas the semantics of the English postmodifier plays heavily on the original meaning of *have*, i.e. possession, for which it uses a synonym.

4.4.2 Infinitive Postmodifiers

From the low numbers of infinitival postmodifiers in English – per quantitative data in Table 1, only 3 occurrences – it seems that the books from which the excerpts were taken, favour infinitives that assume other syntactic functions (appositive, adverbial, Cs etc.). Czech counts appositive infinitives among postmodifiers, but as the source text was an English one where appositives are generally not considered postmodifiers, these did not come into the scope of this study.

Two of the three English postmodifying infinitives showed appositive features, and only one belonged to the specifically English group of infinitival postmodifiers which are clearly non-appositive, and which do not have infinitival counterparts in Czech: that is, infinitives the type of *things to be seen*³, listed in Dušková, 2010:497.

² With this example, the semantic shift is of interest, as it shows the ‘freedom of translation’, when the closest corresponding expression does not necessarily get chosen as equivalent. For *serving a life sentence*, Czech has a parallel expression *odpykávající si doživotní trest*, closer to the original both semantically and syntactically. The choice of a different expression can then be interpreted as authorial idiosyncrasy.

³ The non-appositive nature of this form of postmodification can be seen in its RC paraphrase in contrast to a paraphrase of an infinitive which can alternately be read as appositive: *things to be seen* ~ *things*

This realization form was also, even considering its low representation, remarkably inconsistent in the realization form of its equivalents: each of the three instances was translated using a different equivalent category – respectively an infinitive functioning as postmodifier (the only case of category correspondence), a relative clause (as no other way of literal translation is grammatically possible), and a non-postmodifier:

(44) *an absurd desire to bound along the street,*

- *nesmyslná touha překonat ulici plavnými skoky, /FI 2/*

(45) *I too had sniffed, but could detect nothing to arouse interest.*

- *I já jsem nabral vzduch do nosu, ale nedokázal jsem rozpoznat nic, co by vzbudilo můj zájem. /CH 35/*

(46) *his wife's repeated requests to 'Hush, honey. Wait and see' did little to soothe him.*

- *a ani opakované prosby jeho ženy („Jen klid miláčku. Počkej a uvidíš“) ho příliš neukonejšily. /CH 36/*

While Czech postmodifiers can be realized by infinitives as well, this was not the case for (46) which was separated from the rest of the clause by inserted brackets. With a direct address included, it seems that any other form of realization would not work (*“prosby jeho ženy, aby zachoval klid, [*miláčku], počkal, a uvidí”). The infinitival postmodifier in sentence (46) might alternately be considered an appositive. The postmodifier specifies the nature of *requests*, but at the same time we can notice the copular identity link between the nominal head *requests* and the content of the postmodifier: *requests = to [be silent]*.

This type of construction (i.e. apposition or postmodification using a quote rather than a verb) can also be introduced by the preposition *of* without a change in meaning, which further underlines its appositive nature: cf. e.g. the paraphrase *his wife's repeated requests of 'Hush, honey [...]'*, or a sentence like *His cry of 'They've arrived!' was heard*. (In the latter example, only the *of*-construction can be used).

which can be seen; the request to proceed ~ the request, i.e. to proceed (clear appositive, no RC paraphrase possible).

4.5 Noun Phrase Postmodifiers

This category was only represented by a two occurrences in English, and is not listed in the English grammar books; not even among the minor types of postmodification (with the exception of the CGEL, and a mention made by Dušková in a section on appositives). English commonly uses prepositional phrases to convey this type of syntactic relation, while almost all nominal postmodifiers are actually appositives.

Both English NP postmodifiers were grammatically frozen phrases of a qualitative type, which partially explains the neglect of this category the major grammars:

(47) Books *the dimensions of a tree trunk*,
- *Jsou tu svazky objemné jako kmen stromu*, /DU 11/

(48) *He had a long red wrinkled neck with a bobbing Adam's apple the size of a goiter.*
- *Měl dlouhý červený vrásčitý krk, v němž mu poskakoval ohryzek velikosti volete.*
/CA 16/

Noun phrases are the most frequent type of postmodification in Czech, as seen in Table 1. This makes it remarkable that an adjective phrase postmodification was preferred in the case of /DU 11/. It can be considered another moment of translatorial idiosyncrasy, conditioned by the semantics of the chosen equivalent *objem* for the original *size*: eventhough non-congruent NP postmodifiers are popular in Czech, they do not occur with the same frequency for all potentially postmodifying nouns, and would thus 'feel' more natural for the noun *velikost* in /CA 16/ than for the more specific *objem*, although both are equally grammatically possible (*svazky objemu kmene stromu*). Looking at the potential postmodifier suggested in the previous sentence, we can see that apart from the semantics of *objem*, another blocking factor that probably has led the translator to decide on an AdjP paraphrase was the emergence of a somewhat cumbersome sequence of three nominal postmodifiers, each modifying the preceding noun. Such nominalizations are in Czech more commonly found in academic texts rather than fiction.

The categorization problem these NPs present in English can be demonstrated on example (48). While *the size of a goiter* is in form a noun phrase (as evidenced by the *of*-genitive modification following the nominal head *size*), and is listed as such in this

paper, noun phrases are not counted among postmodifiers in any of the grammar books consulted, with the exception of the earlier-mentioned CGEL. However, CGEL lists this type of expression among adverbial postmodifiers, which does not seem quite fitting. A paraphrase *as large as a goiter* or simply *big* clearly points toward an adjectival nature of the expression, which ascribes a dimension to the preceding noun *Adam's apple*, rather than toward an adverbial. This seems to be supported by the interpretation of Dušková (504), who sets expressions such as *[noun] the size of [noun]*, *[noun] your age*, and *[noun] value [numeral]* apart from appositions among which yet other grammarians list them. Dušková suggests a postmodifier reading for these expressions, stressing the paraphrase using the genitival *of* as an indicator of the modifier status. Since *of* appears with nominal heads in prepositional postmodifiers, while at the same time the preposition in these expressions is missing (and is not merely ellipted), the closest category to include these expressions in seems to be noun phrase postmodification.

Its literal Czech equivalent is easily realized by the nominal expression *velikosti voleté*, as Czech postmodifiers, as was already mentioned, can commonly be realized by a noun in post-position due to the presence of prepositional case endings showing their position within the clausal hierarchy.

4.6 Adjective Phrase Postmodifiers

Despite its listing among “minor types of postmodification” by the CGEL (1985:1293-6), adjective phrase represents the fourth most frequent realization form of postmodifiers in the English texts (viz Table 1), and in Czech the third most frequent, due to the membership of equivalents of English participles in this category. It is only preceded by PPPs, RCs, and participles, the last of which has a similar number of occurrences (9,5 % to 8,5 % respectively).

Unlike the participial postmodifiers which seem to appear mainly out of necessity for textual condensation, the frequency of AdjP postmodifiers seems conditioned by the choice of fiction as the only source text genre, and by the analysis of descriptive parts instead of the characters' utterances.

That is not to say condensation does not play a role in the distribution of adjectival postmodifiers in the English text: all AdjPs are in fact relative clauses with an ellipted relativizer and copular verb, and all can be expanded into RCs.

A number of AdjP postmodifiers appeared as coordinated structures, which made essential the methodological distinction on what would be considered a single occurrence of a postmodifier and what would be treated as two or more postmodifiers. The coordinated adjective phrases in

(49) , *paper as white and as crisp as ice, or as delicate and brittle as the frost layer on a spider's web.*

- , *knihy na papíře tak bílém a křupavém, že připomíná led, nebo na jemném průsvitném papíře podobném ojíněné pavoučí síti.* /DU 15/

, a [Noun]-[AdjP1-or-AdjP2] structure, would both share the ellipsed combination of *which was* or *that was* if expanded into full clauses, and are thus treated as a single occurrence of a multiple postmodifier. Adjective phrases can appear in coordination with other forms of postmodifiers, as is seen in the following example, mentioned earlier in section 2: *the Carters' farm, small then, but today a considerable property* (/CA 4/).

The Czech translation reflects a similar tendency for the reduction of 'superfluous' elements in such heavy descriptive postmodifiers, but does so using two heads and two modifiers rather than one head with a coordinated postmodifier. The same tendency for condensation in both languages is further stressed by the clear dominance of AdjP as the realization form of the Czech equivalents of the English AdjPs (almost 50 %) and a single occurrence (5,88 %) of a relative clause as an equivalent for the English AdjP:

| Czech equivalent of EngT AdjP | Occurrences in numbers | Occurrences in percentage |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Adjective phrase | 8 | 47,06 % |
| Adverbial phrase | 1 | 5,88 % |
| Noun phrase | 3 | 17,65 % |
| Relative clause | 1 | 5,88 % |
| Non-postmodifier equivalent | 4 | 23,53 % |
| Total | 17 | 100 % |

Table 10: Czech equivalents of English adjective phrase postmodifiers

The English AdjPs, as can be seen in the table above, proved to be a category with a large variety of Czech realization form counterparts, with at least one representative in each category.

