

# The expression of interpersonal and textual functions in Czech and in English

## The Czech postfix *-pak* and its translation counterparts<sup>1</sup>

Denisa Šebestová, Markéta Malá

Charles University, Prague (Czech Republic)

**Abstract:** The study explores the possibility to use translation counterparts as “markers” (Malá, 2013), or “methodological anchors” (Gast, 2015), of discourse functions, i.e. formal correlates of interpersonal and textual functions, which make it possible to detect these functions in the text, and to compare their expression cross-linguistically. We focus on Czech expressions containing the postfix *-pak* (such as, *copak* – ‘what + *pak*’, *kdepak* – ‘where + *pak*’). The postfix *-pak* is shown to be a polyfunctional indicator of discourse function (cf. Grepl and Karlík, 1998). The expressions ending in *-pak* were found to have content / speaker-related functions (such as deliberative meaning, emotional evaluation, (im)possibility) as well as communication / addressee-oriented functions (appeal, establishing/maintaining contact) (cf. Aijmer, 2013; Šebestová and Malá, 2016).

**Keywords:** postfix *-pak*, interpersonal functions, textual functions, parallel corpus, Czech/English

### 1. Introduction

The present study examines Czech expressions containing the postfix *-pak* as seen through their English translation counterparts. In most grammars of present-day Czech, the description of such expressions is not systematic, usually being limited to the characteristics of some notable individual particles and pronouns which contain the postfix, and few examples of their typical uses (see Section 2). This study aims to provide a more comprehensive description of the postfix in terms of the discourse functions it can signal. To identify the various functions and uses of the postfix, we employ the methodology of contrastive analysis, using material from a Czech-English parallel translation corpus (Section 4). In this approach, English plays a dual role. Assuming that “linguistic structure is language-specific while the cognitive and functional-communicative substance which

---

<sup>1</sup> This study was supported by the Charles University project Progres Q10, *Language in the shiftings of time, space, and culture*.

constrains it is potentially universal” (Boye, 2012: 7), we may treat the Czech sentences comprising words with the postfix *-pak* and their English translations counterparts as functionally equivalent. This makes it possible for us first, to identify the functions of the Czech expressions by exploring the functions of the English counterparts, and second, to compare the means used to perform these functions in the respective languages.

## 2. Theoretical background: the postfix *-pak*

The Czech postfix *-pak* is attached at the end of the word after all inflectional suffixes,<sup>2</sup> cf. e.g., the declension of the pronominal adjective *jakýpak* (“what-*pa*k”), *jakéhopa*k, *jakémupa*k, *jakémpak*, *jakýmpak*; hence it is termed a “postfix” in grammars of present-day Czech (Karlík *et al.*, 2000: 109). Etymologically, the postfix *-pak* evolved from the particle *pa*k, as witnessed by forms such as *co pa*k, *kde pa*k (Šmilauer, 1969: 28). These forms are considered obsolete today, and are not attested in present-day Czech corpora.<sup>3</sup> Relating the postfix *-pak* to this particle, some Czech grammars refer to it as an enclitic particle (Karlík *et al.*, 1995: 679).

Czech expressions containing the postfix *-pak* are found in several word classes: pronouns, e.g. (1a), pronominal adverbs (1b), particles<sup>4</sup> (1c) and interjections (1d), resulting in homonymous items, such as *copak*.

- (1) a. **Copak** jste tam koupila? (Karlík *et al.*, 1995: 694) – pronoun  
“What-*pa*k you bought there?”<sup>5</sup>
- b. **Kampak** jsi to dal? (Havránek *et al.*, 1960: 826) – pronominal adverb  
“Where-*pa*k you put it?”
- c. **Copak** jsi jiná než ostatní ženy? (Štícha, 2013: 773) – particle  
“*Copak* you are different from other women?”
- d. **Copak**, oni to dnes nehrají? (Havránek *et al.*, 1960: 222) – interjection  
“*Copak*, they aren’t performing it today?”<sup>6</sup>

The expressions containing *-pak* are expressive (Komárek *et al.*, 1986: 393) and stylistically marked (*ibid.*: 100). They are frequent primarily in spoken language (Čermák, 2012: 181; Balhar *et al.*, 2011: 570). Particles with the postfix *-pak* are classified as emotional (Komárek *et al.*, 1986: 236), or interrogative contact particles (*ibid.*: 231). Some of them may carry modal meanings, notably the particle *jestlipak*, which marks a question as deliberative, i.e. posed to oneself (Dušková *et al.*, 2012: 313), or simultaneously to oneself and another addressee (Zouharová, 2008); see example (2).

<sup>2</sup> Being a predominantly synthetic language, Czech is rich in inflection. The declension system of nouns, pronouns and adjectives comprises seven case forms.

<sup>3</sup> SYN 2015, ORAL, InterCorp Czech. Nor are these forms listed in Filipec, Kroupová *et al.* (2005).

<sup>4</sup> In Czech, particles (*částice*) are traditionally viewed as a separate word class and defined as follows: they are not integrated into the syntactic structure of a clause and they express the speaker’s relationship towards the content or form of the communication, to the addressee, etc. (Komárek *et al.*, 1968: 228). Czech particles tend to be emotionally expressive. Many of them are homophonous with members of other word classes.

<sup>5</sup> Unless indicated otherwise, the translations are by Šebestová and Malá.

<sup>6</sup> For the purposes of our analysis, the part-of-speech classification can be disregarded as the major functions tended to occur across part-of-speech boundaries.

- (2) **Jestlipak** sis to už přečetl? (Komárek *et al.*, 1986: 231)  
 “*Jestlipak* you have read it yet?”

Expressions with the postfix *-pak* may express diverse types of the speaker’s stance: different sources list different characteristics, none of them focussing systematically on the semantics of the postfix. Examples of semantic features of various *-pak* expressions mentioned in the literature include: surprise, apprehension (Komárek *et al.*, 1986: 236), admiration, understatement, curiosity, or indignation (Havránek *et al.*, 1960: 222).

In general, the pronouns, adverbs, particles and interjections ending in *-pak* (3a) may be viewed as elements of what Poldauf (1964) described as “the third syntactical plan”, i.e. elements relating the content of an utterance to the individual and “his specific ability to perceive, judge and assess”, and expressing the individual’s “concern” with the content of the communication or with its form (*ibid.*: 242). Poldauf’s findings suggest that English and Czech differ substantially in the means used to express speakers’ stance. Czech employs a wide repertory of such means, often morphological or lexical ones, such as free datives, e.g. (3b), various particles or interjections, e.g. (3c) and (3d), respectively). As the part-of-speech classification of some expressions tends to be problematic (e.g. some may fall into different parts of speech depending on their position within the given sentence, they may or may not be syntactically integrated etc.), Poldauf subsumes them under the broader terms “signals” or “formulas”.

