

Passive Voice in English Literary Texts and Its Czech Translations

Natalie Klusalová

Bachelor's Thesis
2025



Tomas Bata University in Zlín
Faculty of Humanities

Univerzita Tomáše Bati ve Zlíně

Fakulta humanitních studií

Ústav moderních jazyků a literatur

Akademický rok: 2024/2025

ZADÁNÍ BAKALÁŘSKÉ PRÁCE

(projektu, uměleckého díla, uměleckého výkonu)

Jméno a příjmení:	Natalie Klusalová
Osobní číslo:	H21767
Studijní program:	B0231P090005 Anglický jazyk pro manažerskou praxi
Forma studia:	Prezenční
Téma práce:	Trpný rod v anglických literárních textech a jeho české ekvivalenty

Zásady pro vypracování

Studium odborné literatury
Teoretické zpracování tématu
Příprava korpusu
Sběr a analýza dat z korpusu
Vyvození závěrů

Forma zpracování bakalářské práce: **tištěná/elektronická**
Jazyk zpracování: **Angličtina**

Seznam doporučené literatury:

- Biber, Douglas, and Randolph Quirk. 1999. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Harlow: Longman.
Dušková, Libuše. 2003. *Mluvnice současné angličtiny na pozadí češtiny*. 3rd ed. Prague: Academia.
Huddleston, Rodney D., and Geoffrey K. Pullum. 2002. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. Harlow: Longman.
Svartvik, Jan. 2011. *On Voice in the English Verb*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Vedoucí bakalářské práce: **Mgr. Dagmar Masár Machová, Ph.D.**
Ústav moderních jazyků a literatur

Datum zadání bakalářské práce: **2. ledna 2025**
Termín odevzdání bakalářské práce: **6. května 2025**

L.S.

Mgr. Libor Marek, Ph.D.
děkan

doc. Mgr. Roman Trušník, Ph.D.
ředitel ústavu

Ve Zlíně dne 7. února 2025

PROHLÁŠENÍ AUTORA BAKALÁŘSKÉ PRÁCE

Beru na vědomí, že

- odevzdáním bakalářské práce souhlasím se zveřejněním své práce podle zákona č. 111/1998 Sb., v platném znění bez ohledu na výsledek obhajoby;
- bakalářská práce bude uložena v elektronické podobě v univerzitním informačním systému a bude dostupná k nahlédnutí;
- jedno vyhotovení bakalářské práce v listinné podobě bude ponecháno Univerzitě Tomáše Bati ve Zlíně k uložení;
- na moji bakalářskou práci se plně vztahuje zákon č. 121/2000 Sb. o právu autorském, o právech souvisejících s právem autorským a o změně některých zákonů (autorský zákon) ve znění pozdějších právních předpisů, zejm. § 35 odst. 3;
- podle § 60 odst. 1 autorského zákona má Univerzita Tomáše Bati ve Zlíně právo na uzavření licenční smlouvy o užití školního díla v rozsahu § 12 odst. 4 autorského zákona;
- podle § 60 odst. 2 a 3 mohu užít své dílo – bakalářskou práci – nebo poskytnout licenci k jejímu využití jen s předchozím písemným souhlasem Univerzity Tomáše Bati ve Zlíně, která je oprávněna v takovém případě ode mne požadovat přiměřený příspěvek na úhradu nákladů, které byly Univerzitou Tomáše Bati ve Zlíně na vytvoření díla vynaloženy (až do jejich skutečné výše);
- pokud bylo k vypracování bakalářské práce využito softwaru poskytnutého Univerzitou Tomáše Bati ve Zlíně nebo jinými subjekty pouze ke studijním a výzkumným účelům (tj. k nekomerčnímu využití), nelze výsledky bakalářské práce využít ke komerčním účelům;
- pokud je výstupem bakalářské práce jakýkoliv softwarový produkt, považují se za součást práce rovněž i zdrojové kódy, popř. soubory, ze kterých se projekt skládá; neodevzdání této součásti může být důvodem k neobhájení práce.

Prohlašuji, že

- jsem na bakalářské práci pracoval(a) samostatně a použitou literaturu jsem řádně citoval(a); v případě publikace výsledků budu uveden(a) jako spoluautor;
- odevzdaná verze bakalářské práce a verze elektronická nahraná do IS/STAG jsou obsahově totožné.

Ve Zlíně, dne

.....
podpis autora

ABSTRAKT

Tato bakalářská práce se zabývá popisem a srovnáním slovesného rodu v anglickém a českém jazyce. Cílem teoretické části je definovat a popsat trpný rod, popsat jeho funkce a způsob tvoření napříč oběma jazyky se zaměřením na rozlišení druhů různých pasivních konstrukcí. Cílem praktické části je pomocí paralelního korpusu prozkoumat, jak často je anglický trpný rod překládán do českého trpného rodu v literárních textech.

Klíčová slova: trpný rod, činný rod, sloveso, podmět, předmět, agens, patiens, překlad

ABSTRACT

This bachelor thesis deals with description and comparison of the grammatical voice in English and Czech language. The aim of the theoretical part is to define and describe passive voice, describe its function and formation in both languages with focus on distinguishing types of passive constructions. The aim of the practical part is to explore how often is English passive voice translated into Czech passive voice in literary texts using a parallel corpus.

Keywords: passive voice, active voice, verb, subject, object, agent, patient, translation,

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor Mgr. Dagmar Masár Machová, PhD. for her valuable advice and patience. I would also like to thank my family, friends, and partner for their support throughout my studies.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	11
I THEORY.....	12
1 VERBS AS A GRAMMATICAL CATEGORY.....	13
1.1 MAIN VERBS.....	13
1.2 AUXILIARY VERBS.....	14
1.3 PRIMARY VERBS	14
1.4 VERBAL VALENCY.....	15
1.4.1 Intransitive.....	15
1.4.2 Monotransitive	16
1.4.3 Ditransitive.....	16
1.4.4 Complex transitive	16
1.4.5 Copular.....	16
2 VOICE AS A GRAMMATICAL CATEGORY.....	17
2.1 DEFINING VOICE	17
2.2 CONSTRAINTS IN THE ACTIVE-PASSIVE FORMATION	18
2.3 VERB CONSTRAINTS	19
2.3.1 Active voice only	19
2.3.2 Passive only.....	21
2.3.3 Prepositional verbs	21
2.4 OBJECT CONSTRAINTS	22
2.4.1 Clause as object.....	22
2.5 AGENT CONSTRAINTS	24
2.6 MEANING CONSTRAINTS.....	24
3 PASSIVE VOICE	26
3.1 FORMATION AND FUNCTION OF PASSIVES	26
3.2 THEME, RHEME, AND THE PASSIVE VOICE	27
3.3 USE OF THE PASSIVE VOICE	27
3.4 LONG AND SHORT PASSIVES	28
3.5 <i>GET</i> -PASSIVE	29
3.5.1 <i>Get</i> -passives in occurrence with dynamic verbs	30
3.5.2 Agentive interpretation of <i>get</i> -passives.....	30
3.5.3 <i>Get</i> -passives and their context	30
3.6 QUESTIONING THE <i>GET</i> -PASSIVE.....	32
3.6.1 Syntactic differences between <i>be</i> and <i>get</i>	32
3.6.2 Low occurrence of <i>get</i> -passives with agent phrase.....	33
3.6.3 Subject responsibility and agentive interpretation	33
3.6.4 Animacy of the subject entity in the <i>get</i> -passive	35

3.6.5	Subjective viewpoint of get-passives	35
3.6.6	Adversative/benefactive reading	35
3.6.7	Conclusion.....	36
3.7	PASSIVE GRADIENTS	37
3.8	CENTRAL PASSIVES.....	38
3.9	ADJECTIVAL PASSIVES.....	39
3.9.1	Grammatical tests	40
3.10	PSEUDO-PASSIVES	42
4	PASSIVE VOICE IN CZECH.....	44
4.1	PERIPHRASTIC PASSIVE	44
4.2	REFLEXIVE PASSIVE.....	45
4.3	COMPARING ENGLISH AND CZECH PASSIVES	46
II	ANALYSIS.....	48
5	METHODOLOGY	49
6	RESULTS.....	50
6.1	TRANSLATION OVERVIEW: <i>BE</i> -PASSIVES	51
6.1.1	<i>Was used</i>	51
6.1.2	<i>Was born</i>	52
6.1.3	<i>Was made</i>	53
6.1.4	<i>Was found</i>	54
6.1.5	<i>Is considered</i>	55
6.2	TRANSLATION OVERVIEW: <i>GET</i> -PASSIVES.....	56
6.2.1	Got caught	56
6.2.2	Get paid	57
6.2.3	<i>Got/get</i> hit.....	58
6.2.4	<i>Got/get</i> fired	59
6.2.5	Got/get arrested	60
	CONCLUSION.....	62
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	63

INTRODUCTION

The focus of this thesis is to analyse passive voice in English and Czech in terms of translation. The thesis is divided into two parts, the theoretical part and the practical part. The theoretical part first focuses on defining verbs by their role and class and introduces valency patterns. The rest of the theoretical part is dedicated to the grammatical category of voice, namely its passive form. It deals with the definition, formation and function of the passive voice, along with restrictions in the active-passive formation. Passive voice is then described in terms of its types, such as long and short passives, *be*-passives, *get*-passives and certain constructions that may only resemble passives. In the final part of the theoretical part, the properties and use of Czech periphrastic and reflexive passives are described.

Passive voice is known for its wide distribution in academic, formal and objective writing. It is also used more in English language than in Czech language. The aim of the practical part is to analyse how well do English passives correspond with Czech translations in literary texts, and how frequently are they translated into Czech periphrastic and reflexive passives. They will be also analysed from the point of their most common translations. This will be done through a parallel corpus analysis.

I THEORY

1 VERBS AS A GRAMMATICAL CATEGORY

Verbs are an essential part of speech in language. According to Dušková (2003, 165), semantically, it is possible to characterize verbs as words that express “action or state of being”. Verbs may express various actions, events, or conditions and can convey nuances of tense, aspect, mood, and voice. Verbs predominantly signify the activities or experiences of the subject, however, there are multiple classifications of verbs (Biber et al. 1999, 358), which will be covered in this chapter. Verbs can undergo conjugation to denote changes in tense, such as past, present, and future. Verbs can also denote changes in aspect, for instance simple, continuous, and perfect. Mood, thus indicative, imperative and subjunctive, can undergo changes as well. Finally, verbs play an essential role in the formation of passive voice, which is the main focus of this thesis. Because verbs have their function and their use follows certain patterns, the said function and patterns might make their occurrence in the passive voice restricted or completely omitted.

