

Univerzita Karlova v Praze

Filozofická fakulta

Ústav anglického jazyka a didaktiky



Bakalářská práce

Jakub Sláma

English counterparts of the Czech instrumental case

Anglické protějšky českého instrumentálu

Praha 2016

vedoucí práce: prof. PhDr. Libuše Dušková, DrSc.

Velice děkuji vedoucí své bakalářské práce prof. PhDr. Libuši Duškové, DrSc., za její neskonalou trpělivost, ochotu a cenné a podnětné rady a komentáře.

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

V Praze dne 11. srpna 2016

.....

Souhlasím se zapůjčením bakalářské práce ke studijním účelům.

I have no objections to the BA thesis being borrowed and used for study purposes.

## **Abstrakt**

Bakalářská práce se zabývá anglickými překladovými protějšky českých bezpředložkových instrumentálových tvarů substantiv. Teoretická část práce stručně charakterizuje český pádový systém a pozici bezpředložkového a předložkového instrumentálu v tomto systému, dále pak popisuje vybrané (zvláště morfologické) aspekty instrumentálu, načež se zaměřuje na charakteristiku syntaktických funkcí, které mohou bezpředložkové instrumentálové tvary plnit, a významů, jež mohou mít. Následně je věnována pozornost tomu, jaké protějšky těchto tvarů lze očekávat v angličtině (a to především s ohledem k sémantice). Metodologická část práce rekapituluje argumenty pro preferenci primárně sémantického přístupu nad přístupem ryze syntaktickým.

Samotná analýza se zakládá na vzorku 110 dokladů; pro každou z jedenácti vytyčených sémantických specifikací (tj. agens, lokální určení směru či cesty, způsob, průvodní okolnosti, fázový instrumentál, nástroj, látka, prostředek věcný a akční, zřetel, příčina) se pracuje s deseti českými doklady a jejich anglickými protějšky, získanými z paralelního korpusu *InterCorp v8*. Analýza se pokouší pro každou sémantickou specifikaci určit primární realizační formu nalezenou v anglických protějšcích a identifikovat sémantické rysy a gramatémy relevantní pro volbu mezi různými realizačními formami.

**klíčová slova:** pád, český instrumentál, překladový protějšek, realizační forma, sémantická role, syntaktická funkce

## **Abstract**

The present thesis deals with English translation counterparts of Czech non-prepositional instrumental case forms of nouns. The theoretical part briefly describes the Czech case system and the status of the instrumental case, both non-prepositional and prepositional, within this system, and also discusses certain (especially morphological) aspects of the instrumental case. Subsequently, syntactic functions and semantic roles of non-prepositional instrumental case forms are characterized, which serves as a basis for attempting to describe the possible English counterparts of non-prepositional instrumental case forms, especially with respect to the semantics. The methodological section of the thesis includes arguments for a primarily semantic approach (rather than an all-syntactic one).

The analysis is based on a sample of 110 non-prepositional instrumental case forms and their English counterparts, i.e. 10 examples for each of the delineated semantic specifications (viz. agent, direction or path, manner, accompanying circumstances, the phasal instrumental case, instrument, material, means, actional means, viewpoint, cause) excerpted from the parallel corpus *InterCorp v8*. The analysis aims to identify the primary realization form for each semantic specification and to describe semantic and grammatical features relevant to the choice of a realization form.

**key words:** case, the Czech instrumental case, translation counterpart, realization form, semantic role, syntactic function

## Table of Contents

1 Introduction.....	11
2 Theoretical background .....	12
2.1 The Czech and English case systems .....	12
2.2 Notes on the Czech instrumental case.....	13
2.2.1 Notes on morphology .....	13
2.2.1.1 Case marking .....	13
2.2.1.2 Conversion into adverbs, prepositions, and interjections.....	13
2.2.2 The Czech instrumental case in the contemporary Czech language .....	14
2.3 The Czech prepositional instrumental case.....	14
2.4 The Czech non-prepositional instrumental case .....	15
2.4.1 Search for a suitable framework.....	15
2.4.2 Syntactic functions .....	15
2.4.2.1 Part of an analytic predicate .....	15
2.4.2.2 Object complement .....	16
2.4.2.3 Verbless adverbial clause .....	16
2.4.2.4 Modifier.....	17
2.4.2.5 Object .....	17
2.4.2.6 Adverbial .....	18
2.4.3 Semantic roles .....	19
2.4.3.1 Attribute.....	19
2.4.3.2 Patient.....	20
2.4.3.3 Circumstance semantics .....	20
2.5 Possible English counterparts of instrumental case forms.....	24

2.5.1 Concomitant meanings of the i-case .....	24
2.5.2 Other uses of the i-case .....	28
3 Material and method.....	30
3.1 The search for a suitable framework revisited.....	30
3.2 Material for the analysis.....	31
3.2.1 Limitation of realization forms .....	31
3.2.2 Limitation of semantic roles .....	31
3.3 Selection of the material.....	31
3.3.1 The subcorpus and the query.....	31
3.3.2 Reduction of the material.....	32
3.3.3 Selection of the individual samples .....	33
3.3.3.1 Technical aspects .....	33
3.3.3.2 Criteria used for the selection of the samples.....	34
4 Analysis .....	37
4.1 Agent .....	38
4.2 Direction (DIR).....	39
4.3 Manner (MANN) .....	40
4.4 Accompanying circumstances (ACMP).....	41
4.5 Phase .....	43
4.6 Instrument (INSTR).....	45
4.7 Material (MAT) .....	46
4.8 Simple means.....	47
4.9 Actional means .....	50
4.10 Viewpoint (VIEW).....	51

4.11 Cause .....	53
5 Conclusion .....	55
6 References and sources.....	58
7 Résumé .....	63
8 Appendix.....	66



## List of Abbreviations

(the) i-case (the) Czech instrumental case

(an) i-form (a) Czech instrumental case form

*AGSČ* Štícha, F. et al. (2013) *Akademická gramatika spisovné češtiny*. Praha: Academia.

*CGEL* Quirk, R. et al. (1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London and New York: Longman.

*ČŘJ* Čechová, M. et al. (1996) *Čeština – řeč a jazyk*. Praha: ISV nakladatelství.

*ESČ* Karlík, P., M. Nekula & J. Pleskalová, eds. (2002) *Encyklopedický slovník češtiny*. Praha: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny.

*G&K* Grepl, M. & P. Karlík (1998) *Skladba češtiny*. Olomouc: Votobia.

*MČ2* Komárek, M. et al. (1986) *Mluvnice češtiny. 2, Tvarosloví*. Praha: Academia.

*MČ3* Daneš, F. et al. (1987) *Mluvnice češtiny. 3, Skladba*. Praha: Academia.

*SSČ* Filipec, J. et al. (2001) *Slovník spisovné češtiny pro školu a veřejnost*. Praha: Academia.

*DictCam* *English Cambridge Dictionary*. Cambridge University Press. Available online from <<http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english>> (last accessed: 26 July 2016).

NP noun phrase

AdjP adjective phrase

PP prepositional phrase

VP verb phrase

FGD Functional Generative Description

## List of Tables

Table 1: Concordance filters.....	32
Table 2: Overview of the realization forms.....	37
Table 3: Agent.....	38
Table 4: Direction.....	39
Table 5: Manner.....	40
Table 6: Accompanying circumstances.....	41
Table 7: Phase.....	44
Table 8: Instrument.....	45
Table 9: Material.....	46
Table 10: Simple means.....	47
Table 11: Actional means.....	50
Table 12: Viewpoint.....	51
Table 13: Cause.....	53
Appendix Table 1: The sample.....	66
Appendix Table 2: Examples used in the theoretical part.....	85

## 1 Introduction

It is a truth universally acknowledged that the present-day English case system does not comprise any overt counterpart of the Czech instrumental case, and therefore English has to employ other means of expressing the relationship that has this specific form in Czech, for “grammatical features found in one language show up in some form or other in other languages as well” (Fillmore, 1968: 3). The present thesis examines English translation counterparts of Czech **non-prepositional** instrumental case forms, focusing on their realization forms and on their correlation with the semantic roles.

The thesis consists of two major parts, theoretical and practical. The first provides a (necessarily selective) description of basic morphological characteristics of the instrumental case and touches upon relevant related issues, proceeding to present the range of syntactic functions and semantic roles of instrumental case forms. Furthermore, the chapter examines possible ways of translating them into English, the purpose being to arrive at a hypothesis concerning their possible English counterparts. The main part of this theoretical examination is based on Czech academic grammars, i.e. Volume 2 (1986) and Volume 3 (1987) of *Mluvnice češtiny* by groups of authors from the Institute of the Czech Language of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, and *Akademická gramatika spisovné češtiny* (2013) by Štícha et al., as well as the descriptions of the Czech syntax by Grepl and Karlík (1998) and Panevová et al. (2014). However, other works have also been used, especially the study *Instrumentál v struktuře české věty* (2000) by Uličný. The examination of possible English counterparts operates within a framework by Lehmann and Shin (2005) and is based on the Czech grammar of English by Dušková et al. (2012) as well as on English grammars (*CGEL*; Biber et al., 2007).

The second, empirical part of the thesis provides an analysis of English counterparts of Czech non-prepositional instrumental case forms, drawing upon the material of 110 examples from the parallel corpus *InterCorp (version 8)* of the Czech National Corpus project.

## 2 Theoretical background

### 2.1 The Czech and English case systems

The case is studied by both Czech and English linguists as it is present in both of the languages as a nominal category. However, “a [Case] feature is only required in languages that realize grammatical relations through morphology” (Spencer, 2006: 6), and thus “English lacks a case system other than in the possessive construction (and, possibly, personal pronouns)” (ibid.), comprising solely the opposition of the common and the adnominal case (Trnka, 2014: 84; *CGEL*: 318). There is no instrumental,<sup>1</sup> whilst the Czech case system is formed by seven cases, the Czech instrumental case (hereafter referred to as ‘the i-case’) being traditionally listed as the ‘last’ one (although the canonical order is rather arbitrary – cf. *ČŘJ*: 145). The purpose of the following discussion of the Czech case system is to delineate the position of the i-case within this system.

In general, Czech case forms can be prepositional, i.e. preceded by a preposition requiring the particular case, and non-prepositional.<sup>2</sup> This distinction seems substantial as prepositional and non-prepositional case forms differ in characteristics such as function, distribution, and frequency (*ESČ*: 305). The i-case can be expressed by both prepositional and non-prepositional instrumental case forms (hereafter ‘i-forms’).

Another distinction is that of syntactic (non-adverbial, non-semantic, structural) and semantic (adverbial, non-syntactic) cases (cf. Uličný, 2000: 16), sometimes also pragmatic ones (e.g. the Czech vocative case; Uličný, 2013: 33). As Emonds (2007: 82) explains, “[s]emantic’ cases are those assigned before movement of object nominals in passives, while ‘structural’ cases are those assigned after it”; or, as Blake (2006: 214) puts it, syntactic cases generally “encode the grammatical relations of subject and object,” whereas semantic cases “express a specific semantic role.” Uličný (2000: 149), however, concludes that “the distinction made between syntactic and non-syntactic, or semantic vs. non-semantic cases does not reflect the present results of linguistic research,” which is related to the fact that “a primarily grammatical case can have a semantic function” (Blake,

---

<sup>1</sup> As Mitchell & Robinson (1992: 17) point out, “in certain parts of the [Old English] adjective and pronoun declension an instrumental occurs; where it does not, the dative does its work.” By comparison, the Czech system has always had seven cases (Vážný, 1963: 5).

<sup>2</sup> Alternatively, the preposition and the “case” ending are sometimes considered a “bimorph” together (*ESČ*: 305).

2006: 214) and vice versa. The i-case is traditionally deemed primarily semantic (*ESČ*: 182; Adam, 2015: 22).

## **2.2 Notes on the Czech instrumental case**

This section concentrates on some aspects of the i-case, the aim being to touch upon its morphological and stylistic characteristics related to both prepositional and non-prepositional uses of the i-case before treating them separately.

### **2.2.1 Notes on morphology**

#### **2.2.1.1 Case marking**

In Czech the category of case is expressed via case marking, i.e. endings of NP and AdjP heads (and their dependents whose form is given by the case, number and gender concord). These endings simultaneously express case, number and gender (cf. *ESČ*: 305). The declensional paradigms are given in Czech grammars such as *MČ2* and *AGSČ*, and are not elaborated further on here, being rather irrelevant to the concern of the present thesis.

#### **2.2.1.2 Conversion into adverbs, prepositions, and interjections**

What should be touched upon, however, are two processes whereby i-forms convert into either adverbs (adverbialization) or secondary prepositions (prepositionalization), and thus lose their paradigms (cf. *AGSČ*: 508), which leads to their morphemic reinterpretation (cf. Knappová, 1973). Occasionally, i-forms convert into interjections such as *fofrem!* (Vondráček, 2013: 24).

I-forms are, in fact, the most common of all Czech non-prepositional case forms to convert into adverbs, e.g. *smíchy* and *kolem* (*AGSČ*: 281), some of which may become secondary prepositions, the latter being an example (*MČ2*: 204; cf. Havránek & Jedlička, 1981: 131). Other i-forms can convert directly into prepositions, to which i-forms are again the most prone of all case forms, a case in point being *zásluhou* (*MČ2*: 204).

The relevance of the knowledge of these processes becomes apparent when corpora are taken into consideration; while giving examples of problematic areas for the automatic disambiguation and morphological tagging of texts, Petkevič (2014: 202) mentions homonymous word forms which may function as both i-forms (i.e. nouns) and secondary prepositions, including for example *během*, *díky*, and *pomocí*. Similarly, Osolsobě (2014: 180) highlights the importance of being aware of such word-formation processes

when using corpora. The corpus material therefore had to be meticulously checked so as to exclude all adverbs and secondary prepositions falsely tagged as i-forms (cf. 3.3.2).

### 2.2.2 The Czech instrumental case in the contemporary Czech language

In the present-day Czech language (as well as in some other Slavonic languages), originally non-prepositional i-forms are often used with the preposition *s(e)* (especially in the colloquial use), e.g. *sekat se sekerou, trást se stromem* (Trost, 1963: 25; cf. Čechová et al., 2008: 143). The roots of this tendency can be traced back to the period of Old Czech (e.g. *kto s mečem bojuje, kto s pěstí něco vydírá*) and even Old Church Slavonic (Kopečný, 1973: 248).

Another tendency can be observed: i-forms functioning as subject complements of the type *je otázkou* are becoming increasingly frequent (Čechová et al., 2008: 143–144), albeit still considered inappropriate (Pravdová & Svobodová, 2014: 439; Štícha, 2016: 26). Changes in the frequency of predicative nominative forms and i-forms (related to the regional variation) are underway as well (Uličný, 2002: 236).

### 2.3 The Czech prepositional instrumental case

I-forms may appear after the following simple prepositions (given in the order of their frequency): *s(e)* ‘with’<sup>3</sup>; *před(e)* ‘in front of, before’; *mezi* ‘among; between’ (the ‘among’ meaning being the more frequent one); *za* ‘behind’; *nad(e)* ‘above, over’; *pod(e)* ‘below, beneath, under’; *napříč* ‘across, through’ (Cvrček et al., 2010: 288). Moreover, i-forms may be preceded by complex prepositions such as *spolu s* ‘together with,’ *ve srovnání s* ‘in comparison with,’ *z obavy před* ‘for fear of’ and *v honbě za* ‘in pursuit of’ (ibid.).

Prepositional i-forms preceded by one of the simple prepositions given above express primarily locative and temporal meanings (ibid.), an exception being i-forms with *s(e)*, whose primary function is to express the comitative meaning (ibid.; also cf. Spal, 1975). Prepositional uses of the i-case are not elaborated further on; the following discussion deals exclusively with the non-prepositional i-case, the major reason being that prepositional cases are usually seen as the secondary ones, in which the preposition further specifies and modifies the primary case meanings found in non-prepositional uses (cf. MČ2: 199; Uličný, 2000: 21). Moreover, the present thesis is based only on 110 examples,

---

<sup>3</sup> The English equivalents in this section as well as those in section 2.5.1 are based on Fronek’s Czech-English dictionary (Fronek, 2000).

and therefore it seems appropriate to minimize the number of realization forms whose English counterparts are examined.

## 2.4 The Czech non-prepositional instrumental case

### 2.4.1 Search for a suitable framework

The following section attempts to provide an overview of the basic syntactic and semantic characteristics of *i*-forms in Czech. Nevertheless, it can by no means be exhaustive since there seems to be a plethora of different approaches in the Czech syntax, which all, when subjected to close scrutiny, however, appear to point to the same direction: the traditional syntactic theory of clause elements is not satisfactory. Grepl and Karlík enumerate the major problematic areas of the traditional theory (G&K: 25), discussed also in section 3.1.

The following overview tries to provide a description of clause elements suitable for English, distinguishing clause elements such as object, adverbial, modifier, and complement, whereby the overview, however, ignores the fact that (not only) the object-adverbial distinction has been refrained from by most of the representative grammars and syntactic descriptions of Czech.<sup>4</sup>

### 2.4.2 Syntactic functions

#### 2.4.2.1 Part of an analytic predicate

An *i*-form can function as a subject complement after the copular *být* ‘be’ (MČ3: 23), and possibly after light verbs such as *stát se* ‘become’ (deemed a copular verb<sup>5</sup> in the English tradition, cf. CGEL: 1171–1172) and others (MČ3: 23–24; G&K: 222). After the

---

<sup>4</sup> *Skladba češtiny* (G&K) distinguishes the following basic clause elements: verbs, complements, adjuncts, and noun modifiers. The most recent description of the Czech syntax (Panevová et al., 2014), based on the FGD framework, partially abandons the traditional clause element distinctions as well. Furthermore, MČ3 (1987), which also abandons the concept of the Czech ‘doplňěk’ (i.e. object complement and verbless adverbial clause), prefers – similarly to AGSČ (2013) – the complement-modifier (‘komplement’ and ‘suplement’ in Czech) distinction (corresponding to the traditional argument-adjunct dichotomy), which still excludes elements traditionally referred to as adverbials (or adjuncts) of means and instrument, placing them somewhere in between arguments and modifiers (MČ3: 60). The terms ‘argument’ and ‘modifier’ are therefore used in the present thesis as counterparts of the Czech terms ‘komplement’ and ‘suplement’ to avoid ambiguity. The term ‘complementation’ is used broadly in the thesis to refer to any dependent element.

<sup>5</sup> The NPs following some of these verbs (e.g. *cítit se* ‘feel’) are sometimes described as borderline cases between subject complements and verbless adverbial clauses, termed as ‘přísudková doplnění’ (ČŘJ: 281).

resultative *stát se*, the i-form of a noun is obligatory, whereas after the copular *být*, there is a variation – albeit not a free one – between the i-case and the nominative case. Štícha (2004: 113) shows that “there is a functional difference between the two predicative cases” and that “there are strong norms for selecting one of the two cases in communication” (cf. Uličný, 2000: 107–135).

Among other factors, an i-form (unlike a nominative form) can also carry the emphasis (compare *Ale ne, Karel učitelem je* and rather unacceptable *Ale ne, Karel učitel je*; Veselovská, 2004: 207). Furthermore, the choice is partially dependent on the regional variation (cf. 2.2.2), and also a stylistic one; as a result, in fiction only 35.46 % of nominal subject complements are realized via i-forms, while in professional literature the percentage reaches 73.81 % (Jelínek, 2015: 23; cf. Jelínek, 2013: 193).

Apart from i-forms as subject complements following copular verbs, analytical predicates can contain originally adverbial i-forms, such as *Ta branka byla rukou* or *Ta rána byla nožem*, resulting from an ellipsis: *Ta rána byla způsobena nožem*. (G&K: 219)

#### 2.4.2.2 Object complement

I-forms can function as object complements: *Zvolili ho předsedou*. (ČŘJ: 282; also cf. Dušková et al., 2012: 100) I-forms sometimes alternate with *jako* and the nominative case form: *Tu chalupu jsem dostal věnem / jako věno od babičky*. (G&K: 313) Šmilauer (1966: 338) provides further examples such as: *dát, dostat darem, almužnou, nádavkem, náhradou; přinést věnem; učinit oplátkou*.

