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

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

The two languages on which this assumption is tested provide suitable ground insofar as the typological distinctions between English and Czech involve different hierarchies of the operating word order principles: owing to its analytic character, English employs word order primarily to indicate grammatical functions; on the other hand in inflectional Czech the grammatical principle plays a secondary role, syntactic relations being indicated by grammatical endings. Hence Czech word order is free to perform other functions among which indication of the FSP roles of the clause elements ranks highest. Considering these distinctions, similar linear arrangement of corresponding lexical items may be expected to involve differences in syntactic structure.
The present study pursues some aspects of this assumption, taking as a starting point the findings of a diploma dissertation assigned to investigate the constancy of the subject (Čermáková 1999). Commencing the investigation with the subject was motivated by the syntactic features of the subject in English, which in turn largely determine its role in FSP. Owing to the grammatical function of English word order, the English subject mostly occurs in initial position (78.5%, cf. Dušková 1975), which is as a rule the position of the theme. In Czech, on the other hand, the initial thematic position is often occupied by other clause elements, adverbials being nearly as frequent as the subject (29.3% and 33.5%, respectively, cf. Dušková 1975), while the subject fairly often assumes the role of the rheme, and stands at the end (22.4%, cf. Dušková 1986; according to Uhlířová 1974, rhematic subjects account for one third of occurrences). The thematic nature of the English subject was first pointed out by Mathesius (1947), whose ideas were further developed in later studies (Dušková 1975, 1986). In Čermáková's (1999) treatise constancy of substantival and pronominal subjects is investigated in eight parallel texts, two English and two Czech contemporary novels, and their translations into the other language. Identical subjects (i.e. corresponding lexical items construed as the subject in both languages) were counted until the number of nonidentical counterparts of the subject in the other language reached the number 50. In this way the author obtained 100 instances of noncorrespondence in the English-Czech direction, and 100 instances of noncorrespondence in the Czech-English direction. In both directions, instances of correspondence overwhelmingly predominate: 2642 (96.15%) and 2378 (95.65%) as against 100 (3.85%) and 100 (4.35%), respectively (Čermáková 1999: 89, 96).

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

In any case, the degree of interlingual constancy of syntactic function
appears to be very high, and might thus seem to refute the initial assumption
about the relation between syntactic and FSP structure. It should be recalled,
however, that despite typological distinctions, all three languages are mem­
bers of the Indo-European family with a basically identical word class system
and syntactic structure. Moreover, even the fixed grammatical structure of
English (S-V-O, S-V-C_s, etc.) largely coincides with the principle of end
focus. In Dušková (1999b) agreement between the grammatical word order
principle and final placement of the focus in English was found in 62.2%
of instances.

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

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

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

(1) _At dawn she was awakened by the sound of rain_ (BB 56)
    Za svítání ji probudil déšť (BH 62)
    at dawn her ACC awakened rain NOM

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

(2) _— she had toothache that morning_ (BB 10)
    — bolely ji to ráno zuby (BH 13)
    — ached her that morning teeth

(3) _Her face was pale and long._
    Tvář měla bledou a podlouhlou. (S 435)
    face ACC she.had pale and long.
Exx (4) and (5) illustrate the correspondence between the English subject and, respectively, an adverbial and the indirect object in Czech:

(4) her mouth opened to emit a sound (BB 36)
    z pootevřených úst ji unikl zvuk (BH (41)
    from half-opened mouth her DAT escaped sound NOM

(5) Bernie hadn’t after all owned the little house (J 24)
    domek Berniemu vlastně nepatřil (S 432)
    little.house Bernie DAT after.all not.belonged

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

(6) v každém muži je kus sobce (K 23)
    in every man is piece egoist GEN
    every man has a selfish streak in him (H 14)

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

(7) že náš zpěv nikdo nezaslechně (K 22)
    that our singing ACC nobody NOM will.not.hear
    our singing would go unheard (H 13)