Verbs are categorized into two roles, main and auxiliary. Depending on whether they function as main verbs or auxiliaries, verbs further have three classes, lexical, primary and modal (Biber et al. 1999, 358).

1.1 Main verbs

Biber et al. (1999, 103) describe main verbs as verbs that “play a central role in clauses”. This is because of verbal valency associated with them, which determines the preceding and following syntactic functions in a clause. Main verbs have the ability to be used in an independent context without the assistance of auxiliary verbs to convey the primary idea and meaning of the verb phrase (Biber et al. 1999, 358). The class of lexical verbs, as in (1) and (2), and primary verbs (3), falls under this role. For instance:

(1) *Dogs **bark**.*

(2) *John **rides** a motorcycle.*

(3) *He **has** a point.*

1.2 Auxiliary verbs

Quirk et al. (1985, 120) describes auxiliary verbs as such verbs, that “in contrast to full verbs are capable of functioning as helping verbs”. They assist the main verb in generating various grammatical constructs, such as questions, negations, and verb phrases, and they are employed alongside main verbs to convey various grammatical aspects (Quirk et al. 1985, 120). Generally, the properties of auxiliary verbs and modals are referred to as N.I.C.E. properties (Huddleston and Pullum 2002, 92-93):

- i. Negation: *John **is not** angry.*
- ii. Inversion: ***Is** John angry?*
- iii. Coda: *John **is** angry, **isn't** he?*
- iv. Ellipsis: ***Is** John angry? Yes, he **is**.*

Auxiliary verbs include *can, may, will, shall, must, ought, need, dare, be, have* and *do* (Huddleston et al. 2002, 92).

As mentioned before, auxiliaries can undergo negation, which does not occur with main verbs (Huddleston et al. 2002, 75). Whilst *have* and *do* can belong to both roles of main verbs and auxiliaries because they are primary verbs, due to their semantic nature and valency as main verbs they can undergo negation only as auxiliaries. For instance:

(4) **He **does not** my washing.* ~ *He **does not** do my washing.*

(5) *take, want* ~ **tookn't, wantn't*

(6) *can, have* ~ *can't, haven't*

1.3 Primary verbs

Primary verbs can have the function of both main and auxiliary verbs and only three primary verbs exist; *be, have, and do* (Biber et al. 1999, 358). Examples (18) and (19) show the use of primary verbs functioning as main verbs. Examples (20) and (21) show the use of primary verbs functioning as auxiliary verbs.

(7) *He **does** my washing.*

(8) *His dad **was** an art professor.*

(9) *He **doesn't** look at the numbers.*

(10) *He **was** wearing a dark ski mask*

1.4 Verbal valency

As was already mentioned, in clauses, main verbs determine what other elements are required to form such clauses by the pattern of the main verb, which is called the “valency pattern” (Biber et al. 1999, 119). Valency patterns require a subject, and the patterns are “differentiated by the required clause elements that follow the verb within the clause”, such as direct object, indirect object or subject predicative (Biber et al. 1999, 119). Five main valency patterns and their examples are provided by Biber et al. (1999, 119):

- a. intransitive
- b. monotransitive
- c. ditransitive,
- d. complex transitive
- e. copular

1.4.1 Intransitive

In intransitive verb pattern, a verb is preceded by a subject (S + V), as shown in example (24). There are no obligatory elements following the intransitive verb, therefore other elements are only optional, as in the example (25), which also includes an adverbial phrase, specifically a prepositional phrase [PP].

(11) *More people [S] + **came** [V].*

(12) *More people [S] + **came** [V] + to the party [PP].*

1.4.2 Monotransitive

Monotransitive verb pattern requires a monotransitive verb to be preceded by a subject and followed by a direct object [S + V + DO].

(13) *She [S] + **carried** [V] + a long whippy willow twig [DO].*

1.4.3 Ditransitive

In ditransitive verb pattern, a ditransitive verb follows a subject and is followed by an obligatory indirect object and a direct object (S + V + IO + DO).

(14) *Fred Unsworth [S] + **gave** [V] + her [IO] + a huge vote of confidence [DO].*

1.4.4 Complex transitive

Complex transitive pattern requires a verb to be preceded by a subject, followed by a direct object and by an object predicative (15), or an obligatory adverbial (16) instead of an object predicative.

(15) *People [S] + **called** [V] + him [DO] + Johnny. [OP]*

(16) *He [S] + **put** [V] + his hand [DO] + on the child's shoulder [A].*

1.4.5 Copular

Copular verb pattern requires a copular verb to follow a subject and be followed by a subject predicative or by an obligatory adverbial (S + V + SP/A).

(17) *Carrie [S] + **felt** [V] + a little less bold [SP].*

(18) *I [S] + will **keep** [V] + in touch with you [A].*

2 VOICE AS A GRAMMATICAL CATEGORY

2.1 Defining voice

In grammar, voice belongs to the grammatical category of a verb. It refers to how the verbal action expresses the syntactic-semantic relationship between the participants of the verbal action. (Dušková 2003, 253). The distinction influences the focus and emphasis within a sentence by providing several variations in conveying information. Huddleston et al. (2002, 1427) claim that voice “applies to a system where the contrasting forms differ in the way semantic roles are aligned with syntactic functions, normally with some concomitant marking on the verb”. The definition of voice as a possibility to convey information in more variations aligns with Quirk et al. (1985, 159), who state that voice can be defined as a grammatical category that allows the interpretation of a sentence in two different manners, without affecting and altering the accuracy of the reported information.

Voice can be categorized into the active and the passive voice. Active voice is far more common than the passive voice, due to the fact that verbs are generally not restricted in the active voice (Dušková 2003, 253) by their verbal valency, unlike passives that must take a direct object. Quirk et al. (1985, 159) also introduce the verb phrase level and the clausal level as the two grammatical levels within the active-passive relation. In the verb phrase, the main verb’s past participle follows the auxiliary *be* in the passive form. For instance:

- (1) *This man robbed us. [ACTIVE]*
- (2) *We were robbed by this man. [PASSIVE]*

As for the clausal level, Quirk et al. (1985, 159) state that changing a sentence from an active form to a passive form involves a change in the “arrangement of two clause elements and an additional one”:

- i. The active subject becomes the passive agent:

Mary wrote this book. ~ This book was written by Mary.

- ii. The active object becomes the passive subject

*Mary wrote **this book**. ~ **This book** was written by Mary.*

- iii. The preposition *by* is introduced before the agent:

*Mary wrote this book. ~ This book was written **by Mary**.*

Although these changes generally apply to the passive voice, Huddleston et al. (2002, 1427) demonstrate that active subject does not necessarily always act as agent. Semantic roles such as experiencer (3) or instrument (4) can take the place of the agent, or the role of stimulus or theme can take place of the patient (5). Additionally, passive sentences can take form of short passives, which do not require agent with the *by*-phrase.

(3) ***Most members** hated the premier. ~ The premier was hated **by most members**.*

(4) *The vase was broken **by a rock**.*

(5) ***The album** was hated by most people.*

2.2 Constraints in the active-passive formation

Under certain conditions, sentences in their active form cannot undergo passivization and vice versa, or their ability to do so comes with restrictions, often related to verbs and their function. Restrictions can be further caused by various syntactic factors, and in some cases, constraints may also be caused by semantics.

Quirk et al. (1985, 162) distinguish multiple exceptions in the active-passive formation. Such conditions are introduced by Quirk et al. (1985, 162) as “voice constraints”. The authors distinguish between several kinds of voice constraints:

- i. Verb constraints
- ii. Object constraints
- iii. Agent constraints
- iv. Meaning constraints
- v. Frequency constraints

As for the frequency constraints, the category deals with the usage and distribution of the passive voice among different functional styles and contexts, which will be covered later in 3.1.

2.3 Verb constraints

2.3.1 Active voice only

Certain types of verbs cannot be passivized (Quirk et al. 1985, 162). The first type is the intransitive verb (6), which can be defined as a verb that does not require a direct object in sentence formation. Other verbs that do not appear in passive voice are copular verbs (8), which can be defined as verbs that are linked to the subject predicative and link the subject with certain features and attributes. For instance:

(6) John **sneezed** loudly.

(7) *It was **sneezed** loudly by John.

(8) The offer **seemed** shady.

Quirk et al. (1985, 162) further make mention of middle verbs, also described as verbs belonging to the stative class of verbs, which are essentially verbs that only represent a state of “being” and “having”. For instance:

(9) They **have** a nice house.

(10) He **lacks** confidence.

(11) The dress **becomes** her.

(12) John **resembles** his father.

(13) Will this **suit** you?

Generally speaking, stative verbs only appear in the active voice. However, that does not imply that exceptions do not exist, as certain stative verbs may be passivized. Such exceptions are stative verbs expressing “volition or attitude” (Quirk et al. 1985, 162). For instance:

(14) *He is **wanted** by the police.*

(15) *He is **hated** by most people.*

Dušková (2003, 258) lists several more instances that do not appear in passives or their use in the passive voice is restricted, such as *cost, last, measure, weigh, equal, hold, escape*.

Regarding constraints, Dušková notes that generally passive construction occurs with transitive verbs, however, from Dušková's perspective (2003, 258) passivizing with transitive verbs can be restricted, if the verb in question is closer to a copula as Quirk et al. suggested, or if an adverbial adjunct only resembles an object, as exemplified in (17). For contrast:

(16) *John ran the engine. ~ The engine was run by John.*

(17) *Mary ran the entire morning. ~ *The entire morning was run by Mary.*

The verbs *have* and *get* appear in passives in infinitives only (Dušková 2003, 258). For clarification, in this case the verb *get* is not related to the *get*-passive construction, it is related to the use of *get* in the *be* + past participle construction, as Dušková's example suggests:

(18) *There was nothing to be had/got.*

As stated before, the verbs *have* and *get* do not appear in the passive voice apart from infinitives. If not used as an auxiliary, *have* denotes possession or attribute, and *get* denotes receiving or obtaining (Dušková 2003, 258). Whilst this constraint occurs with *have* with the provided definition, it does not occur with *possess*, which is similar in its meaning (Veselovská 2017, 36). For example:

(19) *She **has** blue eyes. ~ *Blue eyes are **had** by her.*

(20) *He **got** a watch. ~ *A watch was **got** by him.*

(21) *Bill **possesses** a book. ~ The book is **possessed** by Bill.*

2.3.2 Passive only

It is also possible for certain verbs to be used only in the passive voice. As for *drowned* (21), it appears in passive voice if the agent is unexpressed (Quirk et al. 1985, 162). Whilst *said* tends to be used in the active voice, its restriction to passive only comes from taking an object + infinitival complement (Huddleston and Pullum 2002, 1435), as in (23).