- (3) a. **Kdepak** asi je? (*ibid.*: 253)  
 “Where-*pak* possibly he is?”  
 I wonder where he is. / Where is he, I wonder? (*ibid.*)
- b. Čas **mu** utíkal pomalu. (*ibid.*: 249)  
 “Time him<sub>DAT</sub> passed slowly.” (*ibid.*: 255)  
 He found time pass too slowly. (*ibid.*: 249)
- c. **Že** je dnes dusno? (*že* = particle, syntactically integrated, *ibid.*: 247)  
 “*Že* it is sultry today?”
- d. Dnes je dusno, **že**? (*že* = interjection, syntactically non-integrated, *ibid.*)  
 “Today it is sultry, isn’t it?”

In English, the elements of the “third syntactical plan” appear to be considerably restricted in comparison with Czech, and they tend to comprise mainly grammatical means (e.g. specific syntactic structures). This is partly due to typological differences between the two languages, cf. for example, free datives in inflectional Czech and their analytical counterparts in English (*ibid.*: 248). The difference may be accounted for also by a generally higher degree of expressivity in Czech (*ibid.*: 254).

Within the “third syntactical plan”, we may differentiate between two types of evaluation: “emotional” in (4) as opposed to “intellectual”, depending on the basis for the individual’s stance (5). According to Poldauf, English shows an overall preference for ‘intellectual’ evaluation (*ibid.*: 253), frequently to the point of styling expressions of emotional evaluation as intellectual. In example (6), for instance, the speaker’s primary aim is to express his feelings, yet the formal representation corresponds to intellectual evaluation (*I wish*).

- (4) **Copak** potřebuje skútr?  
 “*Copak* he needs a scooter?” (*ibid.*: 247)

- (5) **Jestlipak** to víte?  
**I wonder if** you know it? (*ibid.*: 253)
- (6) **I wish** you were here. (*ibid.*)

Both types of evaluation are close to modal meaning (*ibid.*: 244, 247). The modal meaning related to evaluation tends to be epistemic. In example (7a), the speaker expresses his commitment to the truth of a previous statement. In (7b), with the particles *aby tak*, the epistemic modal meaning is deliberative, the speaker is pondering whether it could be raining, while expressing his stance on the possibility of rain.

- (7) a. Je to **myslím** přesně tak. (intellectual, *ibid.*: 244)  
“It is I think exactly so.” (*ibid.*: 253)
- b. **Aby tak** venku přšelo. (emotional, *ibid.*: 247)  
“*Aby tak* it was raining outside.”

### 3. The aims of the study

To return to the topic of the present study, the postfix *-pak* can signal various discourse functions in Czech. Our aim is to offer a comprehensive description of the repertory of these functions. Generally, the same discourse functions can be assumed to be expressed in Czech originals as in their English translation counterparts, since languages share their “needs of expression and communication” (Mathesius, 1936: 95). However, the means of expression as well as the extent to which the functions are explicitly marked are likely to differ in different languages (*ibid.*, cf. also Haspelmath, 2010; Martinková, 2014). For instance, epistemic stance and appeal indicated by the particle *jestlipak* in example (8a) is signalled by *I wonder if* in English.<sup>7</sup> In example (8b), no direct overt counterpart of the particle *copak* can be identified.

- (8) a. **Jestlipak** máte ještě tu tlustou knihu?  
“*Jestlipak* you have still that thick book?”  
**I wonder if** you still have that thick book?
- b. Ale **copak** se to nedalo vymyslit nějak jinak?  
“But *copak* was it impossible to arrange it in another way?”  
But was there no other way to arrange things?

The study pursues two closely intertwined goals: first, a comprehensive description of the discourse functions of sentences containing words with the postfix *-pak*; second, an overview of the means used in English to perform the same discourse functions. The latter aim relates to the wider topic of typological differences between the two languages, bearing in mind the relatively restricted possibilities of emotional evaluation in English (Poldauf, 1964).

Several types of English counterparts are expected to occur as correspondences of the Czech *-pak* expressions, drawing on the literature and the findings of our pilot study

---

<sup>7</sup> Unless indicated otherwise, all examples in Sections 3-6 are from the parallel translation corpus *InterCorp*: the Czech sentences are the originals; their English counterparts (translations) are given below them. Where necessary, literal English translations of the Czech sentences (by Šebestová and Malá) are inserted between the originals and translations, and marked by inverted commas.

(Šebestová and Malá, 2016). For example, Czech questions introduced by the particle *copak*, as in (9), are often translated by polar rhetorical questions (Dušková *et al.*, 2012: 316).

- (9) **Copak** chceš být vyloučen ze školy?  
“*Copak* you want to be expelled from school?”  
Do you want to be expelled from school? (*ibid.*)

Another type of expected English counterparts is negative polar questions. In English, these questions suggest a change in the speaker’s previous assumptions or views; usually, they express the speaker’s unpleasant surprise (Dušková *et al.*, 2012: 314).

- (10) **Copak** nemůže přijít?  
“*Copak* he can’t come?”  
Can’t he come? (Peprník, 1984: 30)

Our pilot study showed that the occurrence of explicit markers, typical of the Czech third syntactical plan, is also possible in English: the introductory signal *I wonder if* corresponded to the Czech particle *jestlipak*; see (8a) above, idiomatic expressions of emphatic negation corresponded to the interjection *kdepak*, as in (11).

- (11) **Kdepak**, teď už bych nic neufoukal.  
“*Kdepak*, now I could not blow anything.”  
**Not a hope.** Couldn’t blow now.

#### 4. Material and method

The material was drawn from the Czech-English fiction subcorpus of the parallel translation corpus *InterCorp*, version 9. The examined material was limited to Czech originals and their English translations,<sup>8</sup> resulting in a subcorpus of 26 Czech original modern novels (complete texts, published mostly between 1950 and 2010) and their English counterparts. The size of the subcorpus (Czech texts) is 2 708 811 tokens.<sup>9</sup>

In total, 576 Czech concordance lines containing expressions with the postfix *-pak* and their English translation correspondences were analysed. Most of the expressions with the postfix *-pak*, as described in grammars and dictionaries of present-day Czech, were represented in the sample, albeit with different frequencies of occurrence (Table 1). The Czech sentences were classified according to the word class of the *-pak* expression. Since the PoS tagging of the corpus proved unreliable and sometimes at variance with our criteria, the classification was performed manually.