The majority of AdjP postmodifiers, in both Czech and English, are complemented. Among those that did not, there was one that was a part of an asyndentic listing / enumerative structure-

(50) *Mr Protheroe had been a man of middle age, bearded, with hair grey at the temples.*

- *Pan Protheroe býval muž středního věku s plnovousem a se šedivými vlasy na spáncích.* /CH 31/

- and one coordinated but further uncomplemented postmodifier for which the AdjP postposition is obligatory in both English and Czech – after an indefinite pronoun:

(51) *He pounced on something bright and glittering*

- *Vrhl se na něco světlého a blýskavého,* /CH 44/

Example (50) is one of the three NP equivalents of the English AdjPs. In this particular case, the incorrespondence of category was conditioned by a nonexistent adjectival counterpart for the word *bearded* in Czech. Despite the *-ed* ending which usually marks past participles, the word is considered an adjective due to the nonexistence of *beard* as a verb.

The complemented AdjP postmodifiers sometimes contain structures in additive coordination (*a mind [like his], lucrative in intelligence, intuition, and lightning decision,* /FI 13/), alternative coordination (example 49), or adversative coordination; some AdjP postmodifiers constitute a comparative structure, such as the one in /DU 12/ - *books as slender as a wand*. The Czech equivalents of the last type showed the greatest convergence of realization form.

4.7 Adverbial Phrase Postmodifiers

This category is represented by only 2 occurrences in the English text, which makes this the least represented category of English postmodifiers. Both of them are translated by a non-postmodifier (respectively a new head and a premodifier), which makes for a zero convergence of form between the English and Czech AdvP postmodifiers:

(51) , *autumn woods aflame*,
 - *zářivé odstíny podzimních lesů*, /DU 12/

(52) *a village fifteen miles away*
 - *z patnáct mil vzdálené vesnice*, /CH 4/

It is however necessary to say that Czech has an adverbial counterpart for both of these instances (*podzimní lesy v jednom ohni; z vesnice patnáct mil daleko*), and the non-correspondence can be again attributed to translatorial idiosyncrasy, as even a preference in Czech for congruent modifiers would only explain one of the equivalents. The high numbers of AdvP occurrences in Czech (over 7 % of all postmodifiers compared to the source text's 1 % for AdvPs) is caused by the presence of some translational equivalents of English PPPs in this category.

4.8 Non-postmodifying equivalents

With a 23,5 % (47 out of 200 samples) proportion out of all means of postmodifier translation, non-postmodifying equivalents (NPEs) would classify as the third most frequent type of equivalents (after NPs and RCs), if they had been considered in the previous tables. They can be differentiated into four subgroups based on their realization form:

- A. premodifiers
- B. separate sentence
- C. total deletion of the original postmodifier
- D. complex structural / syntactic transformations within the entire NP

The representation of these among all NPEs is shown in Table 13:

| Non-postmodifying equivalent | Occurrences in numbers | Occurrences in percentage |
|---|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Premodifier | 10 | 21,28 % |
| Separate sentence | 7 | 14,89 % |
| Deletion without substitute | 2 | 4,25 % |
| Different lexical item | 5 | 10,64 % |
| Structural difference, syntactic reclassification | 23 | 48,94 % |
| Total of non-postmodifying equivalents | 47 | 100 % |

Table 113: Classification of all Czech non-postmodifying equivalents of English postmodifiers

We can see that by far the most frequent reason for the emergence of a NPE was a structural transformation, followed in similar proportion by a reclassification into the premodifier group and by preference for textual segmentation in the form of a separate sentence. The least represented type of non-postmodifying equivalents turned out to be postmodifier deletions without any redistribution of parts of the original postmodifier anywhere in the new sentence: this suggests that while translated Czech fiction texts may rephrase the original English wording, the information tends to be kept elsewhere in the structure, and complete deletion of information contained within the original text is largely avoided.

A note needs to be made here on the treatment of Czech equivalents and their selection. Even examples listed among postmodifiers at times show alternations in the contents of the postmodifier, or a substitution of the head by another noun from the original sentence. However, as long as the deviation from the English original is semantically not too substantial, and the structure remains a postmodifier, the construction is still listed as postmodifying equivalent.

Therefore samples such as

(53) *winter hills of heather*;

- *smutné tóny zimních vřesovišť*, /DU 19/

are still classified as postmodifiers, as the original PPP remained semantically identical (with *heather* as the central noun) and a postmodifier (albeit modifying a different, new head *tóny* – *shades*).

On the other hand, instances such as the one below are listed as NPEs, due to the transpositions that the translation brought into the original structure, whether as the translator's idiosyncrasy or as a systemic feature of the Czech language:

(54) *Back in his room at the boarding-house he examined the additions to his personal property*:

Když se vrátil do ubytovny, pustil se do prohlídky předmětů, jimiž rozhojnil svůj majetek: /FI 18/

In the example above, the original nominal head *additions*, i.e. *objects which were added*, is in Czech reflected in both *objects* and the verb *add*: *objects (předměty)* became the new nominal head, and the modifier was changed into a relative clause with *added (rozhojnil)* as predicate. Such semantic split of the original noun and its postmodifier is considered a NPE in this paper.

Tables 14 and 15 below reveal in which categories of English postmodifiers the majority of NPEs occurred:

| English postmodifier | All equivalents | NPEs | Percentage of NPEs out of all equivalents |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|-----------|---|
| Prepositional phrase | 103 (100 %) | 30 | 29,13 % |
| Finite relative clause | 54 (100 %) | 9 | 16,67 % |
| Non-finite clause - participle | 19 (100 %) | 1 | 1 % |
| Non-finite clause - infinitive | 3 (100 %) | 1 | 33,33 % |
| Noun phrase | 2 (100 %) | 0 | 0 % |
| Adjective phrase | 17 (100 %) | 4 | 23,53 % |
| Adverbial phrase | 2 (100 %) | 2 | 100 % |
| Total | 200 (100 %) | 47 | 23,5 % |

Table 12: The proportion of non-postmodifying equivalents to all equivalents of each postmodifier type

The English categories which produced the greatest percentage of NPEs as opposed to postmodifying equivalents, are Adverbial Phrase (100 % NPEs), in which both of its two postmodifiers became premodifiers in translation, and the equally low-represented infinitives (over 33 % NPEs). The most postmodifier-friendly categories, which produced no or very few NPEs, were Noun Phrases (again a small category consisting of two members) and, more importantly, participles, the third largest category in the source text, all of whose members but one found translation equivalents among the Czech postmodifier categories.

The largest number of NPEs predictably occurred with the most represented categories of English postmodifiers:

| English postmodifier | Non-postmodifying equivalents | Percentage out of the total of 42 non-postmodifying equivalents |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| Prepositional phrase | 30 | 63,83 % |
| Finite relative clause | 9 | 19,15 % |
| Non-finite clause - participle | 1 | 1 % |
| Non-finite clause - infinitive | 1 | 2,13 % |
| Noun phrase | 0 | 0 % |
| Adjective phrase | 4 | 8,51 % |
| Adverbial phrase | 2 | 2,13 % |
| Total | 47 | 100 % |

Table 135: Representation of Czech non-postmodifying equivalents (NPEs) in the English postmodifier types

Out of all NPEs, most (over 60 %) can be found among the counterparts of the English PPPs. The RCs, notable for retaining their RC form in translation (over 80 % rendered as Czech RCs, compared to over 16 % rendered as NPEs), produced the second highest number of NPEs based solely on the size of the category as such. AdjP postmodifiers, again mostly due to their numbers, moved to the third position in the representations of NPEs, as opposed to their fourth place in the previous table which only gave the ranking of the categories within the field of NPE. The greatest difference can be seen in the listing of the AdvP category, which ranks as the most NPE-inducing in the previous table, yet going by sheer numbers, its two NPEs constitute only a little over 2 % of all NPEs.

A. Premodifiers

With 10 occurrences, premodifiers present about 21 % of all NPEs. They occurred with various types of postmodifiers – most (7) occur with PPPs (e.g. *ingredient of life ~ životní potřeba* in /DU 2/), and there is respectively one for AdvPs (/CH 4/ - *a village fifteen miles away ~ patnáct mil vzdálená vesnice*), RCs (/DU 49/ - *research work that Havelock had done ~ Havelockových výzkumů*), and participles (/FI 14/ - *a method preconceived ~ předem připravený postup*).

Only a few of these premodifying NPEs were grammatically conditioned. Most, like e.g. *with hair grey at the temples – se šedivými vlasy na spáncích* (/CH 33/), were merely a translation variant preferred to another; in this case, the longer paraphrase *s vlasy, které byly na skráních šedivé*.

In (55), *a recently widowed farmer of about forty with two school-aged children - nedávno ovdovělý, zhruba čtyřicetiletý farmář se dvěma dětmi školního věku* /CA 34-5/

the choice of anteposition for the first of the two postmodifiers seems motivated not only by using a more natural way of expression, but also by the presence of the other postmodifier (*se dvěma dětmi školního věku*) that may be problematic to combine with the first one (resulting in lengthiness and heaviness).

