ŠIAULIAI UNIVERSITY
FACULTY OF HUMANITIES
ENGLISH PHILOLOGY DEPARTMENT

THE COMMUNICATIVE STRUCTURE OF THE SENTENCE
THE RETENTION OF RHEME IN THE TRANSLATION FROM
LITHUANIAN INTO ENGLISH

Master Thesis

Research Adviser: Dr. Dalia Roikienė

Student: Stefanija Grietnickienė,VM II

ŠIAULIAI

2008

ŠIAULIŲ UNIVERSITETAS
HUMANITARINIS FAKULTETAS
ANGLŲ KALBOS KATEDRA

KOMUNIKACINĖ SAKINIO STRUKTŪRA
REMOS IŠLAIKYMAS VERČIANT IŠ LIETUVIŲ KALBOS
Į ANGLŲ KALBĄ

Magistro darbas

Mokslinio darbo vadovėĮ dr. Dalia Roikienė
Atliko: Stefanija Grietnickienė, VM II

ŠIAULIAI
2008

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

According to the so-called three-level approach to syntax, the production of a sentence involves semantic, syntactic and communicative level. The semantic level is responsible for the generation of sentence meaning which is a combination of appropriate semantic functions. The syntactic level organizes the semantic components into a sentence. The communicative level adapts the sentence to a concrete situation which depends on how the speaker or writer projects his or her thought: what is chosen as 'a point of departure', or *the theme*, and towards what the sentence perspectives, or what is *the rheme*. That is to say, sentence elements are assigned certain communicative values, or they display different degrees of Communicative Dynamism (CD). As Firbas says, Communicative Dynamism is phenomenon constantly displayed by linguistic elements in the act of communication. "It is an inherent quality of communication and manifests itself in constant development towards the attainment of a communicative goal" (Firbas, 1995:7).

This research analyses the communicative structure of the sentence. We may assume that in all languages the clause has the character of a message: it has some form of organization giving it the status of a communicative event. But there are different ways in which this may be achieved. In English, as in many other languages, the clause is organized as a message by having a special status assigned to one part of it. One element in the clause is enunciated as *the theme*; this then combines with the remainder so that the two parts together constitute a message.

In some languages which have a pattern of this kind, *the theme* is announced by means of a particle: in Japanese, for example, there is a special postposition *–wa,* which signifiers that whatever immediately precedes it is thematic. In other languages, of which English is one, the theme is indicated by position in the clause. In speaking or writing English we signal that an item has thematic status by putting it first. No other signal is necessary, although it is not unusual in spoken English for *the theme* to be marked off also by the intonation pattern.

The term *Theme* the first was used by the Prague school of linguists. The *Theme* is the element which serves as the point of departure of the message; it is that with which the clause is concerned. The remainder of the message, the part in which the *Theme* is developed, is called in

Prague school terminology the *Rheme*. As a message structure, therefore, a clause consists of a *Theme* accompanied by a *Rheme*; and the structure is expressed by the order – whatever is chosen as the *Theme* is put first.

The research analyses the retention of the *Rheme* in the translation from Lithuanian into English. The focus is drawn on rhematic Subject, Predicate, Object and Circumstantial Adjuncts. The theoretical basis are works of the Prague school of linguists, Halliday, Lithuanian authors Valeika, Valeckienė, Labutis, Ambrazas, Petronienė, Sirtautas, Vaskelienė, Roikienė and other contemporary sources of English and Lithuanian grammar.

The subject of the present study is the translation of the Rhematic sentence elements, i.e. rhematic subjects, rhematic predicates, rhematic objects and rhematic adverbial adjuncts, from English into Lithuanian.

The aim of the research was to investigate the communicative structure of the sentence and to analyze the translation peculiarities of the Rhematic sentence elements from Lithuanian into English in Jankevičiūtė's book "Lietuva"

The Investigation sets up the following objectives:
1. to present a short overview of the theory of the communicative structure of the sentence;
2. to define the conceptions of the Theme and the Rheme;
3. to analyze the ways the rhematic elements of the sentence were rendered from Lithuanian into English and supplement the analysis with the examples selected from the corpus.

In accordance with the objectives the following hypothesis has been formed: in order to preserve the communicative structure of sentences in translation from Lithuanian into English, the translator has to change the syntactic structure of sentences.

To verify the hypothesis the following **methods** were used: *descriptive – theoretical literature analysis*, which facilitated and supported the attempts to analyze the communicative structure of the sentence; *contrastive linguistic analysis*, which enabled us to study and compare two different languages.

The novelty of the research. This research is new and important because of its concentration on the retention of the *Rheme* in the translation from Lithuanian into English. For example, if we want to translate the sentence from the tongue language to a foreign language we can find words in the dictionary, but this does not work. We have to learn how to connect these

words into the sentence with the highest communicative power in it structure. In communicating information, the speaker or writer has to choose a sentence pattern that is the most appropriate under the circumstances. The choice is determined by what a writer or a speaker considers the point of departure for the message and what a writer or a speaker considers the most important information.

The practical value of our research is a detailed presentation of the peculiarities of translating Lithuanian rhamatic elements of the sentence into English. We consider that our research and the data collected might be of potential interest to foreign language learners, teachers and translators, as well as for students of translation and comparative linguistics conducting their research.

The structure of the thesis. The thesis consists of an introduction, the main part, which includes two chapters, conclusions, a list of references, and sources the linguistic evidence was drawn from.

The introduction presents a brief overview of our research. The main body of the thesis consists of two parts. The first part introduces the theoretical and historical background of the communicative syntax. The second part is intended to analyze the communicative structure of sentences of the corpus and present the ways of rendering Lithuanian rhematic sentence elements into English. Conclusions are presented in a separate chapter.

The analysis was subjected to the guide book *Lietuva* (2006) written and translated into English by Jankevičiūtė. All examples are presented in the annex.

I. THE COMMUNICATIVE STRUCTURE OF THE SENTENCE

Similar to formal syntax, communicative syntax examines the structure of the sentence. They differ in one important aspect: formal syntax is concerned with the syntactic analysis of the sentence while communicative syntax is concerned with the communicative analysis of the sentence. English has a quite fixed word order, normally summarized as *"SVOA"*, that is, *Subject + Verb + Adverbial*. *"SVOA"* means that a declarative statement must carry a subject at the front of the sentence, a verb after it and an object and (or an adverbial) at the end of the sentence.

This kernel sentence structure may be altered to bring elements to the front of the sentence. This movement is called *fronting.* For example *Daniel wrote a very good book last year,* can be created *A very good book, Daniel wrote last year* or *Last year Daniel wrote a very good book* or *What Daniel wrote was a very good book* or *Daniel, he wrote a very good book last year.* But what is the reason of changing the basic structure of the sentence?

The speaker or writer decides where to start the sentence and the beginning of each sentence is its **Theme.** The rest of the sentence tells the hearer or reader something about the Theme. That rest of the sentence tells the **Rheme.** The Theme is the framework or the point of departure of the message. The Rheme is what the addresser wants to convey about the Theme.

The terms *Theme* and *Rheme* are derived from Greek. The term *Theme* comes from the Greek root *the-* "to set, to lay down" and means "that which is set or laid down". The term *Rheme* comes from the root *rhe-* "to say, to tell" and means "that which is said or told about which was set or laid down beforehand". The other terms used are the *Topic* and the *Comment.* However, these terms are ambiguous since the *Topic* is a category representing the notion "what the text, or part of the text, is about". The term *Topic* is also applied to a general statement in the text. The term *Comment* is generally used to mark the part of the text which explicates or responds to the commitment of the *Topic Sentence.*

1. BASIC APPROACHES

1.1. SHORT SURVEY OF THE RESEARCH IN THE FIELD OF COMMUNICATIVE STRUCTURE OF THE SENTENCE

The terminology in this field was created by the scholars of the Prague school of linguistics. **The Prague Linguistic circle** or **"Prague school"** was an influential group of literary critics and linguists in Prague. Its proponents developed methods of structuralism literary analysis during the years 1928-1939. It has had significant continuing influence on linguistics and semiotics. After World War II, the circle was disbanded but the Prague School continued as a major force in linguistic functionalism (distinct from the Copenhagen school or English Firthian – later Hallidean – linguistics).

The Prague linguistic circle included Russian émigrés such as Jakobson, Trubettzkoj, and Karcevskij, as well as the famous Czech literary scholars Wellek and Mukarovsky. The instigator of the circle and its first president was the eminent Czech linguist Mathesius (President of PLC until his death in 1945).

The group's works before World War II were published in the *Travaux Linguistiques* and its theses outlined in a collective contribution to the World's Congress of Slavists. The *Travaux Linguistiques* was briefly resurrected in the 1960s with a special issue on the concept of center and periphery and are now being published again by Benjamins. The group's Czech works were published in *Slovo a slovesnost*. English translations of the Circle's seminal works were published by the Czech linguist Vachek in several collections.

The theory of communicative sentence analysis, or functional sentence perspective (FSP), is a relatively new field of study. The theoretical foundations of communicative sentence analysis were laid down by the Czech linguist **Mathesius** (1882-1945) who was a literary historian, a scholar of English and Czech literature. In 1912 he became the first professor of English language and literature at the Charles University. In 1926 he co-founded the Prague Linguistic circle. He engaged in grammar, phonology and stylistics of English and Czech languages. He was further

interested in general linguistics, language culture and general cultural issues. His works about word order and syntax can be labeled as pioneer projects. According to him, the communicative principle, or to use Mathesius' terminology, the principle of FSP, causes the sentence to open with a constituent conveying *given information* and close with a constituent conveying *new information.* The constituent that conveys *given information* is called the *Theme* and the constituent that conveys *new information* is called the *Rheme*.

What is the Theme? According to Mathesius (1975), thematic elements are elements conveying *facts known from the context* (verbal or non-verbal). Rhematic elements are elements conveying *new, unknown facts.* The definition of thematic elements as elements recoverable from the context caused Mathesius to conclude that text–initial sentences are communicatively indivisible units, i.e. units which contain only *rhematic information.* Thus sentences of existing, such as *Once upon a time there lived a king*, were treated by Mathesius as indivisible, i.e. *rhematic.*

Firbas (1921-2000), was a Czech linguist, a proponent of Prague School of linguists. He developed a theory of informational structure, called Functional Sentence perspective.

Chomsky (born December 7, 1928) is an American linguist, philosopher, political activist, author, and lecturer. He is an Institute Professor and Professor Emeritus of linguistics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Chomsky is related to the creation of the theory of generative grammar, considered to be one of the most significant contributions to the field of linguistics made in the 20th century. He also helped spark the cognitive revolution in psychology through his review of Skinner's *Verbal Behavior*, in which he challenged the behaviorist approach to the study of behavior and language dominant in the 1950s. His naturalistic approach to the study of language has affected the philosophy of language and mind. He is also credited with the establishment of the Chomsky hierarchy, a classification of formal languages in terms of their generative power. Beginning with his critique of the Vietnam War in the 1960s, Chomsky has become more widely known for his media criticism and political activism, and for his criticism of the foreign policy of the United States and other governments.

According to the Arts and Humanities Citation Index in 1992, Chomsky was cited as a source more often than any other living scholar during the 1980-1992 time period, and was the eight-most cited scholar in any time period.

Quirk, CBE, FBA (born 1920) is a British linguist. He was born at Lambfell on the Isle of Man on the TT circuit, the youngest of seven. His parents were Thomas and Amy Randolph Quirk, his brothers Eric, Thomas Leonard and James, and sisters Flora, Anne Anderson and Mona.