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

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

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

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

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

(10) měla jsem aspoň záminku mu zatelefonovat (K 28)
    I.had at.least excuse him DAT phone
    it gave me an excuse to phone him (H 18)
Of the other instances with frequencies of occurrence below ten,² the correspondence between the Czech subject and an adverbial in English needs to be mentioned insofar as the assumption of the superordinate role of the information structure allowed for the correspondence between the English subject and a Czech adverbial, as in ex (4) (16 instances, see above), but not for the same correspondence in the opposite direction. Of the nine attested instances, however, four represent passive counterparts of Czech active sentences whose subject appears as the by-agent in English, cf. (11).

(11) dveře *mi* otevřel predseda výboru (K 40)
    door ACC me DAT opened chairman NOM committee GEN
    I was let in by the chairman of the Party University Committee (H 27)

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

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

Analyzing the factors motivating the attested syntactic changes, Čermáková points out the major role of functional sentence perspective, especially where the correspondence involves the subject in English vs. Czech direct object or adverbial. Generally, both English subject and Czech object or adverbial were contextually bound and represented the theme, whereas the postverbal elements in English (object or adverbial) represented the rhyme and corresponded to the Czech verb or subject in final position (1999: 112). Among other distinct tendencies Čermáková points out the differences in the expression of the possessive relationship, and in verbal as against verbonominal expression of an action (1999: 112–113). Correspondences in the opposite direction moreover suggest the tendency of English to suppress the agent (1999: 114). The differences in the results between the English-Czech and the Czech-English approach are largely accounted for by the structural differences between the two languages (differences in the use of the passive, existential construction in English, subjectless sentences in Czech) (1999: 116). Of these findings, all of which call for further research, in what follows I shall attempt to expound the role of FSP from a different starting point, viz the FSP role of the subject.
3. The concept of FSP adopted throughout is based on Jan Firbas’s theory of functional sentence perspective, elaborated in a large number of studies, and synthetized in his *Functional Sentence Perspective in Written and Spoken Communication* (Firbas 1992). The FSP structure of the examples under consideration is determined on the basis of the interplay of the FSP factors, semantic, contextual, and linear modification (cf. Firbas 1992: 10–11, 115). Intonation, which constitutes an additional factor in the spoken language, plays a subsidiary role in written texts insofar as the position of the intonation centre (the nucleus) results from the interplay of the other three factors. For this reason, no capitals are used to indicate the nucleus bearer: the intonation centre is assumed to fall on whichever element is assigned the FSP role of rheme.

The starting point of the following discussion is the subject with the FSP role of rheme, treated with respect to: (a) its degree of interlingual constancy as compared with that of subjects examined only as syntactic functions; (b) the sentence position of rhematic subjects in the two languages and its effect on the syntactic and/or FSP structure in the other language; (c) the extent to which the syntactic changes contribute to the basic distribution of communicative dynamism (the order theme — transition — rheme, cf. Firbas 1992: 7–8, 10, 104–105, 118).

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

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

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

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

(13) There were lots of flowers. BB 21
    Bylo tam plno kytek. HB 24
    was there lots flowers gen

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

(14) And there were other sources of income. J 22–23
    A má ještě jiný zdroj příjmů. S 431
    and he has still other source incomes gen

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

The remaining examples represent other forms of the presentation scale (cf. Firbas 1992: 66–69, 109–110, 134–140; Firbas 1966; and Dušková 1998). In 5 instances the rhematic subject occupies initial position, its rhematic nature being indicated by the interplay of the other FSP factors, context independence and semantic structure, involving a verb of existence or appearance on the scene. As shown by (15), these factors here act counter to the linear arrangement. In Czech, examples like (15) can have parallel syntactic structure with the rhematic subject at the end.