The instances that truly require the use of a premodifier due to different language usage in Czech, are the following three *of*-PPP and the single participle:

- the postposition of a determiner in *in a corner of it – v jeho jednom rohu* (/CH 15/): as has been mentioned in the introductory part to English vs. Czech postmodifiers, present-day Czech does not normally use pronouns in postmodifying position.
- two occurrences of the same type of construction in respectively /CH 34/ and /CH 41/: *a move of any kind - jediný pohyb*, and *no mark or stain on it of any kind - jakákoli značka ani skvrna*. The literal postmodifying translation *jakéhokoli druhu* is rather restricted in its use in Czech, mostly to referents such as animals etc., which are as a rule divided into kinds. In most contexts however, the more natural premodifier *jakýkoli - any* is preferred. The increase of dynamism in the target text seems to have played a part in the choice of *jediný (a single [noun])* as the equivalent for /CH 34/'s postmodifier.
- *a method preconceived - předem připravený postup* was briefly mentioned in the section on participles (4.4.1). It emerged due to different language usage: Czech adjectival modifiers consisting of an uncomplemented adjective or of an adjective modified by adverb(s), are as a rule used as premodifiers. Unlike in English, they are not postposed even in Czech academic texts. A RC paraphrase (*postup, který je / by byl připravený / připraven předem*) would in this case likely feel too awkward and lengthy, and in addition, as seen in the hypothetical RC above, the translator would need to choose between two possible variants of the copular verb modus, and between an adjective or a transgressive as the counterpart for the participle itself.

B. Separate sentence

These NPEs occur 7 times, and represent almost 15 % of all NPEs. They are found among the equivalents of three postmodifier categories:

- 5 of the 7 occur with RCs (e.g. *the Moonlight Quill Bookshop, which you may have visited*, ~ *v knihkupectví Moonlighta Quilla. Možná že jste tam někdy zašli* –, in /FI 38/),
- 1 occurs with an AdjP (the earlier-mentioned /CA 4/ - *the Carters' farm, small then, but today a considerable property* ~ – *tehdy byla malá, zatímco dnes představuje značný majetek*)
- 1 occurs with an infinitive (/CA 36/: *his wife's repeated requests to 'Hush, honey. Wait and see' did little to soothe him.* ~ *a ani opakované prosby jeho ženy („Jen klid miláčku. Počkej a uvidíš“)* ho příliš neukonejšily.)

Several sentential NPEs are separated from the original matrix sentence by dashes, and have the nature of added commentary. The above-mentioned infinitive-turned-NPE was the only one to use brackets, /FI 38/ above divided the original NP into two sentences separated by a full stop, but /DU 39/ opts for simple coordination (*one master work for which I had been searching for some time ~ jedno mistrovské dílo a celé roky jsem je sháněl*) while /FI 5/ uses an even simpler juxtaposition (*Sterner residence which marked the beginning of the avenue ~ dům Sternerových, ten stojí na kraji ulice*).

A singular instance of change of a RC postmodifier into several constituents of a simple sentence is the example below:

(56) *The young lady who helped me carry the books downstairs obviously thought [...]*
- *Knihy mi pomohla odnést dolů k pokladně mladá prodavačka. [...]* /DU 43/

This example is listed among sentential NPEs, due to the fact that the postmodifier does present the most essential part of the new sentence (the verb, its objects, and the adverbial). It can alternately be considered in terms of syntactic synthesis (unlike the other NPEs), further discussed in part D.

It is noteworthy that out of all 7 NPEs of this type, only the earlier-mentioned infinitive in /CA 36/ does not allow any other form of translation but a NPE.

The uses of a juxtaposed sentence⁴, dashes, brackets and other means of segmentation reflect a perceived weakened link of the English postmodifier to its nominal head.

Another motivation for such changes is seen in e.g.

(57) *New Orleans' Garden District, the neighborhood where the big plantation owners lived*
- *Zahradní čtvrti v New Orleansu – tam žili majitelé velkých plantáží* /CA 42/

Example (57), shortened here due to a desire for brevity of expression, is not a parenthetical clause but has the nature of added commentary, as seen from the continuation of the sentence in the book: *where the big plantation owners lived, the shipowners and oil operators, the richest professional men ~ -tam žili majitelé velkých plantáží, majitelé lodí a spekulanti s ropou, ti nejbohatší lékaři a právníci* (Capote,

⁴ By Bauer and Grepl's criteria, a juxtaposed sentence is not identical with an asyndetic compound sentence: it lacks a direct syntactic and contentual link to the preceding unit. For these reasons, a juxtaposed sentence is marked in spoken discourse by forming a separate intonation unit, and by graphic devices in the written form (Bauer and Grepl, 337).

134/135). The potential reason for the emergence of sentential NPE here may be the heavy multiple subject of the dependent clause which is itself embedded in an appositive (*Garden District, the neighborhood where [...]*). The appositive is not preserved in translation to Czech.

C. Total deletion of the original postmodifier

The deletion of a postmodifier that is not substituted and leaves no trace anywhere in the structure of the Czech sentence, is apparently the least popular type of NPE, with only two representations. Both examples are from the same text, and both occurred with PPPs:

(58) *That the dictators of the world have always looked upon books with mistrust had appeared to me peculiar,*

- *Vždycky mi připadalo zvláštní, že většina diktátorů pohlíží na literaturu s takovou nedůvěrou, /DU 3/*

(59) - *the classic Havelock Ellis, to a large extent now superseded by modern research but still an important early study on that subject, and certainly a wealth of information.*

- - *klasika Havelocka Ellise, vědce do značné míry již překonaného moderním výzkumem, autora, jehož průkopnické dílo však nepostrádá mnohé zajímavé informace. /DU 41/*

The explicit information provided by the English postmodifier (both of which could easily have been rendered into Czech using a nominal postmodifier, either introduced by a preposition or with just a case ending) is in a way entailed by the Czech nouns *dílo* (source-text head *study*) and *diktátorů* (original head), but the information in these two English postmodifiers is apparently considered to be of so little value that a deliberate omission was preferred.

D. Complex structural / syntactic transformations

With about 48 % of all NPEs in this category, these represent the most numerous type of NPEs. They subsume a wide variety of transformations, starting with very simple ones, such as a reduction of a postmodifier or its fusion with the head on the grounds of a nonexistent literal equivalent in Czech, and ending with structural shifts that influence multiple clause elements within the sentence, including other postmodifiers.

These NPEs occurred with all postmodifier categories.

Both synthetic (fusion, e.g. in *periods of time* -> *období*, /CA 3/) and analytic (decomposition, e.g. in *lifted the hem of her skirt* -> *zvedla sukni a lemem [...]* /CA 39/) tendencies were present, the latter typically accompanied by the dissociation of the postmodifier from its head noun, resulting in separation of head and premodifier from the postmodifier.

- 1. Lexical item divergence

Some of these were used with consideration of the target audience (*Fourth of July* - *národní svátek* in /FI 31/ - a substitution of a concept belonging to the US culture with a hyperonym). In others, we may notice the different terminology for a concept in Czech and in English (*a set of false teeth* – *falešný chrup* in /FI 23/) in which the NPE then arises obligatorily. Occasionally, the usage of a literal equivalent is restricted with respect to frequency (*two points of view* – *dvojí možnost* in /FI 15/, often also as *hledisko, pohled*, seldom literally as *úhel pohledu*) and style: cf. *periods of time* – *období* in /CA 3/. The entire phrase *periods of time* corresponds to the Czech *období*, as Czech does not distinguish between *period* and *period of time*, save in formal styles in which the equivalent in the form of premodifier + head – *časová období* – is sometimes used.

In example /CA 20/, we can notice a lexical difference in the verb (eventive verb), which affects the use of postmodifier in the object that follows: the V-O-(postmodifier) structure of the English *give account of his exploits* is shortened into V-O by the translator: *vyličít své výpravy*. The original verb and object are both subsumed in the semantics of the Czech verb, while the original postmodifier moves into the object position.

- 2. Verbalization / Denominalization

This appears to be a very popular feature in translations, both from English into Czech (as discovered among the samples for this thesis) and from Czech into English (cf. the findings in Klégr, 1996). In most cases, the phenomenon of verbalization concerns both the head and the postmodifier (and thus connected to point 5 in its complexity), and shows a desire for greater communicative dynamism, resulting in a different arrangement of clause components.

Just like with the previous group, there are some occurrences of denominalization which emerged as a result of a structural differences between English and Czech language usage. This is especially noticeable in

(60) *the name of the deceased*

– *zesnulý se jmenoval* /CH 12/,

Where the transposition of postmodifier into subject position, and the new verbal status of the original nominal head *name*, is a standard form for the phrase in Czech, despite the existence of a literal translation equivalent.

Abundant examples of items in this category such as *the glow of his own wrist-watch* – *se jen zaleskly jeho vlastní náramkové hodinky* in /FI 16/, *give us [...] accounts of his exploits* – *vyličít své výpravy* in /CA 20/, or *at this repetition of a phrase* – *když uslyšel větu* /FI 35/, show a preference in Czech for deverbal nouns to be converted to their original word class, in the last case connected to the phenomena of generalization in the change of *phrase* into *věta*.

An interesting sample from this category is *and certainly a wealth of information* – *nepostrádá mnohé zajímavé informace* from /DU 42/, where a lexical verb is used instead of the ellipted copular verb of the source text; but as far as the NPE is concerned, we are in this case discussing an instance of denominalization combined with numeralization (the head *wealth* becomes the premodifying numeral *mnohé*) rather than verbalization.