He attended King William College on the Isle of Man. Quirk read English at University College London in 1939-40, 1945-47, MA, PhD, D. Lit; was a Commonwealth Fund (now Harkness) Fellow, Yale and Michigan. 1951-52. Lecturer in English, UCL, 1947-54; Reader, University of Durham, 1954-58; Professor, 1958-60; Professor, UCL, 1960-68; Quain Professor, 1968-81.

Quirk lectured and taught seminars at University College, London, in Old English (Anglo-Saxon) and in History of the English Language. These two disciplines were part of a ten-discipline set of Final examinations in the undergraduate syllabus. At That time, Old and Middle English, along with History of the English Language, were all compulsory subjects.

He also worked closely with Gimson and O'Connor of the Phonetics Department, sitting in as an examiner for Phonetics oral examinations on occasion.

During the early 1960s, Quirk and colleagues, among them young Adams, Davy and Crystal, conducted an ambitious project known as the *Survey of English Usage.* This compilation of a large body of English language data (a corpus) comprises of one million words as recorded in actual use in everyday life. Previous grammars had tended to overuse the canon of quirky English Literature. The project was to the foundation of Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech and Svartvik's *Comprehensive Grammar Of The English Language* (Longman, 1985), a widely-used reference grammar used around the world: the first grammar of English in real use rather than parroting rules handed down by teachers and scholars based on the usage of Latin and Greek which were somehow considered to be "correct" models for living English. Instead of declaring what was correct grammatical usage, Quirk and his collaborators showed readers that different groups of English speakers chose one usage and others another. Quirk, Chomsky and Halliday were the foremost grammarians in the 20th c. Bernstein, sociolinguist, made his name from showing similar choices of variants of English usage. What is correct is what communicates effectively.

He was an open Labour supporter all his life and coveted titles. One of his favorite babies was the world acclaimed "London University Summer School of English" were the abovementioned and other budding leading scholars and buddies of Quirk came to teach for a month. It was considered the most eminent body of English teachers anywhere in the world. The resident students were foreign academics, teachers, students and young German mistresses having

brief encounters away from their German masters and homeland. He threw himself into the social life with gusto and loved singing Victorian ballads over a couple of pints, which he did very well with a take off Cockney accent. When the School moved away from Queen Elizabeth College to the far less salubrious centre of New Cross numbers fell rapidly. The next and last successful director was the phonetician O'Connor. He was president of the British academy from 1985 to 1989 and became a life peer as Baron Quirk, of Bloomsbury in the London borough of Camden in 1994. He currently resides in Germany and England, with his wife , German linguist Gabriele Stein.

The Czech scholar **Travniček** (1961) does not regard the criterion of *given information* as the most important feature of the *Theme*. Accepting this criterion, points out Traniček, some types of sentences used in text-initial position (e.g. *A boy broke a vase*) would have to be interpreted as *themeless.* The scholar adheres to the psychological principle and, similar to Halliday (1925), an English linguist who developed an internationally influential grammar model, the systemic functional grammar (which also goes by the name of systemic functional linguistics [SFL), links the Theme up with the beginning of the sentence. Halliday was born and raised in England. He took a BA Honours degree in Modern Chinese Language and Literature (Mandarin) at the University of London. He then lived for three years in China, where he studied under Changpei at Peking University and under Wang Li at Lingnan University, before returning to take a PhD in Chinese Linguistics at Cambridge. Having taught Chinese for number of years, he changed his field of specialization to linguistics, and developed systemic functional grammar, elaborating on the foundations laid by his British teacher Firtth and a group of European linguists of the early 20th century, the Prague School. His seminal paper on this model was published in 1961. He became the Professor of Linguistics at the University of Sydney, where he remained until he retired. The impact of his work extends beyond linguistics into the study of visual and multimodal communication, and he is considered to have founded the field of social semiotics. He has worked in various regions of language study, both theoretical and applied, and has been especially concerned with applying the understanding of the basic principles of language to the theory and practices of education. He received the status of emeritus professor of the University of Sydney and Macquarie University, Sydney, in 1987, and is currently Distinguished Visiting Professor in the Faculty of Education, University of Hong Kong. With his seminal lecture "New Ways of Meaning:

the Challenge to Applied Linguistics" held at the AILA conference in Saloniki (1990), he became one of the pioneers of eco-critical discourse analysis (a discipline of eco-linguistics).

The Russian scholar **Kovtunova** (1976) points out that the *Theme* does not always express information recoverable from the context. According to the scholar, the concept of the *Theme* is wider than the concept of *Given*, although the *Theme* is usually *Given*. Themes, when used in text-initial sentences, present, as, a rule, *new information* (Kovtunova, 1976:42). The *Rheme* can be both *New* and *Given*. As can be seen, there is some similarity between Travniček's approach and Kovtunova's: they both treat text-initial sentences as containing Themes, which express *new information*.

Authors and linguists of "Lithuanian Grammar" (2006) **Ambrazas**, **Valeckienė** are pointing on variable word order which may be neutral and inverted and in the case of variable word order, sequence of words in sentence is determined by the communicative intention. From this viewpoint is assigned a communicative structure consisting of two parts, the *Theme* and the *Rheme*. The *Theme* carries given information already supplied by the context and the *Rheme* carries the new information which is the most important part from the viewpoint of the purpose of communication. The *Theme* usually precedes the *Rheme* and in the case of neutral word order and neutral intonation pattern it corresponds to the subject (or subject group), while the predicate or the predicate group is the *Rheme*. However, the *Theme – Rheme* structure does not necessarily coincide with the syntactic structure: the content of the *Theme* and *Rheme* can be changed by changing the sequence of words. Thus, if the sentence *Petras atvežė malkų* "Peter brought some firewood" contains a replay to the question "What did Peter do?" the *Theme* coincides with the subject and the *Rheme* is the verb with the object. The subject can be made the *Rheme* by moving it to clause final position, the object becoming the theme in clause initial position:

 (1) *Malkų atvežė Petras*   "The firewood was brought by Peter"

An alternative means of changing the *Theme – Rheme* structure is intonation: any part of a sentence can be rhematical by heavy stress and falling intonation.

Consider the rhematization of the subject:

Kas atvežė malkų? "Who brought the firewood?" – *PETRAS atvežė malkų* "PETER brought the firewood."

Consider the rhematization of the predicate:

Ką padarė Petras? "What did Peter do?" - *Petras ATVEŽĖ malkų* "Peter BROUGHT the firewood."

In written language, word order inversion (along with passivization) is the principal means of changing the *Theme – Rheme* content.

Word order sequences where the *Theme* precedes the *Rheme*, the *Theme* corresponding to the subject and the *Rheme* to the predicate or predicate group, being the most common cases, are regarded as the basic patterns.

It is not always easy to distinguish between the *Theme* and *Rheme* or to determine the boundary between them. For instance, the opening sentence of a text usually contains no given information: it is rhematic and serves to introduce the *Theme* for the subsequent sentences:

(2) *Gyveno du broliai. Jie buvo labai neturtingi.*
"There lived two brothers. They were very poor."

Word order in introductory sentences is usually opposite to the regular word order in sentences with a distinct *Theme – Rheme* structure.

The functional (Theme – Rheme) structure determines the order of the main sentence constituents to a greater degree than that of the constituents within subordinative word groups.

1.2. THEME AND RHEME AS COMMUNICATIVE PATTERNS OF THE SENTENCE

According to Halliday (1985), the *Theme* of a sentence is what speakers or writers take as their 'point of departure'; it is realized in English by the initial sentence constituent, and the rest of the sentence constitutes the *Rheme*. In the following sentences, which represent the same semantic structure, a different element has been chosen as the Theme:

(3) *I can't stand the noise.*

(4) *The noise I can't stand.*

(5) *It's the noise I can't stand.*

(6) *What I can't stand is the noise.*

(7) *The noise, I can't stand it.*

Following Halliday, the choice of the *Theme* is important because it represents the angle from which the speaker projects the message, and partly conditions how the message develops.

In Halliday's analyses, Themes fall into two categories: *unmarked* and *marked.* The *Theme* is unmarked when it coincides with the expected element such as *Subject* in the declarative sentence. When some other element is shifted to initial position, it is a marked *Theme. Objects, Complements* and *Adjuncts* can be fronted as well as whole clauses. Other items whose normal position is at the beginning of the sentence such as *Conjunctions (and, or, but), Conjuncts (however, also, etc.), Disjuncts (personally, fortunately, etc.), Vocatives (Doctor!), question words (who, where, etc.)* and *Discourse Markers* such as *well* are considered part of the *Theme*. In choosing the *Theme*, the speaker or writer is generally guided by what the hearer or reader knows about the state of affairs being described; in other words, whether anything is necessarily involved or presupposed. For instance, *It's the noise he can't stand* seems to presuppose a shared belief on the part of the speaker and hearer that the person in question cannot stand something, and identifies that entity. In distinguishing the *Theme*, Halliday totally abstracts from the preceding context, or from *given information*. Although the author maintains that Themes are generally selected from *given* entities, practically *Givenness* is not regarded as a necessary feature of the *Theme* (1985:278).

It will be obvious that Halliday's analysis is mostly based on the psychological principle, according to which the *Theme* is what people think they are speaking or hearing about and the *Rheme* is what people are saying or hearing about the *Theme*. To Halliday, the *Theme* represents a choice; it permits the speaker or writer the choice of taking as a point of departure one or another constituent. The analysis of the material presented suggests that the *Theme* is what is in practice the *Psychological Subject.* Consider:

(8) *A man walked into the room.*

According to Halliday, the Theme *A man* coincides with the *Psychological Subject*, which is the object which comes uppermost in the mind of the speaker or writer. The formal criterion that helps us to recognize the *Theme* is sentence initial position: any fronted sentence constituent is treated as thematic. All this goes to position: any fronted sentence constituent is treated as thematic. All this goes to say that the *Theme* is deprived of semantic content: it may be *given* and *new information;* it may be *formal (structural)* and *notional*. The speaker or writer is free to choose any constituent as the Theme. Furthermore, if one adopts this line different Themes describe the same situation. Cf.:

(9) *Į kambarį įėjo žmogus* (the Theme is *į kambarį*). Vs.

'A man walked into the room' (the Theme is 'a man').

In view of this, Halliday's model can hardly be used in contrastive studies: languages can only compared provided we have common standard, or a basis for comparison. Such a standard could be the susceptibility of languages being compared to the principle of FSP (Functional Sentence Perspective).

1.3. COMMUNICATIVE DYNAMISM (CD) AND FUNCTIONAL SENTENCE PERSPECTIVE (FSP)

According to Firbas, the sentence is composed of the *Theme*, the *Transition* and the *Rheme*. The *Theme* is the constituent that caries the lowest degree of *communicative dynamism* (CD), by which he means the degree to which an expression advances (i.e. moves forward), or fails to advance the process of communication. The *Rheme* is the expression that carries the highest degree of communicative dynamism. The distinction between the *Theme* and *Rheme* is also based on the distinction between *Given* and *New*. To Firbas, thematic given information is information recoverable from the *immediately relevant* context (1992: 22-23), which is generally the immediately preceding sentence(s). Consequently, the *Theme* is given information recoverable not from a wider context, but from the immediate context. Firbas' criterion is based on the actual presence of an element in, or its absence from the immediately relevant context.