---

<sup>8</sup> It would be interesting to complement the results obtained relying on Czech source texts and English translations by an analysis drawing on the opposite direction, i.e. exploring English originals which were translated into Czech using *-pak* expressions. However, this is beyond the scope of the present paper.

<sup>9</sup> Admittedly, the material used is to some extent problematic as the analysis relies on individual translator’s choices. Nevertheless, we believe that the size of the corpus and range of texts (26), authors (15) and translators (21) makes it possible to make some generalisations. For a detailed description of *InterCorp* see <http://www.korpus.cz>.

**Table 1. Representation of words comprising *-pak* (lemmata) in our data.**

<b><i>-pak</i> expression</b>	<b>no. of instances</b>	<b>%</b>
<i>copak, cožpak, sopak</i>	312	54.2
<i>kdepak, depak, kdepák, depák</i>	98	17.0
<i>jakýpak, jakejpak</i>	37	6.4
<i>jestlipak</i>	32	5.6
<i>kdopak</i>	23	4.0
<i>jakpak, japak, japa</i>	23	4.0
<i>pročpak</i>	17	3.0
<i>kampak</i>	11	1.9
<i>kdypak</i>	9	1.6
<i>zdalipak</i>	4	0.7
<i>natožpak</i>	2	0.5
<i>kolipak, kolipak</i>	3	0.3
<i>odkdypak</i>	2	0.3
<i>čipak</i>	1	0.3
<i>kterýpak, kerejpak</i>	2	0.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>576</b>	<b>100</b>

Where possible, an overt counterpart of the Czech *-pak* expression was identified in the English counterparts of the Czech sentences. The English sentences were classified in terms of sentence type and polarity.

The next step – an analysis of the discourse functions of the English counterparts of the Czech sentences with *-pak* expressions – revealed that several broad functional areas can be identified: epistemic modality, the function of appeal, expressing a change in the speaker’s assumption, emotional expressivity, and expressing contrast or emphasis. The functions were often found to combine, making it impossible to tease out a dominant one (cf. Aijmer, 2013).

As suggested by Johansson (2007: 1), some characteristics which may not be quite salient in the originals may be revealed by translation correspondences. In our analysis, the English translation counterparts were found to contain additional markers of other functions (e.g. sentence-initial coordinating conjunctions). We therefore decided to look more closely at the Czech original sentences in order to find out whether the corresponding Czech markers could be seen to co-occur with the *-pak* expressions. Based on this approach, we identified additional markers of establishing and maintaining contact, expressing politeness or tentativeness, and building textual coherence. Sometimes the markers were present merely in the English translations; in other cases, corresponding markers were also attested in the Czech originals.

In summary, our contrastive analysis was performed in two steps: we started out from the Czech originals, and examined their English translation counterparts; secondly, the English counterparts drew our attention towards elements in the originals which were worth further examination.

As a result of the two-step analysis, each sentence in our data was assigned at least one of the following primary functions: indicating epistemic modality, voicing appeal, or expressing a change in the speaker’s assumption. These functions may either occur on their own or they may combine with each other and with other, secondary functions, such as establishing or maintaining contact, expressing politeness or tentativeness, and building textual coherence (including emphasis or contrast). The secondary functions never occurred alone in our material.

The classes identified empirically in our data correspond to a large extent to Erman’s (2001) categorization of pragmatic markers, attesting to the broad range of pragmatic functions indicated by the Czech *-pak*. However, our classification is more fine-grained and goes across Erman’s three broad categories. Erman’s “textual monitors” fulfil textual

functions, relating to our secondary functions of expressing contrast/emphasis and coherence. Erman's "social monitors" correspond to our functions of appeal (primary) and establishing/maintaining contact (secondary), "[ensuring] that the channel is open between the interlocutors" (*ibid.*: 1339). Finally, Erman's "metalinguistic monitors" are "basically modal" – they relate to our primary functions of expressing epistemic modality and changes in the speaker's assumption.

The following section first introduces the primary functions of the sentences with the expressions containing *-pak*, as identified through their English counterparts, and the means used in English to convey the same function. Then, the secondary functions are described.

## 5. Analysis

As mentioned, three major discourse functions signalled by the postfix *-pak* were identified with the help of the English translation correspondences: indicating epistemic modality, voicing appeal, and expressing a change in the speaker's assumption. We call these functions primary, as all the sentences in our material express at least one of these functions. Primary functions may either occur on their own or in combination with secondary or other primary functions, as in example (12), which signals the speaker's changed assumption: the speaker was convinced that a third person knew something, but the addressee's reaction leads the speaker to question his original assumption. At the same time, the sentence voices the speaker's appeal to the addressee to provide a clarification, as reflected in the introductory signal *you mean*.

- (12) **Copak** von to neví?  
 "Copak he doesn't know?"  
**You mean**, like, he doesn't know?

### 5.1 Primary functions

#### 5.1.1 Expressing epistemic modality

Epistemic modality may be defined as "[the] speaker's attitude to the factuality of past or present time situations", and "qualifications concerning the speaker's knowledge" (Huddleston and Pullum, 2012: 178). Biber *et al.* (1999: 485) term it "extrinsic modality", and define it as "[referring] to the logical status of events or states, usually relating to assessments of likelihood: possibility, necessity, or prediction." Dušková *et al.* (2012: 477-478) list the following epistemic modal meanings: "probability, certainty, doubt based on observation, validity based on other people's beliefs, and limiting the truth value of an utterance".

The definitions of epistemic modality are relatively broad. The English sentences in our material were considered to express epistemic modal meaning if they contained an expression which we viewed as an epistemic modality marker. A list of markers was compiled after examining the corpus material and searching for any expressions which overtly convey epistemic modal meaning, bearing in mind that possible means of expressing modality, other than modal verbs, include lexical verbs, adjectives, adverbs, and nouns (Huddleston and Pullum, 2012: 52, 173-5) as well as certain lexico-grammatical patterns (cf. Daneš *et al.*, 1987: 355). Thus, the markers examined include epistemic modal verbs or modal adverbs, question tags, emphatic *no* negation (epistemic meaning of certainty), and mental verbs.

Question tags may be considered signals of epistemic modality as they "elicit confirmation or agreement" (Biber *et al.*, 1999: 208), i.e. they voice appeal, and, at the same

time, they imply either the epistemic modal meaning of uncertainty (requesting verification) or certainty (requesting agreement), as illustrated in (13).

- (13) **Copak** se to nedá napravit?  
 “*Copak* can’t it be fixed?”  
 Well, that can be put to rights, **can’t it?**

Mental verbs also tend to co-occur with modals, expressing “emotions, attitudes, cognitive states” Biber *et al.* (1999: 491); Poldauf (1964: 244) also notes that intellectual evaluation is closely related to modality, cf. (14).