The possibility for almost all NPEs in this category to be alternately rendered (despite certain semantic and stylistic constraints) as postmodifying equivalents is perceivable even in the most complex example of verbalization and synthesis of the entire sentence in NPE group 2: *Then there was the time we entertained a convict- Pak jsme jednoho krásného dne hostili trestance* /CA 22/. We can notice here an adverbial substitution of the original head + postmodifier phrase. This non-equivalence appears to be motivated by the imprecise meaning of *time* (which has no direct Czech equivalent in this context), and at the same time by the nonexistence of existential *there*-clauses in Czech (and their unnecessary on the grounds of Czech being a pro-drop, free-word-order language). To keep the postmodifier, it would be possible to use a construction like *Pak jednou přišel den, kdy jsme hostili trestance*. However, that would mean adding an unnecessary contrastive value to the entire sentence, which in the original is far from implied (quite the contrary: the original sample implies the existence of a list of similar ‘episodes’). It

appears that while the translator's choice of equivalent does not reflect the English structure syntactically, it is quite fitting with regard to semantics and context.

The single item in this category which requires an NPE is found in

(61) *Then he was standing tense, without breath or need of it,*

- *Zůstal stát, napjatě naslouchal se zatajeným dechem, jako by ani nepotřeboval dýchat,* /FI 8/

As was mentioned earlier, Czech pronominal postmodifiers as a rule do not appear in postposition, not needing a preposition to introduce them, which alone rules out the possibility of the original PPP producing a postmodifying equivalent, unless the translator opted for a direct repetition in the strangely formal- and unnatural-sounding context of *?potřeby dechu*.

- 3. Dispersion of a modifier's meaning into other clause elements

This group subsumes such cases as dissociation and reclassification of the head or the postmodifier. As was the case with previous groups of structural NPEs, some of the items in this category have a literal translation counterpart which was not used (e.g. *lifted the hem of skirt - zvedla sukni a lemem [...] in /CA 39/*). For others, due to different valency or contextual use of the literal Czech counterpart, the NPE remains the only possibility to render the source text postmodifier: e.g. *additions to his personal property - předmětů, jimiž rozhajnil svůj majetek in /FI 18/*, in which the Czech postmodifier originated from both the original head and PPP, whereas a new head is supplied; this construction emerged due to other field of usage and other syntactic patterns of *additions* and its synonyms in Czech (even an expression such as *nové akvizice* would need a RC with a reinvented verb).

One item of this category, *the servants of families – ti, kdo rodinám sloužili in /CA 45/*, is probably the closest to an actual equivalent out of all NPEs: the head *servants* is substituted for a pronoun, and the postmodifier is preserved eventhough it changed from a PPP to a RC. However, since the shift is a rather complex one concerning all clause elements in question, and strictly speaking the PPP only becomes the object within the Czech RC, this example is listed as a non-postmodifier.

- 4. Translatorial ad hoc solutions

These represent a rather diverse group of translatorial idiosyncrasies which radically transformed the entire structure not only syntactically like group 5 below, but also semantically, despite the existence of a satisfactory⁵ postmodifying equivalent. This is especially noticeable with the PPP in *as the frost layer on a spider's web.* – *podobném ojíněné pavoučí síti* in /DU 16/ (-> no constraints for the alternative *podobném námraze / krystalkům ledu na [...]*)

Two other samples of this group show a much greater structural and semantic divergence:

(62) *you stand, smelling the rich smell of the Amazon with Wallace*

– *plujete s Wallacem po divoké Amazonce* /DU 22/,

in which the original PPP becomes a part of an Adv. and its head is deleted without substitution. The verbs *stand* and *smell* are both dismissed for *sail*, while the premodifier of the PPP's head, *rich*, is dismissed for the premodifier *wild* inserted into the PPP-turned-AdvP. Again, no language constraints block the formation of the semantically closer counterpart *stojíte po boku Wallace a nasíváte opojnou vůni Amazonky*.

(63) *but by the character that seemed to emerge from his prose*

- *ale také stylem knihy, který vypovídal o autorově charakteru* /DU 50/

The example above saw a complete translational reversal of semantic content and clause elements within the original prepositional object and its RC postmodifier. This sentence does not discourage a postmodifying counterpart either: cf. e.g. *ale také silou osobnosti, která z knihy vyzařovala*.

- 5. Structural divergences / differing preferences of English and Czech

Unlike the free translations discussed above, with this last group of NPEs involving a structural shift there was no radical difference in the semantics of the message, with more constraints influencing the potential formation of a more literal equivalent.

⁵ It must be noted here that the purpose of this paper is not to 'pick on' idiosyncratic equivalents and non-equivalents which as a matter of fact help 'liven up' a translated text that might appear rather bland if only literal or near-literal equivalents were used. Rather, this paper aims to show when such an equivalent is possible to form, and in which cases there are language-based or outside-based (e.g. culture-based) blocking factors that do not encourage the forming of a literal counterpart.

The preservation of the meaning of individual constituents can be seen in e.g. *with a great show of jovial mystery [he] asked – s okázalou žoviálností se ho spiklenecky zeptal* from /FI 34/, in which the meaning of the original postmodifier is split between the newly added averbial *spiklenecky*, and another adverbial – *žoviálností*. A blocking factor for the emergence of a postmodifying counterpart that led to its split and reclassification, was the semantics of the word *show*, as a rule not used in the sense of *display of emotions* but rather preserved in the premodifier *okázalý*, as done above.

Properties of the head as the blocking factor for the formation of an NPE and for a resulting change in structure, occurs with other members of this category. To name one more, we can consider the head *mind* in *with a mind like his - při jeho způsobu myšlení* (/FI 12/). Unless the translator went for the noun *mozek* which occurs with comparative postmodifiers more freely than *myšlení* or *mysl* (*s takovým mozkiem, jaký má on*), the most natural way seems to be the translator's choice: turning the original head into a postmodifier, and the original PPP into a head involving altered vocabulary. (In addition to the nominal head as one of the factors contributing to the emergence of a NPE, the realization form of the postmodifier itself may be mentioned: the postmodifying *like*-constructions involving pronouns, the type of [*noun*] *like his*, are rather infrequent in Czech, and mostly appear as RCs where a verb is present. This is incidentally one of the two the reason for non-prepositional equivalents only for the two English *like*-PPPs. With the example above, such a structure would be rendered as a RC at best, and the other *like*-PPP again failed at gaining a prepositional equivalent due to the preposition *jako* itself, this time due to its other meaning of *as* and resulting potential ambiguity. This occurs in example /DU 20/ but lays outside the scope of this part).

The same reason (semantics of the head, this time *feel*, in combination with pronominal postmodifier unsuitable for a direct translation) – caused also the creation of a NPE in *there is the feel of them in the heavy leather bindings - polaskat se s těžkými koženými vazbami* in /DU 7/ (**pocit z nich v [...]*). However, this example, expanded to its full length, is best used to demonstrate how the complex changes within one NP (a postmodifier's head / reference / deletion of postmodifier etc.) may influence the syntactic properties or word class of modifiers that follow in the sentence, in this case the *in*-PPP that postmodifies the pronoun *them*:

(64) *And then, as if smells alone were not enough, there is the feel of them in the heavy leather bindings, sleek as a seal, [...]*.

- *Kromě tisíců rozličných vůní si můžete vychutnat i dotek, polaskat se s těžkými koženými vazbami hladkými jako tuleň, [...]. /DU 6-7/*

The reason for the choice of an NPE appears to be the length of the descriptive parts for some occurrences. Cf. e.g. example /DU 9/ - *with the golden glitter of the type buried like a vein in the glossy spine. – [...] se zlatavě třpytivými písmeny prosvítajícími jako žíly z oblýskaných hřbetů*. We are again witnessing a reclassification and raising of the original postmodifier into the position of the head, while the original head becomes a (pre)modifier. In a less complex and lengthy structure, a RC equivalent could work: *a zlatavé záblesky, které vrhalo písmo na hřbetu, prosvítaly [...]*. In this example, however, the main motivation of the translator appears to be to condense the text in a static part.