According to Firbas, text-initial sentences also contain given information, because "It is not context-dependent, but only presented as such." (Firbas, 1992:40). To illustrate the statement, Firbas presents the following examples from O. Henry:

(10) *At midnight the café was crowded.*

(11) *The policeman on the beat moved up the avenue impressively.*

(12) *He really was impossible person.*

(13) *And then, after six years, she saw him again.*

Each of the sentences occurs in text-initial position. In the sentences the subjects convey unrecoverable information which is presented as recoverable: it is not present in the immediately relevant context. This, points out Firbas, creates the *in medias res* effect: the reader is "plunged into the midst of things", i.e. is made to accept the writer's or speaker's vision. Otherwise, the writer makes use of implicature. When such a constituent opens up a text, the reader is under the

impression that the sentence presents a continuation of the story. This "illegitimate" use of definite restrictors in text-initial sentences enables the writer to increase the informational volume of the story without increasing its structural volume. Being thus "recovered" from the pre-text and used in sentence-initial position, such constituents carry the lowest degree of CD and are, therefore, thematic.

Using the concept of *communicative dynamism* (CD), such text-initial sentences as *Once upon a time there lived a king,* can be analyzed as binary structures. Such sentences are binary, for they contain the "object of thought" (*once upon a time there)* and that which *is* said about it *(a king)* – The *Theme* and *Rheme*, respectively. In Firbas' analysis *lived* is the *Transition.* As it carries a low degree of (CD), it belongs with the thematic section of the sentence rather than with the rhematic section. However, of the two thematic constituents (*once upon the time* and *lived)* the constituent *lived* carries the higher degree of CD, but lower than a *king*. This analysis leads to another problem, viz. the boundary between the thematic and rhematic sections of the sentence. It is easy to establish a boundary between them when the sentence consists of two constituents, e. g. *The king has died.* It is more difficult when the sentence is more complex. Consider:

(14) A. *What has happened?*

 B. *John has married a blonde.*

Asking *what has happened?*, we presuppose that some event *has occurred*. Semantically, *has happened* and *has married* are related, the former being a general verb phrase and the latter a specific verb phase. As compared to *happen, marry* carries a higher degree of CD, but lower than the constituent *a blonde*. Thus the boundary line between the thematic and the rhematic parts is as follows:

John / has married a blonde.

This analysis is in accordance with the distributive peculiarities of CD: as we move to the right, the communicative value of sentence constituents increases – the initial constituent, if it functions as the *Theme*, has the lowest degree of CD, the constituent that follows the theme carries an element of novelty, or a low degree of CD, and the constituent taking final position carries the highest degree of CD. As can be seen, communicatively the sentence presents a gamut of degrees of CD.

In this connection mention should be made of Firbas' ideas. According to the scholar, in examining the problem of the boundary between the thematic and rhematic parts of the sentence, we should consider two types of sentence:

a) sentences characterized by contextual independence;

b) sentences characterized by the greatest possible contextual dependence.

In the former case, the temporal and modal exponents of the finite verb function as the *Transition* proper (e.g. *They HAVE* [RhPr] *already been to London* [ThPr]); in the latter case they either constitute the Rheme proper (e.g. *They* [ThPr] *HAVE* [RhPr] *already been in London* [ThPr] or become part of an extensive Theme proper (e.g. *THEY* [RhPr] *have already been to London* [ThPr]). Thus Firbas thinks that in sentences of the first type the boundary line between the thematic and the rhematic parts passes trough the *Transition* (i.e. the verb). To put the otherwise, the *Transition* is the dividing point.

2. CLAUSE AS A MESSAGE

2.1. GIVEN AND NEW INFORMATION

To quote Halliday, "Information is a process of interaction between what is already known or predictable and what is new or unpredictable." (1985:274-5). Hence the information unit is a structure made up of two functions, the *New* and *Given.* In the idealized form, *given information* is necessarily known or predictable information. So, for instance, in written English *given information* is the information recoverable from the preceding sentence or, if we consider spoken English, it will be the information referring to something already present in the verbal or non-verbal context. In text-initial sentences, however, there seems to be nothing that is shared by speaker or writer and the hearer or reader. Can we say that such units are devoid of *given information*? Consider:

(15) *Once upon a time there lived a king.*

As already indicated, Mathesius views such sentences as presenting *new information*, only. In this approach, any sentence consisting of *Subject* and *Predicate* contains both *given* and *new information*. (This also applies to sentences with formal – structural subjects – such as *It is raining* is a notional predicate. *Given information* is ellipted for example, outside, in the street, etc.), but present in the mind of the speaker.) *Given information* is usually, but not necessarily recoverable

from the *immediately relevant context*. As pointed out by Duszak (1983-87), questionable is the notion of a sentence not implicating any context, be it verbal or non-verbal. What is implicated in the case of the above sentence is the time setting: "You want to know what happened a long time ago, so I will tell you. Once upon a time…" As can be seen, the time circumstance does exhibit 'contextual' dependence. This kind of situation is characteristic of text-initial sentences, where recoverable information is often presented as recoverable. This happens not in fairy-tales. It may be treated as a kind of stylish device: as noted by Firbas, by presenting the information as *Given* the narrator "leads the listener or reader into the middle of the story (in medias res) (1992:67). Implicature, then, can be treated as a language economy device. Implicated utterances are covert, or 'silent', utterances.

However, not all linguists are prone to thus expand the notion of *given information*. So, for instance, Quirk et al. (1972:940) define *given information* as "information already supplied by context (perhaps by a preceding part of the discourse)'. When defined so, whole sentences can be treated as containing *new information*. Thus the sentence *John has married blonde*, if it is the answer to *What's new?*, is new information. Only the following sentences consist of *given* and *new information*:

    (16) A. *What are you doing today?*

        B. *We are going to the races.*

    (17) A. *Where are you going today?*

        B. *We are going to the races.*

According to Quirk, *John has married a blonde* would be "the case of *neutral information focus,* where there are no specific assumptions at all" (Quirk et al., op. cit., 940). In our analysis, however, the said sentence is a binary structure, i.e. it contains both *given information (John has married)* and *new information (a blonde).* If we paraphrase the question *What's new?* as *What has happened?*, it will become clear why *has married* is *given information*, not without an element of novelty. Such being the case, both constituents – *John* (it presents *assumed givenness*) and *has married* (it is recoverable from what has been said before) – are *given information*. They will be conceived to be *Given* even in a situation where the speaker comes into the room and says *John has married a blonde,* for this sentence is in fact preceded by the 'presupposed' *"I will tell you what has happened"*.

21

How is *Givenness* expressed? Phonetically, given information is conveyed in a weaker manner than new information: it is pronounced with lower pitch and weaker stress than *new information*. There are a number of elements in language that are inherently *Given* in sense that they are interpretable by reference to some previous mention of some feature of the situation. They are anaphoric and deictic elements. (An anaphoric element is an element mentioned in the text for a second time e.g. *John came in and he lit a fire*, where *he* is anaphoric to *John*. A deictic element is an element that shows the relationship between language and context. The traditional categories of deixis are *person*, *place* and *time*).

How is *Givenness* established? According to Chafe (1976:31), typically a speaker assumes that something is in the hearer's consciousness on the basis of either extra linguistic or linguistic context. The speaker assumes that both he and the hearer share the same knowledge. So, for instance, if the speaker sees somebody looking at a certain picture on the wall, he might say *I bought it last week*, where the idea of the picture is treated as *given* and hence pronounced with low pitch and weak stress, as well as being pronominalized as *it*.

As pointed out by Chafe, the most common linguistic basis for the speaker's assuming something to be in the hearer's consciousness is the prior mention of a referent:

(18) *I'd like show you a painting (New). I bought it (Given) last week.*

(19) *I bought a painting (New) last week. I really like paintings (Given).*

(20) *There was a small earthquake (New) last night. I felt one (Given) last year about this same time.*

How long does *Givenness* last? According to Chafe (1976:32), our consciousness, or memory, is very limited: as new ideas come into it, old ones leave. The speaker's treatment of an item as *Given* ceases when he judges that item to have left the hearer's consciousness. Such a judgment is not easy to make. Therefore speakers often err, thinking that the item is still in the hearer's consciousness. Consider:

(21) A. *What did he you said?* (after a certain lapse of time).
    B. *Who? Who do you mean? We have been talking about Jane.*

Chafe's analysis, however, does not reveal the process of developing a text. More relevant to our analysis is the view expressed by Firbas: "Developing a text, the language user keeps on introducing information previously unexpressed into the flow of communication. Once introduced, a piece of on formation can pass out of this flow without being re-expressed, or it can stay in it and be-expressed once or more times after a shorter or longer intervening stretch of text" (1992:25).

To sum up, the characteristic features of *Givenness* and *Newness* might be done:

1. *Given information* is information recoverable from the context (including the 'prepositional' context), the situation and the common knowledge of the speaker and listener.

2. Given information can be mentioned directly or indirectly. It can be mentioned not only with the identical wording, but also with a synonymous expression, or with a paraphrase (Daneš, 1974:110).

3. The property of being *New* is interpretable in two ways:

   a) not mentioned in the preceding context;

   b) related as the *Rheme* to the *Theme* to which it has not yet been related (i.e. when a given item enters into a new relationship in the sentence (Daneš, 1974:111), e.g. *I don't like this painting*).

2.2. GIVEN-NEW vs. DEFINITER (PARTICULAR) – INDEFINITE (NON-PARTICULAR)

Given items are, as a rule, definite in meaning. Consider:

(22) A. *Look! There is a dog under the table.*
B. *What is it doing there?*

Definiteness, then, can be treated as the superficial (surface) realization of *Givenness*. How is *Definiteness* expressed? In English there is an overt surface marking of definite status, the definite article. In Lithuanian, the function of the definite article may be performed by word order. Cf.

(23) *Po stalu guli šuo: There is a dog under the table.*

(24) *Šuo guli po stalu: The dog is under the table.*

Besides the definite article, *Definiteness* can be indicated by deictic restrictors (demonstrative and possessive pronouns). Words like *this* or *that* include the component of *Definiteness* in what they convey, but they also include an indication of why the speaker expects the hearer to be able to identity the referent: its closeness or distance to and from the speaker or to and from this point in the text (Chafe, 1976:39). A similar case is presented by the possessive pronouns *my, your, his, her, its, our, their*, which, besides *Definiteness*, also indicate possession. Proper nouns are also definite since they name particular referents. (As has been pointed by Chafe (1976:42), *Givenness* may coincide with *Definiteness* and often does, but one can find definite items which express *new information*: *I saw the milkman yesterday for the first time for ages*, with no previous mention of the *milkman* and without one in sight.).

How is *Definiteness* established?

Most obvious is the establishment of *Definiteness* through *prior mention* of an item in the text, or anaphorically:

(25) *A man and a woman were sitting on a park bench.*

The man was about forty years old. The woman was somewhat younger. The bench they were sitting on had recently been painted.

Definiteness can also be established cataphorically by the information contained in a particularizing element, as in: *the bus coming now, the dog under the table*, etc.

As can be seen, *Definiteness* is established by a linguistic context, i.e. inside the language, i.e. endophorically. It can also be established exophorically, outside the language, i.e. with reference to the external physical environment. We can distinguish the following types of external physical environment:

1. The environment of the home:

(26) *He went to the door (the window, the balcony, etc.)*

For the items *door, window, balcony*, etc. to be definite in the hearer's consciousness, both the speaker and the hearer must be present either physically or conceptually in the environment, i.e. they must share the same knowledge. Were it otherwise, *Definiteness* would not establish itself in the hearer's mind. Consider more examples:

(27) *Did you find the cat?* (presumably the cat which lives in the house).