(15) And there were other sources of income. J 22–23
    A má ještě jiný zdroj příjmů. S 431
    and he has still other source incomes gen
(15) *But now a heavy silence lay over it* (J 36)
    Ale v této chvíli byl ponořen do tůživého ticha (S 442)
    But in this moment was submerged in heavy silence

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

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

(16) *proto, že z ní na mne čišel chlad* K 33
    because from it on me blew cold NOM
    because it gave me the shivers H 22

(17) *a na dvou z nich seděli mužové se zakloněnými hlavami* and on two of them sat men with bent heads K 16
    Two of the chairs were occupied by men with heads bent back H 16

(18) *dr Proppera ranila mrtvice* F 8
    Dr. Propper ACC struck stroke NOM
    Dr. Propper’s had a stroke U 2

(19) *všechno zavinil můj neblahý sklon k hloupým žertům* all ACC caused my fatal penchant NOM to silly NOM jokes K 35
    it all goes back to my fatal predilection for silly jokes H 22

Final or late placement of the rhematic element resulting from a different syntactic structure is also found in the remaining pairs of examples, but again the particular correspondences are rare and produce no pattern (Cs 3 instances, verb 1), cf. (20) and (21).
3.2 The second point to be considered is the sentence position of rhematic subjects with respect to its potential influence on the syntactic and/or FSP structure in the other language.

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

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

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

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

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

(24) A memory came to her. BB 26
    Přepadla ji vzpomínka. BH 30
    invaded her memory

The additional 4 rhematic subjects from Čermáková's list occur in initial position (2 instances), medially (1) and at the end (1) as in ex (22).
The Czech counterparts of English rhematic subjects, whether construed as another syntactic element or as the subject, might be expected to occupy the final position. This applies to the nonidentical syntactic counterparts (26 instances, see 3.1.1), but of the remaining 74 instances, which display syntactic correspondence, 13 have the subject in initial or medial position, with the resulting loss of rhematic function. A half of these instances (7) are found in negative existential constructions, which may play a role, negation being semantically disposed to operate within the rhyme. Yet the subject here is context independent, and with the verb of existence constitutes the presentation scale, which assigns it the role of rhyme. Cf. (25).

(25) *There weren't any mourners — no sons or anything.* BB 8  
Žádný truchlíci pozůstali se nevynořili — synové nebo podobně. BH 10  
No mourners not.emerged

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

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

(26) *There had been no other problem over the plaque* J 9  
Jiné problémy s firemním štítkem nenastaly S 421  
Other problems with plaque notOccurred

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

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

(27) *Distress at her own conciliatory nature rose in her throat* BB 27  
Rozmrzelost nad vlastní pasivní povahou ji bobtnala v krku BH
In imitating the English word order the Czech sentence presents the final element as the rheme, whereas the rheme in the English sentence is constituted by the subject.

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

(28) to which only she and he had a key  
     od níž jen oni dva měli klíče

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

(29) Gone were the terracotta roofs of the farmhouses they had known, the stone sinks, the primitive wood-burning stoves.  
     Terakotové strechy jejich bývalých venkovských domů, kamenné vylevky, primitivní plotny, kde se topilo dřevem, upadly v zapomení.

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

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

The 9 additional rhematic subjects from Čermáková’s list are all found in the final position. Syntactic change as a means of achieving final or late placement of the English counterparts of Czech rhematic subjects accounts for 20 instances in my list of 100 rhematic subjects (cf. 3.1.2). Of the 80 examples whose English counterparts retain the subject function 56 (70%) have the subject in initial or preverbal position, cf. exx (31) and (32); 19 instances (23.75%) are rendered by the existential construction, cf. (33); and 5 instances (6.25%) display the pattern Adv-V-S, cf. (34).
but then a miracle occurred

but then occurred miracle

And now him suddenly seizes some pity

A wave of sudden pity came over him,

there were all kinds of speeches and applause

over the burner hangs calendar

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

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

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

There are some unclear instances, due to the uncertainty which sometimes arises where verbs implying existence or appearance on the scene may also be regarded as assigning some feature to the subject, and/or where it is not clear
whether the subject is contextually bound or not, since the object it refers to is mentioned at some distance in the preceding context or is derivable from it, but in the particular sentence it also allows context-independent interpretation. Thus in (36) the Czech sentence resembles the presentation scale, while in the English counterpart the subject is ascribed a feature.