- (14) **Copak** já sem debilní?  
 “*Copak* I am a moron?”  
**You think** I’m a moron?

Epistemic modal meaning seems to be an intrinsic feature of the postfix *-pak*, as it was identified in all examined parts of speech.

As shown in Table 2, the English counterparts pointing towards the primary function of expressing epistemic modality were predominantly interrogative sentences (over 60% of all concordances in which epistemic modality was identified).

**Table 2. English counterparts expressing epistemic modal meaning.**

English counterpart	no. of instances	%	example
interrogative positive non-rhetorical sentence	63	25.0	<b>Copak</b> si šlo Doufala splíst? “ <i>Copak</i> it was possible to mistake Doufal?” How could you take Doufal for somebody else?
interrogative positive rhetorical sentence	53	21.0	<b>Copak</b> vím, kdo k panu asistentovi chodí? “ <i>Copak</i> I know who comes to see the lecturer?” How do I know who comes to see the lecturer?
verbless clause	39	15.5	Ale <b>kdepak</b> , to je poctivý člověk. “ <i>But kdepak</i> , he is an honest man.” <b>But of course not</b> , he is an honest man.
interrogative negative rhetorical sentence	29	11.5	<b>Cožpak</b> jsem vám to neřekl hned, když jsem vás uviděl? “ <i>Cožpak</i> I didn’t tell you...?” Didn’t I tell you the moment I set eyes on you?
declarative negative sentence	28	11.1	<b>Copak</b> se máte tak zle? “ <i>Copak</i> you are that badly off?” You’re not that badly off.
declarative positive sentence	26	10.3	<b>Zdalipak</b> já budu s to ještě někdy dobýt dívku. “ <i>Zdalipak</i> I will be ever able to conquer a girl.” I wonder if I’ll ever conquer a girl...
interrogative negative non-rhetorical sentence	9	3.6	Ale <b>copak</b> se to nedalo vymyslet nějak jinak? “ <i>But copak</i> it could not be arranged another way?” <b>But was there no other way to arrange things?</b>
exclamative sentence	3	1.2	<b>Jakápak</b> záchytko! “ <i>What-pak</i> sobering-up centre!” No centre for him!
Imperative sentence	2	0.8	<b>Depák</b> , to byste se hoší krutě přepočítali! “ <i>Depák</i> you would be brutally miscalculating, boys!” Don’t kid cherselfs now, boyos, cause that’d be brutally miscalculatin!
<b>Total</b>	<b>252</b>	<b>100</b>	



Some of the most prominent English counterparts contained epistemic signals, namely modal adverbs, e.g. *really* and *actually*, as in (15), verbs of thinking, e.g. *think* in (14) above), and modal verbs, cf. *could* in (16), which has no direct counterpart in the Czech original).

- (15) Jana Rybářová se rychle probírala k vědomí, čeká nás důležitý den, ale **copak** nějaký den není důležitý?  
 "...but *copak* some day isn't important?"  
 Jana Rybářová quickly roused herself from sleep, an important day awaits, but are there **actually** unimportant ones?
- (16) A **jestlipak** by i to, co Blběnka s Lídou asi dělávaly, než se Blběnka vydala za oceán, probudilo v páně Zawynatchovi jeho masochistický princip slasti.  
 "And *jestlipak* would even what Dotty and Lida's used to do... have awakened the masochistic pleasure principle in Mr. Zawynatch?"  
 And **could** Dotty and Lida's probable profession have awakened the masochistic pleasure principle in Mr. Zawynatch?

Some of the interrogatives were rhetorical questions. Although formally interrogative, they had the illocutionary force of emphatic statements (Dušková *et al.*, 2012: 316).<sup>10</sup> In (17), the Czech sentence does contain a modal verb (*mám*), but the translation deviates from its usual correspondence (*should*): *mám* is translated as *can*. The meaning of the Czech *jakpak* is made explicit in the English translation; in this rhetorical question, the modality of *mám* is epistemic, the speaker is making an emphatic statement: "I cannot possibly be cross with the boy."

- (17) **Jakpak** se **mám** na hochu zlobit, když byl v právu?  
 "*Jakpak* should I be cross with the boy, when he was in the right?"  
 How can we be cross with the boy, when he was in the right?

Approximately half of the English interrogative sentences (32% of the total number of interrogatives) were rhetorical questions (cf. footnote 9, Dušková *et al.*, 2012: 316). Polar rhetorical questions function as statements of the opposite polarity, e.g. (18).<sup>11</sup> Variable rhetorical questions, ((15) and (19) are paraphrasable by statements containing a reversed-polarity universal quantifier (Dušková *et al.*, 2012: 316)).

- (18) **Cožpak** jsem vám to neřekl hned, když jsem vás uviděl?  
 "*Cožpak* I didn't tell you the moment I saw you?"  
 Didn't I tell you the moment I set eyes on you?  
 (implied meaning: I did tell you the moment I set eyes on you.)
- (19) **Copak** vím, kdo k panu asistentovi chodí?  
 "*Copak* I know who comes to see the lecturer?"

<sup>10</sup> The classification of negative interrogative sentences may be problematic (cf. Dušková *et al.*, 2012: 314-317). In our study, we only consider interrogative sentences rhetorical if they contain an epistemic modality marker, or if the context suggests clearly enough that their illocutionary force is an emphatic reversed-polarity statement. Other instances are viewed as merely expressing a change in the speaker's previous assumption (cf. *ibid.*: 314).

<sup>11</sup> We adopt Huddleston and Pullum's terminology, i.e. polar questions (allowing as its answers a pair of polar opposites, Huddleston and Pullum 2012: 868) as opposed to variable questions, containing "a propositional content consisting of an open proposition, i.e. a proposition containing a variable [...] The answers express closed propositions derived by substituting a particular value for the variable" (*ibid.*: 872).

How do I know who comes to see the lecturer?  
(implied meaning: There is no way for me to know that.)

Verbless clauses were also represented among the English counterparts expressing epistemic modality. All of them were counterparts of the Czech interjection or particle *kdepak*, functioning as an emphatic negative response (a variant of English emphatic *no*). Usually, these verbless clauses contained an emphatic element, e.g. emphatic negation, an element fronted through negation (20), idiomatic phrases, such as *no way*, *some hope*, and *by no means*, as in (21).

- (20) ...o věcech Boga jsem se ani nezmninil, **kdepak**, já byl rád, že tu můžu ležet...  
“...the stuff about Bog I didn’t even mention, *kdepak*, I was glad to lie here...”  
I didn’t even mention that stuff about Bog, **not me**, I was glad to be there...
- (21) **Kdepak**, tady umirají především mladí lidé.  
“*Kdepak*, here mostly young people die.”  
**By no means**. The highest death rates here are among young people.