The existential *there* seems to be behind the emergence of an NPE in another sample - *there were three who will never slip my memory.* - *mi v paměti navždy uvízli tři* (/CA 11/). The main clause with existential *there* and a postmodifier is here condensed into a short matrix clause: *[Ze všech těch, co jsme kdy nakrmili], mi v paměti navždy uvízli tři*. It seems very probable that the reason for this structural transformation was the presence of the existential *there*, and the cumbersome word order of the potential literal equivalent *ze všech těch, co jsme kdy nakrmili, byli tři, kdo mi uvízli v paměti*. (As a side note, in this example, we may also notice the discontinuity in the Czech modifier, mentioned in the theoretical part. It is enabled by the free word order as a FSP device: cf. the original Czech translation above, and the non-discontinuous version which is dispreferred for placing a thematic subject – here also serving as a cohesive device to the previous utterance- last: *V paměti mi navždy uvízli [tři ze všech těch, co jsme kdy nakrmili].*)

4.9 Summary of Findings

This study showed that most English postmodifiers have literal or near-literal Czech postmodifying translation equivalents. Due to language-based grammatical restrictions and different language usage in Czech, the majority of English postmodifiers acquired equivalents of postmodifier categories other than the original one. The last table of this thesis, Table 16 below, illustrates this point.

| EngT postmodifier | Numbers in the EngT | Their CzT equivalents of the same form | Percentage of CzT same form equivalents |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|---|--|
| Prepositional phrase | 103 | 28 * | 27,2 % |
| Finite relative clause | 54 | 44 | 81,5 % |
| Non-finite clause - participle | 19 | - | - |
| Non-finite clause - infinitive | 3 | 1 | 33,3 % |
| Noun phrase | 2 | 1 | 50 % |
| Adjective phrase | 17 | 9 | 52,9 % |
| Adverbial phrase | 2 | 0 | 0 % |
| Total | 200 | 83 | 41,5 % |

Table 16: Agreement of realization form between the English postmodifiers and their Czech equivalents

* - prepositional expressions within the Czech ADV and NP categories

Not even a half of the total of 200 postmodifiers acquired equivalents of the same realization form. The greatest convergence of postmodifier type between Czech and English occurred for relative clauses (over 80 %), followed by two categories with about a half of identical form equivalents: adjective phrases and noun phrases (with the latter category, the result does not have much importance, due to the low representation of NP postmodifiers in the source text. RCs and AdjPs acquired their position in this quantitative comparison due to the fact that these two categories are identical in form in both languages (with minor subclass differences, such as relativizer ellipsis or postposition of preposition in English RCs). Participles would undoubtedly yield a high degree of category correspondence if their counterparts were not classified as adjectives in Czech. With PPPs, all equivalents containing initial prepositions were extracted from the AdvP and NP categories, to which such non-congruent postmodifiers are assigned in Czech: but the different language typology of Czech still resulted in only about 27 % correspondence of form, due to the large numbers of nominal postmodifiers containing a case ending and no preposition.

Despite the divergent realization forms and the exclusion of the categories of PPPs and postmodifying participles from Czech grammatical terminology, Czech and English favour the same ways of expressing postmodification in the fiction texts analyzed, with the two extremes of the explicitness continuum leading the counts: PPPs (English) and NPs (Czech) as the most language-economic category are the most frequent realization form in either language, while relative clauses are the second most frequent due to parts of text in which precision of expression is required. Adjectives, and in the case of English also participles, follow as the third most used realization form; due to their great descriptiveness and at the same time ellipsis of less relevant constituents, these two categories represent popular forms of textual condensation across both English and Czech.

There was a considerable difference between the occurrence counts of postmodifier realization forms in both English and Czech. The most popular postmodifier categories scored over 50 % (PPPs) and 27 % (RCs) in English and about 40 % (NPs, mostly without preposition) and over 33 % (RCs) in Czech, while the other categories had a much lower representation: slightly below 10 % for both participles (about 9 %) and adjective phrases (about 8 %) and only about 1 % of infinitives, AdvP, and NPs in English, and only slightly less than 0% for Czech infinitives. The approximate 17 % of Czech AdjPs are in exact parallel to the combined counts of English participles and AdjPs, the vast majority of whose equivalents are found in this category. The counts of Czech AdvPs are difficult to compare to the original English categories, since their number in Czech is predictably higher because of the presence of PPP equivalents of adverbial nature.

Section 4.2 introduced the English prepositional phrase postmodifiers, and the tables confirmed the findings of the official English grammars: the most frequent prepositions were polysemous simplex words (*of, on, in, with* leading the counts), while the prepositions that have fewer and more specific/literal meanings (*around, for, from, to*) each had very few representations, in two cases (*around, for*) with only one occurrence throughout 200 postmodifiers. The absolute majority of PPPs contained the preposition *of* (68 %, with the remaining 32 % divided between 8 other prepositions), in most cases as part of a genitival construction, such as the possessive or partitive genitive; only a single instance (*account of sth*) used *of* in another sense than marking the genitive case.

Out of the translation equivalents of English PPPs, only about 27 % actually contained a preposition (all of the AdvPs, and about 16 % of NPs, half of them with *with*), which divergence can be attributed to both a high number of non-postmodifying equivalents in this category and to the substitution of prepositions by case endings in a number of instances. All but one of the Czech NPs that did not contain a preposition were equivalents of *of*. Almost 70 % of the English PPPs are rendered in Czech by means of a NP or an AdvP, which speaks of the preference of the translators to keep the brevity of expression when possible. The more explicit realization forms in Czech (AdjP, RC) occur rarely, and at times in cases where the original cannot be translated, or feels unnatural when translated, by any shorter means (*vše ve svých silách* -> *vše, co bylo v jeho silách*).

The NPEs occur mostly in this category (over 63 % of all NPEs), and their numbers are the second highest of all PPP equivalents (over 29 % to over 37 % for Czech NP equivalents). The majority of them were counterparts of the most frequent preposition *of* (otherwise typically rendered as a non-congruent nominal postmodifier), and were grammatically (*in a corner of it*) or collocationally (*no move of any kind*) obligatory only in very few cases. The preposition that only yielded NPEs was *to* with 2 occurrences; however, as both are caused by a reclassification of the nominal head, the preposition is not viewed as NPE-inducing. The most convergent realization forms were discovered with the least represented and most precise prepositions *around* and *for* (only 1 instance each, both among AdvPs), and *with* (10 NPs, 1 RC, no NPEs).

Section 4.3 concentrated on the English relative clauses. They are for the most part introduced by *wh*-relative expressions (over 55 %), with much lower frequencies for *that* (about 18 %), *wh*-adverbials and zero relativizer (about 12 % each). This may be partly caused by the fact that a number of the excerpts provide descriptions of human characters. The text excerpts were chosen so as to represent parts containing mostly event and character descriptions (A. Christie and T. Capote texts), and in equal measure feature object and static descriptions (G. Durrell and F. S. Fitzgerald texts). *Who/m* actually leads the relativizer counts, with 17 occurrences compared to 13 for *which*. It is remarkable that in all four texts, all RCs whose antecedent is an animate human were introduced by *who/m* (no instances of *whose* were encountered), and none used *that* which can also be used to refer to human entities. The polysemy of *that* might play a role here, although the context in all of its 10 occurrences allows no ambiguity of

relative pronoun vs. conjunction reading. The low numbers of zero relativizers, on the other hand, suggest a desire to avoid ambiguity and keep the reference clear in instances where explicitness is required. Restrictivity (harder to determine in some cases as non-restrictive RCs are not always marked by commas), which is frequently researched in this category, was retained in the process of translation. Occasionally the weakened link of a non-restrictive RC postmodifier to its nominal head resulted in a NPE.

The translation equivalents for this category show that RCs are the most convergent category in their realization form: over 81 % of the English RCs are rendered as RCs in Czech, although being the realization form with the second highest numbers in English, even RCs yielded a number of non-postmodifying equivalents (about 16 % of RC translations, about 19 % of all NPEs). The variety of Czech realization form assigned to the English RCs is, compared to other categories, extremely low: only RCs, NPEs, and a single instance of an adjective phrase appeared as equivalents.

The pronoun *který* is used in over 46 % of Czech RC equivalents, and it is the most frequent equivalent for all English relativizers except adverbial and zero ones. English adverbial relativizers correspond for the most part to Czech ones, and the equivalents of zero relativizers are about equally dispersed among all Czech realization forms except for *kdo* (1 occurrence only, and that for *who*) and adverbials. The stylistic distinction between Czech relative pronouns holds true for the analyzed texts. *Jenž*, typical for written / literary / elevated language, scored 14 % in frequency, while the somewhat colloquial *co* only reaches 7 %, even with instances in which its use is obligatory (e.g. *něco, co...*) while *jenž* is in all instances substitutable by other relativizers. Compound relative pronouns such as *kterýžto*, labelled outdated by Czech grammars, did not appear as equivalents at all.

Non-finite postmodifiers, discussed in 4.4, started a section of minority forms of postmodification in English. With only 11 % of occurrences among all postmodifiers, they represent about half of the number of English RCs (27 %), which in turn represent only about a half of the number of PPPs (above 50 %). The participles in this category far outnumbered the infinitives, even when borderline instances of infinitive use were listed: out of the three infinitives found in the texts, two allowed an appositive reading on the grounds of identity between the head and its postmodifier - cf. *desire to bound* in which both head and postmodifier behave like nouns, vs. *nothing to arouse interest*, in which the latter behaves like a RC or an adjective. Since adjective phrases proved, on

the other hand, more represented in the four samples than most grammars acknowledge, an assumption can be made that in place of infinitives behaving like adjectives or RCs, actual RC and AdjP postmodifiers were used. The choice of literary style seems to have influenced the number of postmodifying infinitives as well, as they are commonly encountered in texts of an academic nature rather than fiction.

In translation, infinitival postmodifiers yielded diverse results, producing an infinitival equivalent only in 1 case out of 3.

Participles, both present (about 31 %) and past ones (about 68 %), on the other hand, proved after RCs the most convergent postmodifier form in translation: that is, bearing in mind the different word class membership of these in Czech (adjectival instead of verbal forms). Almost 74 % of participial postmodifiers are translated as an AdjP, 10 % were returned to a finite status in a RC equivalent, and only one produced a NPE. The form of participial postmodification which is typical for academic and scientific style – an uncomplemented participle – was present in a fitting semantic context that evokes academic style rather than fiction (*method preconceived*), and due to its nonexistence in Czech led to the use of an NPE.