(22) *A rhino calf was **born** at the zoo.*

(23) *John was **said** to be a good teacher.*

(24) *Mary was **drowned** in the lake.*

Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 1435) also mention the verbs *repute* and *rumour*. They are found in passives only, because when used, their usage is bound to their past participle variants, *reputed* and *rumoured*. Additionally, this happens due to their complementation, as *reputed* and *rumoured* are followed by an infinitive complement (25), and *rumoured* can also be followed by a “declarative content clause” (Huddleston and Pullum 2002 1435), as in (26).

(25) *Pat is **reputed** to be very rich.*

(26) *It is **rumoured** that there will be an election.*

2.3.3 Prepositional verbs

Quirk et al. (1985, 163) state that prepositional verbs, also described as verbal idioms, are rather common in the active voice than the passive voice, as their use can be restrictive. For instance:

(27) *The engineers went very carefully into the problem. ~ **The problem** was very carefully gone into by the engineers.*

(28) *The engineers went very carefully into the tunnel. ~ ***The tunnel** was very carefully gone into by the engineers.*

(29) *They eventually arrived at the expected result. ~ **The expected result** was eventually arrived at.*

(30) *They eventually arrived at the splendid stadium ~ *The **splendid stadium** was eventually arrived at.*

Whether the use of passive voice with verbal idioms is acceptable depends on whether the passive subject is concrete or abstract (Quirk et al. 1985, 163). All examples above display the use of prepositional verbs *go* and *arrive*. Quirk et al. further comment: “It is only in the abstract, figurative use that *go into*, *arrive at*, *look into*, and many other expressions accept the passive” (1985, 163).

Examples (27) and (29) display the use of prepositional verbs *go into* and *arrive at* in an abstract matter. Generally, *go* is an intransitive verb, which does not allow passivization, which is another reason why *the tunnel was very carefully gone into* is not grammatical, as it also denotes a concrete location. However, in the case of *the problem was very carefully gone into*, it is used as a verbal idiom, and as mentioned above, the usage is abstract rather than locative. This case may also be interpreted differently, as *gone into* in the abstract case suggests exploration or investigation. The same explanation is applicable to *arrive*.

2.4 Object constraints

Transitive verbs can be complemented by either a phrasal or a clausal object, however, the use of clausal objects in the passive voice is more restricted (Quirk et al. 1985, 163).

2.4.1 Clause as object

According to Quirk et al. (1985, 163), passivization is restricted in these instances:

- i. Finite clause: *John thought that she was attractive. ~ *That she was attractive was thought (by John).*
- ii. Non-finite clause (infinitive): *John hoped to meet her. ~ *To meet her was hoped (by John).*
- iii. Non-finite clause (participle): *John enjoyed seeing her. ~ *Seeing her was enjoyed (by John).*

Both Dušková (2003, 259) and Quirk et al. (1985, 164) stress that infinitive clauses generally cannot be passivized. It is noted by Quirk et al., that passivizing finite clauses, such as *John thought that she was attractive* is generally restricted, however, passivizing finite clauses is possible if:

- i. The clausal object is extraposed and replaced by the anticipatory pronoun *it*:

It was thought that that she was attractive.

- ii. The subject of the object clause is made the subject of a passive superordinate clause:

She was thought to be attractive.

As for participle clauses as subjects, anticipatory *it* is never applicable (Quirk et al. 1985, 164). As for infinitives, it can be applied only in certain cases, as examples (31) suggests. In contrast, (32) also uses *it*, however, in this instance a proper agent and patient that would refer to *hope* is missing. In this case, to make using *it* possible the clause would have to be finite with a complement clause, as in example (33). Quirk et al. (1985, 164) claim that even though forming such sentences is possible, it remains questionable in terms of style.

(31) *It was desired to have the report delivered here.*

(32) **It was hoped to meet her.*

(33) *It was hoped that we would meet her.*

Quirk et al. (1985, 164) further state that if there is “coreference between a subject and a noun phrase object”, then such construction cannot undergo passivization. This restriction is evident with reflexive pronouns (35), reciprocal pronouns (36) and possessive pronouns (38) (Quirk et al. 1985, 164), which aligns with Dušková’s claims regarding constraints (2003, 259). For example:

(34) *John could see Paul in the mirror. ~ Paul could be seen in the mirror.*

(35) *John could see himself in the mirror. ~ *Himself could be seen in the mirror.*

(36) *We could hardly see each other in the fog. ~ *Each other could hardly be seen in the fog.*

(37) *The woman shook my hand. ~ My hand was shaken by the woman.*

(38) *The woman shook her head. ~ *Her head was shaken by the woman.*

2.5 Agent constraints

In certain passive formations, it is possible to omit agent. Omitting agent is common especially in short passives, in which the agent is often unknown, unexpressed, or irrelevant, as in example (39). However, example (40) shows that omitting an agent may also occur if incorporating the agent is repetitive (Quirk et al. 1985, 165). Since *Michael* was mentioned in the former clause, the repetition is not necessary.

(39) *The Prime Minister has often been criticized lately.*

(40) *Jack fought Michael last night, and Jack was beaten.*

2.6 Meaning constraints

Although there might not be a shift in terms of grammatical correctness when transforming an active sentence into its passive counterpart, the structure of the passive might deliver a different result in terms of its meaning. By shifting order, there might be a change in emphasis, but also in the “scope of negatives and quantifiers” (Quirk et al. 1985, 165). Structurally (42) is a passive form of (41), however, shifting the agent makes an apparent difference in the meaning. Example (41) suggests that all schoolboys know a joke, whilst its passive counterpart (42) suggests that there is one specific joke that every schoolboy knows.

(41) *Every schoolboy knows one joke at least.*

(42) *One joke at least is known by every schoolboy.*

If an active sentence includes a modal auxiliary, there might be a shift of “modal meaning” in its passive form, as it can be observed in examples (43) and (44), where the verb *can* in the active sentence denotes skill, ability or capability, but in the passive voice it denotes

possibility (Quirk et al. 1985, 165). The same explanation can be applied to (45) and (46).
For instance:

(43) *John cannot do it.*

(44) *It cannot be done (by John).*

(45) *John can't be taught.*

(46) *She can't teach John.*

3 PASSIVE VOICE

3.1 Formation and function of passives

Due to the fact that the English grammatical subject appears in the initial position, therefore, precedes a verb and has subject-verb agreement, passive subject does not convey the same role as in the active voice. Voice was previously defined as a mean of expressing the syntactic-semantic relationship between participants of a verbal action. Whilst the syntactic roles of subject and object account for grammatical positioning of participants in a clause, the semantic roles of agent and patient denotes their semantic behaviour. Therefore, in active voice the subject is often declared to be the ‘doer’ due to its initial position, agentive interpretation of performing a verbal action and subject-verb agreement.

However, when a verbal action is expressed in passive voice, the passive subject is viewed as the one being affected by the verbal action, therefore takes the semantic role of patient. The agent is moved to the latter position of a clause in the form of an adjunct, most commonly the *by*-phrase.

Generally speaking, and according to Brinton (2010, 228), a sentence that is passive is understood to be closely connected to its active equivalent instead of having an entirely distinct structure, as passivized sentences convey the same information.

Forming a passivized sentence requires a verb, which is in most cases the auxiliary *be*, although that depends on the context of the sentence. *Get*-passives occur as well, although the existence of *get*-passives is questioned by several linguists, which will be covered later. These verbs are then followed by a verb in the past participle form. Therefore, the structure of passives generally is:

- i. Be + the past participle
- ii. Get + past participle

Regarding passive voice and verbal valency, passives can be constructed with monotransitive, ditransitive and complex-transitive verbs. For instance:

(1) *The house **was bought** by John.*

(2) *Mary **was given** a book by John.*

(3) *He **was elected** president by the school.*

Dušková (2003, 258) states that forming passives is generally possible with transitive verbs, if “the object is a participant in the verbal action, the object is affected by the verbal action, or the object is acted upon with the verbal action”.

Veselovská (33, 2017) and Dušková (2003, 259) note that passives allow the deletion of agent, which Veselovská refers to as “deagentization”, which is a dominant feature of short passives. Veselovská also mentions that another function of the passive voice is agent “rhematization”.

3.2 Theme, rheme, and the passive voice

The terms ‘theme’ and ‘rheme’ were first introduced by Prague Linguistic Circle. The process of rhematization and thematization refers to the way of organizing information in terms of connecting what has already been stated and what information is new. Theme appears in the former position of a clause, and its function is to convey old information first, in order to connect to the following, latter information in the position, called rheme, which conveys new, relevant, or important information (Halliday 2004, 64-65). This definition aligns with Downing (2006, 223), who comments: „It represents the angle from which the message is projected and sets up a frame which holds at least to the end of the clause”. It was stated that Veselovská considers rhematizing the agent as another function of the passive voice. Because information in the rheme position is either new, relevant or important, this indicates that the purpose of rhematizing agent is to bring focus to the agent, which is not possible to do in the active voice, as the subject that often acts as agent appears in the initial, therefore, in the theme position. For example:

(4) *He was murdered **by his own son**.*

(5) *Penicillin was discovered **by Alexander Fleming**.*

3.3 Use of the passive voice

Biber et al. (1999, 166) claim that the passive voice constructions aren’t as commonly present as the active form and appear in specific discourse purposes. This is true especially for the distinction between written and spoken language, as the passive voice is more

frequent in written texts, and its use is also dependent on the formality level of the text. Quirk et al. (1985, 166) further expand on this claim and mention the use of passive voice especially in more objective, scientific, informative and academic writing, rather than in texts containing imaginative elements. This claim agrees with Dušková (2003, 165) who further notes that academic style often implements a “general human agent” and “authorial passive”. Whilst passive voice appears primarily in scientific style and objective writing, according to Dušková (2003, 265), although less commonly, it tends to make an appearance in colloquial style, when expressing mental or emotional states and responses with animate subject and inanimate agent. Dušková provides these examples:

(6) *I am disappointed.*

(7) *He was confused.*

(8) *She was embarrassed.*

However, the passive nature of such instances might be ambiguous. Passives can take a form of verbal passives, but also adjectival, which according to Huddleston et al. (2002, 1436) only resemble passive constructions. This will be further examined in section 3.7.