#### 2.4.2.3 Verbless adverbial clause

Analogically to the first example introduced in the previous section, i-forms can function as verbless adverbial clauses (as defined in Czech grammars): *Byl zvolen předsedou*. (cf. ČŘJ: 282; Dušková et al., 2012: 512) However, Hrbáček (ČŘJ: 282) points out that in clauses such as *Otec byl jmenován ředitelem*, the i-form functions as what he terms ‘přísudkové doplnění’ (cf. footnote 5) rather than a prototypical verbless adverbial clause (‘doplněk podmětu’). However, according to English grammars, “[t]he object complement becomes the subject complement in the passive clause” (CGEL: 729). In other words, *Ted* is an object complement in *His friends call him Ted* and a subject complement in *He is called Ted by his friends* (ibid.); *předsedou* and *ředitelem* in the examples given above



would not be, therefore, considered verbless adverbial clauses (cf. the broader conception of copular verbs in English grammars).

The difference between the Czech grammatical description and the English one is, moreover, reflected in the fact that verbless adverbial clauses are described as always optional in English (Dušková et al., 2012: 505); some of them, however, seem to be obligatory in Czech as their omission would radically change the meaning, e.g. *Černooká Lu sedávala modelem / jako model adeptům umění malířského* (G&K: 313; cf. ČŘJ: 281). Šmilauer (1966: 338) explains that some of these might behave as obligatory since the verbonominal expressions are fixed, and enumerates further examples such as *pobývati hostem, přijíti návštěvou, vrátit se vítězem*.

#### **2.4.2.4 Modifier**

First, the form of a premodifier (or adjectival postmodifier) is typically (i.e. unless the syntactic adjective is a non-inflected one) given by the case, number and gender concord with its head noun (cf. 2.2.1.1), and a dependent modifier does not have any distinctive semantic characteristics different from those of the NP as a whole (cf. MČ3: 126).

Second, there are postmodifiers whose form is not given by the concord with the head noun. Frequently, such postmodifiers are results of nominalizations: their head nouns are, therefore, deverbative ones, while the modifier refers to one of the participants of the original verb. For instance, *roznáška doručovatelem* should be seen as a transformation of *doručovatel roznáší...* (cf. MČ3: 128; Havránek & Jedlička, 1981: 127). Such modifiers often express the agent (*chvála mateřštiny spisovatelí*; MČ3: 131), means or instrument (*hod dorostenců diskem*; *ibid.*: 132), and circumstances, namely the locative meaning ‘which way’ (*přeprava zboží tunelem*; *ibid.*: 140). Nevertheless, as Čermáková (2009: 81) shows, nouns do not require i-forms as complementations very often.

However, there are also noun modifiers whose form is not governed by the valency of the original verb so strictly. These express a wide range of circumstantial meanings, e.g. the meaning of instrument (*střelba vzduchovkou / ze vzduchovky*; MČ3: 149), of accompanying circumstances (*sezení zády ve směru jízdy*; *ibid.*), and others (*sešlost věkem*; *ibid.*: 148).

#### **2.4.2.5 Object**

According to MČ2 (61), an i-form can be the first object when referring to the patient of a verb with the semantics of ‘hitting’ (*Rozhněvaně bouchl dveřmi*) and of movement

(*Děvčata o Vánocích třásla stromem*). Moreover, i-forms can function as internal<sup>6</sup> objects as well (*Dítě radostně zatleskalo rukama*); i-forms with the semantics of stimulus are deemed objects as well (*Strýc v té době trpěl záchvaty. On svou rodinou pohrdał*). As a second object, an i-form can appear in constructions allowing the lexical-semantic conversion,<sup>7</sup> such as *dolít chladič vodou – dolít vodu do chladiče* (cf. 2.4.3.3.3b), as well as after verbs of substitution (*Nahradili kovové součástky součástkami z PVC*).

Grepl and Karlík (G&K: 248) also include i-forms after verbs of ‘emanation’ (*Zahrada voněla senem. Plyn hoří modrým plamenem*), and other types. In the FGD framework, agentive adjuncts in the passive diathesis also count as objects (Jelínek, 2015: 25).

Complementations of adjectives have been often considered objects (cf. *MČ3*: 67; Havránek & Jedlička, 1981: 131). Most of the adjectives with complementation are, however, deverbative, and thus it is important to look at the structures – similarly to noun modifiers (cf. 2.4.2.4) – as results of nominalizations, e.g. *válkou zpustošená země* is a transformation of *země, která byla zpustošena válkou* (*MČ3*: 69), which the classification of *válkou* in the derived structure as an object fails to acknowledge. Adjectives taking an i-form as their complementation include e.g. *nadšený, nedotčený, oddělený, odsouzený, opilý, opředeny, přitažlivý, zamořený, znechucený* and *zpustošený* (ibid.: 71–72). Adjectives which may require an i-form, albeit not derived from verbs, include e.g. *vinný, bohatý, nebezpečný* and *slavný* (ibid.: 73–75). Kopřivová (2006: 33–36) enumerates a host of further examples.

## 2.4.2.6 Adverbial

### 2.4.2.6.1 Adjuncts

I-forms can function as either obligatory (*Nechej si to projít myslí*; G&K: 253) or optional (most of the examples below) adjuncts. The semantic roles of adverbial uses of i-forms are discussed in section 2.4.3.3.

---

<sup>6</sup> *MČ2* uses the term ‘vnitřní předmět,’ which usually corresponds to the English term ‘cognate object’ (cf. Dušková, 2013: 128). *MČ3* gives the following explanation: “Za ‘vnitřní předmět’ lze pokládat i instrumentály v typu *tleskat rukama, dupat nohama*: doplnění je omezeno na dané substantivum a je sémanticky implikováno už ve slovese.”

<sup>7</sup> For further information, see Kettnerová’s detailed description and the résumé in her study (2014: 243) or other works (Panevová et al., 2014: 44; G&K: 150–151).

The i-forms usually labeled as ‘adjuncts of means and instrument’ in grammars of English (cf. *CGEL*: 482–483; Dušková et al., 2012: 458–459) are quite often classified as borderline cases between objects and adverbials in Czech grammars. For instance, when discussing the adverbial functions of the i-case, Kořenský and Jirsová (*MČ2*: 65) state that i-forms expressing means and instrument in a broad sense are deemed object arguments, but they can function as modifiers as well. *MČ3* (60) includes means and instrument complementation as a borderline case between arguments and modifiers.

#### 2.4.2.6.2 Adverbials peripheral to clause structure

Some i-forms may function in the same way as English conjuncts, the case in point being *jínymi slovy* ‘in other words’ (cf. Dušková et al., 2012: 483). Another example could be *stejným dechem* ‘in the same breadth’ (Rysová, 2015: 169).

Furthermore, we believe that there are i-forms capable of expressing the same meanings as English disjuncts, for instance *svým způsobem*, frequently corresponding to *in a way*, as the following examples from the corpus *InterCorp v8* show (see Appendix Table 2, in which the sources of the examples are given):

DISJ1 *Svým způsobem to potvrdilo platnost nápisu...*

*In a way, this confirmed the validity of the inscription...*

DISJ2 *Svým způsobem to dokazuje, že jsme svou práci dělali dobře.*

*It demonstrates, in a way, that we did our job well.*

DISJ3 *Svým způsobem o moc horší.*

*Much worse in a way.*

Biber et al. (2007: 1080), when discussing retrospective vagueness hedges, point out that these hedges, an example being *in a way*, “are classified as stance adverbials of imprecision,” i.e. epistemic stance adverbials (ibid.: 854), or, as Quirk et al. (*CGEL*: 615) term them, content disjuncts (making an observation as to the degree of truth).

### 2.4.3 Semantic roles

#### 2.4.3.1 Attribute

Predicative uses of i-forms (syntactically, subject complements as well as object complements) carry the semantics of attribute (*CGEL*: 741–742), thus expressing identification and characterization.

### 2.4.3.2 Patient

I-forms express the meaning of patient (affected) quite rarely (Panevová, 1996: 18); this can be explained by the fact that the semantics of means is the central one (Šmilauer, 1966: 200). According to Panevová (1996: 18), i-forms dependent on the verbs of causing motion (*hýbat, házet*) and on those referring to cognitive processes (*zabývat se, pohrdat*) can be deemed to express the semantic role of patient as well as the verbs referring to affecting someone's mental state (*polekat, šokovat*). In the last case, however, the i-forms could be considered to express the means (cf. MČ3: 65), which Panevová does not acknowledge due to the specific (and none too semantic) delineation of patient within the FGD framework and to the principle of shifting (cf. Mikulová et al., 2005: 41; Panevová et al., 2014: 45–7).

### 2.4.3.3 Circumstance semantics

#### 2.4.3.3.1 Space

I-forms can express dynamic localization, whether the goal is specified (*Sešel polní pěšinou na silnici*) or not (*Muž kulhá náměstím*) (MČ3: 86). In some cases, an i-form can alternate with a prepositional locative case form: *Scházíme po tmavých schodech / tmavými schody do krámu. Muž kulhá náměstím / po náměstí.* (ibid.) The locative semantics extends to the pseudotemporal i-forms such as *jedu nocí* (Uličný, 2000: 85).

#### 2.4.3.3.2 Time

There are also temporal uses of the i-case; however, they are limited to a few nouns, by virtue of being lexicalized (Panevová, 1996: 19; AGSČ: 709) and unproductive (MČ3: 90). For this reason, Uličný (2000: 136) considers the temporal use of the i-case not to be systemically integrated. Panevová (1996: 19) gives the following examples: *Chvílemi otevřel oči a podíval se na matku. Přijde každým okamžikem. Časem se vám to bude hodit. Dnem i nocí bdí matka u lože dítěte.* Nevertheless, according to SSČ, *chvílemi* (SSČ: 111) and *časem* (ibid.: 46) should be considered adverbs (cf. 2.2.1.2 above).

#### 2.4.3.3.3 Process: manner, phase, means and instrument, agent

##### 2.4.3.3.3.1 Manner

I-forms can encode several meanings conventionally subsumed under the semantics of manner in a broad sense, viz. manner proper, comparison, and accompanying circumstances.

- a. I-forms expressing the proper manner are usually substitutable with a cognate adverb: *Nové dílo se rodilo závratnou rychlostí / závratně rychle.* (Panevová, 1996: 20)<sup>8</sup> Alternatively, this semantic role can be expressed by NPs which have the i-form *způsobem* as their head: *Krystalový oscilátor nelze rozkmitat tímž způsobem jako Hartleyův.* (ibid.)
- b. The use of i-forms expressing comparison is limited to a few lexicalized and rather archaic cases, e.g. *Zpráva se roznesla bleskem po kraji* (Panevová, 1996: 18–19); *V lukách se kupí ptáci v hejna, mračnem se zvedají* (MČ3: 117); *Voda vře kлокotem* (Uličný, 2000: 136). Similarly to the temporal semantics discussed above, Uličný (ibid.) considers this use of the i-case systemically non-integrated.
- c. According to MČ3 (111), i-forms as those in *Ulehla naznak do pramice, tváří k obloze* and *Ve sklepě visely kýtami vzhůru krásné jalovice* can be interpreted as referring to accompanying circumstances. Uličný (2000: 101–102) describes such cases as expressing the relation between a whole and its part.

#### 2.4.3.3.2 Phasal i-case

I-forms can accompany phasal verbs (in a broad sense – cf. Uličný, 2000: 97): *Program pokračuje písničkou. Vizitu začneme babičkou.* (Panevová, 1996: 20) The examples *Povstání na Kubě už dávno skončilo vítězstvím* and *Rekonvalescencí se začala idyličnost mého života* are used to illustrate the semantics of means by Šmilauer (1966: 301). Panevová (1996: 20), however, subsumes this type under manner adjuncts. Strnadová (Dušková et al., 2012: 301) includes examples of phasal i-forms and their English counterparts as referring to accompanying circumstances.

#### 2.4.3.3.3 Means and instrument

It is the primary function of i-forms to express means in a broad sense (Panevová, 1996: 20). MČ3 distinguishes the following semantic specifications:

- a. instrument (including i-forms referring to body parts as in *mávat křídly, rukou*): *Řezali jsme dříví úplně tupou pilou* (MČ3: 62);

---

<sup>8</sup> MČ3 (117) provides further examples: “V platnosti ADVQual se uplatňuje rovněž prostý I a předložkové pády. Prostý I: *Smekl klobouk dvorným obloukem. Pasážéri ujížděli bleskovou rychlostí kolem nás. Bavili se hrubým, surovým způsobem*; je možná substitute I adverbium: *dvorně, bleskově, rychle, hrubě, surově...*”

- b. material: *nalakovat bezbarvým lakem*; also with verbs such as *narvat*, *napustit*, *dolít* and *mazat*, i.e. verbs allowing the so-called lexical-semantic conversion: *narvat maso do mrazáku – narvat mrazák masem* (Panevová et al., 2014: 120);
- c. mediator: *poslat balík poštou* (MČ3: 63);
- d. means:
  - da. simple: *odměnit zrádce penězi* (ibid.: 65);
  - db. actional, paraphrasable by a subordinate clause introduced with *tím*, *že* and containing a cognate verb: *Příslušník zastavil vůz zvednutím ruky / tím, že zvedl ruku* (ibid.: 63); Běličová (1982: 58), however, points out that even *Strážník zastavil vůz rukou* (albeit not containing the nominalization, i.e. the verbal noun *zvednutím*) still implies the same propositional meaning;
  - dc. according to Panevová (1996: 19), adjuncts formally or lexically related to the verb<sup>9</sup> (*spal těžkým spánkem*, *promlouval kovovou řečí*) are a subtype of this group as well.

#### 2.4.3.3.4 Agent

I-forms (alternating with PPs governed by *od*) express agent in the passive diathesis, e.g. *Studenti budou z biologie zkoušeni prof. Novákem* (G&K: 285), and in the causative ‘diathesis’ (cf. Panevová et al., 2014: 114), with the subject referring to the initiator, e.g. *Petr se dal / nechal vyzkoušet prof. Janyškou* (G&K: 286).

#### 2.4.3.3.4 Viewpoint

I-forms can have the meaning of viewpoint when they are dependent on verbs or adjectives expressing a relation such as comparison or identity: *Zevnějškem se podobá ostatním sousedům*. (Panevová, 1996: 20) Alternatively, i-forms conveying the meaning of viewpoint can accompany the copular *být*: *Petr je rodem Moravan* (ibid.; also Uličný, 2000: 105). According to Uličný (ibid.: 106), such i-forms express some aspect of what is

---

<sup>9</sup> Šmilauer (1966: 279) uses the terms ‘soukmenný’ corresponding to the English adjective ‘cognate’ (cf. *CGEL*: 750) and ‘ze základu souznačného,’ i.e. ‘derived from a synonym.’

referred to by the subject, while the subject complement determines this aspect semantically.

#### 2.4.3.3.5 Contingency

In the realm of contingency, i-forms can express the semantics of cause, as in *Samým leknutím ani nenadával* (MČ3: 100). Non-clausal realization of contingency adjuncts is in general secondary in Czech, and most of nominal adjuncts of cause are therefore nominalizations (ibid.: 99; also cf. Štícha, 2006: 28). Šmilauer (1966: 309–310) distinguishes mental (*Srdíčko mi puká žalem*) and physical (*Také děti už hlady plakaly*) causes of bodily states and processes (including illnesses and causes of suffering, e.g. *Milostpaní trpí nervózou*) as well as ‘other cases’ such as *Hanča náhle procitne hlasitým zavoláním*. Štícha (2006: 29) points out that such examples constitute a group of borderline cases between the semantics of cause and means, and can be often transformed in such a way that the cause is expressed as the subject: *Vzbudil se hlukem. / Vzbudil ho hluk*.

The semantics of cause is sometimes subdivided into two specifications, internal and external cause (MČ3: 100–101); Machová (1972: 49), however, concludes that this distinction is none too efficient and does not reflect two distinctive meanings.

Moreover, MČ3 (105–106) mentions the i-case as a peripheral means of expressing the meaning of purpose, giving the following examples: *Dej udeřit útokem! Šli jsme procházkou na Petřín. Tovarýš se vydal vandrem do světa*. It is, however, noted that the purpose meaning is none too distinctive and the examples present somewhat lexicalized uses; besides, Šmilauer (1966: 279) classifies i-forms such as the one in *Půjdeme procházkou* as expressing accompanying circumstances. Nonetheless, Machová (1972: 78) and others (e.g. Šmilauer, 1966: 317–320) imply that an i-form cannot function as an adjunct of purpose.

#### 2.4.3.3.6 Extent (measure)

Extent (or measure) can be expressed indirectly by means of the correlative pair *čím* [+ A COMPARATIVE FORM] – *tím* [+ A COMPARATIVE FORM], corresponding to the English correlative *the*<sup>10</sup> [+ A COMPARATIVE FORM] – *the* [+ A COMPARATIVE FORM] (Dušková et

---

<sup>10</sup> Note that this correlative pair corresponds to Old English *þȳ... þȳ* (Mitchell & Robinson, 1992: 96), *þȳ* being the singular masculine-neuter i-form of the demonstrative pronoun (Brinton & Aronovick, 2011: 205–

al., 2012: 631; cf. Biber et al., 2007: 820; cf. MČ3: 450). Uličný (2000: 136) includes this type as one with non-systemic integration.

As only Šmilauer (1966: 291) seems to notice, there are also nominal i-forms capable of conveying the extent meaning, as in *Krev se řinula proudem*. However, no other Czech grammar – to our knowledge – mentions nouns expressing the i-case as a realization form of the adjunct of extent; furthermore, this use seems restricted to certain lexicalized collocations.

## 2.5 Possible English counterparts of instrumental case forms

The following overview attempts to find and enumerate the prototypical (i.e. by no means all) English counterparts of Czech i-forms with respect to their realization forms.

### 2.5.1 Concomitant meanings of the i-case

Lehmann and Shin (2005: 24–25) provide a relatively suitable framework for our cross-linguistic analysis, listing seven strategies for the coding of concomitant<sup>11</sup> functions, including instrumental functions; four of these strategies are relevant for the comparison of Czech and English, namely:

- (2) adpositional marking (e.g. English *with*, *by*);
- (3) case marking (e.g. Russian instrumental case);
- (6) conversion (e.g. English *iron* or *hammer*);
- (7) lexical fusion: “The main verb contains a specific concomitant as a feature of its meaning,” as *kick* in English, implying the use of a foot as a tool.

As Narrog (2009: 595) explicates, languages frequently have more than one means of marking the instrumental, English being a case in point, employing three of these strategies, viz. adpositional marking, conversion, and lexical fusion. In Czech the primary

---

206), i.e. being in fact an equivalent of the Czech form *tím*. Note also that the correlative pair is in some dictionaries listed as an adverb (e.g. Ruse & Hornsby, 1990: 653).

<sup>11</sup> According to Lehmann and Shin (2005: 3), the “functional domain of concomitance [...] comprises [these] concomitants”: partner and companion, vehicle, tool, material, manner and circumstance. Their delineation of ‘circumstance’ (ibid.: 15) corresponds to ‘actional means’ described above. The ‘partner and companion’ meaning refers to the reciprocal meaning, which in Czech can be expressed by means of the comitative instrumental with the preposition *s(e)* (cf. Spal, 1975) and by other means as well (cf. Panevová, 2007).



strategy is case marking; however, there can be found instances of lexical fusion, including the Czech counterpart of *kick*, i.e. *kopnout*, as well as other examples, e.g. *tleskat* ‘to clap (one’s hand); to applaud,’ cf. Macháčková’s discussion in *MČ3* (61–62). Conversion<sup>12</sup> seems to be quite common (albeit seemingly limited to means and instrument meanings) in Czech; some more or less common verbs can be given as examples, including *veslovat* ‘to row; to pull (an oar),’ *telefonovat* ‘to telephone, phone,’ *cukrovat* ‘to dust; to sprinkle with sugar’ and *solit* ‘to salt’ (Mališ, 1997: 26), compare also Grepl and Karlík’s discussion of such cases (G&K: 253–254).

The following subsections discuss the three coding strategies generally employed in English, the aim being to find out whether the use of the particular strategy can correspond to Czech i-forms (i.e. results of the use of the case marking strategy) or not.

### 2.5.1.1 Lexical fusion

Lexical fusion is relevant only for some concomitant meanings – for instance the specification of manner contained in the semantics of verbs such as *run* (‘walk with speed’) and *peek* (‘look with curiosity’) (Lehmann & Shin, 2005: 76).<sup>13</sup> When discussing the meaning of instrument, Lehmann and Shin give examples such as *applaud*, *slap*, and *bite*, “verbs [...] generally understood with a default body part” (ibid.: 65), i.e. both hands, one hand, and teeth respectively (cf. Dušková et al., 2012: 429; *CGEL*: 752 on instrumental objects).

