Univerzita Karlova v Praze

Filozofická fakulta

Ústav anglického jazyka a didaktiky

Bakalářská práce

Anna Staňková

English translation counterparts of the Czech construction "mít + participle"

Anglické překladové protějšky české konstrukce "mít + příčestí"

Poděkování

Velice děkuji vedoucí své bakalářské práce PhDr. Gabriele Brůhové, Ph.D. za cenné rady, komentáře a ochotu konzultovat i ve ztížených podmínkách.

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

V Praze dne 28. dubna 2021   Anna Staňková

Abstract

The BA thesis focuses on the Czech "mít" + *-n/-t* participle construction (e. g. "mít uvařeno/zakázáno"), its uses, and their English translation counterparts. English offers more than one equivalent for the Czech construction. This thesis, therefore, aims to demonstrate the variety of the possible counterparts. The construction is a means of expressing diathesis as it is described by Panevová et al. A diathesis uses specific syntactic and semantic structures to convey information, and its subject usually does not carry the agentive semantic role. The verb "mít" in diathesis acquires an auxiliary character.

The analysis is based on 100 examples drawn from InterCorp. The instances of the Czech construction are categorized into three main groups: the possessive resultative (with its non-ambiguous and ambiguous variants), resultative localization, and the recipient passive. The thesis aims to identify their English counterparts and describe the prominent semantic and grammatical features of the translations.

Keywords: diathesis, "mít", possessive resultative, recipient passive, translation counterpart, semantic role

Abstrakt

Bakalářská práce se zabývá českou konstrukcí „mít" + *-n/-t* příčestí (např. „mít uvařeno/zakázáno"), jejími typy a jejich anglickými překladovými ekvivalenty. Angličtina nabízí více možných překladových protějšků, které se tato práce pokouší popsat. Česká konstrukce se objevuje jako prostředek diateze, jevu popsaném profesorkou Panevovou. Diateze vyjadřuje lingvistické obsahy pomocí určitých syntaktických a sémantických struktur. Její podmět většinou nenese roli agentu. Sloveso „mít" užité v diatezi má charakter pomocného slovesa.

Analýza se zakládá na vzorku 100 vět z paralelního korpusu InterCorp. České příklady jsou rozděleny do tří hlavních skupin: posesivní rezultativ (s jeho podtypy „non-ambiguous" a „ambiguous"), rezultativní lokalizace a recipientní pasivum. Cílem práce je analyzovat anglické překladové protějšky těchto konstrukcí a popsat jejich sémantické a gramatické rysy.

Klíčová slova: diateze, "mít", posesivní rezultativ, recipientní pasivum, překladový protějšek, sémantická role

Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations

<u>Literature:</u>

MČ3	*Mluvnice češtiny. 3, Skladba*.
CamGr	*Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*
NESČ	*CzechEncy - Nový encyklopedický slovník češtiny*
OALD	*Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*
PMČ	*Příruční mluvnice češtiny*
SSČ	*Slovník spisovné češtiny pro školu a veřejnost*

<u>Other abbreviations:</u>

SVOCo	subject-verb-object-object complement
ibid.	*ibidem*, in the same place
ex.	example

List of Tables

1 Introduction

The present thesis examines the Czech "mít" + *-n/-t* participle construction and its English translation counterparts. "Mít" complemented by an *-n/-t* participle is usually described as a "resultative construction" (e. g. "mít uvařeno/vyplněno/přečteno") which is "a grammatical form with stative meaning implying a present result of a finished action" (NESČ: Rezultativum). Its other use is the recipient passive where the subject carries the semantic role of a recipient (e. g. "mít zakázáno/zaplaceno"). English offers more than one equivalent for this construction. This thesis, therefore, aims to demonstrate the possible counterparts.

The theoretical part focuses on the topic of diathesis ("diateze" in Czech), its types and characteristics. A diathesis is a relation between the semantic and syntactic structure of sentence elements. More attention is given to the resultative and the recipient passive diatheses. In most cases, the "mít" + *-n/-t* participle construction forms the possessive subtype of the resultative diathesis which describes a result of an action (e. g. "měla uvařeno"). In this diathesis, the semantics of the subject participant might be ambiguous. The construction also sporadically occurs in a form called resultative localization (Panevová et al., 2014: 109). Furthermore, it is used in the recipient passive diathesis which is passive in meaning and emphasizes the recipient nature of the subject participant (e. g. "měla zakázáno"). Subsequently, the various meanings and uses of the Czech verb "mít" and the English verb "have" are presented in separate chapters.

The empirical part analyzes 100 example sentences drawn from the parallel corpus InterCorp. The Czech constructions are classified into three groups as possessive resultative, resultative localization, or recipient passive. In the possessive resultative type, we distinguish cases of a semantically ambiguous or non-ambiguous subject participant. For each of the types, the analysis presents its English counterparts. The most prominent means of translation are commented upon, especially on how they reflect the semantic and syntactic structure of the original verbal phrase as well as the semantic roles of the participants.

2   Theoretical background

2.1   Diathesis

The present chapter focuses on the topic of diathesis ("diateze" in Czech). It tries to define what a diathesis is, as well as to explain the difference between grammatical and semantic diathesis. Later it presents the types of grammatical diatheses which appear in the Czech language and provides these with example sentences. The examples demonstrated in this part are in Czech since the classification of diatheses is based on Czech grammars. The goal of this study is to examine the Czech "mít" + *-n/-t* participle construction and its translation counterparts, and therefore it is useful to work with Czech examples.

In language, it is very common that one meaning can be communicated by various means. A sentence expressing some situation can be modified or transformed in order to offer a different viewpoint of the situation in question. The examples below are offered by *Příruční mluvnice češtiny* (henceforth PMČ). They show three possible linguistic representations of the same situation:

(1) Zedníci postavili školku za dva roky. (PMČ, 1995: 522)

(2) Školka byla postavena zedníky za dva roky. (ibid.)

(3) Školka se postavila za dva roky. (ibid.)

The term "diathesis" describes "the relation between the semantic structure of the sentence and the corresponding structure of the sentence elements" (ibid.). In other words, it refers to the mapping of the semantic roles onto the formal elements of the sentence. Thanks to diathesis it is possible to analyze the different hierarchizations and mappings of semantic roles and sentence elements. As is apparent from examples (1), (2), and (3), diathesis can alternate the way semantic roles are ascribed to sentence elements. It is also able to change the perspective from which the situation is observed by moving and replacing the participants.

Some researchers of the Czech language include the topic of diathesis in the field of morphology because they consider diatheses to be a matter of verbal aspect, voice, or tense. Sometimes, diathesis is thought to be a separate morphological category. However, it is also closely related to the field of syntax and semantics, as emphasized by Panevová et al. in *Mluvnice současné češtiny II* (2014: 102; henceforth Panevová et al.).

There are two types of diathesis: grammatical and semantic. With changes in grammatical diathesis the valency frame of the verb remains the same, while the formal means of expression change. Such sentences are presented from a "different perspective which results from the changes in the mapping between valency complementations and surface syntactic positions" (Kettnerová and Lopatková, 2010: 187). Semantic diathesis, on the other hand, describes changes in the valency frame of the verb and changes in the lexical meaning of the verb itself (Panevová et al., 2014: 103). In this paper, only grammatical diatheses are addressed.

One of the typical features of grammatical diatheses is that the agent[1] is removed from the subject position which it occupies in the original sentence. This phenomenon is illustrated by examples (4) and (5) below. In the corresponding structure, the agent can be placed in a hierarchically lower position (e. g. adverbial or indirect object) which is shown in (4). In some cases, the agent is left unexpressed (ex. 5).

(4) <u>Zaměstnanci</u> informovali vedení podniku o stávce. - Vedení podniku bylo <u>zaměstnanci</u> informováno o stávce. (Kettnerová and Lopatková, 2010: 190)

(5) <u>Dělníci</u> stavějí novou školou. - Staví se nová škola. (ibid.)

More specific examples are mentioned in the following part where seven distinctive types of grammatical diatheses are introduced: passive, resultative (with its subtypes possessive resultative and resultative localization), recipient, deagentive, dispositional, reciprocal, and causative.[2] The resultative and recipient diatheses are given more attention since they involve the "mít" + -n/-t participle construction, which is at the center of the present analysis.

2.1.1 Passive diathesis

Probably the most common grammatical diathesis is the passive diathesis. It involves primarily transitive verbs, and it takes the form of the periphrastic passive (NESČ: Slovesný rod). The agent is moved away from the subject position and usually transformed into the instrumental case, or it is expressed by a prepositional phrase (preposition "od") with a genitive.

---

[1] The agent participant "instigates or causes the happening denoted by the verb" (Quirk et al., 1985: 741). It acts volitionally and consciously (CamGr, 2002: 230-231). To be able to do that, the entity is usually animate, although, according to Dušková et al. (1994: 397), the agent can sometimes be inanimate.
[2] This classification is adopted from *Mluvnice současné češtiny II* (2014), which is based on the theory of Functional Generative Description. Other Czech grammars, e. g. *Příruční mluvnice češtiny* (1995), use the Two-Level Valency Syntax framework. *Nový encyklopedický slovník češtiny* (2017: Diateze) provides a detailed commentary on these two approaches.

(6) Mluvčí německé Strany demokratického socialismu HH **byl** v pátek **odsouzen** berlínským zemským soudem. (Panevová et al., 2014: 105)

(7) Od učitele **byl** žák **bit** s radostí. (Panevová et al., 2014: 104)

In example (6), "odsoudit" is a transitive verb and it is in the periphrastic passive form ("byl odsouzen"). The agent of the action appears at the end of the sentence and takes the instrumental case. In (7), the affected role is assigned to the subject,[3] while the agentive role is expressed by an adverbial in the form of a prepositional phrase.

2.1.2 Resultative diathesis

Formerly, the resultative diathesis was considered to be a case of the morphological category of verbal tense, voice, or aspect (NESČ: Rezultativ). As the term "resultative" implies, these constructions express a present result of an action that took place in the past. This result has the character of a state (Štícha et al., 2013: 639).

Panevová et al. (2014: 105) distinguish two main types of the resultative diathesis: the simple resultative and the possessive resultative. Additionally, they discuss another subtype of the resultative diathesis which is referred to as resultative localization. The possessive resultative and resultative localization are characterized in more detail in separate chapters as they employ the "mít" + *-n/-t* participle construction.

The simple resultative is formed by using the periphrastic passive form of the verb as exemplified in (8).

(8) **Je uvařeno**. **Bylo otevřeno**. (ibid.)

The agent is unknown, and the sentences lack subjects. The simple resultative form has a character of a general impersonal statement which conveys the message of a resultative state.

Instead of the *-n/-t* participle, the resultative diathesis can appear with deverbal adjectives, for instance, "zrestaurovaný" in (9):

(9) Zámek **je** nově **zrestaurovaný**. (Štícha et al., 2013: 639)

The adjectival form is acceptable and equivalent to the participle one. Even though some researchers tried to look for differences, Panevová et al. (2014: 105) believe that the two

---

[3] Even though the affected role is in most cases ascribed to the direct object, it can also be carried by the subject of a sentence, especially in instances of the passive voice (Dušková et al., 1994: 398).

variants are semantically very close. In this study, only constructions with the *-n/-t* participle will be analyzed and the ones with an adjective will be left aside.

In the example sentences in (8), the position of the direct object is not lexically represented, it is only implied by the neutral form of the *-n* participle. This possible phenomenon is described and exemplified by Štícha et al. (2013: 644). Nevertheless, our analysis focuses primarily on the subject, and not the direct object.

2.1.2.1 Possessive resultative

The possessive resultative form involves the verb "mít" and an *-n/-t* participle of a lexical verb (ex. 10).

> (10) **Mám uvařeno**. (Panevová et al., 2014: 105)

The possessive resultative is not as impersonal in its meaning as the simple resultative. Although "mít" suggests a meaning of possession, in this use it acquires an auxiliary character (see section 2.2.4 "Mít" in diathesis below).

In most cases, the subject of the possessive resultative is semantically non-ambiguous as shown in (11) and (12).

> (11) Pacient **měl zasaženy** vnitřní orgány. (Panevová et al., 2014: 108)
> (12) O mnoho víc **neměl nalétáno** ani čtyřiadvacetiletý pilot. (ibid.)

The mapping of semantic roles in example (11) is clear. The subject "pacient" is the recipient of "zasáhnout" in here,[4] whereas the agent of the action is left unexpressed. Similarly, the sentence in (12) is transparent, since the agentive semantic role is ascribed to the subject "pilot", and no other interpretation is valid.