Although passive voice is more common in written language, it is not completely omitted even in spoken language. Passive voice allows its formation with the verbs *be* or *get*, and whilst it is possible to use them synonymously in certain instances, their usage may differ, which will be further discussed in 2.3.

3.4 Long and short passives

One of the functions of the passive voice is the ability to convey information without expressing agent (Dušková 2003, 259). It was mentioned before that passive constructions with an unknown or irrelevant agent can completely omit it. Such constructions are referred to as short or agentless passives. Therefore, the major difference between long and long passives is the absence of agent. Short passives are also far more frequent in use than long passives. In fact, Quirk et al. (1985, 165) and Svartvik (2011, 141) found that short passives account for around 80% of passive instances.

Huddleston et al. (2002, 1428) comment on the distinction between long and short (agentless) passives:

(9) *Pat stole my surfboard.*

(10) *My surfboard was stolen by Pat.*

(11) *My surfboard was stolen.*

A construction in the passive voice known as a *long passive* is one in which the agent from active sentence is stated specifically in the passive sentence, and it frequently appears as the prepositional phrase [PP] with the preposition *by*. According to Huddleston et. al (2002, 1428), *by Pat* in the passive sentence (10) is the agent phrase, as it functions as a [PP] and is internal to the verbal phrase [VP], whilst in the active sentence (9), *Pat* is the subject and thus is external to the [VP]. Omitting the [PP] *by Pat* in (11) creates a short passive. Whether the agent phrase is omitted or not makes the distinction between long and short passives (Huddleston et al., 2002, 1428). Although (11) is a short passive of equivalent (10), it is contextual and used as a comparison, as Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 1428) suggest that short passives do not have their active equivalents. This indicates that unlike long passives, short passives without context cannot have a concrete active equivalent due to a missing agent.

3.5 *Get-passive*

Besides *be-passive*, it is possible to use the verb *get* to form passives, although less commonly. *Get-passives* are considered to lack formality, therefore unlike *be-passives*, their usage is mostly connected with colloquial, informal style and negative contexts and they are also common in spoken language, which is not as common with *be-passives*, as *be-passives* are rather connected with written language. This aligns with Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 1442), who besides formality further list and comment on these restrictions of *get-passives*:

- i. *Get-passives* are found only with dynamic verbs
- ii. *Get-passives* are more conducive to an agentive interpretation of the subject
- iii. *Get-passives* are characteristically used in clauses involving adversity or benefit

3.5.1 *Get*-passives in occurrence with dynamic verbs

Dynamic verbs tend to describe actions rather than the state of being, like stative verbs do. *Get*-passives often describe events and cannot be used with stative verbs (Huddleston and Pullum 2002, 1442). For instance:

(10) *It **was believed** that the letter was a forgery.*

(11) **It **got believed** that the letter was a forgery.*

(12) *The manager **is feared** by most of the staff.*

(13) **The manager **gets feared** by most of the staff.*

3.5.2 Agentive interpretation of *get*-passives

Regarding agentive interpretation, *get*-passives are more likely to be chosen over *be*-passives in situations with negative results, where “the subject referent is seen as having an agentive role in the situation, or at least having some responsibility for it” (Huddleston and Pullum 2002, 1442). Therefore, it can be used when the patient appears to be the mere cause of a certain event, which as has been suggested, is highly interpretative. For instance:

(14) *Jill **got arrested**.*

(15) *She managed to **get transferred** to the finance department.*

(16) *Go and **get checked out** at the medical centre.*

(17) *He **got killed** due to his negligence.*

3.5.3 *Get*-passives and their context

Get is very common in negative contexts. In fact, the majority of listed examples on the *get*-passive have a negative connotation. However, that does not imply that positive instances do not exist. As mentioned by Huddleston and Pullum, *get*-passive can also occur in cases expressing benefit, such as:

(18) *Kim **got** promoted.*

(19) *My letter **got** published.*

(20) *I **got** accepted.*

As already suggested and according to Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 1440-41), an auxiliary *be* can be synonymous with the verb *get* in certain cases, like in the examples below:

(21) *They **got** bullied by classmates.*

(22) *They **were** bullied by classmates.*

Another relevant point made by Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 1441) is that whether the two verbs are well interchangeable depends on the verbal and adjective elements of a sentence, which can make replacing *get* with *be* less concise. For instance:

(23) *The window **was** broken.*

(24) *The window **got** broken.*

Example (23) which is also a short passive can be interpreted in two possible ways. It can be interpreted as a verbal passive formation, which would indicate that someone did the action of breaking a window, or as an adjective passive complement, which would indicate that the window was already in a broken state (Huddleston and Pullum 2002, 1441). Example (24), however, clearly indicates a verbal passive formation, which conveys the impression that the window got broken by force. The possible ambiguity of (23) is also described by Quirk et al. (1985, 168) as a semi-passive.

It is also claimed by Quirk et al. (1985, 161) that the verb *get* “tends to be limited to constructions without an expressed animate agent” as examples below suggest:

(25) *Mary **got** cut this morning.*

(26) *Thomas **got** bitten at the zoo.*

3.6 Questioning the get-passive

Whilst the occurrence of *get* in passive constructions is often considered as another mean of constructing passives, it is discussed by several linguists that there is a possibility of a different point of view regarding the use of *get* in the place of auxiliary *be*. This section will focus on such views, presented by Toyota (2008) with references to several more linguists.

3.6.1 Syntactic differences between *be* and *get*

Get-passive is often considered to be a dynamic counterpart of the *be*-passive due to its similarity in structure, which is also the reason why it is considered a passive (Toyota 2008, 147-148). However, the existence of *get* as an auxiliary is criticized by several linguists, specifically, Toyota refers to Haegeman (1985, 54-56) and Downing (1996, 183) who point out syntactic differences between *be* and *get*. Auxiliaries have already been defined in the previous chapter, notably, their properties of negation, inversion, coda and ellipsis, which in fact do not correspond with *get* (Toyota 2008, 152). This can be demonstrated on the sentence *John was/got arrested*. For instance:

(27) *John **wasn't** arrested.* ~ **John **gotn't** arrested.*

(28) ***Was** John arrested?* ~ ****Got** John arrested?*

(29) *John **was** arrested, **wasn't** he?* ~ **John **got** arrested, **gotn't** he?*

(30) ***Was** John arrested? Yes, he **was**.* ~ ****Got** John arrested? Yes, he **got**.*

Besides these properties, Toyota (2008, 151) further addresses constraints with quantifiers (31), adverb positioning (32) and the use of nonreferential *there* (33):

(31) *The boys **were** all caught.* ~ **The boys **got** all caught.*

(32) *He **was** never caught.* ~ **He **got** never caught.*

(33) *There **was** a plane hijacked.* ~ **There **got** a plane hijacked.*

3.6.2 Low occurrence of *get*-passives with agent phrase

Additionally, referring to Granger (1983), *get*-passives often lack an active counterpart. It is common for *get*-passives to be agentless, and the occurrence of *get*-passives without an animate agent was already presented by Quirk et al. (1985, 161). This in certain instances prohibits active voice. Toyota (2008, 149) exemplifies this on *get started*, *get lost*, *get involved*, etc., which makes the involvement of agent problematic. Toyota (2008, 149) refers to Stein (1979) and Siewierska (1984, 136) presenting a similar take. Additionally, according to Toyota's findings, the contrast between the occurrence of agent phrase in *be*-passives and *get*-passives is quite significant. It has already been estimated that *be*-passives occur with agent phrase only around 20-30% of the time, however, with *get*-passives this occurrence is even lower, estimated to be only around 2% (Toyota 2008, 159-160). However, it is important to note that this conclusion was drawn from a small pool of data. Whether this is because of the generally lower occurrence of *get*-passives or other reasons is not clear.

For these reasons, Toyota (2008, 151) argues that the *get*-passive should be rather considered a complement with verb + past participle, similarly to *go* + past participle (34). Toyota additionally mentions *fall* + past participle (35), although instances of such combination in Modern English are extremely sparse.

(34) *The criminal **went undetected** for years.*

(35) *This Master Benedicke **fell inamoured** of this maiden.*

3.6.3 Subject responsibility and agentive interpretation

Another point made by Toyota (2008, 156) that marks the difference between *get* and *be* is what Toyota calls "subject responsibility". This characteristic of the *get*-passive was pointed out by Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 1442). Subjects of the *get*-passive lay emphasis on undergoing verbal actions, in the sense of being responsible or being the mere cause of the actions. Toyota (2008, 165) comments on the comparison of examples (36) and (37): "In both cases, an intentional or volitional action can be involved, but the difference lies in whose intention/volition it is".

(36) He *was shot* by the riot police.

(37) He *got shot* by the riot police.

It is further noted that the subject of the *get*-passive has control over the action rather than the passive agent, additionally, Toyota (2008, 157) refers to Klaiman's studies (1988, 1991) that contradict with the passive subject's ability to be in control. Klaiman's studies indicate that subjects in the *be*-passive are not in control over actions, but rather are affected by them or being acted upon. In contrast, subjects of the *get*-passive display a certain degree of agency due to their interpretable nature of responsibility.

However, Toyota comments that the subject's intentionality, volitionality or control can be analysed in terms of gradience (2008, 157). He demonstrates that in certain cases, subjects of *get*-passives are not as much in control of the event, as their "generic characteristics" may play a role in the event as well. For contrast:

(38) He *got shot* by the riot police.

(39) He *got promoted* last week.

(40) He *got accused* of the pedestrian's death.

(41) He *got worried* about the result.

The four examples are compared. It is suggested that in (38) the event is caused by both subject control and characteristics, (39) is caused mainly by characteristics, (40) is considered inconclusive in terms of characteristics and (41) may display both, therefore inconclusive (Toyota 2008, 158). Because this gradient is mostly based on semantic interpretation, this indicates that there isn't a concrete foundation for this scale, as each instance may be interpreted differently in countless scenarios. Even the former examples could have different results depending on the context they came from, especially (40) and (41). This unclear distinction is also admitted by Toyota (2008, 158), which points to the inconclusive nature of this scale.