Another form of textual condensation are adjective phrase postmodifiers, presented in section 4.6. While they are generally viewed as a minor type of postmodifier, they showed only a 1 % lower percentage of occurrences in English than participles (8,5 %). They serve as means of textual condensation, which was manifested by their use in heavy, lengthy sentences describing surroundings in the earlier-mentioned Fitzgerald and Durrell texts. They are formed from RCs through the ellipsis of a relative expression and the copular verb, and alternate with RCs. AdjPs that postmodify indefinite pronouns are however so lexicalized that their RC counterparts are not normally used; these were present in the source texts. None of the analyzed AdjPs was uncomplemented save a single occurrence within a list.

There were about 23 % of NPEs for this category, and few of them could only be rendered by an NPE. AdjPs still remain the most frequent translation counterparts with about 48 % representation. Given their low numbers compared to PPPs (17 AdjPs to 103 PPPs) which contained equivalents from all Czech postmodifier categories but non-finite ones, AdjPs, with equivalents of exactly the same realization forms as PPPs, definitely represent the category with the greatest variety of equivalent type.

Noun phrase postmodifiers (section 4.5) belong among minor types of postmodification in this analysis, and unlike adverbial postmodifiers (section 4.7), they are all but ignored by grammars. Interestingly, both realization forms appear twice in the text samples. The occurrences of NP both represented fixed phrases the type of *the size of [...]*. In Czech, non-congruent NPs, both with an initial preposition and (mostly) without it, represent the most frequent type of postmodification. The two English NPs could therefore have been rendered as Czech NPs without any problems, and only a structural cumbersomeness (sequence of four nouns which would thus emerge) seems to have caused the use of an AdjP equivalent in one of the instances. Still, with 100 % of postmodifying equivalents, the English NPs belonged among the most constant forms of postmodification, unlike the AdvPs.

The two English AdvPs were both translatable as AdvPs in Czech, but the idiosyncratic choice to prefer a premodifier in one case and a structural difference in the other, yielded two NPEs, and made the AdvPs the least convergent category in translation.

Since about ¼ of all Czech translation equivalents were non-postmodifiers, section 4.8 discussed the NPEs in greater detail. Four main subtypes were discovered: some English postmodifiers were translated as premodifiers (about 21 %), some became a separate sentence (about 14 %), most were a result of complex shifts and reclassifications of the head or other clause elements of the original sentence (almost 60 %), and only a very few (about 4 % - 2 occurrences) were simply deleted (non-equivalents). The low number of non-equivalents speaks of the intent to preserve information given in the original text, even if it meant a reclassification of the postmodifier as another clause element (e.g. an adverbial).

The majority of NPEs occurred with the most numerous categories - PPPs (over 63 % of all NPEs), and RCs (almost 20 % of all NPEs). Out of PPP NPEs, the majority was found with the most frequent preposition *of*. As mentioned in the summaries of the individual postmodifier types, however, going by the ratio of all translations of a postmodifier form and the NPEs out of them, the least corresponding categories proved to be small ones – AdvPs and infinitives. PPPs and AdjPs follow, but RCs in this comparison appear to be a category with a fairly low NPE count.

Among the premodifying NPEs, only a few required their form on the grounds of a nonexistent postmodifying equivalent in Czech, such as the phrase *of any kind*, or an

uncomplemented participle / determiner. In other cases, a structural factor (e.g. the emergence of several non-congruent postmodifiers in a sequence that would obscure the syntactic relationships) contributed to the preference of a premodifier.

Sentential NPEs belong mostly to non-restrictive RCs whose looser integration into the sentence structure in English occasionally leads to a complete separation of the RC from the sentence it was embedded in.

The most numerous group of NPEs – those involving alternations of the structure or the head that caused the postmodifier to be fused with another clause element, or to be reclassified – was further differentiated due to the number of representations. There were over 10 % of different lexical item usage: these include item substitutions for both semantic (nonexistence of concept in target language) and grammatical reasons (nonexistence of the postmodifying form in target language). Concerning both the head and its postmodifier, the phenomenon of denominalization / verbalization is also a popular reason for NPE emergence. Only one of these NPEs (again, a preposition + pronoun combination) is grammatically impossible to render as a postmodifier in Czech, the rest simply show a translatorial preference for a more natural way of expression, or for a greater dynamism of the sentence through the use of verbs. Another, smaller subgroup, contains postmodifiers (again with a single preposition + pronoun postmodifier exception) perfectly translatable into Czech without any markedness, for which dissociation from the original head was preferred, and reclassification of the original postmodifier as a different clause element, or an element in a different structure (e.g. a SVO(head+postmodifier) pattern splitting into SVO(head)-and-SVOAdv(original postmodifier)). The other two NPE subgroups contained postmodifier substitutions (as opposed to deletions) and complex syntactic reclassifications, sometimes accompanied by a shift of the semantic content of the original postmodifier as well (e.g. a substitution by an adverbial denoting similar, but not identical quality of the head as the original postmodifier). The different semantic and syntactic constraints of the individual equivalents of the items inside the original NP led to the emergence of many of these NPEs (and again, as throughout most of these categories, a NPE-requiring combination of preposition and pronoun occurred). The reclassification of a postmodifier sometimes influenced a postmodifier that followed either directly, or later in the original sentence.

From the analysis of the individual NPEs, it became apparent that only a small number of instances actually dictated the use of a NPE. Most NPEs were motivated by different language usage in English and Czech, and different collocability of the equivalents.

5. Conclusion

This comparative study aimed to present and contrast the English and Czech postmodifiers, and using 200 excerpts which were subjected to analysis and classification, test the presuppositions made against the results of the analysis. The quantitative data showed that while Czech and English use similar language means of expressing postmodification, these are traditionally listed in different categories in either language. In English, the most represented categories of postmodifiers were prepositional phrase postmodifiers (PPPs), followed by relative clauses (RCs) and participial postmodifying clauses. The largest number of Czech postmodifiers were realized by noun phrase (NP) postmodifiers, suitable for languages with inflections (hence the low number of prepositions in this Czech category, even though it contained the majority of direct equivalents of the English PPPs). Like in English, the relative clauses were the second most represented, showing a preference for a high degree of explicitness; and again like in English, the Czech deverbal adjectives – direct equivalents of the English participles – ranked as the third most frequent.

Not even a half (slightly above 41 %) of English postmodifiers received an equivalent of the same realization form. The category of relative clauses introduced by a relative expression showed the greatest convergence between Czech and English, followed by participles (Eng.)/ deverbal adjectives (Cz.), with about 50 % convergence of form for adjective phrases and noun phrases. The greatest translatorial divergence was seen among some of the least represented categories (AdvP, infinitives), and among PPPs where the vagueness of meaning and differing language usage played a large role. From those data, it can be assumed that the likelihood of an equivalent of the same realization form is in direct proportion to the explicitness of the postmodifier.

The analysis of the ¼ of postmodifiers that was translated using other means, showed that in 198 cases out of 200, the semantic content of the original postmodifier was preserved (even if altered due to item substitution by synonym or hyperonym /generalization /specialization), even if present in a different clause element (typically the nominal head of another clause element, such as adverbial).

The hypothesis that English would contain more non-finite postmodifiers compared to Czech was only partly confirmed: the literal equivalents are provided for 73 % of the English participles, both past and present, but they are not classified as verbal forms. Infinitival postmodifiers proved infrequent (1,5% in English in contrast to 0,65 % in Czech) in both languages in the text examined. For fiction at least, it seems that the English infinitives may be considered minor forms of postmodification, unlike participles.

It was also expected that a number of translation divergences would be caused not only by translatorial idiosyncrasies, but also by the different language types that Czech and English belong to, and that the latter would result in differences between Czech and English understanding of modification, and in differences in the frequency ordering of the realization forms of postmodification. This presupposition proved mostly true for the divergent forms of postmodifiers themselves, in particular for the large disproportion between the occurrence counts of NPs, PPPs and AdvPs in English and Czech.

This study also attempted to determine to what degree the use of non-postmodifying equivalents is caused by linguistic differences between English and Czech, and to what extent a literal equivalent is possible to form, which would point toward a translator's personal preference. No systemic link was discovered among the 47 occurrences of non-postmodifying equivalents, although they could be roughly divided into subgroups based on their realization form and degree of semantic identity. The majority of them emerged as a result of structural transposition(s) due to different language usage, especially the 'normalcy' / frequency / stylistic markedness of a construction existing in both languages. Only a small part of the NPEs did not allow a postmodifying equivalent at all, on the grounds of a differing collocability range, grammatical facts (certain modifiers not occurring in postposition), or nonexistence of an entire head + postmodifier combination denoting a single concept. The assumption that most of the NPEs would be a result of translatorial idiosyncrasies was therefore confirmed.