However, the possessive resultative constructions are sometimes ambiguous regarding what semantic role is ascribed to the subject, so they might offer two hypothetical meanings. The subject of the sentence could be interpreted either as the agent of the process, or its recipient.[5] The potential ambiguity of the subject participant does not complicate the

---

[4] The recipient role is carried by an animate participant "that is passively implicated by the happening or state" (Quirk et al., 1985: 741). This participant is a recipient of the action expressed by the lexical verb, e. g. "Já to řeknu <u>učiteli</u>", or of an object, e. g. "Jana dala <u>matce</u> růže" (PMČ, 1995: 384). In diatheses, the participant is a recipient of an action, e. g. "<u>Student</u> už má od profesora práci zhodnocenu." (Panevová et al., 2014: 107).

[5] Another viewpoint is offered by Giger (2013: 866) who understands the subject participant as a "broadly defined possessor" ("posesor ve velmi širokém chápání").

understanding of the original meaning of the utterance. The reader/listener should be able to infer the correct message even though the subject is ambiguous.

In example (10) above ("mám uvařeno"), the semantic ambiguity is apparent: the unexpressed subject could either carry the semantic role of the agent or of the recipient. Thus, the sentence could be paraphrased in two ways: "<u>já</u> jsem si uvařil" (agentive "já") or "někdo <u>mi</u> uvařil" (recipient "mi"), depending on the intended meaning. In this case, no further context is available which would help with the disambiguation. According to Panevová et al.'s corpus-based research (2014: 108), the number of constructions with a non-ambiguous subject participant is higher than that of the ambiguous ones.

Giger (2013: 866) also mentions the possibility of an inanimate affected subject participant in the possessive resultative construction, such as "Fasády měly [<u>domy</u>] oprýskané, okna vytlučená.",[6] even though it is considered very rare.

2.1.2.2 Resultative localization

Panevová et al. (2014: 109) describe a specific subtype of the resultative diathesis and call it resultative localization ("rezultativní lokalizace" in Czech).

(13) Šaty **mám pověšeny** ve skříni. (ibid.)

(14) **Mám** šaty **viset** ve skříni. (ibid.)

It is constructed from the auxiliary "mít" and the *-n/-t* participle of causative verbs such as "položit" or "pověsit" (ex. 13). Sometimes an infinitive form of the lexical verb can be used instead of the participle (ex. 14). The causative verb implies an inanimate direct object carrying the affected semantic role ("šaty"). The constructions express the affected object's location or position ("ve skříni").

It should be pointed out that Panevová et al. do not consider these constructions to be a case of a specific diathesis, because they are not created paradigmatically. They suggest that this phenomenon should be further examined though. Štícha et al. (2013: 646), for example, include this type among the resultative constructions.

---

[6] The affected role "does not cause the happening denoted by the verb but is directly involved in some other way" (Quirk et al., 1985: 741).

2.1.3 Recipient passive diathesis

In the recipient passive diathesis, the subject carries the semantic role of the recipient. The agentive role is expressed either by an adverbial of origin (ex. 15), or it is completely left out (ex. 16). This structure is formed from either the auxiliary "dostat" (ex. 15) or the auxiliary "mít" (ex. 16), in connection with the *-n/-t* participle of the lexical verb.

(15)   Obec **dostala přidělenu** dotaci na opravu kostela od Ministerstva kultury. (Kettnerová and Lopatková, 2010: 189)

(16)   Od nynějška **mají** proto oficiálně **povolen** vstup do vlasti i ti členové... (Panevová et al., 2014: 110)

Daneš (1985: 41-45) classifies the lexical verbs occurring in recipient passive diathesis into 6 semantic groups ("přidělit", "přidat", "nabít", "vynadat", "nařídit", and "oznámit"). Only verbs with a recipient role in their valency frame can form the recipient passive diathesis. The recipient role is usually expressed by a dative. Apart from the obligatory dative complementation, the lexical verb might have another valency complementation in the form of an infinitive phrase, or an accusative.

Example (15) presents the auxiliary "dostat", which can form this diathesis universally. The auxiliary "mít", which appears in example (16), is slightly more restricted in its compatibility with lexical verbs (Panevová et al., 2014: 110). The auxiliary "mít" can form this diathesis only with lexical verbs which have a dative and an infinitive/accusative complementation (e. g. "nařídit" in "mám nařízeno zůstat doma"), but not with lexical verbs which are complemented by dative only (e. g. "vynadat" in * "mám vynadáno") (Daneš, 1985: 46). According to Panevová et al. (2014: 107), we should consider the "mít" + *-n/-t* participle construction as a means of the recipient passive diathesis only when it is interchangeable with "dostat" + *-n/-t* participle. For instance, the sentence "mám svěřen důležitý úkol" is interchangeable with "dostal jsem svěřen důležitý úkol", and therefore the construction with "mít" can be categorized as the recipient passive diathesis.

The subjects in (15) and (16) (i. e. "obec" and "členové", respectively) are assigned the recipient role, namely the beneficiary role.[7] In the recipient passive diathesis, there can appear

---

[7] The beneficiary role is carried by an animate participant "that something is obtained for or done for" (CamGr, 2002: 233).

also the maleficiary recipient,[8] for example with verbs such as "zakázat" (e. g. "mám zakázáno číst").

These constructions with "dostat" and "mít" are sometimes considered to be a matter of the grammatical category of verbal voice, which is then called "recipient passive" or "indirect passive"[9] (NESČ: Pasivum). This is also reflected by Panevová et al. (2014: 111) who regard the recipient passive diathesis to be semantically close to the passive diathesis.

Furthermore, Panevová et al. (2014: 110) note that there are sentences where the "mít" + -n/-t participle construction could be analyzed as either the possessive resultative or the recipient passive diathesis. They demonstrate such homonymy of diatheses by this example sentence: "Televize <u>má nařízeno</u>, že nás nesmí filmovat." (Panevová et al., 2014: 107). The verbal phrase in the main clause expresses a result of an action, so it could be classified as the possessive resultative diathesis. However, the verbal phrase is at the same time interchangeable with "dostala nařízeno", so it could be considered a case of the recipient passive diathesis. In this study, whenever the "mít" + -n/-t participle construction is paraphraseable by the variant with "dostat", it will be considered a case of the recipient passive diathesis.

2.1.4 Deagentive diathesis

To construct the deagentive diathesis the reflexive form of the lexical verb (NESČ: Reflexivní sloveso) is required. In these structures, the agent is predominantly animate, and it remains unexpressed.

(17) **Tančilo se** až do rána. (Panevová et al., 2014: 111).

(18) **Staví se** nová škola. (Kettnerová and Lopatková, 2010: 190)

The agent of the lexical verb in (17) is unknown, but it is animate, since "tančit" implies an animate agent who acts volitionally. Moreover, this sentence lacks a subject. The agentive participant in (18) is likewise animate. The inanimate subject participant "nová škola" carries the role of the resultant.[10]

---

[8] The maleficiary role is carried by a participant who is the worse for the situation described by the verb (NESČ: Sémantická role).

[9] "Recipientní pasivum"; "nepřímé pasivum".

[10] The resultant role (also called "effected") can be carried by a participant which comes (or came) into existence through the process described by the verb (Quirk et al., 1985: 750).

2.1.5 Dispositional diathesis

The reflexive form of the lexical verb is also necessary for the construction of dispositional diathesis. Another of its fundamental characteristics is the presence of an evaluative adverbial such as "snadno", "těžko", or "pomalu" (Panevová et al., 2014: 112). The agent may be a particular, or a general entity.

(19) To pokládám za vrchol pokrytectví, které **se** zvlášť těžko **toleruje**. (ibid.)

(20) Matematika **se** mi **učí** dobře. (Kettnerová and Lopatková, 2010: 190)

In example (19), the agent of the relative sentence is general and unexpressed. In (20), on the contrary, the agent is a specific person, and it takes the form of a dative.

2.1.6 Reciprocal diathesis

The participants of the verb which is used in reciprocal diathesis are semantically equal. These participants are both agents and therefore mostly animate.

(21) Jan a Marie **se líbají**. (Panevová et al., 2014: 113)

(22) Pavlovi bratři **se** stále **perou**. (ibid.)

Example (21) shows the verb "líbat" which is able to participate in reciprocal diathesis. In this sentence, the subject consists of two coordinated agents. In example (22) the subject is formally a plural, and from a semantic point of view, it comprises multiple agents.

2.1.7 Causative structure

Some researchers list one more type of grammatical diathesis which is called causative. It is possible to build this structure from the verbs "nechat" or "dát" and an infinitive of a lexical verb. The basic meaning of this construction is that someone requests and then anticipates some action from someone else. The subject position is not filled with the agent of the action, but its initiator.[11]

(23) Sestra si **nechala** od obuvníka **opravit** boty. (Panevová et al., 2014: 114)

(24) Učitelka **dala** malého Petra od lékařů znovu **vyšetřit**. (NESČ: Analytická kauzativní konstrukce)

Example (23) demonstrates the causative structure with "nechat", whereas example (24) employs "dát". In both the agent of the action is realized by a prepositional phrase. Panevová

---

[11] According to Dušková et al. (1994: 397), the initiator role is employed with causative verbs (i. e. intransitive verbs used transitively). This participant initiates the action performed by an agent.

et al. (2014: 114) refuse to call this type of structure a diathesis, because it is not grammaticalized.

2.2 The Czech verb "mít"

The Czech verb "mít" presents more than one meaning or function. It can be used as a lexical, modal, or phrasal verb. Apart from that, it participates in the construction of diathesis, where it acquires an auxiliary character. *Příruční mluvnice češtiny* (1995: 334) classifies this verb as "isolated" because of its irregular morphological character. Like "být", it is mostly "polyfunctional", but not as lexically neutral or "emptied" (MČ3, 1987: 212), since it conveys a basic meaning of possession.

2.2.1 Lexical "mít"

Lexical "mít" can form a predicate on its own. It does not require any other complementation in form of, for example, a participle. Primarily, it expresses possession either of a concrete object, as shown in (25), or of an abstract entity, which is presented in (26).

(25)   mít peníze, mít mnoho knih (SSČ, 2003: 182)
(26)   mít radost, mít tušení (ibid.)

The verb phrases with abstract entities are usually paraphrasable by another lexical verb: "mít radost" as "radovat se", "mít tušení" as "tušit".

2.2.2 Modal "mít"

The authors of *Mluvnice češtiny 3* (1987: 281) claim, that just like other Czech modal verbs (e. g. "moci" or "muset"), the modal "mít" is slightly restricted in morphology and syntax. It is unable to form "the imperative, passive participle, mostly not even a deverbal noun, and it has no aspectual counterpart". To form a predicate, it can link itself only to an infinitive of a lexical verb and to no other phrase.

"Mít" as a modal verb conveys the meaning of necessity or obligation ("someone is supposed to do something"). This modal verb implies that the obligation was imposed on a participant by another person in a higher position or by an institution. Example (27) demonstrates this use.

(27)   **Měla jsem** ho uvést do pokoje a **měla jsem** mu uvařit kávu. (PMČ, 1995: 536)

Modal "mít" is further employed in situations where a participant expects something to happen. The verb "mít" indicates that the action of the lexical verb was planned or imposed on someone. In example (28), the speaker expects someone else to do something.

(28)   **Mají** mě čekat na nádraží. (PMČ, 1995: 539)

2.2.3   Phrasal "mít"

Apart from the lexical and modal uses, "mít" also appears in plenty of phrasal constructions and idioms. In this function, its compatibility with other syntactic elements is not restricted. Usually, the verb "mít" and its idiomatic complementation are considered to form a verbal phrase together. Some of the possible constructions are offered by *Slovník spisovné češtiny* (2003: 182), e. g. "má to v krvi" or "mít na čele Kainovo znamení". More of these are described in *Slovník české frazeologie a idiomatiky* (2009: 1054-1065), which also presents possible variants and paraphrases of the idioms.

2.2.4   "Mít" in diathesis

Finally, the verb "mít" is employed in diathesis where it acquires a specific function which could be identified as auxiliary (Panevová et al., 2014: 109).[12] It is complemented by an -*n/-t* participle ("připraveno", "zasunuto") or an adjective ("připravené", "zasunuté").

Auxiliary "mít" appears in the possessive resultative construction (Panevová et al., 2014: 108) as illustrated by examples (10), (11), and (12) in chapter 2.1.2.1 Possessive resultative above. Panevová et al. (ibid.) mention cases of the possessive resultative diathesis with phrasal meaning, e. g. "má vyhráno/namířeno/nahnáno/má pro strach uděláno". In these examples, "mít" has the function of a phrasal as well as an auxiliary verb. The idiomatic uses of "mít" in the resultative diathesis are, however, not analyzed in this paper.

In resultative localization, "mít" is again used as an auxiliary with possessive features. It is shown in examples (13) and (14) in chapter 2.1.2.2 Resultative localization.

Furthermore, auxiliary "mít" is a means of construction of the recipient passive diathesis (Panevová et al., 2014: 109). The use of this verb in the recipient passive diathesis is predictable since it allows for the semantic role of the recipient, which is vital for the construction. An example sentence is provided in (16) in chapter 2.1.3 Recipient passive diathesis.