The instrument is, nevertheless, not explicitly referred to unless “there is something special about it” (Lehmann & Shin, 2005: 65), “an artefact is used instead of a body part” or “a non-standard body part is used” (ibid.: 53), as in *He is painting (a picture) with his foot*. Macháčková describes a group of Czech verbs implying the use of a particular instrument, “expressed only if the instrument is further specified”<sup>14</sup> (*MČ3*: 62; my translation). It can

---

<sup>12</sup> The term ‘conversion’ is used quite loosely to refer to any derivation of a verb from a nominal stem, as becomes apparent from Lehmann and Shin’s (2005: 64) examples from German (such as *köpfen* ‘toss (ball) with head’ derived from the noun *Kopf* ‘head’) as well as from their Table 3 (ibid.: 26). Compare with the definition of conversion as “the derivational process whereby an item is adapted or converted to a new word class without the addition of an affix” (*CGEL*: 558), and similarly restricted delineation of conversion in recent Czech works and university textbooks (e.g. Mališ, 1997: 9–10; Adam et al., 2014: 44).

<sup>13</sup> Seemingly contradicting themselves, however, Lehmann and Shin (2005: 87) for some reason conclude by claiming that “English uses lexical fusion only for tools.”

<sup>14</sup> “vyjadřuje se jen tehdy, je-li určení dále zpřesňováno”

be, therefore, concluded that if the concomitant is for some reason explicitly expressed in a Czech clause, it should be explicitly expressed in its English counterpart as well (and vice versa). For this reason, we do not expect verbs merely implying the use of an instrument (i.e. results of the lexical fusion strategy) to appear as counterparts of Czech i-forms.

### **2.5.1.2 Conversion**

As “[d]erived verbs, so-called instrumentative verbs, which are based on a noun that functions as an instrument in the action, are common in Germanic languages” (Lehmann & Shin, 2005: 64), it can be expected that they might appear as translation counterparts of Czech i-forms, at least of those referring to instruments. When we search in the parallel corpus *InterCorp v8* for the word form *kladivem* in Czech and for the sequence of `[lemma="with"]` in English at the same time, there are 65 results; when we search for the same i-form in Czech and for the word form *hammered* in English at the same time, there are 4 results. Even though these numbers are obviously of little value, they still enable us to conclude that verbs converted from nouns can appear as counterparts of Czech i-forms, even though adpositional marking is probably much more frequent than conversion.

### **2.5.1.3 Adpositional marking (and other strategies)**

The following sections provide an overview of how the individual semantic specifications can be expressed in English, employing the adpositional marking strategy. It is, however, necessary to introduce other strategies for the sake of completeness of the description as well, particularly when discussing the syntactic uses of the i-case and its ‘*čím – tím*’ use.

#### **2.5.1.3.1 Means in a broad sense**

According to Strnadová (Dušková et al., 2012: 299), the prototypical preposition to express the instrument meaning is *with* (cf. Nosek, 1987: 178); Strnadová considers this preposition a mere signal of the case relation (Dušková et al., 2012: 275). In passive sentences, the instrument can be expressed by a *by*-phrase as well, which, however, as opposed to a *with*-phrase, usually excludes a human agency, as in *My car had been damaged by the branch of a tree* (CGEL: 700–701).

There are two alternative constructions; one contains “the verb *use* + a phrase with (*in order*) *to* + infinitive,” in the other “the noun phrase denoting the instrument becomes the

subject” (ibid.: 699): *Someone had broken the window with a stone. – Someone had used a stone to break the window. – A stone had broken the window.* As Biber et al. (2007: 124) put it, “the subject identifies the instrument or means used by an agent to perform an action.”

I-forms expressing means can, according to Strnadová (Dušková et al., 2012: 298–299), correspond to PPs with *in*, *by*, *through*, and *by means of*. *In* seems to be used to express the material (*a picture painted in oils*) or means (*this book is written in English*) meaning (cf. Tyler & Evans, 2003: 190). According to Quirk et al. (CGEL: 699), *by* can express various semantic specifications, including the mode of transport (*I usually go to work by bus*), the means of communication (*Communication took place by letter*) and what we call the actional means (*By working the pumps, we kept the ship afloat for another 40 hours*). When *through* is used, “the notion of a path is salient, which strongly correlates with the idea of [...] a physical transfer” (Tyler & Evans, 2003: 219), e.g.: *He got out through the window. She passed through the open gateway.* (Dušková et al., 2012: 100)

The material meaning is expressed by means of *with* in English: *They loaded the lorry with timber. The sack was stuffed with straw.* (Dušková et al., 2012: 99, 459) As mentioned above, *in* is possible as well; however, this preposition seems to follow only the verbs of ‘expressing’ as Strnadová gives the example *painted in oils* and Tyler & Evans (2003: 190) provide only the example *She wrote in ink*. Because of that, this use of *in* appears somehow related to examples of the semantics of means such as the following: *The document is written in plain English.* (DictCam: *in* ‘expressed’)

#### **2.5.1.3.2 Manner in a broad sense**

By analogy with the Czech i-form *způsobem*, English can express manner explicitly by means of *in ... manner* as in *The job was done in a workmanlike manner* (CGEL: 698). Apart from PPs with *in*, PPs with *with* can be used to express this semantic role: *We were received with the utmost courtesy.* (ibid.) Nevertheless, the adjunct of manner is very frequently expressed by means of adverbs (Dušková et al., 2012: 455), and therefore adverbs could appear as counterparts of Czech i-forms as well, especially since Czech adjuncts of manner are often paraphrasable by cognate adverbs (cf. 2.4.3.3.1a).

Czech adjuncts of comparison could correspond to English phrases with *like* meaning ‘in a manner resembling’ (CGEL: 698).

As Strnadová's example *He turned his back on us. Obrátil se k nám zády* (Dušková et al., 2012: 300) might suggest, English counterparts of the i-case use described in section 2.4.3.3.1c as accompanying circumstances might be simple NPs functioning as direct objects; however, more or less accidentally found examples show that the preposition *with* might be relevant as well: *[The cat] habitually moved in a kind of nautical crawl, with her stomach close to the deck.* (Biber et al., 2007: 318) *The Duke of Edinburgh was opposite the Queen, sitting next to EEC chief Jacques Delor – and with his back to Charles.* (ibid.: 912)

Phasal i-forms could correspond to English *with*-phrases, cf. Strnadová's examples: *The party ended with a dance. We began the day with a swim.* (Dušková et al., 2012: 301)

## **2.5.2 Other uses of the i-case**

### **2.5.2.1 Syntactic uses of the i-case**

Czech i-forms functioning as subject complements, object complements, and verbless adverbial clauses (as defined in the English syntax) generally correspond to common case forms of nouns in English, e.g. *Krádež zůstala nevyřešenou záhadou. The theft remained an unsolved mystery; Byl zvolen předsedou. He was elected chairman.* (Dušková et al., 2012: 100; Trnka, 2014: 236)

Czech i-forms functioning as objects (and possibly expressing the semantics of patient) often correspond to the direct object in English, e.g. *házet čím: throw sth* and *vrtět hlavou: shake one's head* (Dušková et al., 2012: 100). They might, nevertheless, correspond to PPs (with various prepositions) as well: *oplyvat čím: abound in sth; chlubit se čím: boast of sth; zabývat se čím: deal with sth; trpět čím: suffer from sth* etc. (ibid.)

### **2.5.2.2 Non-concomitant semantic uses of the i-case**

Since temporal i-forms appear to be restricted to few lexicalized cases, suffice it to say, their English counterparts are correspondingly lexicalized. For instance, Dušková (2012: 100) mentions the expressions *now and then* and *from time to time* as possible counterparts of *chvílemi* – which is, however, considered an adverb (SSČ: 111) – and *(at) any moment* as a counterpart of *každým okamžikem*.

The case of place adjuncts seems to be a complicated one; i-forms often correspond to PPs with *through* (Dušková et al., 2012: 281) as well as to PPs with *along* and *among*, which Strnadová illustrates with the pairs *Go along the street. Jděte touto ulicí* (ibid.: 286) and

*Peggy moved among the crowd. Peggy procházela davem* (ibid.: 287) respectively. Nevertheless, Strnadová (ibid.: 286) states that *across* can correspond to a PP with *přes*, which is, according to MČ3 (86), all but interchangeable with an *i*-form. Generally, however, the meaning of passage can be expressed by means of *across* (related to the movement on a surface, i.e. to *on*), *through* (related to the movement in what has volume, i.e. to *in*) and *past* (related to *by*) (CGEL: 682). Furthermore, movement with reference to a directional path can be referred to by PPs with *up*, *down*, *along* and *across* (ibid.). To conclude, the group of prepositional heads of PPs possibly corresponding to Czech *i*-forms encompasses a whole range of prepositions, *through* being probably the most common one.

Agentive adjuncts correspond to English PPs with *by*: *This church was designed by Wren.* (Dušková et al., 2012: 299; cf. CGEL: 700)

*I*-forms functioning as viewpoint adjuncts can correspond to fixed expressions with *by*: *by birth / blood / trade / profession: rodem / původem / zaměstnáním / povoláním* (Dušková et al., 2012: 301). Strnadová (ibid.) subsumes *of*-phrases as in *innocent of that crime* and *guilty of murder* under viewpoint adjuncts as well; she also enumerates other viewpoint prepositions (such as *in*), but does not label any of them as possible counterparts of *i*-forms; Dušková (ibid.: 460) includes the example *he is young in years, but old in experience* corresponding to the following Czech sentence using *i*-forms: *je mladý věkem, ale starý zkušenostmi.*

According to Strnadová (Dušková et al., 2012: 293–294), *i*-forms expressing the meaning of cause can correspond to *with*-phrases (*She was shivering with cold*) and *from*-phrases (*He collapsed from fatigue*). Nosek (1987: 173–174) adds the preposition *for*, considering it synonymous with *with* (*He jumped for joy. Skákal radostí. She wept with joy... Plakala radostí*), and *about*: *About their luxuries (tímto přepychem), however, they were as amused as I was.* Quirk et al. (CGEL: 696) point out that *for* “is found with a relatively small number of expressions,” such as *for fear / love / joy / sorrow*.

As suggested in section 2.4.3.3.6, the correlative pair *čím* [+ A COMPARATIVE FORM] – *tím* [+ A COMPARATIVE FORM] expressing extent (measure) corresponds to the English correlative pair *the* [+ A COMPARATIVE FORM] – *the* [+ A COMPARATIVE FORM] (Dušková et al., 2012: 631; cf. Biber et al., 2007: 820).

### 3 Material and method

#### 3.1 The search for a suitable framework revisited

When trying to find a suitable framework, it is necessary to take into consideration the fact that there seems to be a plethora of problematic points, some of which have already been indirectly touched upon. Taking a language such as Czech as the point of departure, it does not appear suitable to rely on the traditional descriptions of clause elements, the major reasons being the following:

- a. Producing possibly the most frequently quoted (e.g. Panevová, 1996: 18; Uličný, 2000: 22; Karlík et al., 2012: 431) statement on the i-case, Šmilauer (1966: 200) verbalized the fact that the boundary between i-forms functioning as objects and as adverbials is vague.
- b. More generally, Czech linguists have never found reliable criteria for distinguishing objects and adverbials (G&K: 25). This seems to have been such an unsurmountable problem that most recent representative descriptions of Czech grammar and Czech syntax, refrain (not only) from the object-adverbial distinction (see footnote 4).
- c. “Traditional” syntactic descriptions often elaborate only on the semantics of adverbials, and thus fail to acknowledge the obvious correlation between constructions such as *dívky zpívají krásně* and *krásný zpěv dívek* (G&K: 25). Such descriptions usually fail to properly describe the syntactic status and semantics of deverbative noun modifiers as well as of complementation of (not only) deverbative adjectives (cf. MČ3: 67, 126).
- d. Generally, the individual clause elements are not usually defined on the basis of the same criteria (G&K: 25; MČ3: 41, 126). Grepl and Karlík’s arguments resemble those of Daneš (cf. Svobodová, 2013: 49).

Consequently, it seems adequate not to overestimate the importance of traditional “labels” such as *object*, *modifier*, and *adverbial* (the attempt at whose delineation would necessarily result into a voluminous logomachy), and to adopt a primarily semantic approach, which is by no means an unprecedented conclusion.<sup>15</sup> The semantic approach is not exactly unassailable either; it allows us, however, to overcome the most obvious above-mentioned

---

<sup>15</sup> Compare with the following examples of formulations in seminal linguistic works: “Základní vlastností našeho modelu je to, že se vychází od sémantické (významové) struktury věty.” (G&K: 26); “Z těchto důvodů v naší práci k větněčlenskému hledisku nepřihlížíme (až na zřetelně vydělené členy větné makrostruktury subjekt a predikát a fakultativní doplněk).” (Uličný, 2000: 22)

disadvantages of the primarily syntactic approach, which would necessarily require us to address major theoretical problems far beyond the scope of the present thesis.

## **3.2 Material for the analysis**

### **3.2.1 Limitation of realization forms**

The analysis examines only non-prepositional i-forms of nouns, i.e. nouns which express the i-case and function as heads of NPs not governed by a preposition. This limitation should not have any serious ramifications except for the exclusion of the extent use realized via i-forms of the pronouns *čím* and *tím* (cf. 2.4.3.3.6), which, however, should not present a problem since this construction has a systemic English counterpart (cf. 2.5.2.2).

We do not suppose that NPs entering the relations of coordination and apposition require any special treatment since coordinated NPs as well as appositives share the same syntactic function (cf. G&K: 333, 345), to which one semantic role can be ascribed.

### **3.2.2 Limitation of semantic roles**

The analysis excludes i-forms with the semantics of attribute (i.e. predicative i-forms) since such i-forms correspond to common case nouns in English (cf. 2.4.3.1 and 2.5.2.1). Furthermore, the analysis excludes archaic, lexicalized uses of the i-case (cf. Uličný, 2000: 136), viz. temporal i-forms (cf. 2.4.3.3.2), i-forms expressing comparison (cf. 2.4.3.3.3.1b), and i-forms of nouns expressing extent (cf. 2.4.3.3.6). Moreover, i-forms potentially expressing purpose are not dealt with for reasons given in 2.4.3.3.5. For reasons touched upon in sections 2.4.3.2 and 2.5.2.1, patient is excluded as well.

As a result, the analysis concentrates on the following semantic specifications (listed in no particular order, regardless of their hierarchy): 1. agent; 2. space – direction; 3. manner; 4. accompanying circumstances; 5. phase; 6. instrument; 7. material; 8. simple means (including the ‘mediator’ specification); 9. actional means; 10. viewpoint; 11. cause.

## **3.3 Selection of the material**

### **3.3.1 The subcorpus and the query**

The analysis is based on data from the parallel corpus *InterCorp (version 8)* of the Czech National Corpus project, accessed through the *KonText* interface.<sup>16</sup> More specifically,

---

<sup>16</sup> Available online from <<https://kontext.korpus.cz>>.

a subcorpus was created, comprising fiction written originally in Czech, with the English version of the corpus aligned.

A simple CQL query was used to find all word forms which are tagged as i-forms of nouns and which are not immediately preceded by a preposition requiring an i-case complementation, i.e. *[lemma!="(s|nad|pod|před|za|mezi|napříč)"] [tag="N...7.\*"]*. The result of the query comprises of 23,455 concordance lines.

### 3.3.2 Reduction of the material

A series of filters were applied to the concordance lines in order to remove the highest possible number of irrelevant lines (without removing relevant ones). First of all, a positive filter (selected token: first; search span {0;1} including KWIC; the CQL query: *[tag!="R...7.\*"] [tag="N...7.\*"]*) was applied, which removed 17 falsely tagged lines (such as *On/RR--7----- a/NNNS7-----A----- s ním jistě ta jeho banda*). Subsequently, 10 negative filters were applied, as summarized in the following table:

	span (incl. KWIC)	the CQL query	lines removed
<b>1</b>	{-1;1}	<i>[tag="R...7.*"] [tag="[APC]...7.*"] {1} [tag="N...7.*"]</i>	4,812
<b>2</b>	{-2;1}	<i>[tag="R...7.*"] [tag="[APC]...7.*"] {2} [tag="N...7.*"]</i>	708
<b>3</b>	{-3;1}	<i>[tag="R...7.*"] [tag="[APC]...7.*"] {3} [tag="N...7.*"]</i>	47
<b>4</b>	{-4;1}	<i>[tag="R...7.*"] [tag="[APC]...7.*"] {4} [tag="N...7.*"]</i>	5
<b>5</b>	{-4;0}	<i>[tag="R...7.*"] [tag="[APC]...7.*"] [tag="N...7.*"] [tag="J^.*"]</i>	138
<b>6</b>	{-3;0}	<i>[tag="R...7.*"] [tag="N...7.*"] [tag="J^.*"]</i>	280
<b>7</b>	{-2;-1}	<i>[lemma="stá(va)?t"] [lemma="se"]</i>	51
<b>8</b>	{0;0}	<i>[word="bý(va)?t"]</i>	51
<b>9</b>	{-1;0}	<i>[word="bý(va)?t"] [tag="[APC]...7.*"]</i>	26
<b>10</b>	{-1;0}	<i>[lemma="být" &amp; tag="V[em].*"] [tag="[APC]...7.*"]</i>	1

**Table 1: Concordance filters**

Filters 1–4 removed 5,572 constructions in which there are prepositional i-forms of nouns preceded by noun modifiers which follow the preposition and whose form is governed by the head noun, examples being *s přísnou tváří*, *nad každou údajnou chybou*, *mezi vši tou slavnostní zelení*, and *s těma čistějma modřejma indiánskejma jezerama*.



Filters 5 and 6 removed 418 constructions of two coordinated i-forms governed by the same preposition such as *s tmavými vlasy a tmavýma očima* and *mezi oknem a dveřmi*.

Filter 7 removed 51 constructions in which an i-form follows the resultative copula (*stala se obětí*), while filters 8–10 removed 78 constructions in which an i-form follows a nonfinite form of the copular verb *být* (*být matkou; být soudním znalcem; jsa naším vědomím*), i.e. constructions in which there is an i-form with the semantics of attribute.

There being 17,319 concordance lines left, a random sample of 5,000 lines was generated, which was, subsequently, manually reduced to 3,486 lines by removing those containing:

- a. annotation errors (as in *když ho revma/NNNSZ-----A----- chytlo*);
- b. annotation errors resulting from the processes of adverbialization and prepositionalization (cf. 2.2.1.2), assessed by comparison with *SSČ* (e.g. *následkem* is included in *SSČ* as a preposition, and the occurrences of this word form used as a preposition were therefore removed from the material whenever falsely tagged as an i-form; other examples include the prepositions *jménem, vlivem, vinou, prostřednictvím, směrem k / na / proti / od / do*, and *závěrem*, as well as adverbs *časem, bokem, rázem, chvílemi, závěrem*, and *většinou*);
- c. remaining prepositional i-forms (*musí s panem hejtmanem mluvit*);
- d. i-forms following the copular *být*, including cases when it is elided in the surface structure, as well as other i-forms with the semantics of attribute (*musí být vítězem i rytířem; Švejk vojenským sluhou u polního kuráta; Raději zůstane obyčejným infanteristou*);
- e. loose translations and cases of zero correspondence; however, cf. INSTR3 in Appendix Table 1, in which the lexical meaning of the verb *slice* contains the feature ‘with a sharp knife’ (*DictCam: slice* ‘to easily cut into or through something with a sharp knife’), and the example is therefore deemed a manifestation of the lexical fusion strategy, not a case of zero correspondence.

### 3.3.3 Selection of the individual samples

#### 3.3.3.1 Technical aspects

There being 3,486 concordance lines from 19 different works of fiction left, a sample of five (or less, if necessary) i-forms and their English counterparts was excerpted for each

opus. Consequently, there was a sample for each semantic specification of at most 95 concordance lines, from which a random sample of ten examples was generated. There having been delineated 11 semantic specifications, the analysis is based on 110 i-forms and their English counterparts.

### 3.3.3.2 Criteria used for the selection of the samples

The major and most obvious drawback to the semantic approach, i.e. the fact that meanings are often vague, unclear and liable to be interpreted differently by different people, can be partly overcome by examining prototypical uses, rather than peripheral or borderline ones, as well as by attempting to find some formal characteristics peculiar to the individual semantic specifications, less questionable than the mere meaning itself.