3.6.4 Animacy of the subject entity in the *get*-passive

Toyota (2008, 161) suggests that *get*-passive constructions prefer animate subjects over inanimate subjects, favouring human, whereas *be*-passive “does not comply with the human-oriented view on the event”. It was observed that the occurrence of inanimate subjects in *be*-passives increased from 37% to 77% diachronically, in contrast to the *get*-passive, which displays increase of only 6-7% (Toyota 2008, 161).

However, it is questionable whether the provided data is sufficient for comparison, as once again, the size of the data pool for *be*-passives is significantly larger, and displays data from earlier periods of English language, whereas the data for *get*-passives is limited to Late Modern English and Present-day English. Nevertheless, Toyota’s findings show that inanimate subjects occur in *get*-passives 14% of the time, in contrast to 77% with *be*-passives (2008, 161).

3.6.5 Subjective viewpoint of *get*-passives

Another difference between the two passives noted by Toyota is what he calls “subjective viewpoint” (2008, 162). Referring to Downing (1996, 200-2), subjective viewpoint can be interpreted as a mean of voicing an opinion without being directly involved. It was previously stated that the use of *get*-passives and *be*-passives has a different distribution – *get* is preferred in informal, colloquial style, whereas *be* is preferred in formal, objective writing. According to Toyota (2008, 162), with *get*-passive it is possible to express sentiment, sympathy or other emotion, which is not common with *be*-passives. Considering their different distribution, it follows that *get* will be preferred to convey emotion, as *be*-passives and their formal and objective nature is generally more neutral. Additionally, considering the fact that the subjects of *be*-passives were concluded to be rather inanimate, it allows for less emotional engagement. Toyota (2008, 162) comments: “it is much easier for a speaker/writer to associate himself/herself with more animate, preferably human entities”.

3.6.6 Adversative/benefactive reading

The adversative and benefactive nature of *get*-passives was earlier discussed by Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 1442). Two more levels to adversity are introduced by Toyota (2008, 168):

- I. Lexical adversity
- II. Syntactic adversity

Lexical adversity refers to the verb's ability to convey adversity through its meaning, therefore with main verbs such as *arrest*, *beat*, *break*, *chase*, *hurt* and *steal* it is possible to express adversity in both *get*-passives and *be*-passives (Toyota 2008, 168). *Get*-passives, however, can express adversity on a syntactic level with verbs such as *leave* and *send*, which do not denote adversity on their own, but their use with *get*-passives may denote negative emotions or attitude (Toyota 2008, 168). For instance:

(41) *I **got left** with my siblings again.*

(42) *John **got sent** to my office for the third time this month.*

3.6.7 Conclusion

Toyota's findings display several differences between *get*-passives and *be*-passives. His findings show that besides syntactic differences and the uncommon occurrence of agent phrase, *get*-passives can be analysed from a semantic standpoint far more than *be*-passives due to the different frequency of subject animacy, emotional engagement, subject responsibility with agentive interpretation and adversative or benefactive interpretation. Toyota concludes these points to be the reasons why *get*-passives should be considered more than just a dynamic counterpart (2008, 173). He associates subject characteristics with middle-voice and reflexive constructions (2008, 183), which would mark *get*-passives closer to such constructions.

In the end, regarding *get*-passives, Toyota notes (2008, 184) that compared to *be*-passives, *get*-passives constructions are a relatively new phenomenon and still developing, which could explain the differences in quantity of data. He further states that "it is premature to consider it under one category" (2008, 184). This claim indicates that *get*-passives may be a subject for future research. Additionally, because the differences between *get* and *be* heavily come from interpretation, *get*-passives could be simply treated as a variant of *be*-passive that allows a less neutral and objective approach and point of view.

3.7 Passive gradients

Even though by definition the general condition for forming passives is that a passive structure within a clause is formed by past participle and either by the verb *be* or by the verb *get*, Quirk et al. (1985, 167) see such definition as broad, which indicates that such rules do not always apply to passives only. For contrast:

(42) *This violin **was made** by my father.*

(43) *This conclusion **is hardly justified** by the results.*

(44) *Coal **has been replaced** by oil.*

(45) *This difficulty **can be avoided** in several ways.*

Examples from (42) to (45) apply the conditions mentioned above, forming passives, in contrast to examples from (46) to (49), Whilst following the same pattern, are not considered passives:

(46) *We **are encouraged** to go on with the project.*

(47) *Leonard **was interested** in linguistics.*

(48) *The building **is already demolished**.*

(49) *The modern world **is getting** (becoming) more highly **industrialized and mechanized**.*

Although *be* + past participle is present in all the examples, the point of distinction whether a sentence may be regarded as a passive is that if passive-active correspondence is taken into consideration, it becomes apparent that there is no definitive correspondence with an active verb phrase or active clause, which would make such sentences “increasingly remote from the ideal passive” (Quirk et al. 1985, 167). On the provided examples, Quirk et al. demonstrate the possibility of putting provided sentences on a passive gradient, which suggests how well such structures correspond with a “true” passive form. The gradient includes the following:

- i. Central passives
- ii. Semi-passives
- iii. Pseudo-passives

3.8 Central passives

Quirk et al. define central passives as the “true” passives. Such passives have a corresponding, direct active form. For instance:

(50) *My father **made** this violin. ~ This violin **was made** by my father.*

(51) *The results hardly **justify** this conclusion. ~ This conclusion **is hardly justified** by the results.*

In certain cases, passives have more than one active counterpart. Quirk et al. (1985, 168) state that forming an active counterpart can be dependent on how the *by*-phrase is interpreted. In example (52), the *by*-phrase *by oil* acts as a *by*-phrase with an agent that corresponds to the active subject, whereas in (53) *by oil* acts as an instrument (Quirk et al. 1985, 168).

Quirk et al. further mention that passives may also have more active counterparts, if the passive in question is a short (agentless) passive (54). For instance:

(52) *Coal has been replaced by oil. ~ Oil has replaced coal.*

(53) *Coal has been replaced by oil. ~ (People in many countries) have replaced coal by oil.*

(54) *This difficulty can be avoided in several ways. ~ John/He/One can avoid this difficulty in several ways.*

Although Quirk’s definition suggests that central passives must have their direct equivalents, provided examples of short passives suggest otherwise. The main attribute of short passives

is the absence of agent, either because it's unknown or irrelevant. Therefore, if agent is unknown, it is not possible to form a direct active equivalent. Nevertheless, it is possible to use a 'general human agent' in these instances, such as *people, one, someone* etc., especially if such instances are bound to general knowledge or they can be logically deduced or derived from context.

3.9 Adjectival passives

Adjectival passives or semi-passives can be defined as constructions that may exhibit ambiguity that comes from having both adjectival and verbal properties, and their active counterpart may make them look "verb-like" (Quirk et al. 1985, 168). Therefore, it is important to recognize the patterns and attributes of adjectives that may resemble verbal passives. For example:

(55) *We are encouraged to go on with the project. ~ (The results) encourage us to go on with the project.*

(56) *Leonard was interested in linguistics. ~ Linguistics interested Leonard.*

Quirk et al. (1985, 168) state that due to their adjectival nature, these instances might as well can:

- i. coordinate the participle with an adjective
- ii. modify the participle with *quite, rather, more*, etc
- iii. replace *be* by a lexical copular verb such as *feel* or *seem*

Due to the fact that adjectives tend to be stative and verbs in passives are mostly dynamic, it may be one method to tell the two apart. If ambiguous, stative interpretations favour adjectives (Quirk et al. 1985, 168). In adjectival instances it is also uncommon to use the *by*-phrase, however, it will be explained later why this is not a reliable indicator.

Quirk's definition corresponds with Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 1436). For instance:

(57) *The kitchen window **was broken** by the thieves.*

(58) *They were **very worried**.*

(59) *They **were married**.*

(60) *They **were married** by the priest.*

Example (57) is an instance of a verbal passive, and worried in (58) is an adjective.

Previously in section 3.5.3, where the interchangeability of *be*-passives and *get*-passives was discussed, *window was broken* was considered an adjectival passive by Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 1441). What differentiates the adjectival passive from a verbal one may be the *by*-phrase *by the thieves*, which also turns the otherwise short passive into a long passive, as short passives are expressed without agent. This is also the reason why the interpretation of (58) may be ambiguous. Similarly to (57), it is possible to use *by the priest*, which makes the passive verbal, as shown in (59). However, this does not act as a reliable indicator in every case. Certain adjectives allow *by*-phrase, and in that case it is possible to use adjectival grading, along with other grammatical tests introduced by Huddleston and Pullum, which will be discussed in 3.9.1.

Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 1436) state that “adjectival passives are passive only in a derivative sense”, as all sentences contain *be* + past participle, however, what appears to be a verb is in fact an adjective, as shown in (58).

3.9.1 Grammatical tests

In terms of further reducing ambiguity, Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 1436) also introduce properties applicable to adjectives:

- i. Modification by *very*, *too*, *very much*, *too much*
- ii. Negative prefixes
- iii. Occurrence with other verbs taking predicative complements

Gradable adjectives can be modified by adverbs such as *very* and *too* (i.), which cannot be used with verbs. For contrast:

- (61) *It was **very** enjoyable. ~ *We **very** enjoyed it.*
- (62) *They are **too** quarrelsome. ~ *They quarrel **too**.*
- (63) *He was **very** embarrassed by their behaviour.*
- (64) *He was **too** embarrassed by their behaviour.*

However, if *very much* or *too much* can be used instead, the following word is in fact a verb (Huddleston and Pullum 2002, 1436). This, however, does not apply to non-gradable adjectives, due to their inability to be modified by *very* or *too*. Therefore, for non-gradable adjectives this does not serve as a sufficient test.

Svartvik (2011, 160) further notes that ambiguity can sometimes arise in passive voice even with grading, but resists it in its active form, as exemplified in (68).

- (65) **It was **very much** enjoyable. ~ We very much enjoyed it.*
- (66) **They are **too much** quarrelsome. ~ They quarrel too much.*
- (67) **He was **very much/too much** embarrassed by their behaviour.*
- (68) *He was **very/very much** interested in linguistics. ~ *Linguistics **very** interested him.*

It was previously stated that the *by*-phrase might be a mean of reducing the ambiguity between verbal and adjectival passives. Whilst this is applicable to a certain degree, it should not be considered as the primary method for identifying passives. With certain words such as *embarrassed*, the state of the sentence still remains ambiguous. However, if modified by *very* or *too*, it becomes clear that the word in question is an adjective.