(28) *Where did you park the car?* (your car or our car – shared 'legal' environment).

(29) *Did you repair the roof?* (presumably the roof of the house is lived in).

It should be noted, however, that such definite items as *cat, car, roof* do not necessarily have to be in the environment shared by the speaker and hearer; they may be part of the hearer's environment, but then the hearer must have introduced the items before.

(30) *You know, my cat disappeared yesterday.*

Did you find it (the cat)?

2. The environment of the town or village:

(31) *John has gone to a shop (the post office, the theatre, the cinema, etc.).*

Definiteness is generally associated with the use of the definite article. However, nouns used with the indefinite article can be conceived to be definite, at least partially, when they have a partitive meaning: *John has gone to a shop*, (one of the given set). But: *John has gone to a theatre*. The sentence is acceptable if:

a) there are several theaters in the locality or

b) the speaker implies contrast (e.g. *John has gone to a theatre, not to the cinema*).

Consider more sentences;

(32) *As she was strolling along the street she looked at the clothes in the store windows.*

(33) *They were sailing along the river watching the clouds in the sky.*

3. The environment of the world or the universe:

(34) *The earth spins on its axis once every 24 hours which makes our day and night.*

(35) *The moon is 400,000 km away and has a diameter of 3,500 km.*

(36) *The sun is a vast ball of glowing gas.*

2.3. GIVEN – NEW vs. THEME – RHEME

There has been a great deal of confusion of *Given* and *New* with the *Theme* and *Rheme*, and a great deal of misunderstanding. Indeed, there is a close semantic relationship between the two types of structure – informational and communicative. The speaker or writer will generally choose the *Theme* from within what is *Given*, which is especially true of text-developing, or succeeding sentences. Consider:

(37) *A strange dog came to the porch. The dog seemed very friendly.*

(38) *A man is standing near the window. The man will be our guest speaker tonight.*

(39) *John is a student at Oxford University.*

Were it otherwise, the sentence would not be in a position to perform its role of a message. So, for instance, the sentence *A boy is writing a letter*, when used initially, is difficult for the hearer to understand – it sounds "out of the sky". A regards the *Rheme*, the speaker or writer is free to choose between what is *New* and what is *Given.* Consider:

A.

(40) *[What is boiling?] The kettle [is boiling].*

(41) *[Who has called?] The doctor [has called].*

In the said text the *Rheme* is *given*; both the speaker and hearer know which kettle is boiling and which doctor has called.

B.

(42) *A beautiful girl came out on the balcony.*

(43) *And across old Jolyon's face there flitted a gleam.*

The *Rheme*, as used in the above sentences, present *new information*.

Given and *New* are categories of the text which are concerned with the informational growth of the text. *Theme* and *Rheme* are categories of the text which are concerned with the organization of the text as a message.

As already seen, the sentence can include more than one *given* and *new* element. As for the *Theme* and *Rheme*, the sentence, no matter how long it may be, includes only one *Theme* and one *Rheme*. In constructing a sentence, the speaker can use any given element (presuppositional or situational) as the *Theme* and add either a *new* or a *given* element to it. The *Rheme* is what the

speaker treats as communicative important. It is the information he perspectives or orientates the hearer to (Firbas,1992).

Summing it up all, scholars are dealing with the problem of communicative sentence analysis have pointed out three aspects:

1. *Given information – New information.*
2. Theme – Rheme.
3. Different degrees of Communicative Dynamism (CD).

The distinction between *Given – New* information and *Theme – Rheme* goes back to Mathesius, who defines the 'starting point of the utterance' as 'that which is known or at least obvious in the given situation and from which the speaker proceeds', whereas 'the core of the utterance' is 'what the speaker states about, or in regard to the starting point of the utterance' (Daneš L., 1974:106).

Distinction has been introduced by Firbas. By CD he means "the extent to which the sentence constituent contributes to the development of the communication" (1964). According to Firbas, the *Theme* is the sentence constituent that carries the lowest degree of CD within the sentence. Such being the case, the *Theme* "needs not necessarily convey known information or such as can be gathered from the verbal and situational context" (1964:272). This being so, the sentence *Once upon a time there lived a king* is analyzed into the *Theme Once upon a time there lived* and the *Rheme a king.* That is, the first part of the sentence expresses the lowest degree of CD and the second, the highest. Firbas' analysis suggests that the sentence may exhibit an uneven distribution of CD, i.e. we may assign various degrees of thematicity or rhematicity to different sentence elements. The communicative importance (or the communicative dynamism) of a constituent increases as we move to the right and it decreases as we move to the left. Similar to Mathesius, Firbas bases his analysis on the dichotomy of *given-new information*: Themes are typically selected from *given items*, from "the immediately relevant context". However, the *Theme* does not necessarily convey *given information* (e.g. *A boy broke a vase*), nor does the *Rheme* necessarily convey *new information. Given-new information* are components belonging to the deep semantic layer of the text, while the *Theme-Rheme* are components of the surface communicative layer of the text. The choice of the *Theme* or the *Rheme* is determined by pragmatic factors: in the case of *Theme*, it may be the desire of the speaker or writer to talk about an entity speaker or writer is

interested in; in the case of the *Rheme* it may be the desire of the speaker or writer to focus on a entity that speaker or writer wishes the listener or reader to treat as the most important. The same holds good for the sequencing of the two components: logically the speaker or writer should arrange the constituents in the order *Theme – Rheme*. The order, however, may be reversed owing to the systemic peculiarities of a language or to pragmatic factors, such as the desire to give greater prominence to rhematic information.

From the point of view of text organization, it is the *Theme* that plays an important constructional and cohesive role in the text by connecting back and linking it to the previous text. But from the point of view of the text development, it is the *Rheme* that "pushes the communication forward".

Mention should be given to Halliday's position in regard to *Given-New information* and the *Theme – Rheme*. According to Halliday (1985:39), *Given* means 'what you were talking about' or what I was talking about before' and *New* means information not recoverable from the situation. As already indicated, the *Theme* is identified as that element which comes in initial position in the sentence; its function is to organize the sentence as a message. As can be seen, the *Theme* is identified with initial position; it may be both *Given* and *New.* Cf.:

(44) *The man came into the room (The man* is given information).

(45) *A man came into the room (A man* is *new information* or 'news')

Themes whose position coincides with the position of the *Subject* are called *unmarked.* But there are cases when the position of the *Theme* does not coincide with the position of the Subject:

(46) *This book I haven't read.*

(47) *It is this book that I haven't read.*

Such *Themes* are called *marked*. To make matters more complicated, Halliday introduces the term *Focus,* which is identified with the constituent on which the nucleus falls (e.g. *It was John who failed to come*). As noted by Daneš (1974:108), the position of Halliday is not quite clear; "Roughly speaking, the most discussed problems are the *Focus* (new information) and the *Theme* (what is being talked about), while the other two functions stand rather in the background".

The focus follows on analysis of text-sentences of FSP, which is the most consistent formulation of the problem how to retain the *Rheme* in the translation from Lithuanian into English.

II. THE RETENTION OF THE RHEME IN THE TRANSLATION FROM LITHUANIAN INTO ENGLISH

1. RHEMATIC SUBJECTS.
1.1.UNEMPHATIC RHEMATIC SUBJECTS

Rhematic subjects are of two types: *marked* and *unmarked*. Marked rhematic subjects are subjects occurring in sentence-final position or, to be more precise, subjects occurring after predicates:

(48) *Along came Mary Macgregor.*

(49) *Thus died John.*

(50) *Into the room came a tall man.*

(51) *There remain many problems.*

Such sentences are generally built on intransitive verbs. From a semantic point of view, the verbs express the process of being or coming into being. The subject may be both *Existent* (as in exaple (48)) and *Affected* (as in the example (49).

Subjects in 'extra posed' sentences are also marked. Cf.:

(52) *It is difficult to explain the contradictions of his policy.*

(53) *It was practically impossible for everyone to escape.*

(54) *It is a pity you're leaving the company.*

(55) *It is a bore when people can't make up their minds.*

Unmarked rhematic subjects can also be found in intransitive sentences based on resultative causative verbs. Cf.:

(56) *The door opened and in came a girl he had not seen before.*

(57) *The snow and ice melted and there appeared grass in the field.*

It will be seen that, when analyzed out of context, these sentences are ambiguous: the subject of the sentences, expressed by a definite noun phrase, may be treated as either rhematic or thematic. Cf. Lith.:

(58) *Atsidarė durys, ir įėjo mergaitė, kurios nebuvau matęs anksčiau.*

(59) *Durys atsidarė, ir įėjo mergaitė, kurios nebuvau matęs anksčiau.*

It is only when such subjects are actualized as indefinite noun phrases that they function as *Rhemes:*

(60) *An old lady has collapsed in the street.*

(61) *A kettle is boiling.*

(62) *A man was walking along the street.*

(63) *Summer came.*

Consider transitive-verb sentences:

(64) *A. Who married Mary?*
    B. John (married Mary).

(65) *A. Who broke the vase?*
B. boy (broke the vase).

(66) *A. What has happened?*
B. A boy has broken a vase.
    A vase has been broken.

Texts (64), (65) illustrate rhematic subjects; text (66) is problematic. As already pointed out, the sentence *A boy has broken a vase* contains only one constituent that is recoverable from the preceding stretch of the text, viz. the predicate – *has broken* (= has happened), while *a boy* and *a vase* represent *new information*. However, *new information* is not always rhematic information. Rhematic information, according to Firbas, is the information that pushes the message forward; it is

the most important information to the speaker or writer, not to the hearer. Returning to the sentence *A boy has broken a vase,* communicatively the most important information is expressed by *a vase,* not by *a boy.* This suggests that the subject is thematic in the said text.

It is important to point out the role of the article, or in general the role of the category of definiteness and indefiniteness in the realization of the communicative structure of the sentence. In analyzing sentences of existing, we can see that the rhematic subject is, as a rule, an indefinite noun-phrase. But, as we pointed out, there is nothing that prevents the rhematic subject being actualized as a definite noun-phrase (Sheviakova, 1980:114):

> (67) *Many interesting people were invited to the party. There were, for example, Mrs. Simpson and her daughter.*
>
> (68) *And through his mind there flashed the thought.*
>
> (69) *There comes the train.*

Themes can also be actualized as both definite and indefinite noun-phrases:

> (70) *The school was right at the edge of the suburb.*
>
> (71) *A boy took us into the physics class-room.*

The first sentence expresses a locative process. As already pointed out, the subject of a locative sentence is thematic. The second sentence expresses a transitive process of doing. The subject of such sentences, no matter which article is used, is thematic.