While we consider the semantic criterion a sufficient one for identifying i-forms expressing the spatial meaning (cf. 2.4.3.3.1) and the material meaning (cf. 2.4.3.3.3b) as well as phasal i-forms (cf. 2.4.3.3.3.2), we believe that the other meanings should not be judged by semantic criteria alone. The following criteria (deduced from the linguistic studies referred to in the theoretical part) were therefore used for the selection of the individual samples:

1. an **agentive** i-form a) denotes the agent of an action referred to by the clause element governing the i-form, and b) appears in a passive construction or a causative construction, or in a construction resulting from the nominalization of either of these two (cf. 2.4.3.3.3.4);
2. a **spatial** i-form denotes the path of a movement (cf. 2.4.3.3.1);
3. an i-form expressing **manner** a) denotes manner of an action; b) either the i-form is *způsobem* and has at least one modifier, or the i-form is paraphrasable by a cognate adverb with the same meaning (cf. 2.4.3.3.3.1a, including footnote 8); the latter criterion was “violated” in a few cases, including MANN7 (cf. Appendix Table 1) – *husím pochodem* is not paraphrasable by a cognate adverb, but analogical constructions such as *pomalým pochodem* or *organizovaným pochodem* are;
4. an i-form expressing **accompanying circumstances** a) refers to a part of a whole which is denoted by the subject (as in *Ve sklepě visely kýtami vzhůru krásné jalovice*) or object (as in *Sestra ho obrátila obličejem k oknu*; Uličný, 2000: 101) of the verb of the clause; b) the construction has an obligatory directional complementation (cf. *\*Ve sklepě visely kýtami krásné jalovice*; *\*Sestra ho obrátila obličejem*); c) the i-form is a part of an

underlying finite clause: cf. *Ve sklepě visely krásné jalovice a směřovaly kýtami vzhůru; Sestra způsobila, že směřoval obličejem k oknu* (cf. 2.4.3.3.3.1c); the data have shown that the underlying construction can be fully expressed in the surface structure (cf. ACMP5 in Appendix Table 1);

5. a **phasal** i-form a) refers to a part of what is conceived as lasting in time, and b) is governed by a phasal verb (in a broad sense) or its nominalization (cf. 2.4.3.3.3.2);

6. an i-form expressing the **instrument** meaning a) denotes the instrument of an action, and is used b) in a clause describing a situation in which an active animate participant does something to affect a more passive, animate or inanimate participant, using the instrument, i.e. c) in a clause paraphrasable in the above-mentioned way (cf. 2.5.1.3.1; 2.4.3.3.3.3a);

7. an i-form expressing the **material** meaning refers to a substance or material with which a container is being filled or with which a surface is being covered, including figurative uses as well as constructions without an agent such as *strom obrostl břechťanem, pěšina zarostla travou, obvaz prosákl krví* (cf. Panevová et al., 2014: 126); such i-forms tend to be (although not necessarily are) linguistically described by means of a construction allowing the lexical-semantic conversion (cf. 2.4.2.5; 2.4.3.3.3.3b);

8. an i-form expressing the **simple means** meaning a) denotes the means of an action, not describing an action or a complex situation itself, and thus failing the paraphrase criterion described below, which distinguishes the ‘simple’ means from the ‘actional’ means, and b) refers to an entity traditionally subsumed under the semantics of means (also cf. MČ3: 65), especially a mediator or a means of transport or communication (cf. 2.4.3.3.3.3c, da);

9. an i-form expressing the **actional means** meaning a) denotes the means of an action, b) this means being another action, which can be tested by paraphrasing it as a subordinate clause introduced with *tím, že* and containing a finite verb cognate with the i-form, while paraphrasing it as a clause of cause with the same meaning is not possible (cf. 2.4.3.3.3.3db);

10. an i-form expressing the **viewpoint** meaning a) refers to a certain ‘aspect’ as discussed above, and b) is either dependent on a verb or an adjective expressing a relation such as comparison or identity, or co-occurs with the copular *být* and fulfills the semantic conditions as described above (cf. 2.4.3.3.4);

11. a **causal** i-form a) refers to a mental or physical cause of a bodily state or process (including illnesses and causes of suffering), b) and is paraphrasable by a subordinate adverbial clause of cause, i.e. the primary realization form of the semantics (cf. 2.4.3.3.5).

When classifying individual i-forms, it is substantial not to commit the “lexical fallacy,” i.e. to keep in mind that the lexical meaning of an i-form alone is not conclusive, particularly because an i-form of a lexical unit is not limited to a single semantic specification (for instance, *vodou* is an instrument in *umýt vanu horkou vodou*, but a material in *napustit vanu horkou vodou*; MČ3: 61).

## 4 Analysis

The analysis examines 10 examples for each of the previously delineated semantic specifications, i.e. a total of 110 i-forms and their English counterparts (which are included in Appendix Table 1, sorted by the semantics of the i-forms). Table 2 below provides an overview of the realization forms found in the English counterparts; in the following sections, the results are discussed within Lehmann and Shin's framework (cf. 2.5.1), the individual samples are (again, in no particular order) subjected to scrutiny, the aim being to identify semantic and grammatical features relevant for the choice of a realization form in English, and the findings are compared with information presented in the theoretical part.

realization forms		semantic specifications											total
		AGENT	DIR	MANN	ACMP	PHASE	INSTR	MAT	MEANS		VIEW	CAUSE	
									s.	a.			
PP	<i>with</i>	-	-	-	3	7	8	10	1	-	-	6	35
	<i>by</i>	9	-	-	-	1	-	-	4	7	-	-	21
	<i>in</i>	-	-	8	-	1	-	-	2	-	8	1	20
	<i>through</i>	-	6	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
	<i>from</i>	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2
	<i>along</i>	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
	<i>down</i>	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	<i>across</i>	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	<i>on</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1
NP		-	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	7
VP	fusion	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
	conversion	-	-	-	2	-	1	-	2	-	-	-	5
	other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	3
adverb		-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
AdjP		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2
<b>total</b>		10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	<b>110</b>

**Table 2: Overview of the realization forms**

## 4.1 Agent

The following table provides an overview of the realization forms corresponding to the agentive i-forms in the sample as well as of the constructions in which these i-forms appeared.

Realization form	Number of instances	The i-form governed by	Number of instances
PP with <i>by</i>	9	causative construction	1
		finite passive verb	2
		non-finite passive verb	1
		deverbative adjective	5
PP with <i>from</i>	1	deverbative noun	1
<b>total</b>			10

**Table 3: Agent**

As expected (cf. 2.5.2.2), the vast majority of the agentive i-forms in the sample correspond to English PPs with *by*, no matter whether used in the causative construction or the passive diathesis (cf. 2.4.3.3.3.4), irrespective of whether the i-form is dependent on a verb, finite or non-finite, or its nominalization: all of these constructions correspond to the use of a passive verb form in English even if there is no explicitly passive element in Czech, as in the case of the causative construction:

AGENT1     „...*kdybychom vás dali prohlédnout soudními lékaři?*“  
               “...*if we were to send you to be examined by court physicians?*”

A PP with *from* appeared only in the following example:

AGENT10     ...*exemplární potrestání ředitelem školy...*  
               ...*an exemplary penalty from a principal...*

The fact that the *from*-phrase is not dependent on a passive verb form seems more relevant than the fact that it is dependent on a noun, for the presence of a passive verb form would require the use of a *by*-phrase (cf. Biber et al., 2007: 475). Nevertheless, the choice of *from* rather than *by* is in part based on a slight semantic difference from the meaning of the Czech i-form: unlike *by*, *from* implies the meaning of originator, based on the metaphorical extension of the ‘starting point – destination’ situation (*CGEL*: 686). If translated back to

Czech, however, this use of *from* would probably correspond to a PP with *od* in Czech, rather than to an i-form (cf. Dušková et al., 2012: 299), which reflects the semantic shift.

#### 4.2 Direction (DIR)

As suggested in 2.5.2.2, there is quite a welter of prepositions that could correspond to the use of the i-case; as shown in the following table, in the sample there appeared only four of them, the most frequent one being *through*, which seems to confirm the hypothesis of *through* being the most common and possibly the most ‘neutral’ preposition:

Realization form	Head nouns in the embedded NPs	Number of instances
PP with <i>through</i>	<i>streets, anteroom, Prussia, air, night, city</i>	6
PP with <i>along</i>	<i>corridors, river</i>	2
PP with <i>down</i>	<i>hall</i>	1
PP with <i>across</i>	<i>Europe</i>	1
	<b>total</b>	10

**Table 4: Direction**

The choice of a particular preposition is semantically conditioned (cf. 2.5.2.2); it is, nonetheless, impossible to delineate a set of semantic specifications and to ascribe one preposition to each. For instance, the use of *down* in reference to a horizontal axis (as in DIR6: *She’s walking down the hall*) “expresses the notion of ‘along’” (CGEL: 683), and is close to the use of *along* in DIR8 (*a somewhat exhausting march along many corridors*) and DIR9 (*I was swimming along a dark and turbulent river*), which corresponds to Quirk et al.’s delineation of *along* as referring to the movement ‘from one end towards the other’ in terms of a horizontal axis (ibid.). However, a very similar meaning is expressed by means of *through* in DIR1 (*I moved [...] through the little streets and lanes*).

As mentioned previously, the use of *through* (as opposed to *across*) is related to the movement in what has volume (as opposed to the movement on a surface), as the example *The picture of him falling through the air* (DIR4) and the pseudotemporal use in *a pleasant drive through a pleasant California night* (DIR7). Nevertheless, the examples DIR3 (*that horrible retreat through Prussia*) and DIR5 (*Alex traveled across vanquished Europe*) demonstrate that two cognitively very similar (if not identical) situations can be linguistically described by different, slightly nuanced means: in DIR5, *vanquished Europe*

is treated as a two-dimensional surface, while in DIR3, *Prussia* is treated as a three-dimensional space.

Cross-linguistically, *through* primarily corresponds to an i-form (Dušková et al., 2012: 281), which may alternate with a PP with *po* (MČ3: 86), whereas the more specified prepositions have also prepositional counterparts: *along* frequently corresponds to the Czech preposition *podél* and *across* often corresponds to *přes* (Dušková et al., 2012: 286). However, that does not mean that the semantics changes (as in the case of *from* corresponding to *od*, as described in 4.1), it is only more specific (cf. MČ3: 86–87); it may be, therefore, concluded that there is a correspondence between i-forms and *through*-phrases, the other means being – both in English and Czech – more specialized, and therefore used in fewer cases. This also manifests the fact that unlike *by* in agentive phrases with no prepositional counterpart in Czech (cf. 4.2), these prepositions are not mere function words signaling a certain relation, but also have their own lexical meaning.

#### 4.3 Manner (MANN)

As the following table shows, the primary means of expressing the manner relation corresponding to Czech i-forms is an *in*-phrase:

Realization form	Number of instances	The correspondence	Number of instances
PP with <i>in</i>	8	N → <i>in</i> Det N'	1
		A N → <i>in</i> Det A' N'	7
adverb	2	A N → (A > Adv)	2
<b>total</b>			10

**Table 5: Manner**

These results confirm what has been said in 2.5.1.3.2. The most frequent correspondence pattern is that of an i-form of an adjective (A), or, more precisely, an AdjP, and its head noun (N) in the i-case corresponding to the sequence of *in*, determiner (Det), equivalent adjective (A') and equivalent noun (N') in English, as in MANN10 and MANN6:

MANN10 *Tváře kolegyně známým způsobem potemněly...*

*The faces of the female colleagues darkened in typical fashion*

MANN6 *„Klekní si!“ křikl úplně jiným hlasem.*

*“Kneel!” he shouted in a completely different voice.*



When compared with MANN6, the use of an adverb in the following example (cf. the structurally identical example MANN9 in Appendix Table 1) documents that an *in*-phrase and an adverb might be interchangeable (i.e. *sternly* can be replaced by *in a stern voice*); the adverb, however, has a vaguer meaning than the corresponding *in*-phrase since the Czech head noun is lost in translation:

MANN4        „Pryč,“ řekl **přísným hlasem**.  
                   “*Away,*” he answered ***sternly***.

However, since the adverb in English corresponds to an adjective in Czech, the English equivalent cannot be paraphrased by a cognate adverb when there is only an *i*-form of a noun in Czech (even though *polohlasem* can be still replaced with *polohlasně*):

MANN3        ...přál si podobaný téměř **polohlasem**.  
                   ...*the pock-marketed man requested in a half-whisper*.

#### 4.4 Accompanying circumstances (ACMP)

The following table provides a basic overview of realization forms found in English counterparts of *i*-forms expressing accompanying circumstances:

Realization form	Number of instances	Subtype	Number of instances
verb (conversion)	2		2
NP	5	object of <i>turn</i>	2
		‘subject’	3
PP with <i>with</i>	3		3
<b>total</b>			10

**Table 6: Accompanying circumstances**

In the following two instances, the participles *facing* (introducing non-finite adverbial clauses) can be deemed results of the previously mentioned conversion strategy (cf. 2.5.1):

ACMP5        ...jejich řada stála teď pod pódiem po celé jeho délce a byla obrácena  
                   **tvářemi** k půlkruhu sedících žen a do sálu...  
                   ...*they stood in a line before the dais, covering the whole of its length and*  
                   ***facing*** the seated women and the audience.

ACMP7        *Oba hoši se poslušně otočili **čelem** k baculaté barokní madoně...*  
*The two lads turned away obediently, and continued their cosy gossip*  
***facing** a plump Baroque Madonna...*

These two examples should not, however, imply that the conversion strategy is employed whenever *face* is involved, as the following example proves:

ACMP4        *...a ona se obrátila **tváří** ke kůře stromu a rozplakala se.*  
*...and she turned **her face** to the bark of the tree and burst into tears.*

In ACMP4, the i-form corresponds to a common case noun functioning as the direct object of the verb *turn*; this construction appeared in one more example (*Irena turned her back to me*; ACMP8). Furthermore, common case nouns were found three times as ‘subjects’ of absolute constructions in detached predicatives (cf. Biber et al., 2007: 137), as exemplified by the following sentence pairs:

ACMP6        *Nazí a po kolena v moři, **zády** k evropské pevnině, se spojenýma rukama*  
*hleděli Borek a Jana k severu.*  
*Naked, standing in the sea up to their knees, **their backs** to the European*  
*continent, hand in hand, Borek and Jana looked north...*

ACMP9        *letěl přede mnou, **botama** napřed*  
*Sharky went flying past, **shoes** first*

ACMP10      *...až když jsem kudlici zas držel já, **ostřím** k němu*  
*...till I had the blade back in my hand, **edge** toward him*

It is noticeable that in ACMP10 as well as in another example of a detached predicative provided by Biber et al. (2007: 137) – “*Oh, but I do!*” *Miss Tish exclaimed, **face** in a veil of truth.* – the nouns *edge* and *face*, albeit with definite reference, are used without a determiner. That could be ascribed to the adverbial nature of these detached predicatives, manifested for instance in the idiomatic expression *head first* as well.

As Biber et al. (ibid.) point out, “[s]uch constructions are often introduced by the preposition *with*” (also cf. Dušková et al., 2012: 508), which might account for the use of *with* in the three cases, exemplified by the following one:

ACMP2        *rozevřenou [...] detektivku položenou na okénku **hřbetem** vzhůru*  
*an open [...] detective novel placed on the windowsill **with its spine** face up*

However, it is hard to accept that the status of the *with*-phrase in ACMP2 could be the same as the one of the *with*-phrase in ACMP1:

ACMP1        *Balouna, který stál sice pevně opřen **nohama** na zemi*  
                 *Baloun who was standing, that is resting firmly **with both feet** on the ground*

While the *with*-phrase in ACMP2 introduces a peripheral (and thus optative) clause element, the *with*-phrase in ACMP1 seems more integrated into the sentence structure: whereas it is possible to omit *with its spine face up* (but not only *with its spine*), omitting *with both feet on the ground* would result in an unacceptable sentence (and omitting *firmly* as well would completely change the meaning); however, unlike in ACMP2, the *with*-phrase alone can be omitted (...*that is resting firmly on the ground*). Nonetheless, the use of *with* in ACMP1 seems explicable by the fact that *both feet* might be claimed to be cognitively conceptualized as a kind of instrument. ACMP3 appears to stand somewhere in between ACMP1 and ACMP2 since neither *with his back* nor *with his back to us* as a whole can be omitted:

ACMP3        *Vstal a postavil se k nám zády.*  
                 *He rose and stood **with his back** to us.*

It seems possible to ascribe these structural differences to dissimilar syntactico-semantic relations within the constructions: consider the status of *hřbetem vzhůru* linked to the object and verb in the transformation *někdo položil detektivku hřbetem vzhůru* as opposed to the status of *nohama na zemi* linked to the subject and verb in *stál opřen nohama na zemi*. Consider also the fact that the “somewhere in between” status of ACMP3 can be ascribed to two possible interpretations of *se*: *postavil se* can be interpreted (synchronically) as a verb (*k nám zády* would be thus linked to the subject and the verb) as well as (diachronically)<sup>17</sup> as a verb with a proper reflexive accusative pronoun functioning as an object (*k nám zády* would be thus linked to this reflexive object and the verb).

#### 4.5 Phase

The following table summarizes the realization forms found in the counterparts of phasal *i*-forms, providing an overview of lexical units fulfilling the syntactic “slot” governing the phasal *i*-forms as well as their English counterparts:

---

<sup>17</sup> On the status of *se* in a diachronic perspective see especially section 2.1 in (Pergler, 2016).

Realization form	Governing element (lemma)	Number of instances
PP with <i>with</i>	<i>(s)končit – to end</i>	4
	<i>končit – to stop</i>	1
	<i>zahájit – to kick off</i>	1
	<i>začít – to begin</i>	1
PP with <i>by</i>	<i>zakoňit – to follow</i>	1
PP with <i>through</i>	<i>počít – to conceive</i>	1
PP with <i>in</i>	<i>zakoňit – to end</i>	1
<b>total</b>		10

**Table 7: Phase**

The central means equivalent to the phasal i-forms in the sample is the preposition *with*, which corresponds to the hypothesis proposed in 2.5.1.3.2. The *with*-phrases are dependent on the central phasal verbs *to end*, *to stop* and *to begin* and on the causative verb *to kick (sth) off* closely connected to the concept of ‘phasality’ (*DictCam: kick (sth) off* ‘If you kick off a discussion or an activity, you start it’). These translations are faithful to the original choice of verbs in Czech, for instance:

PHASE2      *Končila **nařizním**, aby byly pečlivě probrány žurnální knihy...*  
*It ended **with a directive** to review all the old police blotters...*

Similarly, PHASE8 contains the phasal verb *to end* and presents a faithful translation, differing only in the choice of the preposition (governed by the verb *to end*):

PHASE8      *prchavé schůzky na Petříně, zakončené neobratným **polibkem***  
*fleeting moments in Petřín park, ending **in an** awkward **kiss***

The use of a *by*-phrase and a *through*-phrase, seems to result from lexical differences between the original sentences and their English translations, and possibly from the fact that the verb forms governing the PPs are the only two passive verb forms in this sample:

PHASE4      *Mé úniky (nebo spíš úskoky, zakončené mocným **přískokem**) byly...*  
*My flights (or rather dodges, followed **by** powerful **leaps back**) were...*

PHASE7      *celý můj životní příběh byl počat v omylu, špatným žertem pohlednice, tou náhodou, tím **nesmyslem***

*the entire story of my life was conceived in error, **through** the bad joke of the postcard, that accident, that **nonsense***

Because of the passive, the choice of *by* in PHASE4 is natural since *powerful leaps back* would be the subject of a corresponding active clause, and the subject “may correspond to a *by*-phrase in passive paraphrases” (Biber et al., 2007: 123) even if it does not serve the semantic role of agent (ibid.: 475).

In PHASE7, the choice of *through* rather than *with* seems to be based on the semantic shift from the phasal meaning of the original i-form to a rather vague meaning of means (cf. Dušková et al., 2012: 299), which is partly based on the difference between the Czech verb *počít* and its counterpart *conceive*. While *počít* can have a strictly phasal meaning and can be accompanied by a phasal i-form, as in *boj o svobodu (se) počal revoluci* (SSČ: 278), *conceive* does not allow a strictly phasal interpretation (*DictCam* includes the following senses: *conceive* ‘to imagine something,’ ‘to invent a plan or an idea,’ ‘to become pregnant, or to cause a baby to begin to form’).

#### 4.6 Instrument (INSTR)

The following table presents an overview of the realization forms found in the counterparts of the instrument i-forms in the sample:

Realization form	Number of instances
PP with <i>with</i>	8
verb (fusion)	1
verb (conversion)	1
<b>total</b>	10

**Table 8: Instrument**

As expected (cf. 2.5.1.3.1), *with*-phrases are the primary realization form, as in INSTR6 below (the conditions for the use of a *by*-phrase, for example, are not exactly favorable since all the i-forms in the sample are governed by active verb forms or their nominalizations).