Another group of English counterparts were negative declarative sentences. They express negative epistemic modal meaning, i.e. the speaker’s certainty about an explicit negative statement, proving that the Czech original interrogative sentences are indeed rhetorical, as shown in (22).

- (22) **Copak** se máte tak zle?  
“*Copak* you are that badly off?”  
You’re not that badly off.

Epistemic modality may also be expressed by positive declarative sentences (they express the speaker’s certainty about the truth of the statement). Many of them contained the verb *wonder* (mostly the initial signal *I wonder*), expressing deliberative meaning (23).

- (23) **Jakpak** asi skončí tamta partie, pohlédla ke schodišti.  
“How-*pak* will that game end, she looked towards the staircase.”  
Bridge, is it? the blonde thought, and **wondered** how the other game would turn out.

Epistemic modal meaning may combine with the function of appeal in two types of counterparts, namely in deliberative questions and emphatic statements. Deliberative questions posed to oneself (and potentially also to another addressee) express the epistemic modal meaning of uncertainty, as in (24). Here there are explicit appeal signals, namely the term of address *you bums*, the second person verb form and in English also the possessive pronoun *your*. On the other hand, emphatic statements appealing to the addressee to acknowledge the speaker’s assertion express a high degree of certainty: example (25) has the illocutionary force of an emphatic statement (the speaker is convinced that ‘we do not have to be like that’) as well as containing an appeal signal, the inclusive plural *we*.

- (24) **Jestlipak** jste, vy syčáci, nezapomněli otčenáš?  
“*Jestlipak* you haven’t, you bums, forgotten ‘Our Father’?”  
**Could it be, you bums**, that you have forgotten **your** ‘Our Father’?”

- (25) **Copak** musíme být jak pekař s pekařkou na peci?  
 “*Copak* we have to be like the baker and his wife on the stove?”  
 Do we have to be like the baker and his wife on the stove?

In idiomatic constructions containing a *-pak* expression and an ‘echo’ element, the epistemic modal meaning combines with the cohesive function of *-pak* as *jakpak by ne*, or *jakýpak* + ‘echo’ (26). We are using the ad-hoc term ‘echo’ element here to refer to a recurrence of any expression from the preceding context, such as the word *offense* in example (26). This recurrence is not necessarily verbatim, i.e. the ‘echo’ element may be, e.g., an anaphoric pronoun. A certain degree of variation within the ‘echo’ element is possible, cf. the adjective *embarrassing* echoed by the corresponding noun *embarrassment* in (27).

- (26) To všechno jsou ovšem jednotlivosti; ale stačí je osvětlit vaším dnešním, přítomným **deliktem**, aby se náhle spojily v celek výmluvně svědčící o vašem charakteru a vašem postoji. – **Ale jakýpak delikt**, křičel jsem. Vyložím přede všemi věci tak, jak se odehrály: jsou-li lidé lidmi, musí se tomu přece smát.  
 “...but just look at them in the light of your present offense... – But what-*pak* offense, I shouted. ...”  
 All these, of course, are isolated facts; but just look at them in the light of your present **offense**, and they suddenly unite into a totality of significant testimony about your character and attitude. – **But what sort of offense!** I’ll explain publicly what happened. If people are human they’ll have to laugh.’ ...’
- (27) “Představ si, jak by to bylo **trapné**, kdybychom nepřišli,” řekl jsem. – „**Copak trapné**, ale přišli bychom o Dvořákův violoncellový koncert!”  
 “‘Imagine how embarrassing it would be if we didn’t come,’ I said. - ‘*Copak* embarrassing, but we would miss Dvořák’s cello concerto!’”  
 “Just imagine how **embarrassing** it would be if you hadn’t remembered and we didn’t turn up,” I said. – “**Never mind the embarrassment**, think of the Dvořák’s cello concerto we’d be missing!”

### 5.1.2 Voicing appeal

Appeal is understood as prompting the addressee to react to and to become actively involved in the interaction – to “do” something verbally. In fact, the interrogative sentence type automatically entails a certain basic amount of appeal expressed by the utterance; any question presents an appeal to the addressee to provide the missing information (Dušková *et al.*, 2012: 311). Therefore, the interrogative sentence type on its own was not regarded as a sufficient criterion for a sentence to classify as expressing appeal. Other indicators of appeal had to be present.

The presence or absence of an addressee is a crucial factor in questions. If the question is posed to an addressee, its function is that of appeal. On the other hand, if there is no second person present, the speaker poses the question to himself, i.e. the question is deliberative and dubitative, and it expresses epistemic modality. Therefore, we looked for second-person signals in the English counterparts. Considering the communicative contexts, we have arrived at the following set of appeal markers: vocatives, second person finite verb forms,<sup>12</sup> second person pronoun as affected object, as in (28), second person possessive pronoun (29),

<sup>12</sup> Unless the 2nd person is a general human agent, in which case the question is rhetorical: *Copak dnes najdeš někoho, kdo by měl trochu odvahy?* ‘How often nowadays do you find someone with some courage?’

inclusive plural, e.g. (25) above, question tags (30), verbs referring to the ongoing communication, as *I ask you* or *tell me* in (31).

- (28) **Copak ti** udělali ti hoši?  
“What-*pak* have these boys done to you?”  
What have these boys done **to you**?
- (29) **Copak tvuj** táta nebyl vlk?  
“*Copak* your dad wasn’t a wolf?”  
Wasn’t **your** dad a wolf, **then**?
- (30) Počítač je nám, jako ve většině případů, na nic, ale **copak** neznáme tradiční metody, jak pracovat s fotografií?  
“...but *copak* we don’t know the traditional processing methods?”  
As in most such cases, computers are a fat lot of good. But there are still the good old-fashioned processing methods, **aren’t there**?
- (31) “**Kdopak ti** udělal monokl?” obrátil se k paní Venuši.  
“Who-*pak* gave you the monocle?...”  
“**Tell me**, who gave you that monocle?” he turned to Mrs Venus.

In the English counterparts, the function of appeal was fulfilled primarily by interrogative sentences; the majority of them were non-rhetorical, as in (32). Variable questions occurred more frequently than polar ones, and positive more often than negative ones.

- (32) **Pročpak** jste napadl na [*sic*] toho plešatého pána?  
“Why-*pak* did you attack the bald gentleman?”  
**Why is it that** you attacked the bald gentleman?