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

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

(37) na jeho čelo a hrud’ dopadlo bledé světlo lampy F 7
on his forehead and chest fell pale light lamp GEN
the pale lamplight fell on his face and chest U 1

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

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

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

(38) The previous year his office had been plagued by an outbreak of obscene letters J 35
Vloni jeho kancelář zaplavila hotová průtrž obscénních dopisů S 441

(39) at no time had Bernie been invited to ... J 39
a Bernieho nikdy nikdy nepožádal, aby ... S 444
The Czech counterparts of the English thematic subjects occur in two positions, initial (29 instances), or they occupy the medial position after another thematic element or the verb (35). Where they follow the verb, which primarily functions as transition (cf. Firbas 1992: 70–73), the English word order is more consistent with the basic distribution of communicative dynamism than the Czech. In both these positions the Czech counterparts preserve the FSP role of theme, their syntactic function being mostly direct object (37 instances); the other syntactic functions involve adverbials (13 occurrences), \( O_i \) (12), \( O_{prep} \) (2), Vb (3), the genitive and possessive determiner (1 occurrence each), and 5 instances without an explicit counterpart. In 5 instances the Czech counterparts of English thematic subjects occur in the final position, with a change in FSP as a result. Compare ex (40), in which the English thematic subject appears in Czech as the rheme at the end.

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

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

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

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

3.3.2 Thematic subjects in Čermáková’s Czech examples account for 61 instances, the remaining 10 sentences being constituted by subjectless verbal clauses (for rhematic subjects, see 3.1 and 3.1.1). In more than a half (35) the subject is expressed by the personal ending of the verb. Unlike English thematic subjects, Czech thematic subjects expressed by a pronoun or a noun occur in all positions in the sentence except at the end, the initial position being the most frequent (17 instances). The other positions are illustrated by (42), in which the subject follows an adverbial, and (43), where the subject is preceded by the verb and the object.
(42) ... když se ve schránce něco bělá ... F 7

when  in box  something  is. white

The minute I see something white in the letter box ... U 1

(43) ... vadit jí to nebude ... K 21

matter  her  DAT it  not. will

... she won’t mind ... H 11

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

(44) ... ale moje samota zůstává nedorčená. K 14

but  my  solitude  remains  intact

... but I keep my privacy intact. H 4

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

(45) ... tam měl nejraději opice a slony ... F 9

there  he. liked  best  monkeys  and  elephants

... the monkeys and the elephants were his favorites ... U 3

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

3.4 The last point to be noted is the effect of syntactic change on the basic distribution of CD as against instances in which the syntactic structure of parallel sentences remains the same. Here a comparison is made only in the Czech-English direction, since Czech applies the principle of end focus as a matter of course. This has been demonstrated in the foregoing discussion by the almost exclusively final position of the rheme in the Czech examples.
Since the examples on which this study is based do not contain counter­
parts of thematic subjects without syntactic change, directly comparable
instances are provided only by rhematic subjects.

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

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

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

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

(47) ... v šeru dálky zahlédne jakýsi povědomý dům. F 35
     in dark distance GEN he sees some familiar house
     ... in the darkness ahead a familiar house stood out. U 35

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

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

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

Syntactic change in the English-Czech direction appears to be due to other than FSP factors. Obviously, a language with free word order does not need syntactic change to achieve a different linear arrangement of sentence elements. Nevertheless, it is approximately as frequent as in the opposite direction. Here the factors involved partly consist in language specific modes of expression (predications with mit 'have' or other transitive verbs of a generally possessive or locative meaning as against predications with be in the other language), and partly in a different status of the Czech passive both in the verbal and the grammatical system, reflected in the uses of the passive in discourse.

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

Notes

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

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

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