INSTR6      *Štrůdl mě musel drcnout do zadku **saxofonem**, tak sem byla zafixovaná*  
*Strudl had to poke me in the behind **with his saxophone**, I was that rigid*

The two peripheral strategies, i.e. the lexical fusion strategy and the conversion strategy, are exemplified by INSTR3 and INSTR8, respectively, and discussed below.

INSTR3        *Spíš rozkuchat nožem břicho... napadlo Bubacka.*  
                   *Or perhaps **slicing** its stomach open, Buback thought.*

The hypothesis that “if the concomitant is for some reason explicitly expressed in a Czech clause, it should be explicitly expressed in its English counterpart as well” formulated in 2.5.1.1, albeit not counter-intuitive, should be rejected: both the Czech verb *kuchat* (SSČ: ‘nožem otvírat zabitá zvířata a vyjímat vnitřnosti’) and its English counterpart *slice* (*DictCam*: *slice* ‘to easily cut into or through something with a sharp knife’) have the instrument incorporated in their lexical meaning, and yet the Czech sentence in INSTR3 explicitly expresses the concomitant even though there is nothing “special” about it.

INSTR8        *pak mě mozek Psice poslal ke stařeně, která **nabírala lopatkou** uhlí do kýblů*  
                   *then She-Dog’s brain sent me to an old woman **shoveling** coal into pails*

The use of the conversion strategy allows the construction to become syntactically less complicated; moreover, other possible lexical choices would result in constructions of disputable acceptability (such as *an old woman filling pails with coal with a shovel*).

#### 4.7 Material (MAT)

Since all the counterparts of the i-forms in this sample refer to the material via a *with*-phrase, the following table also provides an overview of the semantic subtypes of the construction:

Realization form	Type of situation	Number of instances
PP with <i>with</i>	a container is being filled by somebody	4
	a surface is being covered by somebody	4
	constructions without an agent	2
<b>total</b>		10

**Table 9: Material**

The semantic specification of material is often subsumed under the semantics of instrument or means in a broad sense and “a semasiological investigation of instrumental structures in diverse languages reveals that the material used is conceived as a kind of instrument in some of them” (Lehmann & Shin, 2005: 66); it is, therefore, none too surprising that

*with*-phrases are a major means of expressing the specification of material, *with* being the prototypical preposition to express the instrument meaning (cf. 2.5.1.3.1).

As a result, *with*-phrases appear in all the three subtypes (cf. MAT1, MAT6, MAT10), including figurative uses (cf. MAT3), seemingly irrespective of the nature and grammatical properties of their governing elements (an active finite verb in MAT1, an active participle in MAT3, a past participle of passive meaning in MAT6, an adjective in MAT10).

MAT1        *Pravou sešvihala proutím a levou namazala mastma.*  
*she whipped the right with a switch and smeared the left with ointments*

MAT3        *Občas sem vtrhla parta kluků z jejich třídy a naplnila pokojik halasem svých hrdel*  
*Occasionally a gang of lads from his class would crowd in, filling the tiny room with their noisy voices.*

MAT6        *už nikdy nebudu tak šťasten jako teď na kavalci vycpaném senem*  
*I'd never be as happy as I am right now on a mattress stuffed with straw*

MAT10       *všechno bylo nasáklý vlhkem z dešťů*  
*everything was soggy with moisture from the rain*

#### 4.8 Simple means

The following table reflects the fact that the simple means i-forms in the sample most frequently refer to a means of transport, and provides an overview of realization forms found in the English counterparts:

Realization form	Number of instances	Subtype	Number of instances
PP with <i>in</i>	2	means of transport	2
PP with <i>on</i>	1		1
PP with <i>by</i>	4		3
PP with <i>with</i>	1	other	1
verb (conversion)	2		2
<b>total</b>			10

**Table 10: Simple means**

The i-forms referring to the mode of transport most frequently correspond to *by*-phrases, but also to *in*-phrases and to an *on*-phrase. While the use of *by* confirms what is stated in section 2.5.1.3.1, to account for the use of *on* and *in*, it is necessary to revisit Quirk et al.'s (CGEL: 699) description: "Mode of transport is expressed by *on* as well as *by*: *on the bus/the train/a ship/a plane*. These are not purely locative phrases – location in such cases would be expressed by *in* rather than *on* – but rather indicate a condition of being 'in transit'." The use of *in* in MEANS4 and MEANS10, in which the vehicle is conceptualized as a location (cf. also Lehmann & Shin, 2005: 47; 53), corresponds to that; on the other hand, the use of *by* in MEANS8, albeit describing a situation similar to MEANS4, is justifiable as *taxicab* is conceptualized as a simple means rather than a location:

MEANS4      *šampaňské, kterého sem dopravila hned na počátku taxíkem tři bedýnky*  
                   ...right at the beginning she'd hauled three cases of it over **in a taxi**

MEANS10     *Rudolf mi vbod drogu a mně se tohle všechno zdá a jedu autem s fízlama*  
                   ...an this whole thing is just a dream, I'm ridin **in the car** with the spooks

MEANS8      *Raglánka jsem musela z Granady odvézt domů taxíkem...*  
                   I had to take Rags home from the Granada **by taxicab**

It might be useful to take into consideration a rather formal aspect; the 'zero article' (cf. Biber et al., 2007: 262) in the institutionalized sporadic use (cf. CGEL: 277–278) is "restricted to prepositional phrases opening with *by*" (Biber et al., 2007: 262),<sup>18</sup> and the use of a determiner is thus restricted to *in*- and *on*-phrases, conceptualized as locations.

The use of *on* in MEANS7 corresponds to the aforementioned concept of being 'in transit':

MEANS7      *Tramvaje začaly jezdit a Jana si přijela šestnáctkou...*  
                   ...and Jana arrived **on number sixteen**

Moreover, "[t]here is a fair amount of semantic and even lexical conditioning, thus of idiomaticity, involved in the choice of particular concomitant markers" (Lehmann & Shin, 2005: 87): the popular grammar book for students *English Grammar in Use* (Murphy,

---

<sup>18</sup> Quirk et al. (CGEL: 700) state that "[a]bsence of the article is normal with the unmodified noun phrase after *by*, but not obligatory." Note the discrepancy in terminology: while CGEL uses the term *absence of the article* (corresponding to Czech *bezčlennost*; Dušková, 2013: 115), Biber et al. use *the zero article* (corresponding to Czech *nulový člen*; *ibid.*: 117).



2005: 256) mentions that *in* is used for cars and taxis, while *on* is used for bicycles and public transport (buses, trains etc.).

In the cases not referring to modes of transportation, i-forms correspond to a *by*-phrase, a *with*-phrase and twice to finite verb forms resulting from the use of the conversion strategy. The preference for *by* in MEANS9 is probably reinforced by the passive meaning of its governing element, i.e. *punishable* (cf. *DictCam: punishable* ‘A punishable crime is one that someone can be punished for’), and the lack of implied human agency (cf. the deagentive diathesis in the Czech sentence).

MEANS9     *poslech cizího rozhlasu se trestá v těžkých případech i smrtí*  
              *listening to foreign radio stations was punishable, in extreme cases, **by death***

On the other hand, in the case of MEANS3, the idiomaticity<sup>19</sup> principle seems to override any other possible factors, and *with* is used:

MEANS3     *Místo toho Beran vstal a překvapil ho podivnou otázkou.*  
              *Instead, Beran stood up, surprising him **with an odd question.***

The following two examples illustrate the use of the conversion strategy:

MEANS2     *Saturnin hledal inzerátem v novinách místo sluhy*  
              *Saturnin **advertised** in the newspapers for the position of manservant*

MEANS6     *zavolal jí telefonem z recepce a potom šel za ní*  
              *He **phoned** first from the reception desk, then went upstairs.*

MEANS2 is slightly different from all the other examples of the conversion strategy in that the Czech i-form *inzerátem* is a noun derived from the verb *inzerovat* ‘to advertise’ (cf. *diktovat* > *diktát*; Mališ, 1997: 22); in English, the corresponding noun is derived by means of suffixation (*advertisement*). On the other hand, *telefonem* in MEANS6 is not a noun derived from the verb *telefonovat* (on the contrary: *telefon* > *telefonovat*; Mališ, 1997: 26) and the other i-forms corresponding to results of the conversion strategy (*čelem* in ACMP5

---

<sup>19</sup> A simple corpus query (*[lemma="surprise"][word="(her|him|them|us|you|me)"]**[lemma="(with|by)"]*) shows that in the whole corpus *InterCorp v8 – English*, there are 67 instances of an active form of the verb *surprise* followed by a personal pronoun and either *with* or *by*. The latter is used 23 times, 22 times with a gerund, once with a subordinate clause introduced by *how*; *with* is used in 44 cases, being always followed by a syntactic noun (including one nominal relative clause and seven pronouns). Therefore, the idiomaticity can be claimed to follow this rather formal distinction.

and ACMP7, *lopatkou* in INSTR8) do not even have corresponding verbs (the verb *čelit* has only figurative meanings; cf. SSČ: 47).

#### 4.9 Actional means

The following table summarizes the realization forms that appear among the counterparts of i-forms expressing actional means:

Realization form	Number of instances	Subtype	Number of instances
PP with <i>by</i>	7	<i>by</i> + a gerund	6
		<i>by</i> + a noun	1
non-finite verb form	3	gerund	1
		participle	1
		infinitive	1
<b>total</b>			10

**Table 11: Actional means**

As expected (cf. 2.5.1.3.1), the primary realization form is the *by*-phrase, typically followed by a gerund, as in MEANS14 (also cf. footnote 19):

MEANS14 *Předběhl jsem to **podpisem** Charty.*

*I headed them off **by signing** the human rights document Charter 77.*

In all the seven cases, the *by*-phrase is dependent on an active verb form; the only noun governed by the preposition *by* is an action noun (nomen actionis) in MEANS20 (*before blowing it to smithereens in a split second, **by an imperceptible change** of pressure*).

The following examples illustrate non-prepositional realization forms, i.e. a gerund (MEANS11), an infinitive (MEANS15) and a participle (MEANS18):

MEANS11 *Lhaním a **vymejšlením** se dá plno věcí ulehčit.*

*Lying and **making things up** made all sorts of things easier.*

MEANS15 *hrozila **útekem** z domova a ještě horšími věcmi*

*she was threatening **to run away** from home and even worse things*

MEANS18 *Až když jednou při mši zanotoval [...] z hůru několik taktů toreadorské písně,*

*vykázal ho regenschori na místě ze svého chóru hněvivým **napřažením** ruky...*

*Not until he sang a few notes [...] of a toreador song during mass did the choirmaster banish him from the choir, **pointing** a furious finger...*

The use of the gerund in the subject position in MEANS11 is explicable in terms of the concept of topic-focus articulation since *Lying and making things up* can be considered contextually bound, the contextual boundness being based on an indirect anaphora (cf. the broader context of MEANS11 in Appendix Table 1); there is a correspondence between an initial thematic adverbial in Czech and an initial thematic subject in English (cf. Dušková, 2005: 250).

The infinitive in MEANS15 functions syntactically as the only object of the verb *threaten* (cf. Dušková et al., 2012: 550); the verb has another valency frame with an object and a complementation realized as a *with*-phrase (ibid.: 209) referring, however, to an instrument rather than means (cf. *DictCam: threaten: They threatened the shopkeeper with a gun.*)

In MEANS18, the participle introduces a non-finite clause; its choice seems a matter of emphasis, the information given in the final supplementive clause is conceived as less important (cf. Biber et al., 2007: 201); nevertheless, a *by*-phrase more integrated into the sentence structure would be possible in a less loose translation (*by an angry wave of his arm*).

#### 4.10 Viewpoint (VIEW)

The following table summarizes what realization forms were found in the counterparts of the Czech *i*-forms in the viewpoint sample:

Realization form	Number of instances
PP with <i>in</i>	8
NP	2
<b>total</b>	10

**Table 12: Viewpoint**

Surprisingly, none of the examples contain a *by*-phrase (cf. 2.5.2.2). The most frequent counterpart is an *in*-phrase, which correspond to both the constructions described above (cf. 2.4.3.3.4), illustrated by VIEW5 (the “comparative” construction) and VIEW8 (the

construction with a copula). The two constructions can, however, combine, as VIEW7 shows:

VIEW5 *Lišily jsme se podstatněji jen **zkušeností** (bod pro mě)*  
*We differed more substantially only **in our experience** (a point for me)*

VIEW8 *...a jež byly svým **původem** ryzí a nevinné*  
*...and that were **in origin** pure and innocent*

VIEW7 *předstíral jsem, že jsem starší (duchem a **zkušenostmi**), než jsem byl*  
*pretending to be older (**in spirit and experience**) than I was*

Apart from VIEW7 and VIEW8, the construction with the copular *be* appeared only in VIEW9, in which, nevertheless, the copula is not expressed in the surface structure:

VIEW9 *do Bulvárky chodili [...] taky aficionados, **duchem** obvykle trochu chudí...*  
*The Boulevard was frequented [...] by aficionados of jazz as well, usually a little wanting **in intellect**...*

This use of *in* corresponds to Dušková's example quoted in 2.5.2.2 (*he is young in years, but old in experience*) and to the 'characteristics' meaning of *in* described in *DictCam* (*in* 'used to show which characteristic or part of a person or thing is being described'), one of three exemplifications provided in the dictionary being the following: *Are the two bags equal in weight?*

In two cases (VIEW1 and VIEW4), the Czech *i*-form referring to an aspect of another entity (syntactically, a subject) corresponds to an English common case noun determined by the adnominal case form of the equivalent of the Czech subject (which is, however, not explicitly expressed in the Czech clause in VIEW4, Czech being a pro-drop language):

VIEW1 *Pokoj **vzhledem** i rozměry připomínal spíše kajutu.*  
*The room's **appearance** and dimensions suggested a ship's cabin.*

VIEW4 *Buback znal... [...] Propůjčenou **hodností** se mu ostatně rovnal!*  
*Buback knew... [...] After all, Buback's borrowed **rank** made them equals.*

Especially in VIEW4, the choice of the particular construction (rather than e.g. *After all, they were equal in rank*) can be explained if the topic-focus articulation is taken into consideration; both the Czech sentence and its English counterpart are ordered according to the rising communicative dynamism. Note, nevertheless, that this construction can be often

formed from an *in*-phrase as well: for instance, *that were in origin pure and innocent* in VIEW8 can be paraphrased as *their origin was pure and innocent*, which corresponds to the semantic relations characterized in 2.4.3.3.4.

#### 4.11 Cause

As the following table shows, the adpositional marking strategy is the central one in the equivalents of the causal *i*-forms in the sample:

Realization form	Number of instances
PP with <i>with</i>	6
PP with <i>from</i>	1
PP with <i>in</i>	1
AdjP	2
<b>total</b>	10

**Table 13: Cause**

The use of prepositions partly corresponds to the delineation of possible counterparts in 2.5.2.2; however, the use of *in* was not expected.

Nevertheless, the following two examples, for instance, might suggest that the choice of a particular preposition of cause might be more subject to individual preferences or slight semantic nuances:

CAUSE4     *Lidé se před vámi třesou **úctou**...*  
*You make everybody tremble **with respect**...*

CAUSE6     *Santnerová se třese, snad **vztekem**, ale možná lítostí.*  
*Mrs. Santner is trembling, perhaps **from anger** but possibly from sorrow...*

The PPs in bold are both governed by the same verb, both refer to unintentional causes, and yet the choice of preposition is different even though it is not possible to identify any difference in the meanings of the constructions without overvaluing the lexical meaning of the nouns *respect* and *anger* (and thus committing a kind of “lexical fallacy”). Note, however, the looser syntactic connection between the verb (that usually governs a *with*-phrase as its complementation) and the *from*-phrases in CAUSE6.

Similarly, the use of *in* in CAUSE10 is difficult to explain satisfactorily:

CAUSE10    *Vyjekl jsem úlekem a bolestí.*  
*I yelped in astonishment and pain.*

Even though *with*-phrases with abstract nouns often function as subject adjuncts or adjuncts of manner proper (Dušková et al., 2012: 459), the possibility that *with astonishment and pain* would have a meaning different from *in astonishment and pain* does not seem plausible. The use of *in* might be lexically conditioned, or possibly slightly more idiomatic (cf. *DictCam: yelp* ‘to make a sudden, short, high sound, usually when in pain’); however, the use of *with astonishment and pain* in CAUSE10 seems perfectly acceptable.

Quite surprisingly, in two cases there is a correspondence between a Czech *i*-form and an English adjective premodified by the adverb *so* and followed by the correlative *that* not expressed in the surface structure (as it “is sometimes omitted in informal style”; *CGEL*: 1142) introducing a subordinate adverbial clause of result or effect:

CAUSE1    *baronka von Botzenheim nemohla se pohnutím udržet slz*  
*Baroness von Botzenheim was so moved she couldn't hold back her tears*

CAUSE7    „*Strachem se pochcal!*“  
*“So scared he's pissed himself!”*

As Dušková (2012: 636) points out, this construction is related to the causal semantics in such a way that it can be transformed into a complex sentence with an adverbial clause of cause (corresponding to the main clause of the complex sentence with a clause of effect); for instance, CAUSE1 can be reformulated as *she couldn't hold back her tears because she was very moved*. As the pair of correlatives *so... (that)* “introduce[s] constructions that combine the notion of sufficiency or excess,” which is, however, not present in the original Czech clauses, “with the notion of result” (*CGEL*: 1142), it can be concluded that in the two examples, the Czech causative constructions are ‘reversed’ in translation (i.e. the situation is viewed from a different perspective) so that the original cause could be emphasized.

## 5 Conclusion

The aim of the present thesis was to examine how Czech non-prepositional i-forms of nouns are translated into English. The basic hypothesis, based on Lehmann and Shin's framework, was that to express syntactic relations encoded in the system of case marking in Czech, English deploys its resources of function words (more specifically, prepositions); for the choice of a particular preposition, the semantics was expected to be of paramount importance. It was hypothesized that results of the conversion strategy could appear as translation counterparts of i-forms as well, especially of those with the semantics of instrument; on the other hand, results of the lexical fusion strategy were not expected to appear as translation counterparts of i-forms.

PPs were used in 90 examples (out of the total of 110 examples), thus confirming the first part of the hypothesis; the conversion strategy was employed five times (in INSTR8, ACMP5, ACMP7, MEANS2, MEANS6), the lexical fusion strategy only once (INSTR3), which is still more than was expected. There are 14 examples which are seemingly not accounted for by Lehmann and Shin's framework, which is, however, partly a consequence of their framework being devised for concomitant meanings only, partly a consequence of the fact that some of the constructions can be deemed secondary transformations of primarily prepositional constructions.

As expected, the choice of a particular preposition is primarily based on the semantics: *with*-phrases proved to be the primary means of expressing the semantics of phase, instrument and material; the phrases referring to manner as well as viewpoint are primarily introduced by the preposition *in*; agentive i-forms systemically correspond to *by*-phrases; *through* seems to be the most neutral (i.e. the least marked or specific) preposition to explicate the 'direction' or path meaning; in general, the counterparts of i-forms expressing the semantics of means tend to rely on *by*-phrases. The counterparts of i-forms referring to accompanying circumstances do not conclusively prove any realization form to be the primary one, which can be more or less ascribed to the characteristic, slightly vague nature of the semantic role.

There are also identifiable secondary means of expressing some of the semantic roles: prepositions such as *along*, *across* and *down* can refer to the direction or path as well, but convey more specialized meanings than the primary preposition, *through*; manner can be

expressed by adverbs, which, however, have vaguer meanings than corresponding *in*-phrases.

Nevertheless, there are cases requiring adjustments to the above-mentioned semantic “rules.”

The choice of a particular preposition (or other realization form) can be sometimes ascribed to the government of a particular verb (*differ in, tremble with, to threaten to do sth*) and idiomaticity (cf. the choice between *on* and *in* with different kinds of vehicles). Moreover, sometimes there are choices between equally acceptable prepositional phrases (cf. for instance *through* in DIR3 and *across* in DIR5 seem slightly nuanced, the subtle difference described in section 4.2 would, however, hardly cause miscommunication).

There are also cases in which an ostensible departure from the semantic preferences takes place; the choice of an unexpected realization form in such cases is, however, based rather on more (cf. CAUSE1, CAUSE7) or less (cf. AGENT10) radical changes in meaning resulting from the translation. For instance, unlike the Czech *i*-form in AGENT10, its English counterpart is conceived as an originator rather than a typical agent; in some cases, vehicles are conceived rather as locations rather than means (cf. MEANS4, MEANS7, MEANS10).