Some examples contained mental verbs in the second person, e.g. the introductory signal (*do you mean*, as in example (12), repeated here as (33). Others included emphatic elements: *whatever*, *why on earth*, the intensifier *really*, *it*-clefts or inferential constructions (Delahunty, 1995) of the type *could it be that* (34).

- (33) **Copak** von to neví?  
“*Copak* he doesn’t know?”  
**You mean**, like, he doesn’t know?
- (34) **Jestlipak** znáte časopis Svět zvířat?  
“*Jestlipak* you know the magazine The Animal World?”  
**Could it be that** you know the magazine The Animal World?

The appeal may be voiced explicitly in imperative sentences, or in verbs with meta-communicative reference, e.g. *I ask you* in (35).

- (35) **Copak** je to možné?  
“*Copak* is it possible?”  
**I ask you**, is it possible?

Appeal may also be voiced by a rhetorical question (with the illocutionary force of a reversed polarity statement) – all the examples were polar questions, as in (36). There were also instances of additional emphatic elements: an *it*-cleft (36) and the intensifier *really*.

- (36) **Copak** jsi mi tuto větu ve svém automobilu z ledu sám nevytetoval na stehno?  
 “*Copak* you didn’t tattoo that sentence...?”  
**Wasn’t it you** who tattooed that sentence on my thigh in your automobile of ice?

In declarative sentences, appeal often co-occurs with deliberative epistemic modal meaning. Signals of deliberative meaning include *perhaps*, *I wonder*; see example (37), or other mental verbs. Sentences introduced by *I wonder* sometimes end with a question mark (9 out of the total 19 in our material). Nevertheless, we classify all of them as declarative sentences, based on their formal characteristics (word order). The optional question mark most likely reflects their illocutionary force, e.g. (37).

- (37) Aha, a **jestlipak** víš, že největší herec všech dob byl Charles Laughton?  
 “Oh right, and *jestlipak* you know...?”  
 Oh, right, but **I wonder** if you know that the greatest actor of all time was Charles Laughton?

The function of appeal may co-occur with the expression of change in the speaker’s previous assumption, which usually concerns the addressee, i.e. there tends to be a term of address or a vocative, as in (38).

- (38) **Copak** vy zase nepatříte ke společenský smetánce, **pane profesore**?  
 “*Copak* you don’t belong to the cream of society again, professor?”  
 Don’t you belong to the cream of society again, **professor**?

Table 3 summarizes the different English counterparts of *-pak* voicing an appeal and their distribution in our data.

**Table 3. English counterparts voicing appeal.**

English counterpart	no. of instances	%	example
interrogative non-rhetorical positive sentence	89	53.9	<b>Copak</b> byl domov ještě domovem? “ <i>Copak</i> home was still home?” Do you think that home was still home?
interrogative non-rhetorical negative sentence	38	23.0	<b>Copak</b> nevíš, jak tě mám rád? “ <i>Copak</i> you don’t know how much I love you?” Don’t you know I love you?
declarative positive sentence	13	7.9	<b>Jestlipak</b> vůbec víš, že tvůj děda původně pocházel z vesnice, která se menuje Vlčeves. “ <i>Jestlipak</i> ... you know that your grandfather...?” I wonder if you know that your grandfather originally came from a village called Vlčeves
interrogative rhetorical positive sentence (all polar)	8	4.8	<b>Copak</b> se mi chtělo? “ <i>Copak</i> I wanted to?” Do you think I wanted to leave?

interrogative rhetorical negative sentence (all polar)	6	3.6	Ale <b>copak</b> vy sám většinou nemluvíte, jenom abyste mluvil? “But <i>copak</i> you yourself mostly don’t talk just for the sake of talking?” Don’t you yourself talk mostly just for the sake of talking?
imperative – positive sentence	6	3.6	...tělo neměl zhrublý a ztěžklý svejma bitvama a už vůbec ne chlastem, <b>kdepak</b> , sportoval. “...his body wasn’t made coarse and heavy by his battles... <i>kdepak</i> he was a sportsman.” ...his body wasn't all coarse an hard from battle, an forget about booze, this boy was an athlete.
declarative – negative sentence	3	1.8	... <b>copak</b> máš pas? “... <i>copak</i> you have a passport?” you don't even have a passport!
imperative – negative sentence	2	1.2	<b>Cák</b> já. “What- <i>pak</i> me.” But don't take no account of me.
<b>Total</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>100</b>	

### 5.1.3 Change in assumption

The third main discourse function signalled by *-pak* is that of expressing a change in the speaker’s previous assumption. It is strongly linked to emotional expressivity (especially in cases when the speaker expresses an unpleasant surprise). Virtually all the English counterparts here were interrogative sentences (see Table 4), mostly polar questions. A case in point is example (39) where the second speaker had presupposed that the cousin was rich. This assumption appears to be false, forcing the speaker to reassess the situation.

- (39) On má bratránek pro dámy veliké kouzlo. Dámy ho mají za boháče. – **Copak** není bohatý?  
“...Ladies take him for a rich man. – *Copak* he isn’t rich?”  
My cousin has a great appeal for the ladies. They think he’s rich. – **And isn’t he?**

**Table 4. English counterparts expressing a change in the speaker’s assumption.**

English counterpart	no. of instances	%	example
interrogative positive non-rhetorical sentence	44	51.2	<b>Copak</b> von to neví? “ <i>Copak</i> he doesn’t know?” You mean, like, he doesn't know?
interrogative negative non-rhetorical sentence	38	44.2	On má bratránek pro dámy veliké kouzlo. Dámy ho mají za boháče. - <b>Copak</b> není bohatý? “...Ladies take him for a rich man. – <i>Copak</i> he isn’t rich?” My cousin has a great appeal for the ladies. They think he's rich. - And isn't he?
declarative sentence	4	4.7	<b>Copak</b> , snad se nebojíte? “ <i>Copak</i> , hopefully you aren’t scared?” You're not scared, are you?
<b>Total</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>100</b>	

As regards co-occurring elements, verbs of thinking were found, such as *you think* in example (40) and *you mean* in (33) above. There were also some emphatic means identified in interrogatives, such as *wherever*, *where on earth*, the intensifiers *really*, *at all* as in (41), or the inferential construction (*is it that* as in (40)).

- (40) Ty vopice jedna, **copak** myslíš, že se budu jen s tebou bavit?  
 "...*copak* you think that I'd be prattling with you only?"  
 You singular monkey, **is it that you think** that I'd be prattling with you?
- (41) **Copak** nemáš ani trochu slitování?  
 "*Copak* you don't have a bit of pity?"  
 Have you no pity **at all**?