---

[12] Other Czech grammars, such as *Příruční mluvnice češtiny* or *Mluvnice češtiny 3*, do not mention the auxiliary type of "mít". *Slovník spisovné češtiny* identifies this use as copular "mít". This study will work with Panevová et al.'s term "auxiliary".

2.3 The English verb "have"

Just like the Czech verb "mít", the English verb "have" occurs in multiple functions. It carries a broad lexical meaning, so it can be employed as the main verb of a sentence. Moreover, it also acquires the status of an auxiliary or a modal verb in other contexts. Finally, it appears in specific constructions such as the causative, experiential, and experiential-resultative use. This chapter provides an overview of the various functions which the verb "have" may perform.

2.3.1 Lexical "have"

When "have" is used as a main verb, it adopts its lexical meaning. Since its semantics is quite broad, for instance, *The Oxford Dictionary* enumerates 33 distinctive meanings of "have" (OALD: have), it is convenient to identify two subtypes of the lexical "have": stative and dynamic.

Quirk et al. (1985: 131) define the stative "have" as primarily expressing possession. It is the state use of the verb, where the possession can affect concrete objects or properties. When constructing a negative utterance or applying inversion, the auxiliary "do" is not necessary (Dušková et al., 1994: 177). This is especially evident in British English. Quirk et al. (1985: 131) provide examples of this:

(29)   We **don't have** any money. **Do** you **have** a lighter?

(30)   We **haven't** any money. **Have** you a lighter?

In example (29), the "do" support mechanism is employed. Example (30), on the other hand, shows negation and inversion of "have" without the auxiliary "do". In American English, only the variant in (30) is possible.

In British English, there exists the "have got" alteration. This is used mainly in informal language (CamGr, 2002: 112).

(31)   John **has** courage. = John **has got** courage. (Quirk et al., 1985: 131)

The "has got" alternative in (31) is described by Quirk et al. (ibid.) as "perfective in form but non-perfective in meaning".

The second type of lexical "have" is called dynamic, and it expresses events rather than states (CamGr, 2002: 111). It is very close to verbs with dynamic semantics, such as "receive", "take", or "experience" (Quirk et al., 1985: 132), for example, "have a lunch" or "have difficulty

with solving the problem". "Do" support is vital for the construction of negative statements, and inversion in interrogative sentences (Dušková et al, 1994: 177).

Cambridge Grammar mentions one specific use of the dynamic lexical "have", which is illustrated by examples (32) and (33).

(32)   He **had** a swim. (CamGr, 2002: 111)
(33)   She **had** a smoke. (Dušková et al., 1985: 417-418)

Cambridge Grammar categorizes this type of "have" as a light verb because it does not carry the primary meaning of the predicate. However, Dušková et al. (1994: 417-418) consider this "have" to be a copular verb. Quirk et al. (1985: 1171) do not list "have" as a copular verb. They regard this to be the case of a dynamic "have" with an eventive object, which could be classified as idiomatic (1985: 132).

Lexical "have" with existential meaning constitutes an alternative to "there" in presentation sentences, which "serve to bring something on to the discoursal stage deserving our attention" (Quirk et al., 1985: 1408). This use is illustrated by examples (34) and (35) below:

(34)   The porter **has** a taxi ready. (ibid.)
(35)   He **had** several friends in China. (ibid.)

The sentence in (34) could be paraphrased as "there is a taxi ready", and the sentence in (35) as "there were several friends (of his) in China". In contrast to *there*-existentials, the *have*-existentials express an extra participant. This extra participant might carry the semantic role of an agent (as "the porter" from the example above), but also the recipient (as in "you have a taxi ready"). Quirk et al. (1985: 1412) prefer ascribing this participant the affected role, because of its generality.

Apart from that, "have" is employed in several idioms, for instance "have done with something" and others (see OALD: have).

2.3.2   Auxiliary "have"

The verb "have" also functions as an auxiliary. Alongside "be" and "do" it is a grammatical word with no lexical meaning. These verbs constitute a semantic unity with the lexical verb to which they are attached. According to Dušková et al. (1994: 174), auxiliary verbs are characterized by these key features:

a. the negative particle "not" or its shortened variant, e. g. "have not" or "haven't", is used to create negation

b. the auxiliary can occur in the sentence-initial position as a means of inversion in interrogative and conditional sentences, e. g. "Had I known it, I could have stayed at home."

c. the auxiliary can stand in for the whole predication (in form of an ellipsis or a proform), e. g. "You've finished, haven't you?"

The auxiliary "have" is employed in perfect tenses (present perfect, past perfect), in the perfect infinitive, perfect participle, and perfect gerund (Dušková et al., 1994: 176).

2.3.3 Modal "have"

"Have" can participate in the modal construction "have + *to*-infinitive", or in British English also "have + got + *to*-infinitive", which carries modal semantics. Since it expresses necessity, it stands in close relation to the modal verb "must". Quirk et al. (1985: 145) classify this construction as a semi-auxiliary. They further claim that "have + *to*-infinitive" "can stand in for *must* in past constructions where *must* cannot occur" (ibid.).

(36)   These days you **must** work hard if you want to succeed. (ibid.)
(37)   In those days you **had to** work hard if you wanted to succeed. (ibid.)

Example (36) shows a sentence with the primary modal "must", whereas in (37) the construction with "have" is used since the sentence refers to the past. Dušková et al. (1994: 193) distinguish between the deontic and epistemic modality of "must". The phrase "have to" is the past counterpart of the present deontic "must", e. g. "I had to wait." However, when expressing the past, the epistemic "must" is complemented by a past infinitive, e. g. "It must have been expensive".

Cambridge Grammar (2002: 111-112) does not consider "have" to be a modal auxiliary, because, unlike "must", it lacks the modal properties, e. g. it can co-occur with another modal verb as in "We may have to cancel it".

Additionally, Dušková et al. (1994: 178) mention the modal construction "had better + bare infinitive" (e. g. "we'd better be going"). In *Cambridge Grammar* (2002: 113), it is considered to be an idiomatic form, where the verb "had" is usually reduced only to "'d", or it

is completely left out (e. g. "you better go now"). According to Quirk et al. (1985: 141), it should be analyzed as a modal idiom.

2.3.4 Causative "have"

In causative constructions, "have" is usually complemented by a direct object and a past participle, but other complements are also possible (present participle or bare infinitive). The subject is the initiator of the action described by the lexical verb. Moreover, "the position of the direct object has a grammatical function" (Dušková et al., 1994: 178).

(38)　He **had** the roof **repaired**. (causative "have")

(39)　He **had repaired** the roof. (auxiliary "have") (ibid.)

The examples above demonstrate the difference between the causative "have" in (38), and the auxiliary "have" in (39). One can distinguish between these two types of "have" thanks to the position of the direct object. The subject "he" in (38) is the initiator, not the agent, of the verb "repair".

"Have" in causative constructions is considered to carry dynamic lexical meaning (Quirk et al., 1985: 132; CamGr, 2002: 111). Quirk et al. (1985: 1207) note the possible ambiguity of such a construction:

(40)　The guard patrol **had** two men **shot**. (ibid.)

The example in (40) is ambiguous since the sentence could either mean "the patrol caused two men to be shot" or "the patrol suffered the loss of two men by shooting". Only the first option presents the causative "have". Furthermore, another meaning of the "have + direct object + past participle" is possible, where "the -*ed* clause is analyzed as a postmodifier of the object; e. g. "she had a book (which was) stolen from the library" (Quirk et al., 1985: 1208).

2.3.5 Experiential and experiential-resultative "have"

Similar in form to the causative "have" is the experiential "have" expression. In these, the subject does not carry the role of the initiator, neither of the agent. The subject participant is affected to some extent by the action described by the lexical verb.

(41)　He **had** his pocket **picked** in the bus. (Tomozawa, 2002: 6)

(42)　The house **had** its roof **ripped off** by the gale. (Tomozawa, 2002: 7)

24

In examples (41) and (42) the "have + direct object + past participle" experiential construction is presented. In both the subject participant "is marked by general inability to resist the event described" (ibid.). Moreover, the lexical verbs are associated with negative connotations.

In her MA thesis, Mikulášová (2019) identified a subtype of the experiential "have" and called it the experiential-resultative construction. Such constructions "do not really depict an action the subject experienced but rather a result of an action which happened in the past" (Mikulášová, 2019: 34). The subject, however, somehow participated in the action which led to the resultative state.

(43)   I **have** your dress **prepared** for tomorrow. (ibid.)

(44)   We **had** our minds **made up** that we were going to win this thing. (Mikulášová, 2019: 39)

In both (43) and (44), the verbal phrase expresses the result of an action which happened in the past. The subject participants were engaged in the processes conveyed by the lexical verbs, which in these constructions carry neutral or even positive connotations.

3   Material and Methods

3.1   Material

This BA thesis focuses on the Czech "mít" + *-n/-t* participle construction and its English translation counterparts. In order to collect the sample sentences, the parallel corpus InterCorp was used. The analysis works with 100 example sentences from the Czech-English InterCorp (version 12), which were accessed through the KonText interface.[13] InterCorp contains mostly fiction, but also journalistic and legal texts, subtitles, and Bible translations. The corpus material is provided with linguistic annotation. Thanks to the alignment of the original texts with their translations it is possible to analyze the counterparts. Moreover, the immediate context of the searched string can be viewed, which was beneficial in this study when examining the semantic roles of the subject.

3.2   Methods

The scope of texts in InterCorp was reduced to fiction written originally in Czech. A CQL query was used to find the Czech construction:

[lemma="mít"] []{0,4} [tag="Vs.*"] within <s/>

The query searches for the Czech verb "mít" in any grammatical form followed by a passive participle. Since it was possible that there would appear some extra word forms between "mít" and the participle, an additional position for maximum of 4 intervening words was included. Apart from that, the query specifies that the string should appear as a whole within one sentence. The order of the results was randomized by the "shuffle" function.

Among the data excerpted from the corpus, there were instances which needed to be excluded from the research because they were in some way unsuitable. These were manually deleted from the final set of example sentences.

First, there were strings containing modal "mít" followed by the auxiliary "být" and an *-n/-t* participle, e. g. "měly být vyřízeny" or "mělo být deportováno". This analysis focuses on the auxiliary "mít" in connection with the *-n/-t* participle so the instances with modal "mít" were omitted.

---

[13] Available at https://www.korpus.cz/.

Second, all defective strings were excluded – these were the ones where "mít" and the *-n/-t* participle did not constitute a verbal phrase together, because the two elements belonged to different clauses, e. g. "ale co prý z toho měla, když byla obtížena kanystrem" or "neměl východiska, byl chycen". In such strings, "mít" and the participle occur near each other, but they do not stand in the same phrase.

Finally, idiomatic structures were filtered out from the dataset, e. g. "měli namířeno", "měl vyhráno", or "má pro strach uděláno". Panevová et al. (2014: 108) mentions that the possessive resultative construction has an idiomatic character quite often, but this analysis concentrates on non-idiomatic expressions. The final dataset containing 100 Czech sentences with their English counterparts is placed in the Appendix with relevant annotation. The example sentences presented in the following text are provided with their reference number from the Appendix in square brackets for better orientation.

3.3   Hypothesis

The analysis will classify the Czech examples into three groups: possessive resultative, resultative localization, and recipient passive. We expect the possessive resultative type to be more frequent than the recipient passive according to Panevová et al.'s (2014: 110) research, as well as the resultative localization to be only a subsidiary phenomenon. Additionally, we will examine the semantics of the subject participant in the possessive resultative constructions.

Furthermore, the analysis will focus on the English translation counterparts. Among the anticipated means of translation is the perfect tense which expresses resultative meaning and shares formal aspects (auxiliary "have" + *-ed* participle) with the possessive resultative. We expect verbs in the passive voice which employ a similar semantic structure as the recipient passive. The counterparts could also comprise instances of "have" in its lexical meaning as it implies the meaning of possession, or "have" as a part of complex transitive constructions representing the SVOCo word order (causative, experiential, and experiential-resultative use).

The analytical part is divided into three main sections. The first one focuses on the possessive resultative construction (and its subtypes "non-ambiguous" and "ambiguous"), the second on the resultative localization, and the third on the recipient passive construction. The character of the Czech constructions is briefly examined in the individual chapters; special attention is given to the semantics of the subject. Furthermore, their English translation counterparts are discussed, especially the most prominent ones, with regard to their semantic

and syntactic features. Finally, we briefly compare the overall results with Dušková's (2005) research on Czech-English translations.