The role of the article is greater in the so-called resultative causative sentences, in which the process is presented as developing. In these sentences the indefinite article unambiguously marks the Rheme. As for the definite article, it may be used with both thematic and rhematic subjects. Cf.:

> (72) *A. What is happening there?*
>
> *B. A kettle must be boiling.*

It is only when the definite article has anaphoric reference that it can be said to be a marker (to be more precise, and extra marker) of thematicity. Consider:

> (73) *One evening of late summer a young man and woman were approaching the large village of Weydon-priors.* **The man** *was swarthy, and stern in aspect...***The woman** *enjoyed no society whatever from his presence.*

1.2. EMPHATIC RHEMATIC SUBJECTS

Emphatic sentences derive from the corresponding unemphatic sentences by reversing the order of the rhematic constituents. So, for instance, if we shift a rhematic constituent to thematic position, the result will be an emphatic sentence:

(74) *John came into the room.* vs. *It was John who came into the room.*

There are cases, however, when front-position rhematic subjects are not conceived to be emphatic:

(75) *A. Who came into the room?*

    B. John (came into the room).

(76) *A man died in the street yesterday.*

However, when put into an appropriate context, these subjects may turn into emphatic ones. Consider:

(77) *A. Who discovered America?*

    B. Amerigo Vespucci.

    A. Who?

    B. Amerigo Vespucci.

(78) *A. Baby has swallowed a teaspoon.*

    B. Who?

    A. Baby.

(79) *A.* Who discovered America?

    B. Amerigo Vespucci.

    Oh, no! Columbus (discovered America).

When read out, the rhematic subjects occurring in the above texts will be pronounced with an emphatic intonation. This is determined by the following pragmatic factors:

1. When the speaker is surprised or dismayed at what he is told, his interlocutor, who is no less surprised or dismayed, pronounces the rhematic part of the information with an emphatic intonation (dialogue 77, 78).

2. When the speaker seemingly presents the wrong information, his interlocutor presents an alternative which takes a heavy stress and a falling tone (dialogue 79).

In written English, emphasis can be indicated by typographical methods (capital letters, italics, bold type) if the context is insufficient to show it. Rhematic subjects can be rendered emphatic by 'cleaving' the sentence into a structure of two components. For instance, from the sentence *Peter got married yesterday* we obtain *It was Peter who got married yesterday*. As can be

seen, a cleft sentence starts with the pronoun *it,* which is an 'empty' subject, followed by the past tense of *be,* the Rheme and the thematic part expressed by a predicative unit. In the written language, the clef sentence is especially useful since it helps the reader to identify the Rheme, without the need for graphic aids such as capital letters, italics, bold type, or a dash (it is used before the Rheme).

Another type of clefting is illustrated by *What hurts is my left leg.* The type of cleft sentence, which is generally called a pseudo-cleft sentence, constitutes a special type of identifying sentence, in which one clause is identified by another clause. The *Identifier* is typically the one which receives the greater pitch prominence and so carries rhematic information, no matter which order the clauses occur. Notice that when the *Identified* is a person functioning as a subject, a WH-word is hardly ever used, being replaced by the *one(s) who/that* (Downing and Locke, 1992:250). Cf.:

(80) *The one who likes surfing is my brother.* vs.

My brother is the one who likes surfing.

(81) *Whom I don't like is deputy chairman.*

(82) *What he likes to eat is chocolate.*

(83) *What I won't do is give in to her demands.*

The cleft sentence is a useful textual device. To quote Quirk (Quirk et al., 1972:951): "The usefulness of the cleft sentence resides in its unambiguous marking of the focus of information (the Rheme) in written English, where the clue of intonation is absent. The highlighted element has the full implication of contrastive focus: the rest of the clause is taken as given, and a contrast is inferred with other items which might have filled the focal or 'hinge' position in the sentence".

However, there are linguists who think that the cleft sentence is used primarily as a means of giving prominence to the Rheme, not as a means of emphasis proper: when the Rheme is really emphatic, it is printed in italics or preceded by a particle of emphatic precision (Sheviakova, 1980:211). According to Sheviakova, only cleft sentences with inversion (rhematic subject + it + verb) render the rhematic subject emphatic:

(84) *He it was who bowed low and deep with grave smiles.*

Sheviakova maintains that the inversion within the complex *'it is that (who)'* is resorted to facilitate the growth of emphasis, as the use of the ordinary cleft sentence would not be able to do it. To prove it, she presents the following text:

(85) *Only William could act his part: he alone remembered to employ his hands. And when at the end the family applauded each other, again William was the important figure. He it was whom they cheered. And he it was who bowed low and deep with grave smiles.*

Thinking that emphasis may vary in the degree of intensivity, i.e. we can speak of constructions that express different degrees of emphasis: some constructions are more emphatic, others are less emphatic.

Last but not least, the usefulness of the cleft sentence lies its acting as a text-cohesive device: it enables the writer or speaker to achieve a greater degree of cohesion between the text-sentences. Cf.:

(86) *The subject of the author's concern is the interaction of particles. It is these interactions that cause the emission and the absorption of photons. vs.*

The subject of the author's concern is the interaction of particles. The emission and the absorption of photons are caused by these interactions.

(87) A. *Hallo Dick, I am ringing from Stavanger, so I can't be too long.*

B. *Stavanger? What on earth are you doing there?*

A. *We have a branch here, didn't you know? I've here regularly over the past two years. It was from Stavanger that I sent you that nice wooden sculpture, remember?*

vs. *I sent you that nice wooden sculpture from Stavanger, remember?*

(The text has been drawn from Seuren, 1996:315)

Of the two versions of the same text, the first easier to follow: it is more cohesive. The reason why it is conceived to be more cohesive is that the Rhemes of the sentences are placed side by side, not at a distance as in the second version (a chain or consecutive link).

To return to the so-called pseudo-cleft sentence in contrast to the cleft sentence, the pseudo-cleft sentence identifies the Rheme exclusively, i.e. without the implication of contrast. Cf.:

(88) *An old man was sitting by roadside.* vs.

It was an old man who was sitting by the roadside.

The one who was sitting by the roadside was an old man.

The pseudo-cleft sentence has other textual functions as well:

1. It is used to introduce a new *Topic* (*Topic* is a textual category which represents the notion 'what the text, or part of the text, is about'. From a communicative point of view it may be both thematic and rhematic. In the sentence given below the *Topic* is the Rheme), e.g.

(89) *What we shall consider today is the expression of emphasis in English.*

2. It is used to thematize a previous part of the text and thus render the text cohesive:

(90) *We arrived home to find the place flooded; what had happened was that a pipe had burst.*

(91) *Do you mean that we should buy a caravan?*

No, what I meant was that we should hire one.

Pseudo-cleft sentences are always reversible, which makes them very useful to the writer or speaker who can use any of the two [parts as the *Theme*.

Rematic subjects can also be rendered emphatic by the use of particles of focusing adjuncts, or rhematizers:

(92) *Even John came to the party.*

(93) *Simon alone knew the truth.*

(94) *Joan Greenwood in particular I thought was wonderful.*

(95) *John also phoned Mary today.*

1.3. THE RETENTION OF THE SUBJECT TRANSLATING FROM LITHUANIAN INTO ENGLISH

Word order in Lithuanian is a means of signifying the functional (Theme – Rheme) sentence perspective and, to a much lesser degree, the syntactic relations between sentence constituents. Word order can be variable and structurally fixed.

Variable word order is not rigidly determined by the syntactic sentence structure and it may vary depending on the functional sentence perspective and on expressive and stylistic factors. Variable word order is characteristic of Lithuanian. This is due to a highly developed system of inflections which signal the syntactic functions of words in a sentence and their semantic roles. The sequential arrangement of words does not usually change their syntactic or semantic functions. The Rhematic subject is translated in these cases:

1. According to the Lithuanian words order in the sentences in many cases Rhematic Subject became Thematic in the translation. Cf.:

(96) *Profesijos pradmenis universitete įgijo **iškilūs tapytojai Pranciškus Smuglevičius, Jonas Rustemas, architektas Laurynas Gucevičius**.* vs.
Celebrated painters Franciszek Smuglewicz and Jan Rustem, and the architect Laurynas Gucevičius *studied at the University.*

(97) *1812 m. birželį pro Aušros vartus į Vilnių iškilmingai įžengė **Napaleono kariai**, besiveržiantys į Maskvą.* vs.
*In June 1812, **Napoleon's soldiers** entered Vilnius through Au6ros Gate, on their way to the siege of Moscow.*

(98) Vieni pirmųjų jo *(atgimimo)* atstovų buvo Vilniaus universiteto auklėtiniai **Simonas Stanevičius ir Simonas Daukantas.** vs.
*Vilnius University graduates **Simonas Stanevičius and Simonas Daukantas** were the first representatives of this movement,[…].*

2. To retain the Rhematic subject The Passive Voice and the preposition *by* is used, e.g.:

(99) Pasak tradicijos, Vilnių, kaip besiformuojančios lietuvos valstybės sostinę, XIV a. įkūrė **didysis kunigaikštis Gediminas.** vs.
*According to tradition, Vilnius, the capital of the emerging state of Lithuania, was founded in the 14th century **by Grand Duke Gediminas**.*

(100) XVII a. pradžioje Vilnių nusiaubė **gaisras.** vs.
*Vilnius was ruined **by fire** at the beginning of the 17th century.*

(101) Po gaisro 1419 m. ją *(bažnyčią)* atstatė **Vytautas.** vs.
*It was rebuilt **by Vytautas the Great** after the fire of 1419.*

36

(102) *Aikštę Didžiosios ir Subačiaus gatvių sankryžoje šiaurinėje pusėje uždaro masyvus buvusios miesto salės, **dabartinės filharmonijos pastatas**.*vs.

*A square at the intersection of Didžioji and Subačiaus streets is bordered on the north side by the massive **Philharmonic Society building**, formerly the City Hall.*

3. In some cases the Rhematic subject is retained by changing its syntactic function:

a) the Rhematic subject becomes the object of the sentence. Cf.:

(103) Po II pasaulinio karo rytinės pusės namai buvo nugriauti, važiuojamoji dalis išplėsta įsibraunant į buvusią geto teritoriją, išilgai naujos trasos pastatyti neišvaizdūs **gyvenamieji namai**. vs.

*After the Second world War the buildings on its east side were demolished and the street itself widened; it ultimately encroached on the former Ghetto territory and ended up with a long row of plain **residential buildings**.*

b) the Rhematic subject becomes the predicate of the sentence. Cf.:

(104) Didžiuliame istorizmo stiliaus pastate priešais skverą veikia **Mokytojų namai**. vs. *The large historicist style building across from the square is called **the Vilnius Teacher's House.***

c) the Rhematic subject becomes the adverbial adjunct. Cf.:

(105) *1972 – 2006 metais veikė **architektūros muziejus**.* vs.

*The church has also functioned **as a Museum of Architecture** (1972 – 2006).*

In the case of variable word order, sequence of words in a sentence is determined by communicative intention. However, the Theme – Rheme structure does not necessarily coincide with the syntactic structure: the content of the Theme and Rheme can be changed by changing the sequence of words.

2. RHEMATIC PREDICATES.

2.1. UNEMPHATIC RHEMATIC PREDICATES

As already known, predicates can be of two types: *verbal* and *nominal.* In English sentences with Rhematic predicates are constructed in accordance with the grammatical principle, which suggests that the communicative structure of the sentence coincides with its syntactic structure: *Theme = Subject; Rheme = Predicate*. Consider:

(106) *The King has died. Long live the King!*

(107) *The moon will rise in a moment.*

(108) *The baby is sleeping.*

(109) *The girl was smiling at me.*

(110) *We had been traveling since dawn.*

(111) *It is raining*.

As it is shown, the post-subject position of the predicate is not necessarily interpretable as Rhematic. When examined in isolation, sentences (106), and (107) can be given two analyses: the predicate may be conceived to be Rhematic and Thematic. Consider:

1. *The King has died: Karalius mirė / Mirė karalius.*
2. *In a moment the moon will rise: Mėnulis patekės po minutės / Po minutės patekės mėnulis*.