## 5.2 Secondary functions

Secondary functions of the postfix *-pak* can be identified on the basis of some additional signals. Sometimes, these signals are present only in the English translation, having no direct counterpart in the Czech original. This suggests that the postfix *-pak* has a certain potential to fulfil the given function. This potential would be difficult, if not impossible, to identify if we only analysed the original texts (cf. Johansson, 2007). This can be exemplified by the occurrence of cohesive ties in the English translation, pointing towards the ability of *-pak* to contribute to textual cohesion. For example, in (42), the English conjunction *and* has no explicit counterpart in the original.

- (42) **Kdepak** ses tu vzala, slečinko?  
 "Where-*pak* have you come from, little lady?"  
**And** where **may** you have come from, little lady?

However, in other cases these additional signals are present in the English translation as well as in the Czech original. Here, we adopt a perspective based on Partington's (2015) theory of evaluative harmony. The potential of the postfix *-pak* to fulfil the given function is strengthened by its co-occurrence with another signal of the same function, e.g. as in (42), where the potential of *-pak* to serve as a means of expressing politeness is supported by the presence of the honorific *slečinko* / *little lady*.<sup>13</sup> When combined, the co-occurring signals reinforce each other's potential. Simultaneously, they create evaluative harmony, contributing to textual cohesion.

From a methodological point of view, it may be worth noting that the two types of signals described above (those limited to English translations and those occurring in both the translation and the original) can only be linked through contrastive analysis. The secondary functions could hardly be reliably identified in any other way than through a translation corpus study. Moreover, a relatively large quantity of material is needed to arrive at plausible generalisations, as the secondary functions are not ubiquitous, unlike the primary ones.

### 5.2.1 Contact function

The function of establishing or maintaining contact was ascribed to *-pak* based on English translations which contained clearly identifiable, explicit contact signals. These were defined as terms of address (*Sir*, *Miss*), honorifics (*your eminence*), vocatives, contact interjections (*come on*, *hey*, *look here*), and greetings (*good afternoon*). The contact function is linked to

<sup>13</sup> Even though the vocative may appear ironic here, the co-text rather suggests a "good-natured teasing" interpretation: *A long stick of a man, stooping a little, he had a bald head and a good-natured teasing grin, rather like the mysterious old man who appears in fairy tales. "And where may you have come from, young lady?"*

the function of appeal as well as to emotional expressivity, of which some terms of address were evaluative, functioning as stance markers, e.g. (43).

- (43) **Pročpak**, vy jeden siamskej slone, nemyslíte?  
“Why-*pak* don’t you, you Siamese elephant, think?”  
How come, you Siamese elephant you, that you don’t think?

### 5.2.2 Politeness/tentativeness

The role of *-pak* as a politeness or tentativeness marker was suggested by its co-occurrence with honorifics (therefore coinciding with the contact function), such as *slečinko* / *little lady* in example (42). Further, some morphological politeness signals were identified in English (the epistemic modal *may* in (42); past tense in (44)). Unlike the other functions, which were distributed evenly across different word classes, the function of a politeness signal was most common in *-pak* interjections. This is exemplified in (45), which contains an explicit comment suggesting the polite tone of the utterance not present in Czech (*he said modestly*).

- (44) [...] řekla jsem Ludvíkovi, **jestlipak** víte, že jedu za tři dny na Slovácko dělat reportáž o Jízdě králů.  
“[...] I said to Ludvík, *jestlipak* you-know that I am-going in three days to Slovácko to do a feature on the Ride of the Kings?”  
[...] I said to Ludvík, **did you know** I was going to Moravia for three days to do a feature on the Ride of the Kings?
- (45) Vy jste umělec, důstojný pane, řekl jsem. - Bránil se: Ale **kdepak**, pane profesore. To já si s tím jenom tak hraju, když mám trošku času.  
“...But *kdepak*, professor. I just tinker around...”  
You’re an artist, Father, I said. - **Oh now**, Mr. Smiricky, he said **modestly**. I just tinker around for fun when I have a little time.

### 5.2.3 Cohesive function

The role of the postfix *-pak* in structuring the text and establishing relationships within the discourse was indicated by linking devices (most frequently the coordinator *and*) and by several instances of English discourse markers in the translations which had no direct counterparts in the Czech originals, viz. *then*, *so*, *well*, and *now* (functioning as conversation openers, as *so* in (46)).

- (46) **Kdypak** vy jste měli fáro?  
“When-*pak* did you have a car?”  
**So when** did you have your own wheels?

The cohesive uses of *-pak* included those establishing a relationship of emphasis or contrast, represented mostly by the particle *copak* and the interjection *kdepak* in (47). This particle tends to be followed by an ‘echo’ element, thus supporting the cohesion by lexical repetition.

- (47) **Strejček** chrápal, až se vohejbaly divizny, [...] a snažili se ho křísit, jenže **kdepak strejček**, ten chrápal a chrčel a slintal a vodfukoval...  
“The uncle was snoring..., and they tried to revive him, but *kdepak* the uncle, he snored...”



The **uncle** was snoring so hard it was making the mullein plants bend over, [...] and they tried to revive him, but the **uncle** just kept snoring, his throat rattling and he was drooling and exhaling loudly...

Finally, through their emotional expressivity, *-pak* expressions contribute to evaluative harmony, or the tendency of elements sharing the same evaluative polarity, i.e. positive or negative, to co-occur and create consistent cohesive evaluative “chains” throughout texts, as in (48), which serves as another means of textual cohesion (Partington, 2015: 283-4).

- (48) Yveta Trojanová, dcera toho **sviňáka** [offensive], [...] proč ona může mít, na co jen ukáže prstem - na tom prstě safír v platině za pět **papírů** [slang, expressive] - vozit si **prdel** [vulgar] v auťáku a každoročně letadlem k moři, **copak** ona má díru do **zadku** [informal] jinde než já?  
“...to the sea, *copak* she has a hole in her butt different from mine?”  
Yveta Trojanová, the daughter of that **pig** [offensive], [...] why does she get whatever she points her finger at, a finger with a platinum ring with a sapphire that cost five **grand** [slang, expressive] – she drives her **ass** [vulgar] around in a car and flies every year to the sea, is the hole in her **butt** [informal] any different from mine?

## 6. Conclusions

The aim of the present study was to contribute to the description of the Czech postfix *-pak* through examining its English translation correspondences with respect to discourse functions. The results of our contrastive analysis suggest that the postfix *-pak* is a polyfunctional indicator of discourse functions. The major functions of the postfix are to mark epistemic modality (such as certainty in rhetorical questions or deliberative meaning in dubitative questions), voice an appeal to the addressee, and mark a change in the speaker’s previous assumption. These functions tend to occur together. Beside these primary functions, the postfix has also manifested the ability to mark other pragmatic meanings. These functions are termed secondary as they occur only in combination with the primary ones. The secondary functions were establishing/maintaining contact, signalling politeness and marking textual cohesion. Finally, the study confirmed that the postfix *-pak* tends towards emotional expressivity, and occurs frequently in spoken interaction (all our examples come from direct speech in fiction dialogues).