4 Analysis

The analysis revealed that the possessive resultative construction was the most frequent in the dataset. Table 1 shows the outcomes of the classification of the Czech examples:

type of construction	total	%
possessive resultative	78	78
resultative localization	3	3
recipient passive	19	19
total	**100**	**100**

Table 1: Proportion of the "mít" + *-n/-t* participle construction in the dataset

Most of the examples were analyzed as the possessive resultative construction (78%) and were further divided as ambiguous and non-ambiguous regarding the semantics of their subject. Only three examples from the dataset were described as the resultative localization (3%), which shows the subtype's exclusivity. Finally, there appeared several instances of the recipient passive (19%). This supports Panevová et al.'s finding (2014: 110) that the "mít" + *-n/-t* participle construction in the recipient diathesis is less common than in the possessive resultative one.

4.1 Possessive resultative construction

The central characteristic of this construction is that it expresses a result of an action. Example (1) illustrates the resultative meaning:

(1) (…) **neměl jsem vyvětráno** a přikrývky byly rozházené po nábytku. [ARES8]

Another characteristic of the possessive resultative is the fact that its subject can be semantically ambiguous or non-ambiguous. The distinction between the two options was often made only after inspecting the sentences in their broader context (usually the paragraph where the construction appeared). Table 2 shows the results of this classification:

semantics of the subject participant	total	%
non-ambiguous	67	86
ambiguous	11	14
total	**78**	**100**

Table 2: Semantics of the subject participant in the possessive resultative construction

The proportion of the ambiguous and non-ambiguous cases of the possessive resultative construction approximately corresponds with the numbers given by Panevová et al. (2014: 108), whose dataset comprised 38% ambiguous and 62% non-ambiguous cases. In the present study, there was also a majority of the non-ambiguous cases, but their incidence was higher than in Panevová et al.'s study. The difference between this study and that of Panevová et al. was probably caused by Panevová et al.'s inclusion of idiomatic constructions into their research.

The subject of the non-ambiguous constructions carried either the agentive, recipient or affected role. The agent participant "instigates or causes the happening denoted by the verb" (Quirk et al., 1985: 741), it is usually animate and acts volitionally. The recipient is an animate participant "that is passively implicated by the happening or state" (ibid.). In diathesis, the recipient subject is a recipient of an action, e. g. "Student už má od profesora práci zhodnocenu." (Panevová et al., 2014: 107). The affected participant "does not cause the happening denoted by the verb but is directly involved in some other way" (Quirk et al., 1985: 741). Table 3 shows the results.

semantic role of the subject	total	%
agent	56	84
recipient	8	12
affected	3	4
total	**67**	**100**

Table 3: Semantic roles of the subject in non-ambiguous possessive resultative constructions

The most frequent was the agentive role (84%). The recipient role appeared only 8 times (12%). Additionally, there was a minimum of affected subject participants (4%) which were inanimate. This finding corresponds with Giger's (2013: 866) claim about the rareness of an inanimate subject in the possessive resultative (see section 2.1.2.1 Possessive resultative).

The agentive subject occurred particularly with lexical verbs describing the result of a body parts movement (ex. 2) or a similar movement (ex. 3).

(2) **Měla** jednu ruku **přehozenu** přes jeho tělo a oči zavřené. [NRES29]
(3) Byla hubená, vytáhlá, kostnatá a tvář **měla zahalenu** šátkem. [NRES7]

In (2), the agent of "přehodit" is the unexpressed subject. Example (3) likewise shows an agentive subject participant. Both of these agentive participants are animate since they act consciously and volitionally. In total, there were 22 instances of situations involving a body

parts movement (or resembling body parts movement) where the subject was agentive. This shows a pattern of expressing such results by the "mít" + -*n/-t* participle.

There appeared a less prominent pattern of describing results of cognitive activities or communication acts in the dataset (ex. 4):

(4) **Měl** vše **vymyšleno**. [NRES11]

The unexpressed subject in (4) carries the agentive role.[14] There were 10 instances in the analyzed material where the subject was an agent of a mental activity or a communication act (e. g. "měl jsem spočítáno" or "mám prokonzultováno").

The recipient subject in non-ambiguous cases is illustrated by (5) and (6):

(5) Obě zápěstí **měl** řemínky **připoutány** ke konzolám po stranách postele (…) [NRES30]
(6) (…) já jsem jí jen řekl, že můj děda **má** na pomníku **napsáno** Johan Ditie, že byl panským štolbou (…) [NRES60]

In (5), something unpleasant is happening to the subject, so it is classified as a maleficiary recipient. The subject "můj děda" from (6) is also recipient; he could not be the agent since he had already passed away by the time of the action described by "napsat". Each of these instances presents a result of an action where the agent is omitted, presumably because it is unknown or not important for the communication.

Finally, example (7) shows the affected inanimate subject participant "obchody". The animate agent of "zavřít" is omitted.

(7) Jsou to ukrutně ohyzdné panny, ale co jsem měl koupit, když jsme vstávali až v poledne a všechny obchody **měly zavřeno** (…) [NRES52]

Examining the context of the sentences from the dataset proved crucial for analyzing most of the possessive resultative constructions as non-ambiguous and ascribing a semantic role to the subject participant. This was the case of, for instance, sentence (8):

(8) Někdy **měla** socha rty **roztaženy** v úsměvu (…) [NRES63]

The subject "socha" in (8) seems to be an inanimate participant, but after the context is studied, it is observed that the statue possesses animate-like character. It moves on its own and changes

---

[14] In these cases, the subject participant instigates the cognitive activity and is in control of it. Therefore, it is not considered to be an experiencer, but rather an agent (see CamGr, 2002: 232 or Quirk et al., 1985: 746 for more on the experiencer role).

its expression and posture daily, which is why the subject has been identified as an agent of "roztáhnout".

In the dataset, there were 11 instances of the possessive resultative construction where the subject could not be assigned a definitive semantic role (illustrated by ex. 9); these were classified as "ambiguous".

(9) Na stolku vedle lůžka **má připraveno** několik knížek. [ARES7]

In example (9), the semantic role of the unexpressed subject is ambiguous. It is unclear whether the subject is the agent of "připravit", or its recipient (or rather a beneficiary), in which case an unknown participant would perform the action for the benefit of the subject (see section 2.1.2.1 Possessive resultative for more on ambiguity and its possible paraphrases). The verbal structure as well as its broader context enabled more interpretations of the subject participant probably because the primary aim of the utterance is to inform about the result of the action without necessarily specifying its participants. In a few cases, the ambiguity was a product of the overall vagueness and intentional indefiniteness of the fictional work (e. g. the novel *Sestra* written by Jáchym Topol).

4.1.1 English counterparts of the possessive resultative construction

The means of translating the possessive resultative constructions are shown in Table 4.

means of translation	subtype	total of subtype	total	%
active voice, simple tense	another lexical verb	17	24	30.7
	lexical "have"	5		
	lexical "be"	2		
perfect tense	past perfect[15]	14	17	21.8
	present perfect	3		
non-finite verb form	-*ed* participle	10	12	15.4
	-*ing* participle	1		
	gerund	1		
complex transitive construction	complex transitive "have"[16]	8	9	11.5
	complex transitive "get"	1		
passive voice			8	10.2
copular construction	copular "be" + adjective		6	7.7
noun			2	2.6
total			**78**	**99.9[17]**

Table 4: Translation counterparts of the possessive resultative construction

The heterogeneity of translation means was significant in this group. The most frequent were lexical verbs in the active voice (simple present, simple past, or progressive; 30.7%). Among the other prominent means were perfect verb forms (21.8%), non-finite verb forms (15.4%), complex transitive constructions (11.5%), and verbs in the passive voice (10.2%). Less frequent were copular constructions (7.7%) and nouns (2.6%).

---

[15] One example contained copular "be" in past perfect (ex. NRES28 in the Appendix); it was classified under "past perfect".
[16] One example contained a complex transitive verbal phrase in the perfect tense (ex. NRES67 in the Appendix); it was classified under "complex transitive construction".
[17] The results have been rounded to the nearest tenths since there were few differences between them. This led to a total of 99.9%.

4.1.1.1 Lexical verbs in the active voice

The translation counterparts which used lexical verbs in the active voice often corresponded with the original semantics of the subject, although they did not really reflect the resultative state (ex. 10).

(10) "**Mám** to již dávno **prokonzultováno** s právníky," řekl doktor Škréta s tichým ostychem.

"I **consulted** lawyers a long time ago," Dr. Skreta said shyly. [NRES23]

Example (10) employs an agentive subject in both counterparts, but the verb form "consulted" does not signal the result of an action.

An interesting phenomenon was the specific way of translating body parts movement (ex. 11):

(11) Oči **měla upřeny** do dálek.

Her eyes **stared** into the distance. [NRES64]

In (11), the original animate subject participant was removed and replaced by the inanimate body part ("eyes"). However, the possessive determination "her" refers to the animate possessor. This phenomenon is mentioned by Procházková (2014: 67) in her diploma dissertation where she describes the tendency of English to use an inanimate subject instead of an animate one when talking about physical motion. Nevertheless, Procházková (2014: 69) claims that this tendency is not pervasive. The results of the present study support her argument since there were instances of the inanimate as well as animate subjects in the body parts movement clauses.

Example (12) shows a Czech construction with a semantically ambiguous subject "ona" and its English counterpart containing a lexical verb "wear":

(12) Ona štíhlá a kostnatá, (…), kolem zápěstí **měla ovinuto** pokračování drátu, který zdobil zápěstí jejího muže, (…)

The woman was slim and bony, (…), round her wrist she **wore** the continuation of the wire which adorned her husband's wrist, (…) [ARES4]

In this case, the English subject "she" carries the positioner role[18] which contrasts with the original Czech ambiguity. Surprisingly, the translation uses active voice which does not reflect the syntactic structure of the possessive resultative. However, it employs the stance verb "wear", which resembles the stative semantics of the Czech original.

4.1.1.2   Perfect tense

Verbs in perfect retained the agentive semantics of the non-ambiguous subject participant as well as the resultative meaning of the original (ex. 13 and 14).

(13)   **Mají** už **osazeno** přes šedesát procent veškerých světových břehů;

They **have** already **settled** more than 60 per cent of all the world's shores; [NRES34]

(14)   Pepa s Kačenkou a Pepíčkem už **měli dojedeno**, (…)
Pepa, Kačenka and Pepíček **had** already **finished eating**. [NRES22]

The ability of the present perfect to imply a result of a past action with the result being somehow relevant in the present is described by Leech (2004: 39). Moreover, the resultative semantics is emphasized in (14) by the extra verb "finished".

(15)   Kdo **má zajištěn** pohřeb žehem, ničeho se bát nemusí (…)
The person who **has made sure** of cremation need be afraid of nothing. [ARES10]

Example (15) shows again the correspondence of the resultative semantics. It is interesting to notice that English uses the same structure as Czech, namely the auxiliary "have"/"mít" and a past participle.[19] The auxiliary character of these verbs is discussed in chapters 2.3.2 Auxiliary "have" and 2.2.4 "Mít" in diathesis. Nevertheless, there is a difference in the arrangement of semantic roles. Even though the Czech subject "kdo" is semantically ambiguous, the English subject carries a specific semantic role, namely that of an agent. This way, the original ambiguity is deleted in the counterpart.

---

[18] Quirk et al. (1985: 746-747) characterize the positioner participant as controlled by intransitive non-action stance verbs such as "sit", "stay", "remain", or transitive verbs related to stance verbs such as "carry", "hold", "keep" and "wear".

[19] The perfective nature of the Czech "mít" + -*n/-t* participle construction has been noticed and described in a corpus-based study by Mira Načeva-Marvanová (2010).

4.1.1.3 Non-finite verb forms

Out of the non-finite verb forms, the *-ed* participle occurred the most (ex. 16).

(16)   Bertlef ležel na boku, dýchal zhluboka a vlasy, které **měl** ve dne pečlivě **učesány**, byly rozcuchány (...)

Bertlef was lying on his side, breathing deeply, and his hair, always carefully **combed** during the day, was disheveled (...) [NRES58]

The reason for employing the *-ed* participle in the translations is probably the fact that it usually has a passive, mostly resultative meaning (Dušková et al., 1994: 270), which reflects the original. Furthermore, the example in (16) presents another instance of body parts movement pattern where the animate participant is deducible from the possessive determinator ("his"). The use of non-finite verb forms as counterparts for Czech verbal constructions confirms Dušková's (2005: 42) claim of Czech being more verbal than English. This issue is further discussed in chapter 4.4 English counterparts of "mít" + *-n/-t* participle: an overview.

4.1.1.4 Complex transitive constructions

There was one instance of a complex transitive construction with causative "have" (ex. 17).

(17)   Stejné soustrojí jsem **měl instalováno** ve svém staroměstském bytě.
I **had had** the same apparatus **installed** in my apartment in the Old Town. [NRES67]

The English subject "I" in (17) carries the role of an initiator; this participant only initiates the action which is performed by someone else not mentioned here (probably because it is not important for the communication). Causative "have" is discussed in more detail in section 2.3.4 Causative "have" above. The other complex transitive constructions were categorized as experiential-resultative (ex. 18), which is a term used by Mikulášová (2019: 34). This type is characterized in section 2.3.5 Experiential and experiential-resultative "have" in more detail.