2. 2. EMPHATIC RHEMATIC VERBAL PREDICATES

In speech, predicates are made emphatic by intonation. Cf.:

(112) *Jane **phoned** me yestarday* (i.e. she did not write or call, she phoned).

As can be seen, a change in emphasis can give a completely different meaning to a sentence. Emphasis is often put on auxiliary verbs. This can give more contrast between true and false or between present and past. Cf.:

(113) *Gosh, you **have** grown!*

(114) *I **am** talking the truth!*

(115) *I **couldn't** swim last year, but I really can now.*

In written English, the Rhematic verbal predicate, when expressed by verbs other than anomalous finites, is made emphatic by the use of the auxiliary *do*. Cf.:

(116) *You're quite wrong: she **does** like you!*

The verbal predicate can be made emphatic by the use of the continuous form preceded by an adverb of frequency. Cf.:

(117) *She is such a kind person: she **is always doing** things for other people.*

Besides the morphological devices, English can render the predicate emphatic by the use of the pseudo-cleft construction. Cf.:

(118) ***What he did was*** *rent a car.*

(119) ***What we should all do*** *is hurry off home.*

Last but not least, to this end English can use focusing adjucts (*even, just, only, merely, purely, simply)* or intensifying adjuncts *(actually, certainly, clearly, definitely, indee; etc.)*
A.

(120) *She did not **even read** the lettre.*

(121) *She had **only just moved** in.*

(122) *She **could only obey**.*

(123) *She **merely wanted** to know.*

B.

(124) *He **actually sat** next to her.*

(125) *I **simply don't believe** it.*

(126) *I **certainly wrote** to him.*

(127) *She **really enjoyed** the party.*

2.3. RHEMATIC NOMINAL PREDICATES

In an unemphatic sentence nominal predicates follow Thematic subjects:

(128) *The concert **was marvellous** (a characterizing predicative).*

(129) *The orshestra **was the London Philharmonic** (an identifying predicative).*

In an emphatic sentence, the order is just the opposite, i.e. to render Rhematic nominal predicatives, we shift them to front position:

(130) ***Marvellous was** the concert.*

(131) ***Short was** the summer night.*

(132) ***Sad was** Oliver's chilhood.*

(133) ***Bright and sunny was** the morning.*

However, this device does not work in the same way with sentences containing identifying predicatives:

(134) *The London Philharmonic was the orchestra.* vs.

The orchestra was the London Philharmonic.

The point is that sentences with identifying predicatives are reversible and, when examined in isolation, fronted predicatives will be conceived to be Thematic, not Rhematic.

Let us have a look at sentences with emphatic characterizing predicatives. A modification of this pattern is the exclamatory construction:

(135) ***How precise and thorough** her observations **are**!*

(136) ***How clever** he **is**!*

To quote Cobuild, *"sentences like these are not usually used in modern English. Instead of* **'How clever he is!'**, *people usually say* **'He's so clever'**, **'Isn't he clever?'**, *or* **'What a clever man!'** *"* (1992:301). According to Cobuild, in the past, people used *How* in front of adjectives to remark statement, however, is only true of modern spoken English, but not of literary English, which continues to use the pattern *How + adj. + Subj. + Verb.*

As it is seen, nominal predicates may be made emphatic lexically, i.e. by the use of emphatic particles:

(137) *I was* ***so*** *busy.*

(138) *These games are* ***so*** *boring.*

However, if an adjective precedes a noun, it uses *such*, not *so*:

(139) *It's such a cold day today.*

(140) *She seemed such a happy woman.*

The particles *so, such* are often used in clauses of result:

(141) *She is* ***so*** *emotional that every little thing upsets her.*

(142) *This is* ***such*** *ugly furniture that I am going to give it away.*

For greater emphasis, we can change the order of the words in the main clause with *so:*

(143) ***So emotional is*** *she that every little thing upsets her.*

Besides the particles *so, such,* we can find *indeed, ever, only, too*. Emphasis can also be achieved by the adverbs of degree. Cf.:

A.

(143) *Their meeting* ***was joyful indeed***.

(144) *She* ***has become even more beautiful***.

(145) *Statute law* ***is only a part*** *of English law.*

(146) *He* ***is stupid and lazy too***.

B.

(147) *Oliver's Twist's childhood* ***was extremely sad***.

(148) *They* ***were totally ignorant*** *of the options open to them.*

(149) *She* ***was utterly convinced*** *of his loyalty.*

(150) ***I'll be perfectly frank*** *with you.*

Nominal predicates can also be made emphatic by the use of the contrastive construction:

(151) *Your handbag is **light, not heavy***.

(152) *This problem **is difficult not easy***.

(153) *This boy is **fat and not meager***.

2.4. THE RETENTION OF RHEMATIC PREDICATES IN THE TRANSLATION FROM LITHUANIAN INTO ENGLISH

According to Valeika, in English sentences Rhematic predicate is in its traditional position: *Theme = Subject; Rheme = Predicate.*

(154) Vienuolynas ir senoji vienuolyno bažnyčia **buvo uždaryta** 1864metais.

 *The Dominican monastery and its old church **were closed** in 1864, […].*

(155) *XIII – XIV a. piliakalniai **sudarė** vieningą gynybinį kompleksą.*

*In the 13th – 14th century the fortress hills **comprised** a unified defense complex.*

(156) *Pajautos slėnyje archeologai 1986 metais **aptiko** miesto liekanas, įvairių XIII amžiaus daiktų.*

*Archaeologists **discovered** the remains of a city and various 13th century items in the Pajauta valley in 1986.*

(157) *Su vietovės istorija bei archeologų radiniais **supažindina** muziejaus ekspozicija.*

*An exhibition on the area's history, as well as examples of local archaeological discoveries, **are found** in the town museum.*

(158) *Dabartinė neogotikinė švč. Trejybės bažnyčia (1865) **išaugo** Radvilų laikų evangelikų šventovės vietoje.*

*The existing neo-gothic Church of the Holy Trinity (1865) **was built** on the site of an evangelical sanctuary from that period.*

(159) *Kadaise nutolęs nuo Vilniaus miestelis šiandien **atsidūrė** ties sostinės riba.*

*Once a fair distance from Vilnius, the town now **borders** on the growing capital city.*

Sometimes Rhematic Predicate follows after circumstances before Rhematic subject:

(160) *Akmenų mūru apjuostame šventoriuje **yra** kapinės.*

*The stone wall of the churchyard **encircles** a cemetary.*

(161) *XV a. medinės pilies vietoje **iškilo** mūrinė.*

*In the 15th century a wooden castle **was replaced** by a brick one.*

(162) *Ant kalvelės prie Mindaugo gatvės **stūkso** pranciškonų bernardinų vienuolyno griuvėsiai.*

*Looming on a hill near Mindaugas Street **are** the ruins of a Franciscon Bernardine monastery.*

(163) *Kitame Galvės ežero krante **baltuoja** Užutrakio dvaro rūmai.*

*On the other side of Lake Galvė **are** the white buildings of the Užutrakis estate.*

(164) *Už pilies gynybinio griovio **rymo** raudonų plytų šv. Jurgio Kankinio bažnyčia ir bernardinų vienuolynas.*

*Behind the ruins of the castle **loom** the red brick Church of St. George the Martyr and the Bernardine monastery.*

In many cases when Rhematic Predicate is before Rhematic Subject this Subject becomes Thematic and Rhematic Predicate appears in its traditional place in translation from Lithuanian into English:

(165) *Tris neoklasicizmo formų altorius **puošia** XVIII – XIX a. drobės.*

*Canvases from the 18th – 19th century **adorn** three neo – classicist style altars.*

(166) *Kriptoje po bažnyčia **ilsisi** fundatoriaus palaikai.*
*The remains of its founder **lie buried** in the church crypt.*

(167) *Šio kalno viršūnėje 1989 metais **pastatytas** obeliskas karaliui Mindaugui.*
*An obelisk to King Mindaugas **was erected** there in 1989.*

(168) *Senuosiuose Trakuose 1350 metais **gimė** didžiojo kunigaikščio Kęstučio ir Palangos vaidilutės Birutės sūnus Vytautas.*
*Vytautas, son of Grand Duke Kęstutis and Palanga pagan priestess Birutė, **was born** here in 1350.*

(169) *Sudervės dvare **gyveno** Vilniaus universiteto rektorius, žinomas publicistas Marianas Zdriechovskis.*
*Vilnius University rector and known publicist Marian Zdziechowski **lived** on the Sudervė estate [in the first half of the 20th century].*

(170) *Medinius XVII a. pabaigoje pastatytus domininkonų vienuolyno namus 1812 metais **nusiaubė** Napoleono kareiviai.*
*Napoleon's soldiers **demolished** the wooden monastery (end of 17th century) in 1812; [it was resurrected in brick in 1833].*

According to Lithuanian Grammar (2006:697), in Rhematic sentences the regular word order is either VSO or OVS, with the predicate preceding the subject. Sentences with the most common SVO and SOV order may have no Theme distinguished either, but in this case their communicative indivisibility is not marked by word order: it can be made clear by the context and it is often indicated by an indefinite adverbial in the initial position. In this kind of sentence, if the subject is not expressed, the object is usually placed in final position after the predicate.

3. RHEMETIC OBJECTS.

3.1. UNEMPHATIC RHEMATIC OBJETS

As Lithuanian linguist Valeika (2001:53) states, rhematic objects can be of two types: objects of active –verb sentences and objects of passive–verb sentences:

(171) Peter **has bought a new car**.

(172) This **house was built by my grandfather**.

Transitive-verb sentences may have two objects – direct and indirect. Systematically, such sentences are constructed in two patterns:

1) Subject + Predicate + Direct object + Indirect Object:

(173) *Who did he read the letter to?*

He read the letter to me.

2) Subject + Predicate + Indirect Object + Direct Object:

(174) *What did he do?*

He read me the letter.

It is easy to arrange the objects in sentences where one of the objects is recoverable from the preceding sentence: the objects are arranged according to the principle of FSP – Thematic objects precede Rhematic ones. This principle, however, does not always apply. Consider the following texts:

(175)

A. *Who did he read the letter to?*

B**.** *He read the letter to all his friends*.

(176)

A. *What did he read to all his friends?*

B. *He read all his friends the letter* (uncommon).

He read the letter to all his friends.

In arranging the objects in text (176), the writer or speaker is guided by the principle of weight, according to which lighter (shorter) constituents are followed by heavier (longer) constituents. For

this reason, English tolerates sentences in which the preposition and its object precedes the direct object (Hornby, 1962:55). Cf.:

(177) *I explained **to him** the impossibility of granting his request.* vs.

*I explained the impossibility of granting his request **to him*** (uncommon).

The order of the objects may also be determined by the semantic principle, which requires that the constituents should be arranged in such a way that the intended semantic relations will not be violated. Consider:

(178) *We heard from Jones all about his sister's escape.* vs.

We heard all about his sister's escape from Jones.