The present study has also provided an overview of the means which may be used in English to convey the same functions as those signalled by the Czech postfix *-pak*. The English counterparts of the Czech sentences comprising words with the *-pak* postfix constitute a scale ranging from specific sentence types (e.g. negative rhetorical questions, exclamative sentences) via lexico-grammatical structures of varying degrees of fixedness (*I wonder if*) to individual lexical markers of the discourse functions (e.g. intensifiers, lexical negators). In both Czech and English, discourse function indicators have shown a preference for clause-initial position. In English this applies, for instance, to conjunctions reinforcing the contact-maintaining function (*and*), interrogative sentence-opening expressions (e.g. *I wonder if...*, *Is it that...*), or negative idiomatic constructions (e.g. *not a hope*). The analysis also suggests that where the Czech particles indicate negative epistemic modal meaning (certainty about negative polarity) or discourse functions of objection, reproach, disagreement etc., English tends to express the negative meaning explicitly (e.g. by negative declarative clauses or introductory negative expressions, such as *not at all*). The study further supported the assumption that the expression of stance and interpersonal functions in English relies

more on grammatical means, though lexical ones are involved as well (introductory signals such as *I wonder*, discourse markers and conjunctions).

Finally, from a methodological perspective, the present study has shown that a combination of methodological approaches is required to provide a comprehensive overview of the functions which the postfix *-pak* may signal in discourse. The unidirectional contrastive approach proved efficient as a starting point, but when complemented by a focussed analysis of individual recurrent signals, it led to a more exhaustive characteristic of the postfix, including its potential (secondary) functions.

## References

- Aijmer, K. 2013. *Understanding Pragmatic Markers: A Variational Pragmatic Approach*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Balhar, J. et al. 2005. *Český jazykový atlas 5*. Prague: Academia.
- Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S. and Finegan, E. 1999. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Harlow: Longman
- Boye, K. 2012. *Epistemic Meaning. A Crosslinguistic and Functional-cognitive Study*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Čermák, F. 2012. *Morfematika a slovtvorba češtiny*. Prague: Nakladatelství Lidové Noviny.
- Daneš, F., Hlavsa, Z. and Grepl, M. 1987. *Mluvnice češtiny. 3, Skladba*. Prague: Academia.
- Delahunty, G.P. 1995. The Inferential Construction. *Pragmatics* 5(3): 341–364.
- Dušková, L., Strnadová, Z., Knittlová, D., Peprník, J. and Tárníková, J. 2012. *Mluvnice současné angličtiny na pozadí češtiny*. Prague: Academia.
- Erman, B. 2001. Pragmatic markers revisited with a focus on *you know* in adult and adolescent talk. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33: 1337–1359.
- Filipec, J. et al. 2005. *Slovník spisovné češtiny pro školu a veřejnost*. Prague: Academia.
- Gast, V. 2015. On the use of translation corpora in contrastive linguistics. A case study of impersonalization in English and German. *Languages in Contrast* 15(1): 4–33.
- Grepl, M. and Karlík, P. 1998. *Skladba češtiny*. Olomouc: Votobia.
- Havránek, B. et al. 1960. *Slovník spisovného jazyka českého I; A – M*. Prague: ČSAV.
- Haspelmath, M. 2010. Comparative concepts and descriptive categories in crosslinguistic studies. *Language* 86(3): 663–687.
- Huddleston, R. and Pullum, G.K. 2002. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Johansson, S. 2007. *Seeing through Multilingual Corpora: On the use of corpora in contrastive studies*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Karlík, P., Nekula, M. and Rusínová, Z. 1995. *Příruční mluvnice češtiny*. Prague: Nakladatelství Lidové Noviny.
- Komárek, M., Kořenský, J., Petr, J. and Veselková, J. 1986. *Mluvnice češtiny. 2, Tvarosloví*. Prague: Academia.
- Malá, M. 2013. Translation counterparts as markers of meaning. *Languages in Contrast* 13(2): 170–192.
- Martinková, M. 2014. K metodologii využití paralelních korpusů v kontrastivní lingvistice. *Naše řeč* 97(4-5): 270-285.
- Mathesius, V. 1936. On some problems of the systematic analysis of grammar. *Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Prague* VI: 95–107.
- Partington, A. 2015. Evaluative Prosody. In *Corpus Pragmatics: A Handbook*. K. Aijmer and C. Rühlemann, (eds), 279–303. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Peprník, J. 1984. *Angličtina pro pokročilé I*. Prague: SPN.
- Poldauf, I. 1964. The Third Syntactical Plan. *Travaux linguistiques de Prague 1, L'école de Prague aujourd'hui*, 241–55.

- Šebestová, D. and Malá, M. 2016. Anglické překladové protějšky českých vět s částicemi *copak* a *jestlipak*. *Časopis pro moderní filologii* 98(1): 228–237.
- Šmilauer, V. 1969. *Novočeská skladba*. Prague: SPN.
- Štícha, F., Vondráček, M., Kolářová, I., Hoffmannová, J., Bílková, J. and Svobodová, I. 2013. *Akademická gramatika spisovné češtiny*. Prague: Academia.
- Zouharová, M. 2008. *Slovník frekventovaných syntaktických terminů*. Available at <http://clanky.rvp.cz/clanek/c/Z/1940/slovník-frekventovanych-syntaktickych-terminu.html> / [last accessed 30 October 2017].

## Primary sources

- Czech National Corpus - InterCorp 9. Institute of the Czech National Corpus, Faculty of Arts, Charles University, Prague. Available at <http://www.korpus.cz> [last accessed 5 October 2017].
- Czech National Corpus - ORAL2013. Institute of the Czech National Corpus, Faculty of Arts, Charles University, Prague. Available at <http://www.korpus.cz> [last accessed 5 October 2017].
- Czech National Corpus - SYN2015. Institute of the Czech National Corpus, Faculty of Arts, Charles University, Prague. Available at <http://www.korpus.cz> [last accessed 5 October 2017].

## Corresponding author's address

Denisa Šebestová  
Department of English Language and ELT Methodology, Faculty of Arts  
Charles University, Prague  
nám. Jana Palacha 2  
116 38 Praha 1  
Czech Republic

sebestovadenisa@gmail.com