6. Shrnutí

Tato práce porovnávala užití postmodifikátorů - přívlastků v postavení za řídicím členem - v anglickém textu a jeho českém překladu. V části teoretické jsme si přiblížili jev postmodifikace a jeho realizační formy v angličtině a češtině, s následným porovnáním postmodifikátorů v obou jazycích, a jejich odlišné klasifikace a třídění: dělení na shodné/neshodné, dle stupně rozvitosti, a rozlišování přívlastků a závislých vět přívlastkových jakožto typické pro češtinu, vs. dělení podle postavení vzhledem k řídicímu členu a podle realizační formy, která jsou typická pro angličtinu, i když se druhé členění objevuje i v češtině; naproti tomu členění na restriktivní a nerestriktivní modifikátory odpovídá českému rozdělení na přívlastky těsné a volné. Byly zmíněny i rysy, které se vyskytují pouze u českých (např. shoda koncovky, diskontinuity způsobené aktuálním větným členěním) nebo pouze u anglických přívlastků (např. diskontinuity v rámci předložové fráze, elipsa relativa u vztažných vět). V části pojednávající o méně jednoznačných formách postmodifikátorů bylo zjištěno, že tyto rysy mohou přispívat ke vzniku dvojznačnosti v obou jazycích. V části teoretické byly rovněž zmíněny anglické konstrukce, které se formou blíží postmodifikátorům (např. některé adverbialní fráze, nebo vztažné věty modifikující celou větu hlavní), ale jejich syntaktická funkce je jiná, a nejsou proto obsaženy v samotné analýze.

Část týkající se metodiky excerptce specifikovala důvody výběru konkrétních textů a dále upřesnila výběr 200 vzorků (zejména z hlediska toho, co je považováno za jeden příklad přívlastku, a které přívlastky jsou považovány za několikanásobné a tím i řazeny jednotlivě).

Část analytická byla rozčleněna podle jednotlivých realizačních forem postmodifikátorů, seřazených podle četnosti zastoupení v anglickém textu. Každá část byla posouzena z hlediska konstantnosti realizační formy ve verzi anglické a české a z hlediska počtu nepostmodifikujících ekvivalentů, a důvodů, které mohly vést k jejich použití. Bylo zjištěno, že pouze necelá polovina anglických postmodifikátorů získala český protějšek stejné formy. Největší shodu formy v překladu – přes 80 % – vykazovaly vztažné věty, po nich pak další dvě kategorie (typy, realizační formy) se zhruba 50 % shodných forem ekvivalentu: adjektivní fráze a málo zastoupené jmenné fráze. Shoda u prvních dvou kategorií plyne zejména z faktu, že v angličtině i češtině se

vyjadřují stejnými výrazovými prostředky (na rozdíl od např. anglických přívlastků vyjádřených předložkovou frází, kterým v češtině často odpovídají pádové koncovky substantiva), a mají i podobnou frekvenci a sféru užití. Menší rozdíly v rámci podkategorií, jako např. v češtině neexistující elipsa relativa ve vztažné větě, zde nebyly brány v potaz. Rovněž participia vykazovala vysokou konstantnost formy v překladu (přes 70 %, tím pádem vyšší než adjektivní i nominální postmodifikátory), jsou však v češtině zpravidla považována za jinou realizační formu (adjektivní fráze).

Nejčastějšími formami postmodifikace byly předložkové fráze v angličtině a substantiva v češtině, tedy forma s nejmenší explicitností. Naopak druhý nejvyšší počet výskytů měla v obou jazycích kategorie vztažných vět, tedy forma nejexplicitnější. Nejméně zastoupené byly jak v angličtině, tak v češtině, infinitivy (jen málo přes 1 % všech postmodifikátorů v angličtině, a pouze jeden výskyt, tj. necelé 1 %, v češtině). Anglické fráze adverbialní a substantivní (nominální) měly minimální zastoupení, ovšem český text jich obsahoval podstatně více z důvodu zařazení doslovných ekvivalentů původních předložkových frází právě do těchto dvou kategorií, vzhledem k faktu, že konzultované české gramatiky pojem *předložková fráze* neuvádějí.

Z celkem osmi druhů (dle použité předložky) postmodifikátorů předložkových byly v angličtině nejčastější předložky polysémní s povětšinou neadverbialním významem (např. *of* či *on*), zatímco předložky s konkrétními adverbialními významy (např. *around*, *for*), navzdory malému počtu výskytů, vykazovaly velkou konstantnost nejen formy, ale i dané předložky v překladu. Nadpoloviční většina předložkových postmodifikátorů obsahovala předložku *of* (68 %), která téměř ve všech případech vyjadřovala genitiv, a také byla nejčastěji genitivní koncovkou přeložena, což zdůvodňuje nominální ekvivalenty coby nejčastější formu překladu anglických předložkových přívlastků.

Předložku obsahovalo pouze 27 % českých ekvivalentů této anglické kategorie – všechny ekvivalenty náležící v češtině mezi adverbialní fráze, a menší část (zhruba 16 %) ekvivalentů nominálních. Z českých nominálních frází neuvedených předložkou byly všechny až na jedinou protějšky předložky *of*. Nominální či adverbialní frází je tedy do češtiny převedeno téměř 70 % anglických předložkových postmodifikátorů, což svědčí o snaze zachovat v překladu jak formu, tak stručnost původní vazby. Explicitnější formy protějšků, jako např. věta vztažná, se proto vyskytují mnohem řidčeji.

Nepostmodifikujících protějšků se pro tuto anglickou kategorii vyskytlo plných 63 % celkového počtu nepostmodifikátorů, a tvoří po nominálních frázích druhou nejčastější formu překladu. Většinou jde o ekvivalenty předložky *of*, které nebylo možno přeložit postmodifikátorem z gramatického (např. v konstrukci *in a corner of it*) či kolokačního / výskytového hlediska (např. v konstrukci *no move of any kind*).

Věty vztažné, druhá nejčastější forma postmodifikace jak v angličtině, tak v češtině, byly nejčastěji uvedeny *wh*-relativy (*wh*-vztažnými zájmeny), a to v 55 % případů. Relativum *that* s 18 % výskytů bylo užito mnohem řidčeji, stejně jako *wh*-adverbia (vztažné příslovečné výrazy) a nulové relativum (obojí zhruba 12 % výskytů). To může být způsobeno pasážemi věnujícími se popisu osob (pro které se v angličtině nejčastěji užívá relativum *who*), zejména v textech A. Christie a T. Capotea, čemuž napovídá i nejvyšší počet výskytů pro zájmeno *who/m* ze všech relativ: se 17 výskyty překonává i počet užití zájmena *which* (13 výskytů). Je překvapivé, že ačkoli pro lidské antecedenty je možné užívat i zájmeno *that*, toto relativum v textech nebylo s touto referencí užito ani jednou. Zde je možné, i když ne příliš pravděpodobné, že jistou roli hraje polysémie slova *that*, které v angličtině funguje též jako spojka *že*. Na druhou stranu malé zastoupení nulového relativu naznačuje snahu o jasnou referenci a strukturu pro tuto nejrozvinutější a sémanticky nejkonkrétnější formu postmodifikace. R

Restriktivita (tj. volnost nebo těsnost) tohoto typu přívlasku byla v překladu zachována, ovšem oslabený vztah vztažné věty nerestriktivní k větě nadřazené se někdy projevil vznikem nepostmodifikujícího protějšku v podobě nezačleněné věty s povahou volně připojeného komentáře.

Jak bylo řečeno, co se týče překladových protějšků, mají anglické vztažné věty nejvíce shodných realizačních forem v českém textu: přes 81 % jich odpovídá české vztažné větě. Dalších zhruba 16 % ekvivalentů tvoří nepostmodifikátory (celkově kolem 19 % všech nepostmodifikujících protějšků). Na rozdíl od předložkových přívlasků ovšem tato kategorie vykazuje jen malou různorodost forem ekvivalentů: kromě vět vztažných a nepostmodifikátorů se vyskytuje pouze ojedinělý překlad pomocí adjektivní fráze, jiné formy zastoupeny nejsou.

V téměř polovině ekvivalentů je užito zájmeno *který*. Anglické adverbiální výrazy povětšinou odpovídají českým, a ekvivalenty nulových relativ jsou v excerptech všechna česká relativum s výjimkou adverbiálních výrazů a zájmena *kdo* (které má celkově pouze jediný výskyt, což naznačuje klesající popularitu tohoto výrazu v češtině,

a to i po ukazovacím zájmenu, kde bývá nahrazeno relativem *co*). V českých ekvivalentech se odráží i stylistické rozlišení, které angličtina mezi svými relativy nemá: paradigmatické varianty zájmena *jenž*, typického pro psaný / literární / stylisticky nadřazený jazyk, jsou obsaženy ve 14 % ekvivalentů navzdory tomu, že jsou ve všech výskytech plně nahraditelné konkurenčními relativy, kdežto poněkud hovorové *co* je přítomné pouze v 7 % protějšků, a to včetně výrazů, kde je obligatorní (např. konstrukce *něco, co...*). Složená relativa typu *kterýžto* nejsou užita vůbec.