The second sentence suggests that the speaker's sister escaped from Jones and that we heard all about the incident. If the objects are of similar length, the writer or speaker arranges them according to the principle of FSP. Cf.:

(179) *Add to the examples you already have those I have written on the blackboard.*

vs. *Add the examples I have written on blackboard to those you already have.*

One more question must be discussed, viz. the so-called indivisibility of the Verb + Object Complex. It is generally assumed that the ordinary place of objects in English is immediately after the verb which they belong and the placing of adverbials between the verb and the object is avoided much as possible. In practice, however, we can witness many cases when an adverbial (or a particle) is placed between the verb and its object. The separation of the verb and its object often takes place when the writer wishes to render the adverbial less conspicuous. In doing so, the writer achieves a certain stylistic or rhythmic effect: the sentence constituents become more cohesive and are given greater prominence. Cf.:

(180) *Now we may turn to the category of case.* vs.

We may turn now to the category of case.

(181) *He saw a little photograph in her hand.* vs.

He saw in her hand a little photograph.

(182) *We have briefly considered the problem.* vs.

We have considered briefly the problem.

(183) *Style is a quality of language which precisely communicates emotions or thoughts, or a system of emotions or thoughts, peculiar to the author.* vs.

Style is a quality of language which communicates precisely emotions or thoughts, or a system of emotions or thoughts, peculiar to the author.

(184) *He only played instrumental music.* vs.

He played only instrumental music.

Prepositional objects bear separation better than non-prepositional as they are less closely connected with the verb than non-prepositional ones:

(185) *They joined for twelve years with the colors.*

3.2. EMPHATIC RHEMATIC OBJECTS

Objects can be rendered emphatic in more than one way. The most usual way is the use of cleft and pseudo-cleft constructions:

A.

(186) *It was an explosion that we heard.*

(187) *It's more time that we need.*

B.

(188) *What we need is more time.*

(189) *More time is what we need.*

As already pointed out, the cleft sentence generally expresses contrastive *Rhemes*. Sometimes, however, the contrast is minimized to such a degree that the Rhematic object may not be conceived to be contrastive, Cf.:

A.

(190) *However, it turns out there is rather interesting independent evidence for this rule, and it is to this evidence that we must turn to.* vs.

However, it turns out there is rather interesting evidence for this rule, and to this evidence we must turn to.

B.

(191) *What John broke was the window.*

(192) *What we're all hoping for is a rise in salary.*

 (193) *What he said was that the machine had broken down.*

(194) *What we need is more time.*

(195) *What he gave to my aunt was the teapot.*

(196) *The one he gave the teapot was my aunt.*

(197) *What no-one seemed to notice was the writing on the wall.*

 (198) *The ones you never see are the smugglers.*

(199) *The thing that impresses me most is their enthusiasm for the job.*

Negated object can be made emphatic by fronting them and inverting the subject and the predicate:

(200) *Not another word did Mr Dick utter on the subject.*

(201) *But no trace of the body could we find.*

(202) *Only one little gleam of hope did I get.*

Rhematic object can also be made emphatic by the use of the contrastive construction:

(203) *I will read this book and not that one.*

(204) *He is going to do his job and not yours.*

Apart from the grammatical devices, objects can be made emphatic lexically:

(205) *She uttered not even a syllable.*

(206) *He played only instrumental music.*

Notice that the focusing adjuncts *even* and *only* can be used with any sentence constituent. If the verb is not *BE* and *even* and *only* do not apply to the subject, we usually put them in front of the verb or after the first auxiliary, regardless of what they apply to. Cf.:

(207) *Even/Only a child could do it.*

(208) *He can't even write his own name.*

(209) *We could only choose two of them.*

(210) *He didn't even answer my letter.*

However, if we want to be quite clear (when used before the verb, *even* and *only* may be interpreted as a modifier of both the verb and the object), we must put them in front of
the constituent they apply to:

(211) *He played only instrumental music.*

(212) *They may lend you even a million.*

To give special emphasis to the Rheme, the constituent thus marked can be separated from the sentence. Consider:

(213) *He'll eat anything – even raw potatoes.*

(214) *I haven't seen one flower yet this year – not even a snowdro*p.

3.3. THE RETENTION OF THE RHEMATIC OBJECT IN THE TRASLATION FROM LITHUANIAN INTO ENGLISH

1. In the translation from Lithuanian into English the Rhematic Object in many cases has its traditional position: Subject + Predicate + Object. Compare:

(215) *Pažaislis vėl teko **kazimierietėms**.*

*In 1992 it was returned **to the St. Casimir nuns**, […].*

(216) *XVIII a. pilį įsigiję Gelgaudai ją ne tik pertvarkė, bet ir davė **valdai savo vardą**.*

*Acquired in the 18ᵗʰ century by the family Gelgaudas who renovated and gave **the domain their name,** […].*

(217) *Po Žalgirio mūšio gyvenvietė ir jos apylinkės teko **Lietuvos didžiajam kunigaikščiui.***

*[…] the settlement and surrounding territories ended up **in the domain of the Grand Duke of Lithuania** after the battle of Grunwald.*

(218) *Pilies interjerai neišliko, pastatas pritaikytas **mokyklai.***

*[…] the building itself was converted **into a school**.*

(219) *Jie sugrupuoti **į sodybas, nedidelius kaimus, miestelį.***

*Fifty-one buildings grouped **into farmsteads, hamlets and a village** […].*

(220) *Atskira ekspozicija **tremties atminimui**.*

*A separate exhibition is dedicated **to the deportation period.***

2. In some cases when predicate is Thematic and subject Rhematic the defining subordinate clause is used in the translation from Lithuanian into English. Consider:

(221) *Kapinėse XX amžiaus pabaigoje pastatytas paminklas apylinkėse **žuvusiems pokario antisovietiniams rezistentams ir tremtiniams**.*

*A monument **to deportees and to anti-Soviet resistance fighters** who were killed in the district was erected in the cemetery at the end of the 20th century.*

(222) *Kluoniškiuose atidengtas paminklas **tragiško likimo lirtuvių kilmės poetui Andriui Višteliui-Višteliauskui**.*

*A monument **to the poet Andrius Vištelis-Višteliauskas** who was born near Gaižėnai was erected in Kluoniškiai in 1989.*

As Lithuanian Grammar says (2006: 695), the position of an object is also dependent on the lexical meaning of the verbal predicate.

4. RHEMATIC CIRCUMSTANTIAL ADJUNCTS
4.1. UNEMPHATIC SPATIAL AND TIME ADJUNCTS

According to Valeika (2001:54), the use of Rhematic spatial and time adjuncts does not cause any difficulty to the translator, reader or to the learner. If they are unemphatics, they occur in post –predicate position. Compare:

A.

(223) *We drove by / past the town hall.*

(224) *The police were standing on guard around the building.*

(225) *Switzerland lies between France, Germany, Italy and Austria.*

(226) *We stopped to refuel at New York on our way to Tokyo.*

B.

(227) *The boys visited us yesterday /on Saturday / last week / three weeks ago.*

(228) *I saw her the January before last.*

(229) *The festival will be held the day after tomorrow.*

 (230) *Please send me the tickets by next week.*

As the sentence can contain more than one adjunct, we should say a few words about their relative order. Time adjuncts are different: some are specific, others are general. The more specific expressions of time come before the more general:

 (231) *He was born at six o'clock on Christmas morning in the year 1822.*

The same holds good for spatial adjuncts:

 (232) *He told me this in his sparsely furnished office in a drab government building in downtown London.*

If the sentence contains spatial and time adjuncts, spatial adjuncts usually precede time adjuncts:

 (233) *She spoke at the village hall last night.*

4.2. EMPHETIC SPATIAL AND TIME ADJUCTS

There two devices of making the adjuncts emphatic: syntactic and lexical-syntactical.

A.

 (234) *It was at the university that I saw him.*

 (235) *At the university did I see him.*

 (236) *It was two years ago that we first met.*

 (237) *He considered his early disease a piece of poetic justice. For twenty years the fellow had enjoyed the reversion of his wife and house (J. Galsworthy).*

 (238) *He lives in Birmingham, not in London.*

 (239) *They met in summer, not in autumn.*

B.

 (240) *In Ulster alone had the tenant some protection.*

 (241) *Only then was the King left in peace.*

Special mention should be made of sentences opening with adverbial particles of direction. We think that the adverbials in such sentences also have the force of emphasis:

(242) *We were almost the last passengers to arrive. "In you jump", I said to Mary, and bundled her into a compartment. There is a time to be gentle, and a time to be brusque. Up went the mountain of luggage into the racks; down plumped Mary in a corner seat: and away went the train. Phew! It was a close shave (Kelly, 1962:159).*

This pattern is used to create the dramatic effect of the immediacy of the action. It is also used in spoken English to form a lively imperative. Cf.:

(243) *In you go!* vs. *You go in!*

(244) *Out you come*! vs. *You come out!*

(245) *Up you go!* vs. *You go up!*

(246) *Off you get!* vs. *You get off!*

(247) *Over you get!* vs. *You get off!*

(248) *Under you go!* vs. *You go under!*

(249) *Down you go!* vs. *You go down!*

When the adverbial particles are placed in front, the order is determined by their relative weight: a short unstressed pronoun comes between the adverb and the verb.

4.3. UNEMPHATIC RHEMATIC MANNER, CONTINGENCY, ACCOMPANIMENT, MODALITY, DEGREE AND ROLE ADJUNCTS

Rhematic manner adjuncts are generally placed after the predicate (if the verb is intransitive) or after the object (if the verb is transitive):

(250) *How does he speak?*

He speaks fast.

Rhematic contingency adjuncts, which cover such meanings as *cause, purpose, reason, concession, condition and behalf*, occur in post-position to the predicate:

(251) A. *Why did you do it?*

  B. *Because I wanted to help him.*

(252) A. *What did he go to the bof office early for?*

  B. *He went to the box office early to buy the best seats.*

(253) A. *Why did you stay in?*

B. *We stayed in on account of the rain.*

(254) *Everyone can take part regardless of their ability.*

(255) *They will strike regardless of what the law says.*

(256) *The cost of public services has risen steeply despite a general decline in their quality.*

(257) *Don't be uneasy on my behalf.*

(258) *I'll help you for your sister's sake.*

(259) *He argues for the sake of arguing.*

(260) *We cannot survive deprived of food.*

(261) *She will apologize if only to avoid bad feeling.*

Rhematic adjuncts of accompaniment occur in postposition to the predicate:

(262) *John came with Mary.*

(263) *He came instead of Peter.*

(264) *Tom came with a different haircut.*

Rhematic adjuncts of modality (*possibly, probably, certainly*) generally occur in preposition to the predicate; if the predicate contains a form of the verb be, the adjuncts occur after the verb:

(265) *Television is possibly to blame for this.*

(266) *He is probably telling the truth.*

(267) *The letters certainly added fuel to the flames of her love for Tom.*

Rhematic degree adjuncts may be used both in pre-predicate (if the predicate is nominal) and pre-predicate or post-object position (if the predicate is expressed by a transitive verb):

(268) *He is very hospitable.*

(269) *He is extremely clever.*

(270) *I completely forgot to bring my passport.*

(271) *I need this book badly.*

Rhematic role and matter adjuncts are used in postposition to the predicate:

(272) *She works as a teacher.*

(273) *My upbringing was fairly strict in regard to obedience and truthfulness.*

4.4. EMPHATIC MANNER, CONTINGENCY, ACCOMPANIMENT, MODALITY, DEGREE AND ROLE ADJUNCTS

As the mechanism of rendering the adjuncts emphatic does not differ from the mechanism described earlier, we shall confine ourselves to presenting a few illustrations:

(274) *Kill Diana? Willingly would she do that. Happily would she mix the draught that would kill her rival.*