(18)   **Neměl jsem připravenu** ani jedinou větu, jedinou novou větu.
I **didn't have** a single sentence **prepared**, not a single new sentence. [NRES56]

The meaning of the experiential-resultative construction is very close to those employing regular perfect tense since it could be paraphrased as "I haven't prepared a single sentence".

These translation equivalents corresponded closely with the Czech original from the semantic as well as the formal point of view.

4.1.1.5 Passive voice

Example (19) presents a passive translation counterpart of the non-ambiguous possessive resultative:

(19)   Agnes je vlečena matkou a hlavu **má otočenu** dozadu, k otci.

Agnes is dragged by her mother and her head **is turned** back, towards her father. [NRES10]

Passive constructions resemble the possessive resultative ones in their specific structuring of the syntactic and semantic elements in the utterance. Both portray the described situation from a different perspective than their counterparts in the active voice. The occurrence of passive translations also reflects the discussion about the specific character of the resultative construction, which is sometimes regarded to be an instance of verbal voice (see chapter 2.1.2 Resultative diathesis).

4.1.1.6 Copular constructions

Example (20) shows an example of copular "be" complemented by an adjective:

(20)   No a nakonec tedy k paní Eichenkranzové, ještě za světla nebo šera, dokud **má** paní **otevřeno**.

After all that was done, she'd go to Mrs Eichenkranz while it was still light or at dusk, while her shop **was** still **open**. [NRES51]

Copular constructions were not that frequent, but they demonstrated the inclination of English for using an inanimate subject participant. This was not perceived only with body parts movement, but in other situations, too, which is demonstrated by (20).

4.1.1.7 Other means of translation

Example (21) shows one of the minor, though interesting, translation devices, namely a noun.

(21)   "Dej Bůh štěstí domu tomu," **měli vyšito**.

"God grant this home happiness," said **an embroidery**. [ARES5]

The semantically ambiguous subject participant (the unexpressed subject of "měli vyšito") is left out from the English structure. In this manner, the counterpart avoided clarifying the Czech ambiguity. The noun "embroidery" expresses a result of "embroidering" which corresponds with the original resultative meaning. Moreover, this example demonstrates the tendency of Czech to have a more verbal nature than English, as was noticed by Dušková (2005: 42).

4.2   Resultative localization

There were 3 instances of the resultative localization in the dataset. This construction employs a causative verb (e. g. "položit", "pověsit") and expresses a result of situating an inanimate object by an animate participant. It is illustrated by (22):

(22)   Na misce s mýdlem **měl** namísto holicí štětky **položen** malířský štětec. [LOC3]

Example (22) shows an affected inanimate object ("štětec") which was placed somewhere by the agent. The clause contains an adverbial of place ("na misce s mýdlem") which denotes stative localization rather than expressing direction. These characteristics correspond with Panevová et al. (2014: 109).

It should be noted that in all three cases of resultative localization the semantics of the subject was non-ambiguous. The subject carried the agentive role each time, which was deduced after inspecting the context. Since the constructions resembled the possessive resultative so much, we suggest considering them instances of the possessive resultative.

4.2.1   English counterparts of the resultative localization

Table 5 presents the translation counterparts of the resultative localization.

means of translation	subtype	total	%
active voice, simple tense	another lexical verb	2	67
non-finite verb form	*-ed* participle	1	33
total		**3**	**100**

Table 5: Translation counterparts of the resultative localization

There were two instances of lexical verbs in the active voice (ex. 23) and one *-ed* participle (ex. 24).

(23)   Tereza prala prádlo a vedle vany **měla položenu** knížku.

Whenever she did the clothes, she **kept** a book next to the tub. [LOC1]

The lexical verb "keep" in (23) is a stance verb, which reflects the stative meaning of the Czech sentence (this tendency has been already noticed in section 4.1.1.1 Lexical verbs in the active voice).

(24)   Sinhálec vyňal ještě tři škeble z pytlíku, který **měl pověšen** na krku.
The Singhalese took out three more shells from the bag **slung** around his neck.
[LOC2]

The *-ed* participle in (24) has a resultative meaning (see section 4.1.1.3 Non-finite verb forms above).

The translation counterparts of the resultative localization do not show any prevalent pattern since it was very scarce in our study. However, the Czech examples as well as the English equivalents support our belief that it could be classified as the possessive resultative.

4.3   Recipient passive construction

Whenever the "mít" + *-n/-t* participle construction could be paraphrased by "dostat" + *-n/-t* participle, the example sentence was classified as a recipient passive one. This substitution test is proposed by Panevová et al. (2014: 107) and we discuss it in chapter 2.1.3 Recipient passive diathesis. The subject of these constructions carries the recipient role,[20] whereas the agentive participant is left in the background.[21] Example (25) shows the recipient subject "stráže":

(25)   (…) pokynul za dveře, aby jeho pobočník zůstal u obou přítomných, kdyby snad něco potřebovali, protože stráže **měly zakázáno** mluvit. [REC2]

The variety of lexical verbs occurring in the participle form was restricted. The most frequent verbs were "zakázat" (5 instances) and "dovolit" (4 instances) followed by others

---

[20] Again, we consider this participant to be a recipient of an action.
[21] There was only one instance of an expressed agent in the recipient passive (see ex. REC13 in the Appendix).

semantically very close to these (e. g. "povolit"). The set of lexical verbs essentially corresponded with the set found by Panevová et al. (2014: 110).

4.3.1 English counterparts of the recipient passive construction

Table 6 shows the counterparts of the recipient passive.

means of translation	subtype	total of subtype	total	%
passive voice[22]			12	63
active voice, simple tense	lexical "have"	3	4	21
	another lexical verb[23]	1		
omitted			2	11
perfect tense	past perfect		1	5
total			19	100

Table 6: Translation counterparts of the recipient passive construction

The equivalents show a clear preference for verbs in the passive voice (63%). Among the minor counterparts, there were lexical verbs in the active voice including lexical "have" (21%). In two cases the information carried by the original construction was omitted in the translation (11%). The perfect tense, which was quite frequent in the possessive resultative group, appeared scarcely (5%).

4.3.1.1 Passive voice

Passive voice proved to be a productive counterpart as it reflected the original passivity of the Czech construction (Panevová et al., 2014: 111). All the 12 verbs used were ditransitive, e. g. "forbid" (ex. 26) or "prescribe" (ex. 27).

(26) Goethe byl nemocen a **měl zakázáno** pít.

Goethe **was** ill and **forbidden** to drink. [REC3]

(27) A každý také dostal poctivou porci, jakou **měl předepsáno**.

Each did get an honest portion of what **was prescribed** for him. [REC1]

---

[22] There were two instances of a verb in the passive voice in the past perfect tense (ex. REC8 and REC12 in the Appendix). They were classified under "passive voice".

[23] The other lexical verb was "hold" which was semantically close to lexical "have" (see ex. REC9 in the Appendix).

In most cases (11 out of 12), the subject was an animate recipient, like "Goethe" in (26). This type of construction is called "semi-passive" by Quirk et al. (1985: 168) since "forbidden" has verbal as well as adjectival properties. On the one hand, it has an active verbal counterpart ("[Somebody] forbid Goethe to drink"), on the other hand, "forbidden" is coordinated with the adjective "ill". The example in (27) expresses the recipient participant by a prepositional phrase ("for him"); this construction would be classified as "central passive" by Quirk et al. (ibid.). The "passive gradient" (Quirk et al.'s term) is an example of how linguistic categories are not definitive, and individual phenomena should rather be identified on a scale.

4.3.1.2 Lexical "have"

Example (28) shows lexical "have" complemented by a noun.

(28)   Klára **měla** proto přísně **nařízeno** nikomu neotvírat.

Klara **had** strict **orders** not to open the door to anyone. [REC18]

The lexical "have" in this case is classified as dynamic (see chapter 2.3.1 Lexical "have" above) as it could be paraphrased by "receive" (OALD: have). This situation is comparable with the one in Czech where the recipient passive diathesis employs the auxiliaries "mít" and "dostat", even though there are some restrictions to their interchangeability (see chapter 2.1.3 Recipient passive diathesis). The sentence in (28) could be paraphrased as "Klara was ordered not to open the door to anyone", which shows the relation between lexical "have" complemented by a noun and passive (or rather semi-passive) constructions.

4.4   English counterparts of "mít" + -*n*/-*t* participle: an overview

Table 7 presents all the possible means of translation which appeared in the material and their frequency of occurrence.

means of translation	subtype	total of subtype	total	%
active voice, simple tense	another lexical verb	20	30	30
	lexical "have"	8		
	lexical "be"	2		
passive voice			20	20
perfect tense	past perfect	15	18	18
	present perfect	3		
non-finite verb form	-*ed* participle	11	13	13
	-*ing* participle	1		
	gerund	1		
complex transitive construction	complex transitive "have"	8	9	9
	complex transitive "get"	1		
copular construction	copular "be" + adjective		6	6
noun			2	2
omitted			2	2
total			100	100

Table 7: English counterparts of the "mít" + -*n*/-*t* participle construction: an overview

It was surprising that most of the translations used lexical verbs in the active voice and simple tense (30%) since this form does not essentially reflect the resultative, nor recipient passive meaning of the original constructions. The high frequency of passive (20%) and perfect verb forms (18%) agreed with our expectations. Non-finite verb forms were relatively frequent (13%). The occurrence of complex transitive constructions (9%) corresponded with our former hypothesis. Among the less frequent devices appeared copular constructions (6%), nouns (2%), and omitted translation (2%), which were not initially anticipated.

Generally, the studied material showed syntactic constancy of the verbal phrase in Czech and in English, although there were a few exceptions, as is demonstrated by Table 8.

form of translation	total	%
finite verb form[24]	83	83
non-finite verb form	13	13
non-verbal form	2	2
omitted translation	2	2
total	100	100

Table 8: Syntactic constancy of the Czech and English equivalents

In most cases, the construction was translated by a finite verb form (83%). Non-finite verb forms were not so common, but still, they comprised 13%. There were only 2 instances of non-verbal forms, and in two cases the Czech verbal element was omitted from the English translation. These results are comparable with Dušková's (2005: 38) findings, where the English counterparts of Czech finite verbs were mostly finite verb forms (90%), followed by non-finite verb forms (9%) and non-verbal forms (1%). Dušková (2005: 42) explains this slight divergence in translations by claiming that Czech has a more verbal character than English which uses more condensations.

---

[24] Similar to Dušková (2005), the group titled "finite verb forms" comprises simple predicates as well as copular, modal, and complex transitive predications.

5 Conclusion

This study aimed to analyze the Czech "mít" + *-n/-t* participle construction and then describe its possible English counterparts. To achieve this, 100 example sentences were excerpted from InterCorp. They came from originally Czech fiction and they were hand-filtered to exclude instances of idiomatic and other irrelevant uses of "mít".

The analysis of the Czech examples showed that the possessive resultative construction was much more frequent (78%) than the recipient passive one (19%). This corresponds with Panevová et al.'s (2014: 110) finding in their corpus-based study. The resultative localization occurred only minimally (3%). Furthermore, the present analysis focused on the semantics of the subject in the possessive resultative constructions and distinguished between the non-ambiguous and ambiguous types.

The non-ambiguous type occurred more frequently than the ambiguous one (86%). The subject participant carried a clear semantic role; mostly it was the agentive one (84%) which appeared primarily in sentences describing results of body parts movement or cognitive activities. There were a few instances of the recipient subject in the non-ambiguous set (12%). Finally, only 4% of the examples employed an affected inanimate subject. This finding corresponded with Giger's (2013: 866) claim. The ambiguous type was not so frequent in the dataset, comprising 14%. It was used when the identity of the subject participant was not important to be specified or because the style of the primary source was intentionally vague.

The variety of the possessive resultative translation counterparts was wide. Most of them were translated by a lexical verb in the active voice (30.7%) or the perfect tense (21.8%). Quite frequent were non-finite verb forms (15.4%), mostly the *-ed* participle which conveys passive, resultative meaning. An interesting phenomenon was presented by the complex transitive constructions following the SVOCo word order (11.5%). Other relatively prominent means were passive (10.2%) and copular (7.7%) predications. A significant number of instances describing body parts movement were translated by using an inanimate subject (body part) instead of the originally animate one (possessor of the body part). The noun phrase containing the inanimate subject usually referred to the animate participant by a possessive determinator. The English equivalents of the originally ambiguous constructions dealt with the ambiguity by either ascribing a definitive semantic role to the subject participant or by omitting the participant from the structure completely.