Regarding *by*-phrase, Quirk et al. (1985, 169) also say that *by*-phrase may also be a postmodifier, or it can occur with adjectives without “corresponding active infinitive or finite verb forms”, as in (69):

- (69) *We were **unimpressed** by his attempts. ~ *His attempts **unimpressed** us.*

This instance also confirms Huddleston's point on the negative prefixes (ii.). Verbs cannot be modified by negative prefixes like *un-*, *in-*, *im-* etc. like adjectives can, which is demonstrated in examples from (70) to (72). If a verb occurs with *un-* as in *undo*, *untie*, *unplug*, *unlock* etc., the prefix does not indicate negation, it denotes taking back or reversing an action (73). Such prefix is called 'reversative' (Bauer et al. 362). Therefore, if conversion to the active voice is attempted with an adjective, the sentence suddenly lacks logic, because of the difference in meaning between verbal and adjectival *un-*.

(70) *They were **unrepentant**. ~ *They **unrepented**.*

(71) *It was **unmemorable**. ~ *We **unremembered** it.*

(72) *The results were **unannounced**. ~ *They **unannounced** the results.*

(73) *The door was **unlocked**. ~ Someone **unlocked** the door.*

Lastly, (iii.) Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 1437) and Quirk et al. (1985, 168) agree that adjectives do not have to appear only with *be*. With adjectives, it is possible to use copular verbs such as *seem*, *look*, *feel* and *remain* instead of *be*. For contrast:

(74) *They **looked/seemed/felt** worried.*

(75) **The window **seemed broken** by the thieves.*

3.10 Pseudo-passives

Pseudo-passives only resemble passive constructions because of their *be* + past participle formation. However, they lack a concrete active counterpart and generally do not occur with agent (Quirk et al. 1985, 169). The general inability to occur with agent is noted by Svartvik (2011, 161), who together with Quirk et al. refer to pseudo-passives as "statal passives". Svartvik further notes that pseudo-passives may occur only occasionally with agent, however, if they do, it is still quite problematic to form a concrete active counterpart (76). It is possible with what Svartvik refers to as "serial relation" (2011, 161), essentially changes

in tense or aspect of the structure (77). This pattern is also noticeable with Quirk's examples (78) and (79). Quirk et al. (1985, 170) further comment: „That is, *is demolished* denotes a resultant state: it refers, like the perfective, to a state resulting from the demolition, rather than to the act of demolition itself“.

(76) *This memorial **is placed** here by his friends and neighbours. ~ *His friends and neighbours **place** this memorial here.*

(77) *This memorial **is placed** here by his friends and neighbours. ~ His friends and neighbours **have placed** this memorial here.*

(78) *The building **is already demolished**. ~ *Someone already **demolishes** the building.*

(79) *The building **is already demolished**. ~ Someone **has** already **demolished** the building.*

(80) *The modern world **is** getting more highly **industrialized** and **mechanized**.*

Statal interpretation also occurs with *industrialized* and *mechanized* in (80). The sentence is not agent oriented, as the meaning denotes reaching such state, rather than being affected by verbal actions of an entity. *Be* in the instances of pseudo-passives has a copular function, and therefore can be replaced with *seem*, *look*, *feel*, *remain* etc. (Quirk et al. 1985, 170), similarly how these copular verbs were presented as an indicator of adjectival passives.

4 PASSIVE VOICE IN CZECH

In the Czech language, two types of passives can be distinguished:

- I. Periphrastic passive
- II. Reflexive passive

4.1 Periphrastic passive

Czech periphrastic passive is the equivalent of the English *be*-passive. It is constructed with the relevant form of the verb *být* + past participle (Komárek 1986, 172). For instance:

(1) *Obraz **byl dokončen**.*

(2) *Dům **byl postaven**.*

(3) *Žák **byl pochválen**.*

Komárek notes that periphrastic passives can have either eventive, stative or resultative meaning (1986, 172). Eventive meaning is associated with imperfective verbs (4), whereas stative and resultative meaning is associated with perfective verbs (Komárek 1986, 172), as in (5). For instance:

(4) *Je/Byl/Bude **chválen**.*

(5) *Toto křeslo je **zhotoveno** z bambusu.*

It is further noted by Komárek (1986, 172) that periphrastic passives do not occur with verbs expressing physical or emotional state as in examples from (6) to (8), and imperfective verbs cannot be passivized if they denote certain static relations, such as the words *mít* (9) or *obsahovat* (10):

(6) *Bolí ho hlava.*

(7) *Svědí mě kůže.*

(8) *Trápí ho svědomí.*

(9) *Mám koně.*

(10) *Rybí tuk obsahuje vitamin D.*

Regarding English prepositional passives, such constructions do not occur in Czech periphrastic passives. If an object with preposition is passivized, it remains in the same state and is expressed through impersonal passive (Dušková 2003, 251). For instance:

(12) *The problem **was talked about**. ~ *Problém byl mluven o. ~ **Mluvílo se** o problému.*

(13) *This possibility has **been reckoned with**. ~ S touto možností **se nepočítalo**.*

(14) *The doctor should **be sent for**. ~ **Mělo by se** ihned poslat pro lékaře.*

(15) *Their help cannot **be relied on**. ~ Na jejich pomoc **se nelze spolehnout**.*

Similarly to English *be*-passives, Czech periphrastic passives mostly occur in formal style and objective writing. (Havránek and Jedlička 2002, 105).

4.2 Reflexive passive

Reflexive passive constructions are formed with the reflexive participle *se*. The function of the reflexive passive is to convey information without expressing agent and is restricted to 3rd person (Grepl et al. 1987, 238). For example:

(16) *Vařím oběd. ~ Oběd **se** vaří.*

(17) *Lidé hlídali vinohrady až do rána. ~ Vinohrady **se** hlídaly až do rána.*

According to Grepl et al. (1987, 238), reflexive passives do not only omit the agent. The agent may also become anonymous as a result of the restrictive nature of reflexive passives.

Whether the agent is known but unspecified depends on the contextual setting, as shown in (18), however, reflexive passives are often used when the agent does not serve a significant role, and when the construction implies a “general human agent” (Grep1 et al. 1987, 238), as in (19). It is further stated by Grep1 et al. that reflexive constructions are commonly found in instructive texts or manuals (20).

(18) *Studovali jsme i o vánočních svátcích. ~ Studovalo se i o vánočních svátcích.*

(19) *O tom se všude mluví.*

(20) *Omáčka se procedí a přileje se víno.*

According to Grep1 et al. (1987, 239), the use of reflexive passives tends to be restricted to inanimate subjects, because animate subjects are often found with reflexive verbs (21), which often occur “when the subject is capable of performing the verbal action on themselves“. This does not occur with inanimate subjects (22), therefore they are preferred in the reflexive construction. For contrast:

(21) *Umývají Pepíka. ~ Umývá se Pepík.*

(22) *Umývají okna. ~ Umývají se okna.*

4.3 Comparing English and Czech passives

Both English and Czech passives allow omitting agent. The difference between constructing Czech and English passives arises when verbal valency is taken into consideration. In English, passive voice can be formed with ditransitive, complex transitive and monotransitive verbs, whilst Czech is restricted to monotransitive verbs (Dušková 2003, 250). Therefore, the similarity in passive voice construction is associated only with monotransitive verbs.

It is further noted by Dušková (2003, 250) that English verbs that take direct object may correspond to Czech verbs, whose objects take a genitive (23), dative (24), or instrumental case (25) in passive voice. For instance:

(23) *The aim has been reached. ~ Cíle bylo dosaženo.*

(24) *What is it called? ~ Jak se tomu říká?*

(25) *What language is spoken there? Jakým jazykem se tam mluví?*

II ANALYSIS

5 METHODOLOGY

The aim of the analysis is to observe how passive constructions in literary texts behave in Czech translations. Because only two types of passives in the Czech language can be recognized, namely periphrastic and reflexive passives, I will observe the frequency of the two constructions in translated texts and evaluate most common patterns of their translation. The use of Czech passives is comparable to English passives because of their use in formal, objective and academic writing. Therefore, my aim is to observe their frequency outside these contexts in terms of translation.

For the purposes of this research, I used the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA) and the InterCorp tool KonText. For the purpose of parallel text comparisons, I chose the English and Czech InterCorp v16ud corpus models.

In order to choose constructions for translation, I compiled a list of most commonly used passive constructions of *be*-passives and *get*-passives based on results from COCA, using these prompts:

I. BE_v?n*

II. GET_v?n*

From said list I chose 5 *be*-passive and 5 *get*-passive constructions. Results were then used in the parallel corpus to generate translations. For the purpose of analysing literary texts, genres of drama and fiction were chosen. Each passive construction was analysed based on a sample of 50. However, *get*-passives were generally far less frequent in the corpus. Therefore, three *get*-passive constructions were lower in terms of results, therefore results from their *got* and *get* variants were combined in order to get as many samples as possible. In total, 463 translations were analysed.

6 RESULTS

According to the findings, English passive constructions in literary texts are predominantly translated into active voice. Chosen *be*-passives were transformed into active voice in 72,8% occurrences, whilst periphrastic passives represented only 17,6% of all instances. Reflexive passives occurred only in 9,6% of the translations. As for *get*-passives, their frequency in Czech translations is even lower. *Get*-passives were translated into active voice in 93,9% instances.

These findings confirm that regarding translation, passive voice is preferred significantly less in literary texts than in formal registers. Literary texts tend to be more stylistically dynamic, therefore it would make sense that passive constructions were omitted in Czech translation. Additionally, Czech language is far less restricted in translation due to word order flexibility, grammatical case and due to being a pro-drop language, which would be further reasons for not translating passives. Although most *get*-passive instances were not directly translated into passive voice, their informal nature was still reflected in translation.