In the counterparts of *i*-forms expressing means, there might exist a preference for the choice of *by* if a gerund follows and *with* if a noun or pronoun follows.

The passive voice of a governing verb (or its nominalization in a broad sense) might be a factor for choosing *by* over another preposition; this supposition, however, cannot be actually supported by other than the agentive examples and potentially by the disputable examples PHASE4 and MEANS9 (in the latter, nevertheless, the passive meaning is expressed only lexically) discussed above. On the other hand, there are examples with a passive verb form, in which, however, a *by*-phrase does not appear, such as *her forehead bedewed with perspiration* in MAT8 and *a mattress stuffed with straw* in MAT6, i.e. cases in which there cannot be any human agency involved as well as cases in which there must be some human agency involved.

Furthermore, information structure occasionally operates as a factor in the choice of a realization form as well, resulting in the correspondence between an initial thematic adverbial in Czech and a thematic subject in English (cf. MEANS11 and VIEW4 discussed



above). Moreover, information structure might play a role in choosing the conversion strategy over the adpositional marking strategy – for instance, in INSTR8 discussed above, the choice of the verb *shovel* rather than the PP *with a shovel* might be a result of an attempt to avoid putting too many contextually non-bound elements at the end of a clause (cf. also MEANS2).

Finally, it seems appropriate to acknowledge at least some shortcomings of the present thesis. Even though the results more or less cover the central area of cases corresponding to Czech non-prepositional i-forms of nouns, the format of the thesis and the limited size of the material for the analysis do not allow sweeping generalizations for instance about the counterparts of i-forms expressing accompanying circumstances (and more data would be undoubtedly useful in more cases); as a result, some (rather peripheral) constructions<sup>20</sup> are not dealt with at all.

Furthermore, the size of the individual samples and their random selection reflect only the central realization forms and are not necessarily representative; for instance, the construction of *so... (that)*, which appeared twice in the CAUSE sample, was by no means proportionally frequent in the data from which the sample of 110 examples was excerpted. In addition, the sample for ‘simple means’ should have been perhaps based on different criteria since other means than vehicles are represented by only four examples, which is not exactly a sufficient material basis for any conclusions. (Note also the potentially problematic distinction of “simple” and “actional” means.) Additionally, a certain limit on the number of occurrences of a single lexical unit in the examples should have been established (for instance, the verb *end* governs the PP corresponding to an i-form in half of the phase examples, *differ* – or *different* – is a governing element in three examples of viewpoint, *(polo)hlasem* appears four times in the sample of manner i-forms).

---

<sup>20</sup> Consider, for instance, the following examples found in the sample of 3,486 concordance lines (cf. 3.3.2): *ztrácejí každou sklenici piva [...] možnost koupit si vojenský lístek / with each stein [...] he was losing the ability to purchase a military fare-card; neúprosně přibývaly každou poštou / mercilessly kept coming and adding up with each mail delivery; ona se vracela každým přepisem / it kept coming back with every written communication.*

## 6 References and sources

### References

- Adam, R. et al. (2014) *Úvodní jazykový seminář: výklad a cvičení*. Praha: Karolinum.  
Available online from  
<[http://www.cupress.cuni.cz/ink2\\_stat/dload.jsp?prezMat=53866](http://www.cupress.cuni.cz/ink2_stat/dload.jsp?prezMat=53866)> (accessed:  
11 April 2015).
- Adam, R. (2015) *Morfologie. Příručka k povinnému předmětu bakalářského studia oboru ČJL*. Praha: Karolinum. Available online from  
<[http://www.cupress.cuni.cz/ink2\\_stat/dload.jsp?prezMat=53806](http://www.cupress.cuni.cz/ink2_stat/dload.jsp?prezMat=53806)> (accessed:  
27 September 2015).
- Běličová, H. (1982) *Sémantická struktura věty a kategorie pádu. Příspěvek k porovnávací syntaxi ruské a české jednoduché věty*. Praha: Academia.
- Biber, D., S. Johansson, G. Leech, S. Conrad, E. Finegan (2007) *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Harlow: Longman.
- Blake, B. J. (2006) “Case”, in Keith Brown (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics*, 212–220. Amsterdam: Elsever.
- Brinton, L. J. & L. K. Arnovick (2011) *The English Language: A Linguistic History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cvrček, V. et al. (2010) *Mluvnice současné češtiny. 1, Jak se píše a jak se mluví*. Praha: Karolinum.
- Čechová, M. et al. (1996) *Čeština – řeč a jazyk*. Praha: ISV nakladatelství.
- Čechová, M. et al. (2008) *Česká stylistika*. Praha: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny.
- Čermáková, A. (2009) *Valence českých substantiv*. Praha: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny.
- Daneš, F. et al. (1987) *Mluvnice češtiny. 3, Skladba*. Praha: Academia.
- Dušková, L. (2005) “Konstantnost syntaktické funkce mezi jazyky”. *Slovo a slovesnost* 66, 243–260.
- Dušková, L. et al. (2012) *Mluvnice současné angličtiny na pozadí češtiny*. Praha: Academia.

- Dušková, L. (2013) *Syntax současné angličtiny: sbírka textů a příkladů k syntaktickému rozboru*. Praha: Karolinum.
- Emonds, J. (2007) “Czech Cases and the Syntacticon: Poznámky k, o, okolo, nad něčím a pro někoho”, in M. Dočekal, P. Karlík & J. Zmrzlíková (eds.), *Czech in Generative Grammar*, 81–103. München: Lincom Europa.
- English Cambridge Dictionary*. Cambridge University Press. Available online from <<http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/>> (last accessed: 26 July 2016).
- Filipec, J. et al. (2001) *Slovník spisovné češtiny pro školu a veřejnost*. Praha: Academia.
- Fillmore, C. J. (1968) “The Case for Case”, in E. Bach & R. T. Harms (eds.), *Universals in Linguistic Theory*, 1–88. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Fronek, J. (2000) *Velký česko-anglický slovník. Comprehensive Czech-English Dictionary*. Praha: Leda.
- Grepl, M. & P. Karlík (1998) *Skladba češtiny*. Olomouc: Votobia.
- Havránek, B. & A. Jedlička (1981) *Česká mluvnice*. Praha: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství.
- Jelínek, T. (2013) “Frekvence syntaktických funkcí substantiv ve vztahu k jejich pádu”, in M. Hirschová et al., *Studie k Moderní mluvnici češtiny. 7, Kapitoly ze syntaktologie češtiny*, 182–195. Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci.
- Jelínek, T. (2015) *Skladební funkce a pád v korpusu: Frekvenční analýza*. Praha: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny.
- Karlík, P. et al. (2012) *Příruční mluvnice češtiny*. Praha: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny.
- Karlík, P., M. Nekula & J. Pleskalová, eds. (2002) *Encyklopedický slovník češtiny*. Praha: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny.
- Kettnerová, V. (2014) *Lexikálně-sémantické konverze ve valenčním slovníku*. Praha: Karolinum.
- Knappová, M. (1973) “K otázkám adverbializace”. *Slovo a slovesnost* 34, 150–157.
- Komárek, M. et al. (1986) *Mluvnice češtiny. 2, Tvarosloví*. Praha: Academia.

- Kopečný, F., ed. (1973) *Etymologický slovník slovanských jazyků: Slova gramatická a zájmena*. Praha: Academia.
- Kopřivová, M. (2006) *Valence českých adjektiv*. Praha: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny.
- Lehmann, C. & Y. Shin (2005) “The functional domain of concomitance. A typological study of instrumental and comitative relations”, in C. Lehmann (ed.), *Typological Studies in Participation*, 9–104. Berlin: Akademie Verlag. Available online from <<http://www.christianlehmann.eu/publ/Concomitance.pdf>> (accessed: 25 February 2016).
- Machová, S. (1972) *Příčina v syntaxi češtiny*. Praha: Academia.
- Mališ, O. (1997) “Nauka o tvoření slov”, in O. Mališ, S. Machová & J. Suk, *Současný český jazyk. Lexikologie (Nauka o tvoření slov, lexikografie, slang)*, 7–60. Praha: Karolinum.
- Mikulová, M. et al. (2005) *Anotace na tektogramatické rovině Pražského závislostního korpusu. Referenční příručka*. Praha: ÚFAL MFF UK. Available online from <<https://ufal.mff.cuni.cz/techrep/tr31.pdf>> (accessed 13 May 2016).
- Mitchell, B. & F. C. Robinson (1992) *A Guide to Old English*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Murphy, R. (2005) *English Grammar in Use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Narrog, H. (2009) “Varieties of Instrumental”, in A. Malchukov & A. Spencer (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Case*, 593–600. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nosek, J. (1987) *Syntax moderní angličtiny. Větné členy*. Praha: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství.
- Osolsobě, K. (2014) *Česká morfologie a korpusy*. Praha: Karolinum.
- Panevová, J. (1996) “Kolik významů má český instrumentál?”, in I. Nebeská & A. Macurová (eds.), *Jazyk a jeho užívání*, 14–23. Praha: FF UK.
- Panevová, J. (2007) “Znovu o reciprocitě”. *Slovo a slovesnost* 68, 91–100.
- Panevová, J. et al. (2014) *Mluvnice současné češtiny. 2, Syntax češtiny na základě anotovaného korpusu*. Praha: Karolinum.

- Pergler, J. (2016) “K otázce tzv. akuzativního *se* v češtině: pohled (nejen) diachronní”. *Slovo a slovesnost* 77, 102–122.
- Petkevič, V. (2014) “Problémy automatické morfologické disambiguace češtiny”. *Naše řeč* 97, 194–207.
- Pravdová, M. & I. Svobodová, eds. (2014) *Akademická příručka českého jazyka*. Praha: Academia.
- Quirk, R. et al. (1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London and New York: Longman.
- Ruse, C. & A. S. Hornsby (1990) *Oxford Student's Dictionary of Current English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rysová, M. (2015) “Discourse Relations Expressed by Multiword Discourse Phrases”, in Š. Zikánová et al., *Discourse and Coherence*, 165–177. Praha: ÚFAL.
- Spal, J. (1975) “Větné členství instrumentálu komitativního”. *Naše řeč* 58, 195–199.
- Spencer, A. (2006) “Syntactic vs. morphological case”, in L. Kulikov, A. Malchukov & P. de Swart (eds.), *Case, Valency and Transitivity*, 3–22. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Svobodová, J. (2013) “K možnostem syntaktické analýzy věty”, in M. Hirschová et al., *Studie k Moderní mluvnici češtiny. 7, Kapitoly ze syntaktologie češtiny*, 35–50. Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci.
- Šmilauer, V. (1966) *Novočeská skladba*. Praha: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství.
- Štícha, F. (2004) “Nominativ a instrumentál predikátového substantiva v současné češtině: sonda do korpusu”. *Slovo a slovesnost* 65, 113–132.
- Štícha, F. (2006) “Jaké jsou možnosti a meze české gramatiky?”, in F. Štícha (ed.), *Možnosti a meze české gramatiky*, 13–35. Praha: Academia.
- Štícha, F. et al. (2013) *Akademická gramatika spisovné češtiny*. Praha: Academia.
- Štícha, F. (2016) “Je pravda, že...”. *Týdeník Rozhlas*, 26.
- Trnka, B. (2014) *Rozbor nynější spisovné angličtiny*. Praha: Karolinum.
- Trost, P. (1963) “K prostému instrumentálu v češtině”. *Slovo a slovesnost* 24, 24–26.

- Tyler, A. & V. Evans (2003) *The Semantics of English Prepositions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Uličný, O. (2000) *Instrumentál v struktuře české věty*. Praha: Karolinum.
- Uličný, O. (2002) “K vývojové dynamice současné české flexe”, in Z. Hladká & P. Karlík (eds.), *Čeština – univerzália specifika 4*, 233–236. Brno: Masarykova univerzita.
- Uličný, O. (2013) “K lokalistickému východisku popisu pádového systému češtiny”, in P. Adámková et al., *Studie k Moderní mluvnici češtiny. 6, Úvahy o české morfologii*, 33–40. Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci.
- Vážný, V. (1963) *Historická mluvnice česká II. 1. část: skloňování*. Praha: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství.
- Veselovská, L. (2004) “Rozšířená verbální projekce v češtině: Tři druhy slovesa být”, in Z. Hladká & P. Karlík (eds.), *Čeština – univerzália specifika 5*, 203–212. Brno: Masarykova univerzita.
- Vondráček, M. (2013) “Vlastnosti slova a slovní druhy”, in P. Adámková et al., *Studie k Moderní mluvnici češtiny. 6, Úvahy o české morfologii*, 17–32. Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci.

## Sources

Český národní korpus – InterCorp (version 8). Ústav Českého národního korpusu FF UK, Prague. Available online from <<http://www.korpus.cz>> (last accessed 7 July 2016).

## 7 Resumé

V současné angličtině se u substantiv zachovává pouze opozice obecného a adnominálního pádu, tento jazyk musí tedy disponovat (analytickými) prostředky pro vyjádření instrumentálního vztahu, v češtině vyjadřovaného synteticky, prostřednictvím flexe. Tato bakalářská práce se zabývá anglickými překladovými protějšky českých bezpředložkových instrumentálních tvarů substantiv, vycházejíc z materiálové základny 110 dokladů excerpovaných z paralelního korpusu *InterCorp* verze 8.

Teoretická část stručně charakterizuje český i anglický pádový systém a nastiňuje dvojí dělení pádů, tj. dělení na pády předložkové a bezpředložkové a dělení na pády syntaktické a sémantické, respektive na syntaktická a sémantická užití pádů. Následně jsou charakterizovány vybrané aspekty českého instrumentálu; v souvislosti s morfologickou charakteristikou je nastíněna problematika přechodů instrumentálních tvarů k jiným slovním druhům (prepozicím, adverbiiám, ale také interjekcím), jež je relevantní pro práci s automaticky značkovánými korpusy. Kromě toho jsou charakterizovány některé tendence ve vývoji pádového systému současné češtiny, související například s opozicí předložkovosti a bezpředložkovosti (srov. hovorové konstrukce typu *sekat se sekerou*). Mimoto jsou stručně popsána předložková užití instrumentálu a jejich frekvenční, gramatické a sémantické aspekty. Práce se následně zabývá pouze bezpředložkovými užitími instrumentálu, neboť předložkové pády bývají chápány jako „nástavbové“ a podle akademické *Mluvnice češtiny* (MČ2: 199) je „podstatou předložek v rámci komplexní výrazové struktury pádu [...] specifikace a modifikace pádového významu“, jak je popsán pro konstrukce bezpředložkové.

Dominantní část teoretického pojednání o instrumentálu tvoří charakteristika jeho syntaktických funkcí (část analytického, zvláště verbonominálního predikátu; doplněk předmětu; doplněk podmětu; přívlastek; předmět; příslovečné určení a výrazy adverbialní povahy, odpovídající anglickým disjunktům a konjunktům) a sémantických rolí („atribut“ či charakteristika; *patiens*; *agens*; místní určení; časové určení; způsob; srovnávací instrumentál; fázový instrumentál; nástroj, látka či materiál a prostředek v širokém slova smyslu; průvodní okolnosti; příčina; případně také účel; zřetel; míra); tento popis vychází primárně z reprezentativních mluvnic a syntaktických popisů češtiny (Čechová et al., 1996; Daneš et al., 1987; Grepl & Karlík, 1998; Komárek et al., 1986; Šmilauer, 1966), ale také z prací profesorky Panevové (1996, 2014), profesora Uličného (2000, 2012, 2013)

a lingvistů spjatých s funkčním generativním popisem (Kettnerová, 2014; Mikulová et al., 2005; Rysová, 2015).

Další sekce práce se zabývá tím, jaké anglické protějšky by mohly odpovídat českému bezpředložkovému instrumentálu, respektive instrumentálovým formám. Vychází se zde z předpokladu existence sedmi strategií pro kódování komitativních významů (včetně významů instrumentálových) v různých světových jazycích (Lehmann & Shin, 2005); mezi tyto strategie patří vyjadřování prostřednictvím pádů (obvyklé v češtině), vyjadřování pomocí předložek (obvyklé v angličtině), ale také konverze v širším pojetí (v obou jazycích, srov. anglické *to hammer* nebo české *telefonovat* či *cukrovat*) a tzv. lexikální fúze (v obou jazycích, srov. anglické *to kick* a české *kopnout*, implikující použití nohy jakožto nástroje). Je stanovena hypotéza, že českému kódování prostřednictvím pádového systému bude odpovídat především vyjadřování vztahů předložkami, okrajově snad i konverze; naopak se nepředpokládá, že by českým instrumentálovým formám mohla v angličtině odpovídat lexikální fúze. Poté jsou na základě relevantních popisů angličtiny (Biber et al., 2007; Dušková et al., 2012; Quirk et al., 1985) odhadovány jednotlivé předložkové vazby, které by mohly odpovídat českým bezpředložkovým instrumentálovým tvarům substantiv (v závislosti na jejich sémantice).

Metodologická část práce rekapituluje argumenty proti syntaktickému přístupu (např. nejasná hranice mezi předmětem a příslovečným určením vyjádřeným bezpředložkovým instrumentálovým tvarem, ale vůbec nejasná hranice mezi těmito dvěma větnými členy v českých syntaxích; valenční rozvití adjektiv bývá obvykle řazeno k předmětům bez ohledu na sémantiku, stejně tak se rozvití substantiv bez výjimek řadí k přívlastkům, opět bez další sémantické klasifikace) a zdůvodňuje tak příklon k primárně sémantickému přístupu práce.

Tato část práce dále popisuje omezení zkoumaného materiálu: analyzovány jsou pouze bezpředložkové tvary substantiv, z různých důvodů jsou vyřazeny některé sémantické role, především archaické či lexikalizované konstrukce měrového substantivního instrumentálu míry (*Krev se řinula proudem*), srovnávacího instrumentálu (*Zpráva se roznesla bleskem po kraji*) či instrumentálu časového (*Přijde každým okamžikem*).

Materiál byl excerpován z paralelního korpusu *InterCorp* verze 8, resp. z jeho české verze se zarovnanou verzí anglickou, na základě striktně vymezených kritérií pro každou z jedenácti sémantických specifikací (agens, směr, způsob, průvodní okolnosti, fáze,



nástroj, látka či materiál, prostředek, prostředek dějového charakteru, zřetel, příčina). Pro každou z nich bylo excerpováno až 95 dokladů (tj. až pět z každého z devatenácti děl v subkorpusu původní česky psané prózy), z nichž byly náhodně generovány vzorky o deseti dokladech; celkem se tedy pracuje se 110 doklady.

Samotná analytická část práce komentuje jednotlivé vzorky dokladů, snaží se identifikovat primární realizační formy nalezené v anglických protějšcích českých instrumentálních forem vyjadřujících jednotlivé sémantické role, vysvětluje užití sekundárních realizačních forem a pokouší se identifikovat sémantické a gramatické podmínky relevantní pro výběr dané realizační formy. Výsledky analýzy jsou konfrontovány s poznatky z teoretické části.

Poslední část samotné práce shrnuje dílčí závěry vyplývající z rozborů jednotlivých sémantických specifikací a pokouší se je zobecnit. Jak vyplývá z příkladů, z nichž vychází analýza, předložka *with* je primární realizační formou v protějšcích fázových, nástrojových a látkových instrumentálních forem, předložka *in* v protějšcích způsobových a zřetelových instrumentálních tvarů, předložka *by* v protějšcích agentivních instrumentálních tvarů v pasivní diatezi či kauzativní konstrukci a v protějšcích prostředkových instrumentálních tvarů, předložka *through* v protějšcích místních instrumentálních tvarů s významem ‚kudy‘. Různorodost protějšků instrumentálních forem označujících průvodní okolnosti, poukazující na nevyhraněnost této sémantické role, neumožňuje jednoznačné stanovení primární realizační formy.

V závěru je upozorněno také na to, že výše popsaná „pravidla“ pro volbu předložky (vycházející ze sémantické role české instrumentální formy) nemají absolutní platnost, neboť někdy dochází při překladu k posunu v sémantice, jindy při volbě anglické realizační formy hraje roli rekce řídicího slovesa či idiomatičnost. Kromě toho je zmíněna také potenciální preference předložky *by*, následuje-li gerundium, a předložky *with*, následuje-li substantivum, v protějšcích prostředkových instrumentálních tvarů. Je také naznačeno, že určitou roli sehrává informační struktura a kontextová zapojenost, jak je patrné především z případů korespondence českého tematického adverbiale a anglického tematického podmětu.