The specific subtype of the resultative diathesis called by Panevová et al. (2014: 109) "resultative localization" comprised only 3% of the dataset, which confirms its exclusive

character. The instances carry all the features of the possessive resultative, so it is probably not necessary to consider them as a distinct category. As there were little data on the Czech construction, it would be difficult to make any clear conclusion about its typical English counterparts. The translations did not show any prevalent pattern.

The recipient passive use of the "mít" + *-n/-t* participle construction was less frequent than the possessive resultative type. The agent of the action expressed by the verb phrase was usually some higher authority. The lexical verbs predominantly denoted meanings of forbidding and allowing (such as "zakázat" and "dovolit"). Most of the English counterparts clearly reflected its character by using verbs in the passive voice (63%). Among the less frequent equivalents occurred lexical verbs complemented by a noun (21%), mostly lexical "have". Both of these devices emphasized the recipient semantic role of the subject participant.

The overall results showed that the range of English counterparts was rather wide, including various grammatical categories (voice and tense) and parts of speech (nouns, adjectives, and verbs) as well as verbs "be" and "have" in their specific functions. Surprisingly, the most frequent were lexical verbs in the active voice and simple tense (30%). Nevertheless, there was a strong tendency towards the passive voice (20%) and the perfect tense (18%), which corresponded with our initial hypothesis. Our analysis also contributed to the discussion about translation constancy of the verbal phrase between Czech and English as it was studied by Dušková (2005) by confirming that Czech has a more verbal character than English.

6 References and sources

References

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

Dušková, L. (2005) "Syntactic Constancy of the Verb between English and Czech," in *Prague Studies in English* XXIV, AUC Philologica 2. The Karolinum Press, 19-44.

Dušková, L. et al. (1994) *Mluvnice současné angličtiny na pozadí češtiny*. Praha: Academia.

Čermák, F. & Hronek, J. (2009) *Slovník české frazeologie a idiomatiky 3, Výrazy slovesné*. Praha: Leda.

Giger, M. (2011) "Rezultativum," in F. Štícha (ed.) *Kapitoly z české gramatiky*. Praha: Academia, 858-882.

Grepl, M. & Karlík, P. (eds.) (1995) *Příruční mluvnice češtiny*. Praha: NLN.

Huddleston, R. & Pullum G. K. (2002) *Cambridge Grammar of the English Language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Karlík, P., M. Nekula & J. Pleskalová (eds.) *CzechEncy - Nový encyklopedický slovník češtiny*. Available online from <https://www.czechency.org/slovnik/> (last accessed 27 April 2021).

Kettnerová, V. & Lopatková, M. (2010) "The Representation of Diatheses in the Valency Lexicon of Czech Verbs," in Loftsson H., Rögnvaldsson E. & Helgadottir S. (eds.) *Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Advances in Natural Language Processing, IceTAL 2010*, 185-196.

Leech, G. (2004) *Meaning and the English Verb.* Harlow: Longman.

Mejstřík, V. (2003) *Slovník spisovné češtiny pro školu a veřejnost*. Praha: Academia.

Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary. Oxford University Press. Available online from <https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/> (last accessed: 28 April 2021).

Mikulášová, M. (2019) *English constructions with the causative and experiential verb „have" complemented by a past participle.* Available online from <https://is.cuni.cz/webapps/zzp/detail/201792> (last accessed 28 April 2021).

Načeva-Marvanová, M. (2010) *Perfektum v současné češtině: korpusová studie jeho gramatikalizace na bázi Českého národního korpusu*. Praha: NLN.

Panevová, J. et al. (2014) *Mluvnice současné češtiny 2, Syntax češtiny na základě anotovaného korpusu*. Praha: Karolinum.

Procházková, I. (2014) *"Be/have", "have/be" as equivalents of Czech "být/mít"; and "být/mít", "mít/být" as equivalents of English "be/have" in parallel texts: a comparison of the semantic and information structure of divergent counterparts*. Available online from <https://is.cuni.cz/webapps/zzp/detail/124072> (last accessed 28 April 2021).

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

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

Tomozawa, H. (2002) "A Semantic Analysis of Causative and Experiential HAVE," in *Hitotsubashi journal of arts and sciences*, 43 (1): 1-9.

Sources

Český národní korpus – InterCorp (version 12). Ústav Českého národního korpusu FF UK, Prague. Available online from <http://www.korpus.cz> (last accessed 15 April 2021).

7   Resumé

Tato bakalářská práce se zabývá českou konstrukci „mít" + *-n/-t* příčestí a jejími překladovými protějšky v angličtině. Pozornost je věnována specifickému charakteru této konstrukce, která se vyskytuje jako prostředek tzv. diateze. Cílem práce je prozkoumat, jak je tato forma překládána do angličtiny, zda anglické ekvivalenty reflektují formu a význam originálu a případně i původní sémantiku podmětu.

Teoretická část představuje problematiku diateze, především jak je pojímána v *Mluvnici současné češtiny II* od Panevové et al. (2014). Jedná se o vztah sémantické struktury věty a struktury větných členů. Díky těmto vztahům lze měnit hierarchizaci a mapování sémantických rolí, což umožňuje vyjádřit jednu mimojazykovou situaci z různých perspektiv. Tato práce se zaměřuje na gramatické diateze, ve kterých dochází ke změně formálního vyjádření, ale ne ke změně valenčního rámce slovesa. Postupně vymezujeme všechny diateze a způsoby jejich tvoření, detailněji se však věnujeme rezultativní a recipientní pasivní diatezi, protože v nich se objevuje konstrukce „mít" + *-n/-t* příčestí.

Podstatný je především poddruh rezultativní konstrukce nazývaný Panevovou et al. (2014) „posesivní rezultativ" (např. „máme napečeno"). Termín poukazuje na základní rysy tohoto jevu: na jeho rezultativní význam a zároveň na přítomnost slovesa „mít", které nabývá v tomto případě auxiliární funkci. Ve většině výskytů je sémantika podmětu jasná („non-ambiguous"), např. agens se větě „Pilot už má nalétáno několik hodin", avšak objevují se i posesivní rezultativy s neurčitou sémantikou podmětu („ambiguous"), např. „máme uvařeno". Podmět zde může nést buď sémantickou roli agenta („<u>my</u> jsme si uvařili"), anebo recipienta („někdo <u>nám</u> uvařil"), z čehož plyne i jistá celková ambivalentnost těchto konstrukcí.

Další podtyp rezultativní diateze se nazývá „rezultativní lokalizace", např. „šaty máš pověšeny ve skříni". I zde se uplatňuje zkoumaná konstrukce „mít" + *-n/-t* příčestí. Lexikální sloveso, ze kterého je příčestí utvořeno, je zpravidla kauzativní (např. „pověsit", „položit"). Tento typ se vyskytuje pouze řídce.

Poslední doménou analyzované konstrukce je recipientní pasivní diateze, kde daná forma tvoří paralelu ke frázi „dostat" + *-n/-t* příčestí, i když její uplatnění je omezenější. Podmět v této diatezi je zpravidla sémantický recipient (recipient nějakého děje), např. „členové mají vstup povolen".

Teoretická část práce se dále zabývá různými funkcemi českého slovesa „mít". Vymezeno je „mít" lexikální a modální, „mít" jako součást frazémů a hlavně jako prvek objevující se v diatezi. „Mít" v diatezi má povahu pomocného slovesa, jelikož je z větší části

lexikálně vyprázdněné a převažuje jeho gramatická funkce. Věnujeme se i anglickému slovesu „have", nejprve jeho lexikálnímu významu, poté ale i „have" jako slovesu pomocnému a modálnímu. Na závěr popisujeme kauzativní, experienciální a experienciálně-rezultativní konstrukce, ve kterých se „have" rovněž vyskytuje.

Analýza pracuje s materiálem 100 vět z paralelního korpusu InterCorp, ve kterých se objevuje „mít" + *-n/-t* příčestí a které pocházejí z česky psané beletrie. Materiál byl ručně upraven tak, aby zahrnoval pouze takové konstrukce, kde "mít" nese jasně auxiliární funkci, tzn. kde se „mít" vyskytuje jako prostředek diateze. Do výzkumu nebyly zahrnuty idiomatické případy této konstrukce.

V prvním kroku si analýza kladla za cíl popsat charakteristiku nalezených českých konstrukcí, dále se zaměřila na anglické překladové ekvivalenty. Na základě zjištění Panevové et al. (2014) jsme očekávali, že se nejčastěji vyskytne posesivní rezultativ, a to jeho forma obsahující podmět s jasnou sémantickou rolí („non-ambiguous"). Tento předpoklad se potvrdil, posesivní rezultativ byl nejvíce frekventovaný (78 %). Z celkového počtu 78 posesivních rezultativů byl podtyp „non-ambiguous" mnohem častější (86 %) než typ „ambiguous" (14 %).

U typu „non-ambiguous" bylo zjištěno, že v pozici podmětu nejčastěji stojí sémantický agens (84 %), dále recipiens (12 %) a úplně okrajově též neživotný, dějem zasažený participant (4 %). Tyto výsledky souhlasily s výzkumem Panevové et al. (2014) i Gigera (2013). V této skupině se ve velmi hojném počtu (22 výskytů) objevily konstrukce popisující pohyby lidského těla a pohyby tomu podobné (např. „měla jednu ruku přehozenu přes jeho tělo"), v menší míře i výsledky nějaké mentální aktivity (např. „měl vše vymyšleno").

Ve většině případů byl posesivní rezultativ přeložen finitní formou slovesa v činném rodě a prostém čase (30,7 %). Toto zjištění bylo překvapivé, protože činný rod zcela nereflektuje význam výsledku děje ani neuplatňuje zvláštní řazení sémantických rolí. Hojně se vyskytly verbální fráze v perfektu (21,8 %), což souhlasilo s naší hypotézou: slovesné fráze v perfektu vyjadřují výsledek děje, zároveň se v nich užívá pomocného „have" a příčestí, a proto je tato forma vhodným překladovým protějškem. Časté byly nefinitní verbální tvary (15,4 %), především minulé příčestí, které nese rezultativní význam. Významným protějškem byly komplexně-tranzitivní predikace (11,5 %), zejména experienciálně-rezultativní konstrukce, kterou popsala Mikulášová (2019) ve své diplomové práci. Tato konstrukce rovněž vyjadřuje výsledek děje a obsahuje sloveso „have". Méně častá byla slovesa v trpném rodě (10,2 %), sponové predikace (7,7 %) a podstatná jména (2,6 %). Materiál mimo jiné ukázal, že angličtina v konstrukcích popisujících pohyby lidského těla preferuje neživotný podmět oproti původnímu životnému podmětu v češtině. V překladech skupiny „ambiguous" bylo zajímavé sledovat, jak

se překladatelé vypořádali s původní neurčitostí podmětu. Někdy byla podmětu připsána jasná sémantická role (např. agens), jindy se v překladu vyskytla taková forma (např. podstatné jméno), kde se původní sémantický participant ani objevit nemohl.

Rezultativní lokalizace se podle očekávání vyskytla pouze minimálně (3 %). Zřejmě to souvisí s její specifickou formou, která podle Panevové et al. (2014) není gramatikalizována. Její překladové ekvivalenty zahrnovaly slovesa v činném rodě a prostém čase (67 %) a minulé příčestí (33 %). Vzhledem k tomu, že počet nalezených konstrukcí byl tak malý, nelze vyvozovat obecnější závěry o jejich překladech. Zároveň navrhujeme, aby tyto konstrukce byly považovány za případy posesivního rezultativu, jelikož vykazují všechny jeho rysy.

Recipientní pasivum se ve vzorku vyskytlo v 19 % případů. Podle našich předpokladů bylo méně frekventované než posesivní rezultativ. V příčestí těchto konstrukcí stála velmi často lexikální slovesa vyjadřující zákaz nebo povolení. U recipientního pasiva byly předpokládány anglické protějšky v trpném rodě, což analýza potvrdila (63 %). Tyto protějšky reflektovaly pasivní význam originálu, a dokonce i recipientní roli podmětu. Mezi anglickými ekvivalenty byla i slovesa v činném rodě (21 %), konkrétně se jednalo o lexikální „have“ a jemu sémanticky příbuzné „hold“, která rovněž vyjadřovala původní význam české konstrukce. Dva překlady danou konstrukci vůbec nereflektovaly (11 %), nejméně častým protějškem byla slovesa v perfektu (1 %).

V závěru analýzy jsme se pokusili podívat na problematiku překladů obecněji. Anglické protějšky konstrukce „mít“ + -*n/-t* příčestí byly nejčastěji tvořeny finitní slovesnou formou (83 %). Poměrně méně bylo nefinitních verbálních forem (13 %). Neverbálních a vynechaných překladů bylo minimálně (každý po 2 %). Naše výsledky byly srovnatelné s analýzou Duškové (2005), tzn. potvrdily její hypotézu, že čeština má verbálnější charakter než angličtina.