	Periphrastic	Reflexive	Active voice
Was used	11	9	30
Was born	4	0	46
Was made	8	3	39
Was found	15	12	23
Is considered	6	0	44
Frequency (<i>be</i>)	44 (17,6%)	24 (9,6%)	182 (72,8%)
Got caught	4	0	46
Get paid	2	1	47
Get/got hit	2	1	47
Get/got fired	0	1	31

Get/got arrested	2	0	29
Frequency (<i>get</i>)	10 (4,7%)	3 (1,4%)	200 (93,9%)
Frequency (total)	54 (11,7%)	27 (5,8%)	382 (82,5%)

6.1 Translation overview: *be*-passives

6.1.1 *Was used*

In the construction *was used*, 11 periphrastic and 9 reflexive passives were found. Periphrastic passives were mostly translated into constructions and their forms such as *byl používán*, *byl použit*, *byl určen*, and *byl využíván*

- (1) *Now, the big Sikorski **was used**... ~ Nyní **byl** velký vrtulník Sikorsky **používán**...*
- (2) *The work never saw the light of the day, in other cases, it **was used** ...některé věci nespatřily světlo světa, další **byly použity**...*
- (3) *No force of any kind **was used**. ~ **Nebyl použit** žádný nátlak.*
- (4) *One of the wagons **was used** as headquarters... ~ Jeden z krytých vozů **byl určen** pro veškeré potřeby...*
- (5) *It **was used** for storage... ~ Statek **byl využíván** v případech...*

In certain cases, *was used* was translated into adjectives:

- (6) *White paint **was used** to erase the murals of doves... ~ Malby na zdech a pamflety s holubicemi **byly zabílené**...*
- (7) *I wonder if it **was used** for all the parachutists... ~ Jestli pak **byl určený** pro všechny výsadkáře...*
- (8) *Every tiny piece of land **was used** for something. ~ Každé sebemenší místočko půdy **bylo nějak využité**.*

In terms *was used* being translated into reflexive passives, such instances were translated into various form of *se + používat*, and some instances were translated in accordance with the context:

- (9) ...although over time Greek was used... ~ ...řeckých slov **se** však **používalo**...
- (10) ...if I knew what the exact purpose was for which it **was used**. ~ ...kdybych věděl, k jakému účelu **se používá**.
- (11) ...another burner phone **was used** to call... ~ Druhý den ráno **se** z dalšího předplaceného telefonu **volalo**...
- (12) He was interested in various handles ... wht wood **was used** and how they were made ~ Zajímalo ho, z jakého dřeva **se dělají** různá držadla...

Another common translation of *was used* was *sloužit* and *posloužit*, primarily in correlation with inanimate subjects:

- (13) The dead gillot's saddle ... **was used** as a model... ~ Sedlo ... **posloužilo** jako vzor pro všechna ostatní.
- (14) ...that it was **used for** the sole purpose... ~ že **sloužil** k jedinému účelu...
- (15) It **was used** as a transportation camp... ~ Tábor **sloužil** coby tábor tranzitní...

6.1.2 *Was born*

The construction *was born* occurred in 48 active voice instances. In most cases, *was born* was translated into the reflexive verb *narodit se*. There were only 4 instances of the periphrastic passive *být + narozen*.

- (16) ...and three years later Susie **was born**. ~ ... a za tři roky **se nám narodila** Susie
- (17) She died when I **was born**... ~ Zemřela, když jsem **se narodila**.
- (18) I **was born** in the Jungle. ~ **Jsem narozen** v džungli.

(19) *I was **born** in the sign of Virgo. ~ Ve znamení Panny **jsem narozen**.*

(20) *...and I was **born** among men... ~ ...já, který **jsem narozen** mezi lidmi...*

(21) *I was **born** ... in the unreliable year of eighteen ninety ... ~ **jsem já narozen** v jednadevadesátém...*

Another translation variant was the reflexive verb *zrodit se*. Its usage is rather metaphoric and it does not denote being physically born:

(22) *Because it was **born**... ~ ...Neboť proč by moje myšlenka ... Proto, že **se zrodila** v této díře...*

(23) *The King and His Court was **born**... ~ Král & Družiníci bylo mužstvo, které **se zrodilo**...*

Was born was replaced by noun in some translations:

(24) *...when they married and their daughter was **born**. ~ že po svatbě s Mikaelem, **narození** dcerky...*

(25) *...the doctor had told her after her child was **born**... ~ ...lékař jí při **porodu** řekl...*

6.1.3 *Was made*

8 Periphrastic passive translations were identified. Passive translations of *was made* were mostly used in the context of creation or production, as in (26) and (27), and if referring to an animate subject, *was made* was translated as *stvořen*, as exemplified in (28) and (29):

(26) *What strength have we for the finding of the Fire in which it was **made**? ~ Máme sílu nalézt Oheň, v němž **byl vyroben**?*

(27) *The wounded man would have no theoretical interest in what the arrow was **made** of... ~ Zraněný jistě neprojeví čistě teoretický zájem, z čeho **je šíp vyroben**...*

(28) *These were the years when he found out what he **was made** of... ~ ...byly to roky , kdy postupně objevoval , k čemu **je stvořen**...*

(29) *(Lady Bruton preferred Richard Dalloway of course.) He **was made** of much finer material. ~ **Byl stvořen** z mnohem jemnějšího materiálu.*

Only 3 reflexive passives were identified:

(30) *This was also the system by which the roll-call **was made**. ~ Tímto způsobem **se ověřovala** i prezence.*

(31) *More surprising mention **was made** of the death of a dog. ~ Kupodivu **se** znovu **mluvilo** o utracení jakéhosi psa.*

(32) *For the world **was made** new each day... ~ Svět **se** totiž každý den **vytváří** znova...*

6.1.4 *Was found*

The construction *was found* had the most instances of passive translations. 15 periphrastic and 12 reflexive passives were identified. This construction occurred primarily in negative collocations, namely death. Periphrastic translation *byl/a nalezen/a* occurred the most.

(33) *The next day his body ... **was found**... ~ Následujícího dne **byla** jeho ... mrtvola **nalezena**...*

(34) *He **was found dead** this morning... ~ Dnes ráno **byl nalezen** mrtev...*

(35) *She **was found** in the Wabash ... just ten days after she was taken... ~ **Byla nalezena** v řece Wabash ... deset dní po únosu...*

(36) *...a farmer's wife, Magda Lovisa Sjöberg, **was found** murdered. ~ ...**byla nalezena** zavražděná selka Magda Lovisa Sjöbergová*

Regarding reflexive passive translations, *was found* was translated into *zjistilo se, našlo se*:

- (37) *When the coffin was pried open ... it **was found** to contain a bag of sand. ~ Když rakev otevřeli ... **zjistilo se**, že pohřbili pytel pisku,*
- (38) *...her car **was found** abandoned some five miles from Guildford. ~ ...její auto **se našlo** opuštěné asi dvě hodiny od Guildfordu*
- (39) *Only, a rather obscure note **was found** among the Bishop's papers... ~ V biskupových poznámkách **se našel** dost záhadný záznam...*

Regarding active voice, was almost exclusively translated into *našel*, *našla*, *našli*, as in examples from (40) to (43), and a few exceptions, such as (44) and (45).

- (40) *Its jaw **was found** in Mauer. ~ Jeho čelist **našli** v Maueru.*
- (41) *The next owner was an English lord **who was found** one day by his wife... ~ Dalším majitelem byl jeden anglický lord. Toho zase manželka **našla** v truhlíku...*
- (42) *...railing like a lunatic on a street corner , that Todd **was found by** Captain John Sommers... ~ kázajícího na ulici jako nějaký pomatenec - ho **našel** i kapitán John Sommers...*
- (43) *She was found lying in the street. ~ Našli ji ležet na ulici.*
- (44) *...and it was with justice that his name **was found** among those of so many other heroes... ~ jeho jméno **se** po zásluze **připojilo** k dlouhému výčtu velikánů...*
- (45) *There **he was found** expiring by the doctor... ~ Dovrávorál do pracovny a padl na divan, kde jej v poslední hodince **zastihl** lékař...*

6.1.5 *Is considered*

6 periphrastic passives were identified with this construction. Periphrastic translations were namely *bude považováno*, *bude přihlédnuto*, and *bude zvážen*. For instance:

- (46) *It was agreed that the proceedings **should be considered** private. ~ Dohodli se, že jednání **bude považováno** za důvěrné.*

(47) *Although Professor Langdon might **not be considered** hunk - handsome... ~ Ačkoli profesor Langdon zřejmě **nemůže být považován** za klasicky krásného muže...*

(48) *In addition to the above, the following elements of your past record will be considered... ~ Mimo výše uvedená obvinění **bude** při stanovení rozsahu disciplinárního postihu dále **přihlédnuto**...*

(49) *... it will **be considered** upon written application... ~ ...**bude** tento Váš požadavek **zvážen** na základě Vaší písemné žádosti...*

In the active voice, translations were rather diverse due to their differences in contextual setting, that most likely led to different interpretation and choice of translation. In cases such as (50), *be considered* was completely omitted, most likely due to its correspondence with the preceding sentence. For instance:

(50) *She shed all excesses that **might be considered** vulgar... ~ Odložila veškerou výstřednost, která **by mohla zavánět** vulgárností...*

(51) *...where health is at stake , **nothing else should be considered**... ~ ...když jde o zdraví, **všechno ostatní musí stranou**...*

(52) *(It was impossible to save the master.). ~ He might **be considered** dead. ~ (Pána jsem zachránit nemohl). **Zemřel by tak jako tak**.*

6.2 Translation overview: get-passives

Instances of *get*-passives translated as passives were found to be extremely sparse. However, their translations still display a certain level of informality, which corresponds to its use in colloquial style and informal language.

6.2.1 Got caught

Only 4 instances of periphrastic passives were found. Translation of such instances were *byl odhalen* (53), *byl přistižen* (54) and *byl polapen* (56).

- (53) *Stole ninety million from his firm and **got caught** four years later... ~ Ukradl devadesát milionů vlastní firmě a **byl** o čtyři roky později **odhalen**...*
- (54) *Rockland **got caught** to the tune of something like six hundred million. ~ Platt & Rockland **byl přistižen**, že vyúčtoval o šest milionů víc.*
- (55) *When the fat blond boy ... **got caught** for talking and then got beaten... ~ Ale když dostával výprask tlustý blondatý kluk ... za to, že **byl přistižen**, jak vyrušuje...*
- (56) *... a scheming usurper ... **got caught** with laughable ease. ~ ...intrikán a uchvatitel ... **byl polapen** směšně snadno.*

Got caught was further translated into *nechal se přistihnout*, as in (57) and (58), *chytili* as in (59) and (60), and *čapli* (61):

- (57) *But only you **got caught**, which indicates an absence of self-control. ~ Ale jenom ty ses **nechal přistihnout**, což značí nedostatek sebeovládání.*
- (58) *He'd been an excellent employee until he got caught stealing equipment. ~ Byl vynikající zaměstnanec, než se **nechal přistihnout**, jak krade vybavení.*
- (59) *I **got caught** smuggling meat into Warsaw... ~ **Chytili** mě, jak do Varšavy provážím maso...*
- (60) *...so I went to find Winn and **got caught**. ~ ...a tak jsem šel najít Winna a tam mě **chytili**.*
- (61) *And he told me about the time my brother got caught... ~ A vyprávěl mi, jak jednou **čapli** mého bratra*

6.2.2 Get paid

Get paid was translated into periphrastic passive in 2 cases, as can be seen in (62) and (63). Only one case of reflexive passive (64) was found. For instance:

- (62) *...all we've got to do is to keep an eye on you for ten hours a day and **get paid** for it. ~ ...že vás máme každý den deset hodin hlídat a za to **jsme placeni**.*
- (63) *...if you knew how badly we get paid... ~ kdybyste věděl, jak špatně **jsme placeni**...*

(64) *You mean you do if you **get paid**. ~ Chcete říct, když se vám zaplatí.*

This construction is mostly translated literally - *dostat zaplaceno*. Therefore, majority of translations were handled this way.