Závěr práce se také pokouší kriticky zhodnotit některé nevýhody a slabiny zvoleného přístupu.

## 8 Appendix

Appendix Table 1: The sample

	source	original	translation
<b>AGENT</b>			
<b>AGENT1</b>	Hašek: <i>Osudy dobrého vojáka Švejka...</i>	„Co byste tomu řekl, kdybychom vás dali prohlédnout soudními lékaři?“	“What would you say if we were to send you to be examined <b>by</b> court <b>physicians?</b> ”
<b>AGENT2</b>	Jirotka: <i>Saturnin</i>	Nežli mohl schránku otevřít, byl vyrušen domácím <b>zaměstnancem</b> p. Saturninem.	Before he could open the case, he was disturbed <b>by a member of the domestic staff</b> , Mr. Saturnin.
<b>AGENT3</b>	Kohout: <i>Sněžím</i>	Z druhého konce stolu řídila bitvu matka, podporovaná zprava zetěm a mladším <b>synem</b> .	From the other end of the table the mother directed her troops, supported on her right <b>by her</b> son-in-law and younger <b>son</b> .
<b>AGENT4</b>	Kundera: <i>Nesmrtelnost</i>	Ale je něco jiného být opuštěn <b>Bohem</b> našich předků, a je něco jiného, opustil-li nás Bůh – vynálezce kosmického kompjúteru.	Yet it is one thing to be abandoned <b>by the God</b> of our forefathers and another to be abandoned by God the inventor of a cosmic computer.
<b>AGENT5</b>	Kundera: <i>Nesnesitelná lehkost bytí</i>	Dejme tomu, že český prokurátor na začátku let padesátých, který žádal smrt pro nevinného, byl oklamán ruskou tajnou policií i <b>vládou</b> své země.	Let us concede that a Czech public prosecutor in the early fifties who called for the death of an innocent man was deceived <b>by</b> the Russian secret police and <b>the government</b> of his own country.
<b>AGENT6</b>	Škvorecký:	Uvěřil, teprve když jistý	In fact, he hadn't believed

	<i>Hříchy pro pátera Knoxe</i>	mladý pán, nalézající se v situaci označované <b>profesorem</b> pohlavní výchovy jako penis captivus, zavolal na policii, ze studu však ohlásil vraždu.	any of it until a certain young man found himself in a situation labelled penis captivus <b>by the</b> sex education <b>professor</b> ; the young man had called the police, but being bashful he had reported a murder instead.
<b>AGENT7</b>	Škvorecký: <i>Příběh inženýra lidských duší I</i>	Bylo to však pásmo většinou vážné, zněly krásné písně, žádné odrhovačky jako „Dej mi pět minut víc“, ale jako „Kde si Suliko, hvězdo má?“ zlidovělá <b>soudruhem</b> Stalinem, generalissimem.	The program was of course mostly serious and there were beautiful songs – none of your low-brow stuff like “Give Me Five Minutes More” but numbers like “Where Are You, Suliko My Star?” a ditty popularised <b>by Comrade</b> Stalin, the Generalissimo.
<b>AGENT8</b>	Topol: <i>Chladnou zemí</i>	Kdykoli bylo třeba, Lebo, často doprovázený právě <b>Sárou</b> , a někdy také dalšími dívkami, odcestoval do banky a vybral potřebný obnos.	Whenever we needed funds, Lebo, usually accompanied <b>by Sara</b> , and sometimes by other girls as well, would make a trip to the bank in Prague and withdraw the required amount.
<b>AGENT9</b>	Topol: <i>Sestra</i>	...hladil svůj růženec s masivními olovenými kuličkami v každé stopě cesty kříže a utrpení na tom drátu zašitým v kůži a dotýkaném samotným <b>Papou</b> po Bohlerově cestě po kolenou do velký Romy...	...he said, stroking his rosary with the massive lead beads touched <b>by the Papa</b> himself after Bohler went on his knees all the way to Roma the great...

<b>AGENT10</b>	Viewegh: <i>Výchova dívek v Čechách</i>	Šest měsíců bez prémie a osobního ohodnocení – exemplární potrestání <b>ředitelem</b> školy, který před tribunou ústředního výboru Komunistické strany Československa déle než dvacet let pochodoval v prvomájových průvodech.	Six months' loss of bonuses and merit awards – an exemplary penalty <b>from a principal</b> who had marched past the platform of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia on May Day marches for more than twenty years.
<b>DIRECTION</b>			
<b>DIR1</b>	Klíma: <i>Láska a smetí</i>	Tak jsem se tedy bral v oranžové vestě <b>uličkami</b> a ulicemi domovského města, které se zvolna vzdávalo ducha, mí druzi jako svědci po mém boku.	Thus I moved in my orange vest <b>through the little streets</b> and lanes of my native city which was slowly giving up its spirit, my companions at my side as witnesses.
<b>DIR2</b>	Kohout: <i>Hvězdná hodina vrahů</i>	Když procházel za jeho zády <b>předpokojem</b> , zkusil Morava Jitce naznačit pokrčením ramen, že netuší, co se děje	As he followed Beran out <b>through the anteroom</b> , Morava tried to signal Jitka with a shrug of his shoulders that he had no idea what was happening.
<b>DIR3</b>	Kohout: <i>Hvězdná hodina vrahů</i>	když se v Berlíně trochu zotavila z toho příšerného ústupu <b>Pruskem</b>	She'd recuperated a bit in Berlin after that horrible retreat <b>through Prussia...</b>
<b>DIR4</b>	Kohout: <i>Sněžím</i>	Naskočil mi obraz, jak padá <b>vzduchem</b> za svou ženou.	The picture of him falling <b>through the air</b> after his wife jumped to mind.
<b>DIR5</b>	Páral: <i>Milenci a vrazi</i>	...Alex po jeho boku rozkošnický projížděl přemoženou <b>Evropou</b>	...at his side Alex traveled <b>across</b> vanquished <b>Europe</b> , lasciviously, with the loop of

		s poutkem černého jezdeckého bičíku na svém zápěstí.	a black riding crop around his wrist.
<b>DIR6</b>	Páral: <i>Milenci a vrazi</i>	Jde <b>chodbou</b> .	She's walking <b>down the hall</b> .
<b>DIR7</b>	Škvorecký: <i>Hříchy pro pátera Knoxe</i>	A ujížděli jsme příjemně příjemnou kalifornskou <b>nocí</b> ...	It's a pleasant drive <b>through</b> a pleasant California <b>night</b> ...
<b>DIR8</b>	Škvorecký: <i>Příběh inženýra lidských duší II</i>	Byl jsem proto hodně nervózní, když jsem se po menším usilovném pochodu mnoha <b>dlouhými chodbami</b> v domě na Letné dostal k pracovníku, z jehož pera [...] vzešel úvodník.	Therefore I was extremely chary when, after a somewhat exhausting march <b>along</b> many <b>corridors</b> of the Ministry headquarters on Letna, I was shown in to the official whose pen [...] had spawned the article.
<b>DIR9</b>	Stýblová: <i>Skalpel, prosím</i>	Plavu tmou tmavou, neklidnou <b>řekou</b> .	I was swimming <b>along a</b> dark and turbulent <b>river</b> which was flowing through some kind of gorge or valley.
<b>DIR10</b>	Topol: <i>Sestra</i>	Pak jsem šel <b>městem</b> k domům kmene...	Then I walked <b>through the city</b> to the home of the tribe...
<b>MANNER</b>			
<b>MANN1</b>	Hašek: <i>Osudy dobrého vojáka Švejka...</i>	„To je vidět podle protokolu, který jste podepsal,“ neméně laskavým <b>tónem</b> řekl soudní rada, „nedělali na vás nějaký nátlak na policii?“	“That's evident from what you have signed,” the amiable magistrate replied, <b>in an</b> equally kind <b>tone</b> . “They didn't pressure you in any way at the police station?”
<b>MANN2</b>	Jirotko: <i>Saturnin</i>	Při chůzi zvláštním <b>způsobem</b> poskakuje a špulí rty.	When out walking she prances about <b>in</b> her own inimitable <b>manner</b> and pouts

			her lips.
<b>MANN3</b>	Kohout: <i>Hvězdná hodina vrahů</i>	- Hlášení! přál si podobaný téměř <b>polohlasem</b> .	- Report, the pock-marked man requested <b>in a half-whisper</b> .
<b>MANN4</b>	Kundera: <i>Nesnesitelná lehkost bytí</i>	„Pryč,“ řekl <b>přísným hlasem</b> .	‘Away,’ he answered <b>sternly</b> .
<b>MANN5</b>	Otčenášek: <i>Romeo, Julie a tma</i>	...jen loudavý krok starých pendlovek proklepává zeď svým jednotvárným <b>rytmem</b> .	Only the sluggish step of the old pendulum clock taps through the wall <b>in monotonous rhythm</b> .
<b>MANN6</b>	Páral: <i>Milenci a vrazi</i>	„Klekní si!“ křikl úplně jiným <b>hlasem</b> .	“Kneel!” he shouted <b>in a completely different voice</b> .
<b>MANN7</b>	Škvorecký: <i>Hříchy pro pátera Knoxe</i>	Pak recepční znovu pokynul urostlému muži a všichni tři se vydali <b>husím pochodem</b> po chodbě.	On the third floor, they followed the same order of precedence, and the three of them proceeded down the hallway <b>in single file</b> .
<b>MANN8</b>	Škvorecký: <i>Příběh inženýra lidských duší I</i>	Možná že se těší, jak uslyší další klasickou pasáž čtenou komickým <b>akcentem</b> .	Perhaps they are hoping to hear another classic passage delivered <b>in a comic accent</b> .
<b>MANN9</b>	Stýblová: <i>Skalpel, prosím</i>	„Teď už je mu pět roků,“ hovoří <b>monotónním hlasem</b> , jako by vyprávěla pohádku v mateřské školce.	“He’s already five years old now,” she continued <b>monotonously</b> , as if she were telling a fairytale in a kindergarten.
<b>MANN10</b>	Viewegh: <i>Výchova dívek v Čechách</i>	Tváře kolegyň známým <b>způsobem</b> potemněly a jejich gesta zvláčněla.	The faces of the female colleagues darkened <b>in typical fashion</b> and their gestures softened.

ACCOMPANYING CIRCUMSTANCES			
<b>ACMP1</b>	Hašek: <i>Osudy dobrého vojáka Švejka...</i>	Byli u kuchyně, obírali maso z kostí a těšili se pohledem na uvázaného Balouna, který stál sice pevně opřen <b>nohama</b> na zemi, poněvadž se nad ním slitovali, ale zato poskytoval zajímavý pohled.	They were at the kitchen, picking meat off the bones and enjoying the sight of the tethered Baloun who was standing, that is resting firmly <b>with both feet</b> on the ground, because they broke down and had mercy on him, but he in turn was offering an interesting sight.
<b>ACMP2</b>	Kohout: <i>Sněžím</i>	Kuriózní známku jeho existence jsem později objevila na WC: rozevřenou českou detektivku položenou na okénku <b>hřbetem</b> vzhůru.	Later I found a curious sign of his existence in the bathroom: an open Czech detective novel placed on the windowsill <b>with its spine</b> face up.
<b>ACMP3</b>	Kundera: <i>Nesmrtelnost</i>	Vstal a postavil se k nám <b>zády</b> .	He rose and stood <b>with his back</b> to us.
<b>ACMP4</b>	Kundera: <i>Nesnesitelná lehkost bytí</i>	Ta laskavost jí rvala srdce a ona se obrátila <b>tváří</b> ke kůře stromu a rozplakala se.	His kindness tore at her heartstrings, and she turned <b>her face</b> to the bark of the tree and burst into tears.
<b>ACMP5</b>	Kundera: <i>Žert</i>	...jejich řada stála teď pod pódiem po celé jeho délce a <b>byla obrácena tvářemi</b> k půlkruhu sedících žen a do sálu.	...they stood in a line before the dais, covering the whole of its length and <b>facing</b> the seated women and the audience.
<b>ACMP6</b>	Páral: <i>Milenci a vrazi</i>	Nazí a po kolena v moři, <b>zády</b> k evropské pevnině, se spojenýma rukama hleděli Borek a Jana k severu...	Naked, standing in the sea up to their knees, <b>their backs</b> to the European continent, hand in hand, Borek and Jana looked north...

<b>ACMP7</b>	Škvorecký: <i>Hřích pro pátera Knoxe</i>	Oba hoši se poslušně otočili <b>čelem</b> k baculaté barokní madoně s trošku moc tlustým Jezuletem.	The two lads turned away obediently, and continued their cosy gossip <b>facing</b> a plump Baroque madonna holding an excessively chubby Christ child.
<b>ACMP8</b>	Škvorecký: <i>Příběh inženýra lidských duší I</i>	Irena se otočila na pohovce <b>zády</b> ke mně, jednu nohu složenou pod sebe.	Irena turned <b>her back</b> to me on the sofa, one leg folded under her.
<b>ACMP9</b>	Topol: <i>Sestra</i>	...letěl jsem první, ale najednou vidím přítele Žraloka, letěl přede mnou, <b>botama</b> napřed...	I was flying in front, until suddenly Sharky went flying past, <b>shoes</b> first...
<b>ACMP10</b>	Topol: <i>Sestra</i>	Tomu jsem úplně uvěřil, až když jsem kudlici zas držel já, <b>ostřím</b> k němu.	I didn't totally trust him till I had the blade back in my hand, <b>edge</b> toward him.
<b>PHASE</b>			
<b>PHASE1</b>	Hašek: <i>Osudy dobrého vojáka Švejka...</i>	Dauerling stále zachovává na cvičišti onen nenucený kasárenský tón, začínající slovem svině a končící podivnou zoologickou <b>záhadou</b> : svinským psem.	On the training ground Dauerling continuously preserves that nonchalant garrison tone, beginning with the word swine and ending <b>with a</b> strange zoological <b>puzzle</b> : swiney dog.
<b>PHASE2</b>	Kohout: <i>Hvězdná hodina vrahů</i>	Končila <b>nařízením</b> , aby byly pečlivě probrány žurnální knihy...	It ended <b>with a directive</b> to review all the old police blotters...
<b>PHASE3</b>	Kohout: <i>Sněžím</i>	Skončilo to snad domovní <b>prohlídkou</b> , i vy dva jste prý měli být u výslechu, že, dostala jsem pocit, že právě	It must have ended <b>with a house search</b> , you two were supposedly at the inquiry, which, I got the feeling, was



		tím přetekla jeho číše a on se rozhodl odejít.	the straw that broke the camel's back and made him decide to emigrate.
<b>PHASE4</b>	Kohout: <i>Sněžím</i>	Mé úniky (spíš úskoky, zakončené mocným <b>přískokem</b> ) byly projevem pudu sebezáchovy...	My flights (or rather dodges, followed <b>by</b> powerful <b>leaps back</b> ) were a manifestation of my instinct for self-preservation...
<b>PHASE5</b>	Kundera: <i>Nesmrtelnost</i>	Láska Anny Kareniny a Vronského skončila jejich prvním sexuálním <b>aktem</b> ...	The love of Anna Karenina and Vronski ended <b>with their</b> first sexual <b>encounter</b> ...
<b>PHASE6</b>	Kundera: <i>Nesnesitelná lehkost bytí</i>	Pronásledování nepředstavitelného však nekončí <b>objevem</b> nahoty, ale pokračuje dál: jak se bude chovat, až ji svlékne?	And then, the pursuit of the unimaginable does not stop <b>with the revelations</b> of nudity; it goes much further: How would she behave while undressing?
<b>PHASE7</b>	Kundera: <i>Žert</i>	...i kdyby to bylo možné a já opravdu vymazal těch několik zbytečných dnů ze svého života, co to pomůže, když celý můj životní příběh byl počat v omylu, špatným žertem pohlednice, tou náhodou, tím <b>nesmyslem</b> ?	...even if I were able to wipe these few pointless days out of my life, what good would that do, when the entire story of my life was conceived in error, <b>through</b> the bad joke of the postcard, that accident, <b>that nonsense</b> ?
<b>PHASE8</b>	Otčenášek: <i>Romeo, Julie a tma</i>	A dívky, plaché, prchavé schůzky na Petříně, zakončené neobratným <b>polibkem</b> před zavřenými vraty domu, mdlá vůně voňavky, zvědavost a touha prostoupená zahanbující bázní před čímsi	And the girls – shy, fleeting moments in Petřín park, ending <b>in an</b> awkward <b>kiss</b> before the house-door opens, a whiff of stale scent, curiosity and desire mingled with a humiliating fear of something as yet unknown...

		neznámým...	
<b>PHASE9</b>	Škvorecký: <i>Příběh inženýra lidských duší I</i>	Moje známost s Milanem málem začala <b>průšvihem</b> a není vůbec vyloučeno, že průšvihem skončí.	My acquaintance with Milan began <b>with a potentially dangerous mix-up</b> , and it is by no means certain that it will not end that way.
<b>PHASE10</b>	Viewegh: <i>Výchova dívek v Čechách</i>	Drobnou kytičku písni [...] zahájil dívčí pěvecký sbor říznou <b>skladbou</b> It's a Long Way to Tipperrary.	The girls' choir, <b>with their</b> vigorous <b>rendition</b> of It's a Long Way to Tipperary, kicked off The Little Garland of Songs...
<b>INSTRUMENT</b>			
<b>INSTR1</b>	Hůlová: <i>Paměť mojí babičky</i>	Malá Ojuna, když viděla, že si s Narou něco šuškáme a tisknem se k sobě, tak mi začla <b>pěstma</b> bušit do stehů a rvát se mezi nás, aby náhodou o něco nepřišla.	Whenever little Oyuna saw me and Nara whispering and cuddling up to each other, she would pound my thighs <b>with her fists</b> and force her way in between us to make sure she didn't miss out.
<b>INSTR2</b>	Klíma: <i>Láska a smetí</i>	Kapitán se napil grogu, vytáhl dýmku a zdravou <b>rukou</b> si nacpal.	The captain took a swig of grog, pulled out his pipe and filled it <b>with his good hand</b> .
<b>INSTR3</b>	Kohout: <i>Hvězdná hodina vrahů</i>	Spíš <b>rozkuchat nožem</b> břicho... napadlo Bubacka.	Or perhaps <b>slicing</b> its stomach open, Buback thought.
<b>INSTR4</b>	Kohout: <i>Sněžím</i>	Namíchla jsem se: nejsem pro blázny, a už nejmíň jí, chce si se mnou hrát jak kočka s myší, než po mně sekne <b>drápem</b> ?	It made my blood boil. I won't be taken for a fool, especially not by her; does she want to play cat and mouse with me before she lashes out <b>with her claws</b> ?
<b>INSTR5</b>	Páral: <i>Milenci a vrazi</i>	Honem to zamlouvala, jestli prej nechcu něco ke svačině	She immediately apologized and asked if I'd like a snack,

		a tak jsem si dala udělat tatarskej biftek ze syrovýho masa – Gráfka ho dělá z pravý svíčkový a žádný jen mletí ve strojku, ale poctivý ruční naškrábání masa <b>nožem</b> – „A spoustu cibule k tomu!“	and so I had her make steak tartare – The old lady makes it out of real sirloin, no less, not grinding it in a machine, but honestly pounding it <b>with a knife</b> – “With lots of onions!”
<b>INSTR6</b>	Škvorecký: <i>Hříchy pro pátera Knoxe</i>	A já z toho byla tak štajf, že sem tam po vodzpívání zůstala stát u mikrouše jako solnej sloup, Jarda Štrúdl mě musel drcnout do zadku <b>saxofonem</b> , tak sem byla zafixovaná...	And I was so wiped out by the whole thing that after I finished singing I just stood there in front of the mike like a pillar of salt, Jarda Strudl had to poke me in the behind <b>with his saxophone</b> , I was that rigid...
<b>INSTR7</b>	Škvorecký: <i>Příběh inženýra lidských duší I</i>	Mistr Vachoušek ťukal <b>šuplérrou</b> do modráku na stole.	Vachousek tapped the blueprint on his table <b>with a pair of callipers</b> .
<b>INSTR8</b>	Topol: <i>Sestra</i>	Pohybovali jsme se v té slasti, a pak mě mozek Psice poslal ke stařeně, která <b>nabírala lopatkou</b> uhlí do kýblů, náhle jsem uslyšel cinknutí lopatky o kbelík, ostře jak strunu, a pak mě poslala na cestu po stařeně.	We were moving in bliss, and then She-Dog's brain sent me to an old woman <b>shoveling</b> coal into pails, suddenly I heard the clink of shovel on pail, clear as a bell, and then she sent me on a journey through the old woman.
<b>INSTR9</b>	Topol: <i>Výlet k nádražní hale</i>	Mičinec byl starší o tolik, že mě kdysi napálil: za střepy z rozbité lahve jsem mu vyměnil otcovy hodinky, kvůli Maškalířový mě zranil bruslema, zlomil mi luk zn.	Mičinec had enough years on me to have taken me more than once: I'd traded him my father's watch for some pieces of broken bottle, he'd slashed me with his skates