8 Appendix

The appendix presents the whole dataset and is divided into 3 parts: possessive resultative (RES), resultative localization (LOC), recipient passive (REC). The possessive resultative constructions are distinguished as ambiguous (ARES) and non-ambiguous (NRES). Each line is provided with a reference number and information about the original source. The Czech construction and its English counterpart are in bold for better orientation in the text. Each of the counterparts is classified according to its form; this classification reflects Table 7 above.

reference number	source	Czech original	English counterpart	means of translation
possessive resultative				
ambiguous possessive resultative				
ARES1	Topol: *Sestra*	Po mým srdci v tý chvíli lezli hrdý mravenci, na overalech **měli napsáno** Svobodu, nebo smrt a ta druhá komponenta byla škrtlá, ...	Proud ants crept across my heart in overalls that **said** Freedom or Death, the second component was crossed out, ...	active voice, simple tense
ARES2	Kundera: *Nesnesitelná lehkost bytí*	Večer dorazili do malé vsi, kde **měli pronajato** několik domků postavených na kůlech.	In the evening, they pulled into a small village where they **had rented** several houses on stilts.	perfect tense
ARES3	Fuks: *Myši Natálie Mooshabrové*	... a po jedné či dvou umělých kytkách, kterými pak ty své hroby zdobila, tak to **měli** lidé **pojištěno** a zaplaceno.	This was something people had paid for, it was part of the insurance they **had taken out**, ...	perfect tense
ARES4	Klíma: *Milostné léto*	... kolem zápěstí **měla ovinuto** pokračování drátu, který zdobil zápěstí jejího muže ...	... round her wrist she **wore** the continuation of the wire which adorned her husband's wrist ...	active voice, simple tense
ARES5	Topol: *Sestra*	"Dej Bůh štěstí domu tomu", **měli vyšito**.	"God grant this home happiness," said an **embroidery**.	noun
ARES6	Fuks: *Spalovač mrtvol*	No ať přijde," řekl pak, "**máme pečeno** a také mandle …	Well, let him come,' he said then, 'we'**ve got** cakes and almonds as well …	active voice, simple tense
ARES7	Klíma: *Láska a smetí*	Na stolku vedle lůžka **má připraveno** několik knížek.	On the little table by the bed **lie** a few books.	active voice, simple tense
ARES8	Urban: *Sedmikostelí*	**Neměl jsem vyvětráno** a přikrývky byly rozházené po nábytku.	Bedding lay scattered about on the furniture and the air **was stale and fuggy**.	copular construction
ARES9	Balabán: *Možná, že odcházíme*	V hledišti, přímo mezi rukojmími, sedí čečenské ženy, manželky zabitých soudruhů, **mají** na těle **upevněny** výbušniny a v rukou svírají detonátory.	In the auditorium, mixed in among the hostages, sit Chechen women, the wives of fighters who had been killed. On their bodies **are** suicide vests, in their hands, detonators.	active voice, simple tense
ARES10	Fuks: *Spalovač mrtvol*	Kdo **má zajištěn** pohřeb žehem, ničeho se bát nemusí, může umřít beze strachu," ...	The person who **has made sure** of cremation need be afraid of nothing. He can die without fear ...	perfect tense
ARES11	Fuks: *Myši Natálie Mooshabrové*	... po jedné či dvou umělých kytkách, kterými pak ty své hroby zdobila, tak to **měli** lidé pojištěno a **zaplaceno**.	This was something people **had paid for**, it was part of the insurance they had taken out, ...	perfect tense

		non-ambiguous possessive resultative		
NRES1	Klíma: *Láska a smetí*	v jednom okně jsem zahlédl oběšence, tvář **měl přitisknutu** na sklo, dlouhý jazyk mu visel z otevřených úst a odspodu ho oblévala krvavá záře.	In one of the windows I caught sight of a hanged man, his face **pressed** to the window-pane and his long tongue hanging from his open mouth.	non-finite verb form
NRES2	Zmeškal: *Milostný dopis klínovým písmem*	... jindy si rty kousala a perutě **měla ovinuty** kolem sebe.	... it was biting its lip with its wings **wrapped** around its body.	non-finite verb form
NRES3	Hůlová: *Paměť mojí babičce*	Pokaždý se mě ptal, jak prej **mám** dneska **navařeno** ...	Whatcha **got cookin'**, he'd always ask	complex transitive construction
NRES4	Kundera: *Kniha smíchu a zapomnění*	(Děti) vystrkují dopředu střídavě nejdřív jedno a pak druhé rameno, hlavu **mají zvrácenu** do výše ...	Children come running to the play area to join him: flinging now one arm, now the other, forward, they **throw** their heads **back** ...	active voice, simple tense
NRES5	Hrabal: *Obsluhoval jsem anglického krále*	... už týden si hrála na gramofonové desky Wagnera, Lohengrina a Siegfrieda, to už **měla vybráno**, že kdyby to byl chlapec, tak by se jmenoval Siegfried Ditie ...	For a week she'd been playing Wagner on the record player, Lohengrin and Siegfried, and she'd already **decided** that if it was a boy she'd call it Siegfried Ditie ...	perfect tense
NRES6	Stýblová: *Skalpel, prosím*	Za chvíli jsme **měli naloženo**.	**Loading** the car was the work of a moment.	non-finite verb form
NRES7	Kundera: *Žert*	Byla hubená, vytáhlá, kostnatá a tvář **měla zahalenu** šátkem;	She was tall, thin, bony, and her face **was veiled** by a scarf.	passive voice
NRES8	Hašek: *Osudy dobrého vojáka Švejka ...*	**Mám** to všechno **zapsáno**.	I **have** it all **written down**.	complex transitive construction
NRES9	Urban: *Sedmikostelí*	Chtěl jsem vytáhnout ruce z kapes, a tu jsem zjistil, že je **mám** vší silou **přitisknuty** na uších.	I felt I should take my hands out of my pockets but discovered I couldn't: I **was pressing** them to my ears with all my strength.	active voice, simple tense
NRES10	Kundera: *Nesmrtelnost*	Agnes je vlečena matkou, a hlavu **má otočenu** dozadu, k otci;	Agnes is dragged by her mother and her head **is turned back**, towards her father;	passive voice
NRES11	Kohout: *Hvězdná hodina vrahů*	**Měl** vše **vymyšleno**.	He **had** it all **thought out**.	complex transitive construction
NRES12	Škvorecký: *Příběh inženýra lidských duší I*	Hetflajš si přišel pro kříže a **měl** jich **připraveno** třikrát tolik než obvykle.	When Hetflajs came for the crow-brackets, there **were** three times as many as usual **waiting** for him.	active voice, simple tense
NRES13	Stýblová: *Skalpel, prosím*	**Měl zapsáno** všechno o skvělých výsledcích neurochirurgie.	It **was** all **written down**, all the excellent results of neurosurgery.	passive voice

NRES14	Klíma: *Milostné léto*	Vždyť já vím, **máš** to **napsáno** v pase, že můžeš jet.	Yes, I know it **says** in your passport that you can travel.	active voice, simple tense
NRES15	Otčenášek: *Romeo, Julie a tma*	Všechno **měl promyšleno** do nejmenších podrobností.	He **had thought** it all **out** to the smallest detail.	perfect tense
NRES16	Urban: *Sedmikost elí*	**Měly** v sobě **vtesánu** pokoru středověkého člověka ...	**Carved** into them I saw the humility of medieval man ...	non-finite verb form
NRES17	Jirotka: *Saturnin*	... ptala se, co dělá můj kotník a jestli už **mám připraveno** vyprávění na večer.	... turned to me, inquiring after my ankle and asking whether I **had** yet **prepared** a story to tell in the evening.	perfect tense
NRES18	Kundera: *Žert*	... ležel na zádech, tvář **měl obrácenu** do nebe a pod hlavou měl pouzdro s houslemi ...	... he was lying on his back with his face **turned up** to the sky, and under his head he had a violin case ...	non-finite verb form
NRES19	Kundera: *Nesmrteln ost*	... nic neviděla **majíc** zavřené oči a tvář **přitištěnu** ke kolenům ...	... with her eyes closed and her face **pressed** to her knees, she saw nothing, ...	non-finite verb form
NRES20	Čapek: *Válka s mloky*	Sakra, **má** to ten Gustl **zařízeno**.	Hell, that Gussie **had done** all right for himself	perfect tense
NRES21	Škvorecký: *Hříchy pro pátera Knoxe*	Ponivač to potvrdí jednu jistou tvoji hypotézu, hlavinko nenormální, a **majíce** ji **potvrzenu**, z toho, co víme o pohybech těch tří v osudný den, snadno vydedukujeme ...	It will confirm a certain hypothesis of yours, and once that **is proven** we will be able to deduce ...	passive voice
NRES22	Dousková: *Hrdý Budžes*	Pepa s Kačenkou a s Pepíčkem už **měli dojedeno**, ...	Pepa, Kačenka and Pepíček **had** already **finished eating**.	perfect tense
NRES23	Kundera: *Valčík na rozloučeno u*	„**Mám** to již dávno **prokonzultováno** s právníky," řekl doktor Škréta s tichým ostychem.	"I **consulted** lawyers a long time ago," Dr. Skreta said shyly.	active voice, simple tense
NRES24	Škvorecký: *Příběh inženýra lidských duší I*	Pro soudruhy posravší se, buď pro krátkost doby vevnitř, nebo pro dlouhost doby v řadě, **má** soudružka Stoličnaja **připraveny** čisté podvlékačky ...	Comrade Stolichnaya **would have ready** a clean change of underwear ...	complex transitive construction
NRES25	Stýblová: *Skalpel, prosím*	**Má** ruce bezmocně **složeny** v klíně ...	Her hands **lay** helpless in her lap ...	active voice, simple tense
NRES26	Hakl: *O rodičích a dětech*	„Šli s ňákou partou přes most Legií, von vylez na zábradlí a šel po něm, a poněvadž **měl vypito**, tak blbě šláp a sletěl do vody.	"There was a bunch of them walking over Legií Bridge, he got up on the railing and walked along it, and because he'**d had** a few he took a wrong step and fell into the water.	perfect tense
NRES27	Kundera: *Nesnesitel ná lehkost bytí*	Bohužel **měl** na ten večer **smluvenu** návštěvu, takže ji k sobě pozval až na příští den.	Unfortunately, he **had** something on that evening and could not invite her to his place until the next day.	active voice, simple tense
NRES28	Urban: *Sedmikost elí*	Měla v úmyslu zajít do botanické zahrady, ale zjistila, že **mají zavřeno**.	She had been hoping to go to the botanical garden, but it **had been shut**.	perfect tense

NRES29	Kundera: *Nesnesitelná lehkost bytí*	**Měla** jednu ruku **přehozenu** přes jeho tělo a oči zavřené.	She **stretched** one arm across his body and closed her eyes.	active voice, simple tense
NRES30	Pekárková: *Dej mi ty prachy*	Obě zápěstí **měl** řemínky **připoutány** ke konzolám po stranách postele ...	Both of his wrists **were fastened** to metal bars on the sides of the bed ...	passive voice
NRES31	Fahrner: *Steiner and Co jsme dělali*	Ani jeden z nás **neměl** hluboko v sobě **uloženo**, že se neshody dají překonat ...	Neither of us **had** any deeper conviction that discord was something you could get over ...	active voice, simple tense
NRES32	Urban: *Sedmikostelí*	Odvěsny svíraly pravý úhel, **měl** k nim **připoutány** roztažené paže.	Enclosed in the triangle was a small naked human figure, its outstretched arms **tied** to the sides just below the right-angled apex ...	non-finite verb form
NRES33	Hašek: *Osudy dobrého vojáka Švejka ...*	Švejk položil na zem hromadu věcí, které vylákal v důstojnické mináži a které **měl zabaleny** do pláště.	Švejk laid a heap of things on the ground which he'd lured away in the officers' mess and which he **had wrapped** in the overcoat.	perfect tense
NRES34	Čapek: *Válka s mloky*	**Mají** už **osazeno** přes šedesát procent veškerých světových břehů.	They **have** already **settled** more than 60 per cent of all the world's shores.	perfect tense
NRES35	Fuks: *Myši Natálie Mooshabrové*	„Šla jsem na pohřeb a tak **mám zavřeno**."	I **had to close** in order to go to the funeral .	active voice, simple tense
NRES36	Jirotka: *Saturnin*	**Má** tam **napsáno**: tovární sklad nábytku.	His **inscription** says Furniture Warehouse.	noun
NRES37	Hašek: *Osudy dobrého vojáka Švejka ...*	Já to **mám napsáno**, pane obrlajtnant:	"I **have** it **written down** OBRLAJTNANT, Sir:	complex transitive construction
NRES38	Stýblová: *Skalpel, prosím*	... přestože sálová sestra **má** každý steh **připraven** dávno předtím, než pro něj natáhne ruku.	... even though the theatre sister **had** every suture **prepared** long before he stuck out his hand for it.	complex transitive construction
NRES39	Lustig: *Modlitba pro Kateřinu Horowitzovou*	... **měl** tu **připraven** svitek dolarových bankovek.	Quickly Mr. Herman Cohen held out his hand distractedly; he **had** in it a roll of dollar bills.	active voice, simple tense
NRES40	Topol: *Sestra*	... počítám, že moje Laosanka už **má sbaleno** ...	... I reckon Lady Laos **is packed** by now ...	copular construction
NRES41	Zmeškal: *Milostný dopis klínovým písmem*	... jakoby nenápadně (ho) pohladila po rukou, které **měl položeny** na stole ...	... she would also quick as a wink, inconspicuously stroke his hands, which **were resting** on the table ...	active voice, simple tense
NRES42	Stýblová: *Skalpel, prosím*	**Měl jsem spočítáno**, že na schůzi přijdu s půlhodinovým zpožděním.	I **reckoned** that I would be arriving at the meeting half an hour late as it was.	active voice, simple tense