Nefinitní formy postmodifikace (infinitivy, participia) jsou použity v 11 % všech příkladů, tj. o více než polovinu méně, než byl počet vztažných vět. Participia jsou použita mnohem častěji než infinitivy. Ty se vyskytly pouze třikrát (zdá se, že se zde projevuje stylistický rozdíl v distribuci: je známo, že infinitivy bývají početné zejména v odborných textech), a to dva z případů připouštěly i přístavkovou interpretaci (tj. v gramatice anglické; české infinitivní vazby v tomto postavení jsou běžně považovány za přívlastky). Typicky anglická nepřístavková vazba bez protikladu v češtině se vyskytla pouze v *nothing to arouse interest*, což vzhledem k celkovému počtu zástupců této kategorie také vysvětluje nízkou korespondenci formy mezi českými a anglickými infinitivy.

Participia přítomná (zhruba 31 % nefinitních postmodifikátorů) a minulé (zhruba 68 %) se ovšem až na fakt, že jejich doslovné protějšky jsou v češtině běžně řazeny mezi fráze adjektivní (deverbálního typu) a nikoli mezi polovětné vazby slovesné, ukázala jako velmi konvergentní co se týče realizační formy. Téměř 74 % všech participií je přeloženo jako adjektivní fráze, pouze 10 % bylo zpětně konvertováno na – zejména v mluvené češtině běžnější – věty vztažné, a jen jediné participium (*method preconceived*, tj. participium v konstrukci, která v češtině neexistuje) je vyjádřeno nepostmodifikátorem.

Jen o 1 % méně zástupců mají adjektivní fráze, které jsou na rozdíl od participií v anglických gramatikách zpravidla řazeny mezi okrajové formy postmodifikace. Tyto fráze, vzniklé elipsou relativa a sponového slovesa ve vztažné větě, slouží ke kondenzaci textu – jak je také vidět z jejich častého užití v popisných statických pasážích zkoumaných textů. Mohou se v angličtině vyskytovat jak v holé (samotné adjektivum, zpravidla omezené na výskyt po zájmenech neurčitých), tak v rozvitě

(komplementované) formě. Až na jediný byly všechny výskyty ve zkoumaných textech rozvíte nebo alespoň v koordinačním vztahu.

V téměř polovině případů je překladovým protějškem rovněž adjektivní fráze, zhruba čtvrtina je přeložena pomocí nepostmodifikátoru, zbylá čtvrtina je přeložena ostatními českými typy (adverbiální i nominální fráze, vztažná věta). Jedná se tedy o kategorii velmi různorodou v překladu.

Nominální fráze se vyskytly ve velmi malém zastoupení. Na rozdíl od češtiny jde v angličtině o kategorii vesměs opomíjenou gramatikami a omezenou na několik ustálených konstrukcí typu *the size of [...]* (užité v textech v obou celkem dvou výskytech). Zajímavostí bylo, že přestože díky pádovým koncovkám nominální fráze velmi často realizují český přívlastek neshodný, v jednom z příkladů byla pro překlad zvolena fráze adjektivní. Tento případ ilustruje spíše snahu o jasnou referenci a ‚nekostrbatost‘ konstrukce, vzhledem k faktu, že při zachování realizační formy by vznikla sekvence čtyř substantiv, která coby projev nominalizace není pro češtinu příliš typická (ačkoli je gramaticky správná), zejména ne pro prózu.

I další okrajový typ přívlastku, fráze adverbiální, měla v angličtině dvě zastoupení. Nicméně idiosynkratické užití dvou českých nepostmodifikátorů coby ekvivalentů z této kategorie udělal typ s nejmenší shodou formy.

Zhruba čtvrtina anglických postmodifikátorů byla do češtiny přeložena nepostmodifikátorem, výjimečně pak vůbec. Nepostmodifikující ekvivalenty se daly rozdělit do čtyř hlavních typů. Téměř 21 % jejich celkového počtu tvořily premodifikátory, tedy přívlastky v postavení před řídicím členem, a tudíž shodné (oproti postmodifikátorům, v češtině z valné části neshodným). Zhruba 14 % bylo realizováno nezávislou větou, zpravidla výrazně oddělenou od zbytku výpovědi (závorky, pomlčky, zcela nová věta). Tento typ se zejména vyskytl u nerestriktivních vět vztažných. Největší část, zhruba 60 %, byla výsledkem komplexnějších změn a syntaktických i slovnědruhových reklasifikací ve větě nebo jen na úrovni členu řídicího. Pouze ve 4 %, tj. ve dvou případech, došlo ke kompletnímu vypuštění původního přívlastku, aniž by byl jakkoli reflektován ve zbytku věty. Fakt, že k tomuto došlo pouze ve dvou případech, svědčí o záměru překladatelů zachovat informační hodnotu originálu, ať už za použití přívlastku nebo jiného větného členu (např. příslovečného určení).

Nejvíce nepostmodifikátorů se vyskytlo mezi ekvivalenty nejpočetnějších kategorií anglických přívlastků - přes 63 % jich bylo protějšky předložkových frází, a dalších zhruba 20 % protějšky vztažných vět. Mezi předložkami způsobovala nejvíce nepostmodifikátorů nejpočetnější předložka *of*. Pokud se ovšem srovná nikoli podíl z celkového počtu těchto ekvivalentů, ale poměr zastoupení nepostmodifikátorů k celkovému počtu protějšků určitého typu přívlastku, pak největší tendenci ke vzniku nepostmodifikátoru vykazovaly typy minoritní- infinitivy a adverbialní fráze, naopak u vět vztažných dochází k použití nepostmodifikátoru jen sporadicky.

Jen u velmi malé části anglických postmodifikátorů nebylo gramaticky možné použít postmodifikující ekvivalent (např. tomu tak bylo u holých participií / zájmen v postpozici). V některých případech byla blokujícím faktorem struktura věty, která by vznikla (např. sekvence čtyř neshodných postmodifikátorů, která by mohla znejasnit syntaktické vztahy mezi členy).

Nejpočetnějším typem nepostmodifikátoru byly případy, ve kterých u původního přívlastku došlo k reklasifikaci větněčlenské a/nebo slovnědruhové, v naprosté většině podmíněné změnami v jiných částech věty nebo pouze v členu řídicím. Tuto kategorii lze přibližně rozdělit do několika podtypů. V části případů se jednalo o problém lexika – nahrazení původního přívlastku jiným větným členem z důvodů sémantických (neexistence nebo neznámost pojmu v cílovém jazyce a/nebo kultuře, ze které čtenář pochází) nebo gramatických (neexistence postmodifikátoru v daném kontextu v cílovém jazyce). Patří sem i sloučení postmodifikátoru s členem řídicím v případech, kdy tato anglická kombinace odpovídá v češtině jednoslovné položce. Často také při překladu do češtiny docházelo k jevu denominalizace či verbalizace původního přívlastku, kde se užitím sloves místo přívlastků či jejich částí projevilo přání zvýšit výpovědní dynamismus a používat i ve zkoumaných popisných pasážích vyjadřování přirozenější a více reflektující mluvený jazyk. U jiných přívlastků v překladu docházelo k disociaci od řídicího členu a syntaktické reklasifikaci na neslovesný větný člen, a to i v případech, kdy celou konstrukci bylo možné přeložit přívlastkem bez podstatného rozdílu ve významu, frekvenci či sféře užití. U další podskupiny byl postmodifikátor nahrazen jinou položkou, přičemž docházelo i k posunu významu (nebyl tedy zrušen, ale ani pouze reklasifikován). Náhradní větný člen pak měl význam podobný, ale ne stejný jako původní anglický postmodifikátor, přičemž rozdíl byl nejen v konotaci, ale i denotaci. Obě zmíněné reklasifikace pak byly v části případů důvodem pro obdobné změny přívlastků následujících reklasifikovaný buďto přímo, nebo dále ve větě.

Porovnáním jednotlivých nepostmodifikátorů se potvrdilo, že jen v minimu případů bylo nezbytné tento typ ekvivalentu použít kvůli neexistenci obdobné postmodifikující konstrukce v češtině. Motivací pro vznik většiny nepostmodifikátorů se zdá být přirozenost konstrukce co se týče nejen formy, ale i obdobné frekvence a sféry užití jako v anglickém originále (snaha o korespondenci v těchto dvou směrech, např. o zachování archaizujícího způsobu vyjádření, je dobře patrná i u přívlastkových ekvivalentů). U části neekvivalentů se stejnými hodnotami jako originál co se týče významu, stylu i frekvence užití, se pak jedná o ryze individuální preferenci jednoho z několika možných výrazových prostředků.

Navzdory zčásti odlišné terminologii a chápání jednotlivých realizačních forem postmodifikátorů v angličtině a češtině, je zřejmé, že s výjimkou typologického rozdílu v podobě českých pádových koncovek, způsobujících oproti angličtině méně přívlastků s předložkou a o mnoho více nominálních, oba jazyky upřednostňují stejné způsoby tvoření postmodifikátoru. To se týká i jejich shodného frekvenčního pořadí, v čele se dvěma opačnými konci stupnice explicitnosti: fráze předložkové (angličtina) a nominální (čeština) reprezentující snahu o úspornost jazyka, a na druhé pozici věty vztažné, značící opačný zájem o maximální transparentnost významu i syntaktických vazeb.

Podobně také odlišná typologie nebo individuální preference ovlivnily jen okrajově počet výskytů nepostmodifikujících ekvivalentů. Hypotéza, že užití nepostmodifikátorů bude záležitostí vesměs idiosynkratickou, se tak potvrdila pouze částečně.