		Malý bizon, páčil mé <b>zapalovačem</b> , donášel...	over the Maškalířová girl, snapped my Little Bison bow in two, burned me <b>with his lighter</b> , ratted on me...
<b>INSTR10</b>	Viewegh: <i>Výchova dívek v Čechách</i>	Na nejbližším rovném úseku jsem se <b>prstem</b> lehce dotkl Beátina nahého stehna – a druhou rukou jsem ukázal na zářivý kotouč slunce:	At the first straight section of road I lightly touched Beata's bare thigh <b>with my finger</b> and with my other hand pointed at the radiant ball of the sun:
<b>MATERIAL</b>			
<b>MAT1</b>	Hůlová: <i>Paměť mojí babičce</i>	Pravou sešvihala proutím a levou namazala <b>mastma</b> , a pak zas naopak.	First she whipped the right with a switch and smeared the left <b>with ointments</b> , then the other way around.
<b>MAT2</b>	Kohout: <i>Sněžím</i>	Přetáhla jsem si svetr, doupravila vlasy a postříkala je silně <b>lakem</b> (aby i na motorce čelily větru).	I pulled on a sweater, finished doing my hair, and shellacked it <b>with a strong hair spray</b> (so that it'd stand up to the wind even on the bike).
<b>MAT3</b>	Otčenášek: <i>Romeo, Julie a tma</i>	Občas sem vtrhla parta kluků z jejich třídy a naplnila pokojík <b>halasem svých hrdel</b> .	Occasionally a gang of lads from his class would crowd in, filling the tiny room <b>with their noisy voices</b> .
<b>MAT4</b>	Otčenášek: <i>Romeo, Julie a tma</i>	Otevřel spíž, nakrájel v rychlosti pár tlustých krajíců, namazal je rozměkklým <b>margarínem</b> , do prázdné láhve od sodovky scedil trochu ranní melty...	He looked into the pantry and hurriedly cut a couple of thick slices of bread, spread them <b>with</b> softened <b>marge</b> and strained some of the breakfast ersatz into a soda-water bottle.
<b>MAT5</b>	Páral: <i>Milenci a vrazi</i>	Julda povzdechl, vstal, ukrojil Maddě chléb	Julda sighed, got up, cut Madda a piece of bread and

		a namazal jej kvasnicovou <b>pomazánkou</b> .	spread it <b>with</b> yeast <b>paste</b> .
<b>MAT6</b>	Páral: <i>Milenci a vrazi</i>	Ale mně je teď báječně... sám jste mi jednou řekl, že už nikdy nebudu tak šťasten jako teď na kavalci vycpaném <b>senem</b> .	But I feel fabulous now... you yourself once told me that I'd never be as happy as I am right now on a mattress stuffed <b>with</b> <b>straw</b> .
<b>MAT7</b>	Škvorecký: <i>Příběh inženýra lidských duší II</i>	Byla v texaskách, k zalknutí krásně vyplněných štíhlými <b>stehny</b> a šponujících přes holčičí zadeček.	She was wearing jeans, filled breathtakingly <b>with</b> slender <b>thighs</b> and stretched tightly across her little-girl bottom.
<b>MAT8</b>	Škvorecký: <i>Příběh inženýra lidských duší II</i>	„Ou – ou – “ táže se děťátko, čelo orosené <b>potem</b> , francouzštinou z Toronta: „la – la toilette?“	“Où est-ò est-” the child asks in her Toronto French, her forehead bedewed <b>with</b> <b>perspiration</b> , “la – la toilette?”
<b>MAT9</b>	Topol: <i>Sestra</i>	Dal jsem jí aspoň ponožky a ona obojí vycpala <b>listím</b> , dala si do bot kůru, šla v rozepnutých... šli jsme mlčky...	I gave her my socks and she stuffed them <b>with</b> <b>leaves</b> , put bark in her boots, left em untied... we walked on in silence...
<b>MAT10</b>	Topol: <i>Sestra</i>	Obrysy hald, zvlněný hřbet Skládky, tak k takovémuhle moři sem doputoval, nešumí příliš, nepřevalujou se tu hřebeny vln, jeden přes druhý, dopředu a nikam... ale Skládka žila, vespod, někdy to bouchalo, jednou jsem viděl vyrazit oheň, porušil stezku, ale protože všechno bylo nasáklý <b>vlhkem</b> z dešťů, oheň se	Silhouettes of trash heaps undulated through the Dump, so this was the sea I'd finally reached, not much murmuring, no waves crashing, one over the other, going forward, going nowhere... but underneath, the Dump was alive, sometimes it erupted, once I saw a fire break out, breach a trail, but since everything

		nikdy nerozšířil...	was soggy <b>with moisture</b> from the rain, the fires never spread...
<b>SIMPLE MEANS</b>			
<b>MEANS1</b>	Hůlová: <i>Paměť mojí babičky</i>	Munchceceg byla mámina sestřenice, která měla taky skoro jen samý dcery a bydlela s nima a se svým manželem Majdarem asi den cesty <b>autem</b> od našeho geru ve vedlejším ajmaku.	Munkhtsetseg was a cousin of Mama's who also had almost all daughters. She lived with them and her husband, Maidar, about a day's journey <b>by car</b> from our ger, in the next aimak over, and they had invited us to come and taste their koumiss.
<b>MEANS2</b>	Jirotko: <i>Saturnin</i>	Saturnin <b>hledal inzerátem</b> v novinách místo sluhy za podmínek, které jsem mohl přijmout, a měl několik velmi dobrých doporučení.	Saturnin <b>advertised</b> in the newspapers for the position of manservant, under conditions which I felt able to accept, and he had several very good references.
<b>MEANS3</b>	Kohout: <i>Hvězdná hodina vrahů</i>	Místo toho Beran vstal a překvapil ho podivnou <b>otázkou</b> .	Instead, Beran stood up, surprising him <b>with an odd question</b> .
<b>MEANS4</b>	Kohout: <i>Hvězdná hodina vrahů</i>	Mezi milováním a při jejím vyprávění stále ještě popíjeli šampaňské, kterého sem dopravila hned na počátku <b>taxíkem</b> tři bedýnky, celou Meckerleho zásobu.	Between lovemaking and her stories they sipped champagne; right at the beginning she'd hauled three cases of it over <b>in a taxi</b> , Meckerle's entire stock.
<b>MEANS5</b>	Kohout: <i>Sněžím</i>	Autem křižoval republiku a <b>letadly</b> celou Evropu...	He crisscrossed the republic by car and Europe <b>by plane</b> .
<b>MEANS6</b>	Kundera: <i>Nesnesitelná lehkost bytí</i>	Tomáš za ní přišel po pracovní době, <b>zavolal jí telefonem</b> z recepce a potom	Tomas went to see her after work. He <b>phoned</b> first from the reception desk, then went

		šel za ní.	upstairs.
<b>MEANS7</b>	Páral: <i>Milenci a vrazi</i>	Tramvaje začaly jezdit a Jana si přijela <b>šestnáctkou...</b>	The streetcars have started running again and Jana arrived <b>on number sixteen...</b>
<b>MEANS8</b>	Škvorecký: <i>Hříchy pro pátera Knoxe</i>	Raglánka jsem musela z Granady odvézt domů <b>taxíkem...</b>	I had to take Rags home from the Granada <b>by taxicab...</b>
<b>MEANS9</b>	Škvorecký: <i>Příběh inženýra lidských duší II</i>	Seděli jsme nad jízdním řádem v bratrancově bytě, na skříni hrálo starobylé rádio s pietně uchovaným varováním, také z protektorátu, že poslech cizího rozhlasu se trestá v těžkých případech i <b>smrtí</b> .	We sat looking at the timetable in the cousin's flat. There was an old radio on the cupboard with a nostalgically preserved card on one of the knobs, also from the days of the protectorate, warning that listening to foreign radio stations was punishable, in extreme cases, <b>by death...</b>
<b>MEANS10</b>	Topol: <i>Sestra</i>	Rudolf mi vbod drogu a mně se tohle všechno zdá a jedu <b>autem</b> s fízlama...	Rudolf injected me with some drug and this whole thing is just a dream, I'm ridin <b>in the car</b> with the spooks...
<b>ACTIONAL MEANS</b>			
<b>MEANS11</b>	Hůlová: <i>Paměť mojí babičce</i>	Jednou mě poslaly hledat argal divokejch horskejch koz, ale když jsem přinesla náš, od tátova dobytka, nechaly se napálit. Lhaním a <b>vymejšlením</b> se dá plno věcí ulehčit. Nic jinýho jsem se od sestry nenaučila. Mý srdce ale nebylo od přirozenosti zlomyslný...	One day they sent me out looking for wild mountain goat argal, but I came back with our own, from Papa's herd, and they got blamed for it. Lying and <b>making things up</b> made all sorts of things easier. That was all I learned from my sister. But my heart wasn't spiteful by nature...
<b>MEANS12</b>	Jirotko:	To děvče ho chodilo	The girl went to visit him,

	<i>Saturnin</i>	navštěvovat, plakalo a zdálo se, že si ji tím <b>průstřelem</b> plíc, jak ona říkala, vybojoval.	shed some tears and it seemed as though, in her own words, he had won her heart <b>by puncturing</b> his lung with a bullet.
<b>MEANS13</b>	Klíma: <i>Láska a smetí</i>	Nedokázal se osvobodit jinak než svým <b>psaním</b> .	He was unable to liberate himself except <b>by his writing</b> .
<b>MEANS14</b>	Kohout: <i>Sněžím</i>	Předběhl jsem to <b>podpisem</b> Charty.	I headed them off <b>by signing</b> the human rights document Charter 77.
<b>MEANS15</b>	Kohout: <i>Sněžím</i>	Byla v kritickém věku, hrozila <b>útekem</b> z domova a ještě horšími věcmi.	She was at a critical age; she was threatening <b>to run away</b> from home and even worse things.
<b>MEANS16</b>	Kohout: <i>Sněžím</i>	Slyšela jsem ho nastartovat (konečně!) a zpomalila, abych na něho trapně nečekala u domu, vlekla jsem se co noha nohu mine a maskovala to <b>hledáním</b> klíčů v kabelce.	I heard him start the engine (finally!) and slowed down, so I wouldn't have to wait for him awkwardly in front of the house; I dragged my feet and disguised it <b>by looking for</b> my keys in my bag.
<b>MEANS17</b>	Kundera: <i>Žert</i>	...potom přistoupil k mikrofonu také Togliatti a pronesl italsky krátký projev a náměstí odpovědělo jako vždy voláním, <b>tleskáním</b> , skandováním.	...and then Togliatti himself went up to the microphone and said a few words in Italian, and the whole square responded as usual <b>by shouting and clapping</b> and chanting slogans.
<b>MEANS18</b>	Páral: <i>Milenci a vrazi</i>	Až když jednou při mši zanotoval (na počest choti frančtináře) z kůru několik taktů toreadorské písně,	Not until he sang a few notes (in honor of the French teacher's wife) of a toreador song during mass did the



		vykázal ho regenschori na místě ze svého chóru hněvivým <b>napřažením</b> ruky k temné díře věžního schodiště.	choirmaster banish him from the choir, <b>pointing</b> a furious finger toward the dark hole of the spiral staircase.
<b>MEANS19</b>	Škvorecký: <i>Příběh inženýra lidských duší I</i>	Moc jsem v jeho existenci nevěřil, jenže jeho neexistencí jsem si nebyl jist, tak jsem se zasichroval <b>modlením</b> .	I did not believe much in His existence, yet neither was I entirely sure of His non-existence, so I covered my bets <b>by praying</b> .
<b>MEANS20</b>	Viewegh: <i>Výchova dívek v Čechách</i>	Její nejúčinnější zbraní se ovšem jednoznačně stal dálkový ovladač hi-fi věže Panasonic: ležela bez hnutí na břiše, ovladač skrytý pod tělem, a nechala místnost naplnit těžkým, dusivým tichem – aby ji pak v jediném zlomku vteřiny nepostřehnutelným <b>přesunutím</b> tlaku na příslušný prst vyhodila do povětří.	Her most effective weapon, however, turned out to be the remote control of the Panasonic hi-fi tower: she would lie motionless on her stomach, the control unit hidden under her, allowing the room to fill with a heavy, stifling silence, before blowing it to smithereens in a split second, <b>by an imperceptible change</b> of pressure on the relevant finger.
<b>VIEWPOINT</b>			
<b>VIEW1</b>	Klíma: <i>Láska a smetí</i>	Pokoj <b>vzhledem</b> i rozměry připomínal spíše kajutu.	The room's <b>appearance</b> and dimensions suggested a ship's cabin.
<b>VIEW2</b>	Klíma: <i>Láska a smetí</i>	Uprostřed zahrady Eden roste strom života, jeho větve se pnou nad celou zahradou a skýtají pět set tisíc druhů ovoce – všechny odlišné	In the midst of the Garden of Eden grows the Tree of Life, its branches reach out over the whole garden and provide five hundred thousand kinds

		vzhledem i <b>chutí</b> .	of fruit – all different <b>in</b> appearance and <b>taste</b> .
<b>VIEW3</b>	Kohout: <i>Hvězdná hodina vrahů</i>	Štíhlý a prošedivělý, vypadal ze všech nejlíp a výrazně se od nich lišil <b>chováním</b> i tónem.	Slender and gray-haired, he looked like the most reasonable of the lot and differed noticeably from the rest <b>in his behavior</b> and tone.
<b>VIEW4</b>	Kohout: <i>Hvězdná hodina vrahů</i>	Buback znal své pappenheimské od toho spolku. Takové drzosti musel učinit přítrž hned, jinak by na něm ten chlap brzo štípal dříví. Propůjčenou <b>hodností</b> se mu ostatně rovnal!	Buback knew the type. He would have to put a stop to this arrogance straightaway or the man would wipe the floor with him. After all, Buback's borrowed <b>rank</b> made them equals.
<b>VIEW5</b>	Kohout: <i>Sněžím</i>	Lišily jsme se podstatněji jen <b>zkušeností</b> (bod pro mě), věkem (bod pro ni) a hlavně tím, že ona zůstávala těm hodnotám věrná...	We differed more substantially only <b>in our experience</b> (a point for me), our age (a point for her), and, most important, in that she had remained true to her values.
<b>VIEW6</b>	Kundera: <i>Nesmrtelnost</i>	Ostatně veškerým svým zjevem i <b>chováním</b> odpovídala loutnička představě ženy-epizody: byla elegantní, ale nenápadná, krásná, aniž oslňovala, ochotná k fyzické lásce, a přece nesmělá...	Besides, <b>in her</b> appearance and <b>behaviour</b> the lute-player fitted exactly the idea of the woman-episode: she was elegant yet not ostentatious, beautiful without being dazzling, ready for physical love and yet shy...
<b>VIEW7</b>	Kundera: <i>Žert</i>	...předstíral jsem, že jsem starší (duchem a <b>zkušenostmi</b> ), než jsem	I tried to impress her by donning a mask and pretending to be older ( <b>in</b>

		byl...	spirit and <b>experience</b> ) than I was...
<b>VIEW8</b>	Kundera: <i>Žert</i>	...tak jako zpustošili Lucii tělesnou lásku a obrali tak její život o nejelementárnější hodnotu, i můj život byl okraden o hodnoty, o něž se mínil opírat a jež byly svým <b>původem</b> ryzí a nevinné;	...just as physical love had been devastated for Lucie, thus depriving her life of a basic value, so my life had been robbed of values that were to have provided its foundations, and that were <b>in origin</b> pure and innocent...
<b>VIEW9</b>	Škvorecký: <i>Příběh inženýra lidských duší II</i>	Samo o sobě to nebylo nic zvláštního: do Bulvárky chodili nejen lovci holek, ale taky aficionados, <b>duchem</b> obvykle trochu chudí, na muziku často poněkud nahluchlí, ale cele soustředění na okázalou vášně.	This in itself was nothing strange. The Boulevard was frequented not only by girl-hunters but by aficionados of jazz as well, usually a little wanting <b>in intellect</b> , often with a rather poor ear for music, but utterly obsessed with their ostentatious passion.
<b>VIEW10</b>	Stýblová: <i>Skalpel, prosím</i>	<b>Zevnějškem</b> trochu ano, to jistě, ale má v sobě dál takovou tu jiskru.	<b>In external appearance</b> , a little, certainly, but she still has the same old spark inside her.
<b>CAUSE</b>			
<b>CAUSE1</b>	Hašek: <i>Osudy dobrého vojáka Švejka...</i>	Když to všechno leželo vybaleno na posteli, baronka von Botzenheim nemohla se <b>pohnutím</b> udržet slz.	When all of it lay unwrapped on the bed, Baroness von Botzenheim was so <b>moved</b> she couldn't hold back her tears.
<b>CAUSE2</b>	Jirotka: <i>Saturnin</i>	Já jsem nezůstal pozadu a slečna Barbora celá <b>radostí</b> zrudověla.	I did not allow myself to be left behind and Miss Barbara turned pink <b>with pleasure</b>

			from head to toe.
<b>CAUSE3</b>	Kohout: <i>Sněžím</i>	A já, věčně prchající lasice [...] jsem se zatetelila <b>slastí</b> , že konečně uvíznu v pevné ruce!	And I, the eternally fleeing weasel, [...] – I shivered <b>with delight</b> that at last I was in strong hands.
<b>CAUSE4</b>	Kundera: <i>Nesmrtelnost</i>	Lidé se před vámi třesou <b>úctou</b> , takže se mi všechny moje manželky i se starou Gertrudou Steinovou zdaleka vyhýbají.	You make everybody tremble <b>with respect</b> , and so all my wives as well as old Gertrude Stein are giving me a wide berth.
<b>CAUSE5</b>	Otčenášek: <i>Romeo, Julie a tma</i>	Vyskočil z vlahého tepla, drkotaje <b>chladem</b> .	He jumped out of his warm bed, chattering <b>with cold</b> .
<b>CAUSE6</b>	Škvorecký: <i>Příběh inženýra lidských duší I</i>	Santnerová se třese, snad <b>vztekem</b> , ale možná lítostí.	Mrs. Santner is trembling, perhaps <b>from anger</b> but possibly from sorrow as well.
<b>CAUSE7</b>	Škvorecký: <i>Příběh inženýra lidských duší I</i>	„Vida, náš demokratickej hrdina! <b>Strachem</b> se pochcal!“	“Well, well, well, if it isn't our democratic hero! So <b>scared</b> he's pissed himself!”
<b>CAUSE8</b>	Stýblová: <i>Skalpel, prosím</i>	Šplhám na okno jako lasička a vřískám <b>nadšením</b> .	I was clambering up to the window like a weasel, squealing <b>with excitement</b> .
<b>CAUSE9</b>	Topol: <i>Chladnou zemí</i>	Když se bandita zastavil před prahem místnosti pana Máry, ztuhly mu <b>hrůzou</b> nohy, pomohl jsem mu.	But when he came to the threshold of Mr Mara's room, he pulled up short, his legs frozen <b>with horror</b> , and I helped him.
<b>CAUSE10</b>	Viewegh: <i>Výchova dívek</i>	Vyjekl jsem úlekem a <b>bolestí</b> .	I yelped <b>in</b> astonishment and <b>pain</b> .

	v <i>Čechách</i>		
--	------------------	--	--

**Appendix Table 2: Examples used in the theoretical part**

	source	Czech version	English version
<b>DISJUNCTS</b>			
DISJ1	Škvorecký: <i>Příběh inženýra lidských duší I</i>	<b>Svým způsobem</b> to potvrdilo platnost nápisu, jenž zdobil stránku definitivně poslední...	<b>In a way</b> , this confirmed the validity of the inscription that graced the absolutely final page...
DISJ2	Ishiguro: <i>Never Let Me Go</i>	<b>Svým způsobem</b> to dokazuje, že jsme svou práci dělali dobře.	It demonstrates, <b>in a way</b> , that we did our job well.
DISJ3	Tolkien: <i>The Return of the King</i>	<b>Svým způsobem</b> o moc horší.	Much worse <b>in a way</b> .