NRES43	Kundera: *Nesnesitelná lehkost bytí*	Zabalila ho do červené šály, kterou **měla uvázánu** kolem krku a přitiskla si ho levou rukou k tělu.	She wrapped it up in the red scarf she **had been wearing** around her neck ...	perfect tense
NRES44	Škvorecký: *Mirákl*	**Měli** tam podle předpisu **zhasnuto** ...	All the lights **were out**, according to regulations ...	active voice, simple tense
NRES45	Kundera: *Nesnesitelná lehkost bytí*	Otevřela mu a stála před ním na svých krásných vysokých nohách, svlečená, jen v kalhotkách a podprsence. Na hlavě **měla nasazenu** černou buřinku.	When she opened the door, she stood before him on her beautiful long legs **wearing** nothing but panties and bra and a black bowler hat.	non-finite verb form
NRES46	Kundera: *Kniha smíchu a zapomnění*	**Měl** křečovitě **staženu** tvář snažil se nikoho nevidět ...	He **was tense**; he made an effort not to look at anyone ...	copular construction
NRES47	Klíma: *Láska a smetí*	Oči **měl** pevně **zavřeny**.	His eyes **were** firmly **shut**.	copular construction
NRES48	Kohout: *Hvězdná hodina vrahů*	**Měl** pro ni **připraven** obdivný pohled, který, jak zpovykaně věděl, při jeho zjevu dosud neselhal ...	He **prepared** his best admiring gaze for her, which, he smugly knew, was infallible ...	active voice, simple tense
NRES49	Kundera: *Nesmrtelnost*	... skoupila všechny své fotografie (byla na nich po boku muže a ruku **měla napřaženu** před svou tváří) ...	... bought up all her photos (showing her at the man's side, with one arm **extended** across her face)	non-finite verb form
NRES50	Kundera: *Žert*	... pak jsem se k němu otočil zády a dal se ulicí k hotelu, kde jsem **měl zamluven** nocleh.	... turning my back on it, set off for the hotel where I **had booked** a room for the night.	perfect tense
NRES51	Fuks: *Myši Natálie Mooshabrové*	No a nakonec tedy k paní Eichenkranzové, ještě za světla nebo šera, dokud **má** paní **otevřeno**.	After all that was done she'd go to Mrs Eichenkranz while it was still light or at dusk, while her shop **was** still **open**.	copular construction
NRES52	Klíma: *Milostné léto*	... když jsme vstávali až v poledne a všechny obchody **měly zavřeno** ...	... what could I buy when we didn't get up till midday and all the shops **were closed** ...	copular construction
NRES53	Dousková: *Hrdý Budžes*	... a pak jí zezadu očuchává punčocháče, jestli tam prej **nemá naděláno**.	... and then she sniffs her tights from behind in case she **has** something nasty on them.	active voice, simple tense
NRES54	Kundera: *Nesmrtelnost*	Hruď **měla skrčenu**, svou nebohou útlou hruď, v které hořel trpký plamen bolavého já ...	Her chest **was caved in**, her poor weak chest burning with the bitter flame ...	passive voice
NRES55	Hašek: *Osudy dobrého vojáka Švejka ...*	**Máte poznamenáno**, že se ten chlap jmenuje Kákonyi?	**Have** you **made a note** that the guy's name is Kákonyi?	perfect tense
NRES56	Klíma: *Láska a smetí*	**Neměl jsem připravenu** ani jedinou větu, jedinou novou větu.	I **didn't have** a single sentence **prepared**, not a single new sentence.	complex transitive construction
NRES57	Kundera: *Nesmrtelnost*	nějaká zcela epizodická událost v sobě **nemá uloženu** sílu, která způsobí ...	some totally episodic event **may not contain** within itself a power that some day could unexpectedly turn it into a cause of further events.	active voice, simple tense

NRES58	Kundera: *Valčík na rozloučenou*	Bertlef ležel na boku, dýchal zhluboka a vlasy, které **měl** ve dne pečlivě **učesány**, byly rozcuchány ...	Bertlef was lying on his side, breathing deeply, and his hair, always carefully **combed** during the day, was disheveled ...	non-finite verb form
NRES59	Jirotka: *Saturnin*	Za hodinu jsme **měli připravenu** hromadu klestí a v upraveném ohništi byla narovnána úhledná hranička ...	In an hour we **had prepared** a heap of brushwood and had created a fireplace...	perfect tense
NRES60	Hrabal: *Obsluhoval jsem anglického krále*	... já jsem jí jen řekl, že můj děda **má** na pomníku **napsáno** Johan Ditie, ...	I could only tell her that my grandfather's name **was spelled** Johan Ditie on his tombstone ...	passive voice
NRES61	Kundera: *Nesmrtelnost*	... **má** ji (hlavu) **otočenu** tak zarputile, vzdorovitě, že dostává do krku křeč;	... she **turns** her head so hard, with so much determination, that she feels a cramp in her neck;	active voice, simple tense
NRES62	Škvorecký: *Příběh inženýra lidských duší II*	... ta taky vedla podobný rituály za úplňku, paže bílé jako Vrchcolábovy kalhoty **majíc vztaženy** k měsíci.	... she conducts a similar ritual by the light of the full moon, and her arms, as white as Vrchcolab's trousers, **stretched up** to the moon.	non-finite verb form
NRES63	Zmeškal: *Milostný dopis klínovým písmem*	Někdy **měla** socha rty **roztaženy** v úsměvu ...	Sometimes the statue's lips **were stretched** into a smile ...	passive voice
NRES64	Kundera: *Nesmrtelnost*	Oči **měla upřeny** do dálek.	Her eyes **stared** into the distance.	active voice, simple tense
NRES65	Zmeškal: *Milostný dopis klínovým písmem*	... doporučil mi, abych zašel na radnici, tam že by měli **mít zaneseny** ve svých mapách i ty nejčerstvější změny.	... (he) recommended I go to town hall, since they were likely to **have** the most recent changes **entered** on their maps.	complex transitive construction
NRES66	Kundera: *Kniha smíchu a zapomnění*	Herečka Hana **měla** nohy **zkříženy** pod sebou, jak je vidíme na soškách Buddhů ...	Hanna the actress sat with her legs **crossed** under her like the Buddha statues ...	non-finite verb form
NRES67	Urban: *Lord Mord*	Stejné soustrojí **jsem měl instalováno** ve svém staroměstském bytě.	I **had had** the same apparatus **installed** in my apartment in the Old Town.	complex transitive construction
resultative localization				
LOC1	Kundera: *Nesnesitelná lehkost bytí*	Tereza prala prádlo a vedle vany **měla položenu** knížku.	Whenever she did the clothes, she **kept** a book next to the tub.	active voice, simple tense
LOC2	Čapek: *Válka s mloky*	Sinhálec vyňal ještě tři škeble z pytlíku, který **měl pověšen** na krku.	The Singhalese took out three more shells from the bag **slung** around his neck.	non-finite verb form

LOC3	Urban: *Lord Mord*	Na misce s mýdlem **měl** namísto holicí štětky **položen** malířský štětec.	A paint brush **lay** on top of the soap bowl.	active voice, simple tense
		recipient passive		
REC1	Hašek: *Osudy dobrého vojáka Švejka ...*	A každý také dostal poctivou porci, jakou **měl předepsáno**.	Each did get an honest portion of what **was prescribed** for him.	passive voice
REC2	Lustig: *Modlitba pro Kateřinu Horowitzovou*	... kdyby snad něco potřebovali, protože stráže **měly zakázáno** mluvit.	... in case they'd need anything, because the guards **were forbidden** to speak to them.	passive voice
REC3	Kundera: *Kniha smíchu a zapomnění*	Goethe byl nemocen a **měl zakázáno** pít.	Goethe **was** ill and **forbidden** to drink.	passive voice
REC4	Hašek: *Osudy dobrého vojáka Švejka ...*	... poněvadž **měl** nějak **dovoleno**, že může se stravovat sám a sobě přilepšit.	Somehow, he **was allowed** to buy his own eats and keep lots of extras with him.	passive voice
REC5	Urban: *Lord Mord*	Gita **měla nakázáno** na petlici zavírat vrata do dvora ...	Gita **had** strict instructions to padlock both the yard door and the house door ...	active voice, simple tense
REC6	Zmeškal: *Milostný dopis klínovým písmem*	Povolení od Aliciny matky měly, i když **měly** zároveň také **přikázáno** být se vším velice opatrné ...	They had permission from Alice's mother, though they **were instructed** to be very careful with everything ...	passive voice
REC7	Urban: *Sedmikostelí*	"Byli jsme zámožné bratrstvo, ale přístup **měl** k nám **otevřen** každý ...	Our brotherhood always enjoyed some affluence, although – and this will appeal to a democrat like you – anybody **was entitled** to join.	passive voice
REC8	Hašek: *Osudy dobrého vojáka Švejka ...*	... ukazoval nám dva zlatníky, ne jeden, jak **měl slíbeno**, a chtěl se s panem Ferdinandem rozdělit napolovic.	... he was showing us two gold pieces, not one as he **had been promised**, and wanted to split it fifty-fifty with Mister Ferdinand.	passive voice
REC9	Čapek: *Válka s mloky*	Ve většině případů **nemáme zaručeno** ani právo rybolovu;	In most instances we do not even **hold** a title to fishing rights.	active voice, simple tense
REC10	Dousková: *Hrdý Budžes*	Po večeři musel jít Pepíček spát, ale přišel pan Dusil, Luděk Starý a Lída Ptáčkova s Ťutim a já jsem **měla dovoleno** do půl desátý.	After dinner Pepíček had to go to bed, but Mr Dusil, Luděk Starý and Lida Ptáčková came along with their dog and I **was allowed** to stay up till half past nine.	passive voice
REC11	Urban: *Lord Mord*	... mezi vraty mi řekl, že vzadu na mě čeká děvečka jménem Dorota, prý to **má dovoleno**, ...	He said she apparently **had** permission, and from the look on his face the permission probably didn't come from him.	active voice, simple tense

REC12	Kundera: *Kniha smíchu a zapomnění*	Passer **má zakázány** procházky i alkohol.	Passer **had been forbidden** both to walk and to drink.	passive voice
REC13	Lustig: *Modlitba pro Kateřinu Horowitzovou*	... zpíval však bez ustání, aniž cokoli k něčemu podotkl, jako by to **měl** přímo **nakázáno** panem Brenskem ...	But he kept on singing, paying no attention to anybody else, as though this was what Mr. Brenske **had ordered** him to do.	perfect tense
REC14	Pekárková: *Dej mi ty prachy*	... z dosahu zvědavé Jindřišky, která **měla zakázáno** na něj příliš zírat, aby neztratil účinnost.	... out of reach of the curious Gin, who **wasn't allowed** to as much as look at it too closely, so it wouldn't lose its power.	passive voice
REC15	Kundera: *Žert*	Dohodli jsme se, že Lucii napíšu pohlednici, abych jí oznámil, kdy **budu mít** zase **povolenu** vycházku ...	We agreed I'd send a postcard to let her know when I had my next leave and could see her.	omitted
REC16	Kundera: *Nesnesitelná lehkost bytí*	Má-li **mít** malíř **povolenu** výstavu, ...	If a painter is to have an exhibition, ...	omitted
REC17	Škvorecký: *Příběh inženýra lidských duší I*	Zbouchnul nezletilou, což jako učitel **měl zakázáno**.	He knocked up a minor, which as a teacher he**'s forbidden** to do ...	passive voice.
REC18	Kundera: *Směšné lásky*	Klára **měla** proto přísně **nařízeno** nikomu neotvírat.	Klara **had** strict orders not to open the door to anyone.	active voice, simple tense
REC19	Hašek: *Osudy dobrého vojáka Švejka ...*	I kouřit **měl dovoleno**.	He **was** even **allowed** to smoke!	passive voice