(275) *Only too well did Maggie know what sheep were.*

(276) *Only in this way did he manage to convince them.*

(277) *Fast fled his days.*

(278) *Slowly Maggie got better.*

(279) *It was slowly that he drove the car into the garage.*

(280) *It was thanks to his doctor's prescription that he found himself well again.*

(281) *It was on your behalf that I spoke to the Director.*

4.5. THE RETENTION OF THE RHEMATIC CIRCUMSTANTIAL ADJUNCTS IN THE TRANSLATION FROM LITHUANIAN INTO ENGLISH

According to Lithuanian Grammar there is no fixed position for all adverbials in sentences: it is determined by the type of adverbial and / or its communicative function. If it is given no particular prominence, it is commonly placed between the predicate and a direct object. It may be given prominence by placing it either in the initial or in the final position. An adverbial (of place or time) modifying the entire sentence is usually thematic and therefore fronted. In many cases in the translation from Lithuanian into English the Rhematic circumstantial adjuncts are retained. Consider:

1. Time circumstantial adjuncts.

(282) *Malūnas malė **iki 1975 metų.***

 The mill functioned <u>until 1975.</u>

(283) *Krekenavos miestelis šaltiniuose minimas **nuo XV amžiaus.***
*Krekenava mentioned in written sources **in the 15th century.***

(284) *Stebuklingas paveikslas ypač pagarsėjo **XVIII a., kai buvo išgelbėtas iš degančios bažnyčios.***
*The painting was declared miraculous **in the 18th century, after being rescued from the burning church;[…]***

(285) *Dievo Motinos šventė minima **kiekvieno mėnesio 15 dieną**, o atlaidai vyksta **rugpjūčio 15-ąją, per Žolinę.***
*[…] the day of the Krekenava Mother of God is celebrated **on the 15th of every month**, and the day of the Assumption **on August 15.***

(286) *Medinė šv. Juozapo bažnyčia baigta statyti **apie 1766 metus** senosios regulos karmelitų rūpesčiu.*
*The wooden Church of St. Joseph was constructed by members of the old Carmelite Order **ca 1766.***

2. Place circumstantial adjuncts.

(287) *Didžiausias Vidurio Lietuvos ir penktas pagal dydį šalies miestas įsikūręs **svarbių kelių sankirtoje**.*
*The largest city in central Lithuania, fifth largest in the country, is located **at the junction of several principal roadways.***

(288) *26 km. Į pietryčius nuo Panevėžio įsikūrusio miestelio įžymybė – Komarų dvaro sodyba **ant Nevėžio intako juostos kranto.***

*The attraction in this village 26 km southeast of Panevėžys is the Komaras **estate <u>on the</u> <u>bank of the</u> Juosta,** a tributary of the Nevėžis.*

(289) *Miestelis **ant Siesikų ežero kranto, 28 km. į šiaurės vakarus nuo Ukmergės.***
*This small town is **on the shore of lake Siesikiai 28 km north-west of Ukmergė**.*

(290) *Jaukus miestelis **ant Šušvės kranto, 11 km. į pietvakarius nuo Radviliškio.***
*A quaint town **is on the bank of the Šušvė 11 km southwest of Radviliškis.***

(291) [...] *bažnytkaimis **vaizdingose apylinkėse tarp Nevėžio ir jo intako brastos upelio, 16 km. į šiaurę nuo Kėdainių.***
*A church hamlet **in a picturesque location 16 km north of Kėdainia between the Nevėžis and its tributary the Brasta; [...]***

To sum up, the translation of Rhematic Adverbial Adjuncts causes no problems to the translator because their typical position is in the end of the sentence.

CONCLUSIONS

The hypothesis of the research work that to preserve the communicative structure of sentences in translation from Lithuanian into English, the translator has to change the syntactic structure of sentences has been supported only in the cases of sentences with Rhematic Subjects inasmuch as a great majority of the analyzed sentences had different syntactic structure in Lithuanian and English.

According to the objectives set in the introduction, the conclusions of the work are as follows:

1. The communicative structure of the sentence can be analyzed according three aspects: *Given information – New information*; *Theme – Rheme*; *Different degrees of Communicative Dynamism (CD).*

2. The speaker or writer decides where to start the sentence and the beginning of each sentence is its **Theme.** The rest of the sentence tells the hearer or reader something about the Theme. That rest of the sentence tells the **Rheme.** The Theme is the framework or the point of departure of the message. The Rheme is what the addresser wants to convey about the Theme.

3. The analyzed corpus showed that Rhematic Subjects became Thematic in the translation or acquired the functions of the Object, the Predicate or Adverbial Adjuncts in English.

4. In many cases Rhematic Predicate appears in its traditional place in translation from Lithuanian into English.

5. In the translation from Lithuanian into English the Rhematic Object in many cases has its traditional position: Subject + Predicate + Object.

6. Rhematic Adverbial Adjuncts do not cause any difficulty to the translator because their typical place is the end of the sentence.

KOMUNIKACINĖ SAKINIO STRUKTŪRA. REMOS IŠLAIKYMAS VERČIANT IŠ LIETUVIŲ KALBOS Į ANGLŲ KALBĄ

SANTRAUKA

Darbe nagrinėjama komunikacinė sakinio struktūra ir remos išlaikymas verčiant iš lietuvių kalbos į anglų kalbą. Analizuojama problema yra iš sintaksės mokslo srities. Žodis „sintaksė" yra kilęs iš senosios graikų kalbos „syntaxis", kurio pirminė reikšmė buvo „sąryšis, jungiamasis sutvarkymas, rikiavimas". Sintaksės aprašymas remiasi keliais aspektais, tokiais kaip formalusis, semantinis, funkcinis ir kt. Funkcinis tyrinėjimo aspektas yra pakankamai naujas, atsiradęs su Prahos lingvitų mokykla (1928 – 1939) ir šiuo metu yra plačiai tyrinėjamas kaip komunikacinis (pasakymo organizavimo) aspektas glaudžiai susijęs su sintaksine teksto analize. Aktualioji skaida yra tartum natūralus tos analizės tęsinys. Sakinys dalomas į dvi dalis: į temą (tai, kas adresatui žinoma, duota, sena, nereikšminga) ir remą (tai, kas adresatui yra nežinoma, nauja, aktualu, rekšminga). Temos atlieka teksto siejamąją (konekcijos) funkciją, remos teikia adresatui naują informaciją. Sakinio dalys: veiksnys, tarinys, papildinys, pažyminys ir antrininkės sakinio dalys gali atlikti tiek temos, tiek remos funkciją. Darbe analizuojama, kaip išlaikoma rema, verčiant iš lietuvių kalbos į anglų kalbą.

Empirinė dalis pagrįsta remos išlaikymu verčiant iš lietuvių kalbos į anglų kalbą Giedrės Jankevičiūtės knygoje „Lietuva" (vadovas), 2006, Vilnius. Darbe analizuojama, kaip išlaikomas rematinis veiksnys, tarinys, papildinys ir aplinkybės; kokios gramatinės konstrukcijos pavartojamos. Knygos autorė daugelyje atvejų išlaiko rematines sakinio dalis, tačiau kitais kartais keičia vienas sakinio dalis kitomis sakinio dalimis bei gramatinėmis formomis, arba sakinio rema tampa tema. Tai yra glaudžiai susiję su lietuvių kalbos laisva žodžių tvarka ir intonacija (frazės kirčiu), kurie yra svarbiausi temos ir remos rodikliai ypač mokslinėje ir dalykinėje kalboje.

Aktualiosios sakinio skaidos problemų tyrinėjimas nėra naujas, bet diskutuotinas dalykas ir yra susiję su tasyklingesnių sakinių konstravimu, tobulesniu bendravimu ir vertimu iš vienos kalbos į kitą, stengiantis perteikti sakinio prasmę kiek galima tiksliau ir išsamiau.

REFERENCES

1. Ambrazas, V. (1997). *Dabartinė lietuvių kalbos gramatika*. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.

2. Ambrazas, V. (2006). *Lithuanian Grammar*. Vilnius: Baltos lankos.

3. Baker, M. C. (1988). *Incorporation*: *a Theoty of Grammatical Function Changing*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

4. Bolinger, D. (1968). *Aspects of Language*. New York.

5. Brown, G. & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge.

6. Bruce, N. J. (1988). *Communicative Dynamism in Expository Academic English*: *Some Strategies in Teaching the Pragmatics of Writing*. Working Papers in Linguistics and Language Teaching, 11, 42-63.

7. Clark, E.V. and Clark, H. H. (1979). *When Noun Surfaces as Verbs*. Language, 55, 767-811.

8. Collins Cobuild (1992). *English Usage*. Prague.

9. Daneš, F. (1994). *The Sentence-Pattern Model of English*. The Prague School of Structural and Functional Linguistics ed. By P. A. Luelsdorf, 197-221. Amsterdam:John Benjamins.

10. Downing, A. and Locke, Ph. (1992). *A University Course in English Grammar*. New York.

11. Duškova, L. (1975). *On Some Semantic and FSP Aspects of the Subject in Czech and in English*. Philologica Pragensia 4.

12. Firbas, J. (1964). *On Defining the Theme in Functional Sentence Analysis*. Travaux Linguistique de Prague, 1, 267-280.

13. Firbas, J (1965). *A Note on Transition Proper in Functional Sentence Analysis*. Philologica Pragensia, 8.

14. Firbas, J. (1971). *On the Concept of Commmunicative Dynamism in the Theory of Functional Sentence Perspective*. Brno Studies in English, 7, 12-47.

15. Firbas, J (1992). *Functional Sentence Perspective in Written and Spoken Communication*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

16. Frank, M. W. (1985). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London.

17. Halliday, M.A.K. (1994). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London.

18. Kelly, B. (1962). *An Advanced English Course for Foreign Students*. Longman.

19. Labutis, V. (1998). *Lietuvių kalbos sintaksė*. Vilniaus universiteto leidykla.

20. Leech, G. N. (1969). *Towardos a Semantic Description of English*. London: Longman.

21. Lyons, J. (1968). *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*. Cambridge University Press.

22. Lyons, C. (1998). *Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics. Definiteness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

23. Mathesius, V. (1975). *A Functional Analysis of Present-Day English on a General Linguistic Basis*. Prague.

24. McCarthy, M. (1994). *Language as Discourse: Perspectives for Language Teaching*. Longman.

25. Petronienė, E. (2003). *Process as Rheme Proper in Lithuanian and English Sentences*. Kalbotyra. 2003. 53 (3).

26. Petronienė, E. (2007). *The Order of Thought and The Order of Words*. Kalbotyra. 2007.57 (3).

27. Quirk, R. (1972). *A Grammar of Contemporary English. New* York.

28. Valeckienė, A. (1998). *Funkcinė lietuvių kalbos gramatika*. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.

29. Valeika, L. (1974). *Word Order in Lithuanian and English in Functional Sentence Perspective*. Publihing House of Vilnius University.

30. Valeika, L. (1998). *An Introductory Course in Semantic Syntax*. Vilnius.

31. Valeika , L. (2001). *An Introductory Course In Communicative Syntax*. Vilnius.

SOURCES

1. Jankevičiūtė, G. (2006). *Lietuva (vadovas).* Vilnius: R. Paknio leidykla.

2. Jankevičiūtė, G. (2006). *Lithuania (Guide).* Vilnius: R. Paknys Publishing House.