(65) *If the priory hasn't got the money, you're not going to **get paid**. ~ Jestli převorství nemá peníze, tak prostě nedostanete zaplaceno.*

(66) *Go and do the washing-up, or you **don't get paid**. ~ Mazej umýt nádobí, nebo nedostaneš zaplaceno.*

(67) *You've been here three weeks and you **don't get paid** until the end of the month. ~ Jste u nás tři týdny a **zaplaceno dostanete** až koncem měsíce.*

(68) *No mention you'll **get paid** for your time. ~ Nemluvě o tom, že **dostaneš** za vynaložený čas **zaplaceno**.*

(69) *Will I **get paid**? ~ Dostanu zaplaceno?*

In certain cases, *get paid* was replaced by adjective:

(70) *The only difference was he had managed to get a job where he could be a voyeur and **get paid** for it... ~ Jediný rozdíl byl v tom, že se mu podařilo sehnat místo, kde mohl dělat voyeur a ještě **je** za to **placený**.*

(71) *Madeline **didn't get paid** for the time she spent on these phone calls... ~ Madeline **není placená** za čas, který tráví na telefonu...*

6.2.3 Got/get hit

Two instances of periphrastic passive were found:

(72) *Serge knows that planes **get hit** by their own shells... ~ Serge ví, že občas **bývají** letadla **zasažena** střelami z vlastních řad...*

(73) A couple of LSTs **got hit**. ~ **Bylo zasaženo** několik invazních lodí, které kotvily v zálivu.

This construction was most frequently translated into *zasáhnout*, or *dostat*, often followed by instrumental case, as in examples from (77) to (79):

(74) *It was a miracle nobody **got hit**.* ~ *Jako zázrakem nikoho **nezasáhl***

(75) *You **got hit** by the thunderbolt, eh ? Tak co , **zasáhl** vás blesk, že ?*

(76) *...I thought you **got hit**.* ~ *...zdálo se mi, že tě **zasáh**.*

(77) *...and Merlin **got hit** in the eye with an arrow.* ~ *...Merlín **dostal** šípem do oka.*

(78) *I **got hit** with a snowball.* ~ *Já **dostal** sněhovou hroudou.*

(79) *...sometimes I felt as if I **got hit** by a rock...~ ...občas jako když **dostanu** kamenem...*

6.2.4 Got/get fired

One instance of reflexive passive was found, although this instance was translated from a prepositional passive, thus its meaning was different from the other results.

(80) *The science of the thing is never to show up against the sky - line, because, if you do, you may **get fired at**.* ~ *Umění celé věci spočívá v tom, abyste se nikdy neukázali proti obloze, protože učiníte-li to, **bude se** na vás střílet.*

With this particular construction it becomes evident that the translations can be quite informal and colloquial. Translations such as *vyhodit* and *vyrazit* are preferred.

(81) *You said that Lancy **got fired** from a good job for stealing.* ~ *Říkala jste, že Lancyho **vyhodili** z dobrého zaměstnání, protože kradl.*

(82) *Wouldn't bother me if they **got fired**.* ~ *Vůbec by mi nevadilo , kdyby je **vyhodili**.*

(83) *The Mommy had been a server ..., but she **got fired**...* ~ *Mamka pracovala v restauraci ..., ale **vyrazili** ji...*

(84) *I guess I figure Candy's right – we'll just **get fired**.* ~ *Bojím se, že tady Candy má pravdu – akorát by nás **vyrazili**.*

(85) *I got fired.* ~ *Fajrovali mě.*

(86) *I just got fired.* ~ *Právě jsem **dostal vyhazov**.*

(87) *We might get fired for this...* ~ *Takhle můžem všichni **dostat padáka**...*

6.2.5 Got/get arrested

Only 2 instances were translated into periphrastic passive:

(88) *I needed something in my stomach — in case I **got arrested**...* ~ *...musím mít něco v žaludku pro případ, že **bych byl zatčen**...*

(89) *..and they might even **get arrested**, which is what they should be.* ~ *...a dámy mohly být odvedeny do vězení, kam patří.*

Most common translation for *got arrested* was *zatkli*, whilst *got arrested* was translated into *zavřít*, *zatknout*, and their variants:

(90) *A lawyer **got arrested**...* ~ ***Zatkli** advokáta.*

(91) *... You got arrested, didn't you?* ~ *...Oni vás **zatkli**, že jo?*

(92) *...Hey, aren't you the guy who **got arrested**?* ~ *...Poslyš, nejsi ty ten chlápek, co ho **zatkli**?*

(93) *They **got arrested** during the Tet offensive.* ~ *Za vietnamské ofenzívy Tét je **zatkli**.*

(94) *If I **get arrested**, I'll go straight to the Post.* ~ *Jestli mě **zatknou**, půjdu rovnou do Postu.*

(95) *"I was hoping he would knock down a waiter," Mike said, "and **get arrested**."* ~ *"Já doufal, že knokautuje číšníka a že ho **zatknou**," řekl Mike.*

(96) *Just don't call me when you **get arrested**.* ~ *Ale až tě **zavřou**, tak mně nevolej.*

Two instances were translated into noun:

(97) *I knew, that would bring me back down to earth with a resounding thud would be for me to **get arrested**. ~ Věděla jsem, že jediné, co by mě zase tvrdě vrátilo do nevíтанé reality, by bylo **zatčení**.*

(98) *A colored guy who would **get arrested** for vagrancy if he didn't work. ~ Černý kluk, kterému hrozí **zatčení** pro příznavství, když nebude makat.*

CONCLUSION

The aim of this bachelor thesis was to define grammatical voice, namely passive voice and to analyse the frequency of English *be* and *get* passives being translated into Czech passives. In the former part of the thesis, verbs and their function were described along with valency patterns. Grammatical voice was then defined and constraints related to its formation were discussed. Several types of passive voice were identified in the theoretical part, such as long passives, short passives, *be*-passives and *get*-passives. An overview of their functions and properties was described, and fundamental differences between *get*-passives and *be*-passives were discussed. Passive-like constructions such as semi-passives (adjectival passives) and pseudo-passives were recognized, and they were distinguished from true passive constructions. Passive constructions in Czech language were then introduced along with their differences when compared with English passives. The practical part focused on the frequency of translation of English passives into Czech passives in literary texts. The results have shown that passive constructions are generally not preferred in translation of literary texts. *Get*-passives in translation were found to be translated into colloquial and informal style far more than *be*-passives.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bauer, Laurie, Rochelle Lieber and Ingo Plag. 2013. *The Oxford Reference Guide to English Morphology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Biber, Douglas, and Randolph Quirk. 1999. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Harlow: Longman.
- Biber, Douglas, and Randolph Quirk. 1999. *Longman Student Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Harlow: Longman.
- Brinton, Laurel J., and Donna Brinton. 2010. *The Linguistic Structure of Modern English*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Davies, Mark. (2008-) *The Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA)*. Available online at <https://www.english-corpora.org/coca/>.
- Downing, Angela, and Philip Locke. 2006. *English grammar: A University Course. 2nd ed.* London and New York: Routledge.
- Downing, Angela. 1996. *The semantics of get-passive*. In Hasan, Ruqaiya, Carmel Cloran and David Butt (eds) *Functional Descriptions*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 179–205.
- Dušková, Libuše. 2003. *Mluvnice současné angličtiny na pozadí češtiny*. 3rd ed. Prague: Academia.
- Granger, Sylviane. 1983. *The 'Be + Past Participle' Construction in Spoken English: with special emphasis on the passive*. Amsterdam: North Holland.
- Grepl, Miroslav, František Daneš and Zdeněk Hlavsa. 1987. *Mluvnice spisovné češtiny (3) Skladba*. Praha: Academia.
- Haegeman, Liliane. 1985. *The get-passive and Burzio's generalization*. *Lingua* 66, 53–77.

Halliday, M.A.K. 2004. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. 3rd ed. London: Hodder Education.

Havránek, Bohuslav, and Alois Jedlička. 2002. *Stručná mluvnice česká*. Praha: Fortuna.

Huddleston, Rodney D., and Geoffrey K. Pullum. 2002. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Klaiman, M. 1988. *Affectedness and control: a typology of voice system*. In Shibatani, Masayoshi (ed.) *Passive and Voice*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 25–83.

Klaiman, M. 1991. *Grammatical Voice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Klégr, A. – Kubánek, M. – Malá, M. – Rohrauer, L. – Šaldová, P. – Šebestová, D. – Vavřín, M. – Zasina, A. J. *Korpus InterCorp – angličtina*, verze 16ud z 17. 9. 2024. Ústav Českého národního korpusu FF UK, Praha 2024. Dostupný z WWW <http://www.korpus.cz>

Komárek, Miroslav a kol. 1986. *Mluvnice češtiny (2) Tvarosloví*. Praha: Academia.

Veselovská, Ludmila. 2017. *English Syntax (1): Syllabi for the Lectures Examples and Exercises*. Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci.

Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. Harlow: Longman.

Siewierska, Anna. 1984. *Passive: A Comparative Linguistic Analysis*. London: Croom Helm.

Stein, Gabriele. 1979. *Studies in the Function of the Passive*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Svartvik, Jan. 2011. *On Voice in the English Verb*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Toyota, Junichi. 2008. *An adversative passive in English: in search of origins*. In N.

Delbecque, & B. Cornillie (Eds.), *On Interpreting Construction Schemas* (pp. 143-170). De Gruyter Mouton.

Toyota, Junichi. 2008. *Diachronic Change in the English Passive*. Palgrave Macmillan.