

English Supplementive Clauses and Their Slovene Translation Equivalents

Maruša Čop and Zarja Križnik

Abstract

The article focuses on English supplementive clauses and their possible Slovene translations. It presents the different types and features of English supplementive clauses and highlights two Slovene non-finite structures—the adverbial participle *deležje* and the participle *deležnik*. A detailed analysis and comparison of examples taken from novels translated in different decades of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries are made to observe varied approaches employed by translators and whether certain translation solutions have become more or less frequent over the years.

Keywords: supplementive clauses, translation, Slovene adverbial participle *deležje*, Slovene participle *deležnik*

1. Introduction

The topic of this article is English supplementive clauses and their translation equivalents in Slovene. First, English supplementive clauses, their characteristics, classification, and usage are discussed; next, supplementive clauses in Slovene are presented; two Slovene non-finite verb forms which appear in them, the *deležje* and the *deležnik*, are highlighted. Following the presentation of the theoretical basis for the research, the aim of the study and the methodology are explained. Then the results of the study are presented and discussed on the basis of analyzed examples. Finally, the findings are summarized.

1.1 Supplementive clauses in English

Quirk et al. (1985) define supplementive clauses as adverbial participial or adverbial verbless clauses which are not introduced by a subordinator. Supplementive clauses are characterized by “considerable indeterminacy as to the semantic relationship” (Quirk et al. 1985: 1123) with the matrix clause; while it can be generally said that they express some kind of accompanying circumstance to the situation presented in the matrix clause, the exact nature of this circumstance needs to be inferred from the context (Quirk et al. 1985: 1124). The indeterminacy of supplementive clauses brings them close to non-restrictive relative clauses and clauses in copulative coordination (Quirk et al. 1985: 1123).

Huddleston and Pullum (2002) do not use the term “supplementive clauses” but discuss this type of clauses as “non-finite clauses as supplements,”¹ these clauses, subordinate in nature, play the role of supplementing the matrix clause, which can be seen as their “anchor.” Similarly to Quirk et al. (1985), who highlight the semantic inexplicitness of supplementive clauses, Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 1266) suggest the lack of “any explicit indication of the semantic relation between the supplement and the anchor” as a vital feature of this type of clauses. This means that the semantic relation needs to be recovered on the basis of the content of the two clauses (“matrix” and “supplementive”) themselves, and/or the context (Pullum 2002: 1266). Supplementive clauses therefore allow for a high degree of flexibility, but also present a possible source of ambiguity, as they sometimes allow for several different semantic interpretations, from temporal to causal, conditional, concessive, circumstantial etc. (Quirk et al. 1985: 1124). This is illustrated by the following example:

- 1) ***Realising he no longer had the premier’s support***, *Ed submitted his resignation* (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 1265).

The possible interpretations of the relationship between the matrix and the supplementive clause in this case are causal (paraphrase: *Because* he realized he no longer had the premier’s support) and temporal (*When* he realized he no longer had the premier’s support); however, as recognised by Huddleston and Pullum (2002), the most natural interpretation is causal; in accordance with this, Quirk et al. (1985) establish that in -ing clauses, dynamic verbs usually suggest a temporal relationship, whereas stative verbs tend to imply a causal one (Quirk et al. 1985: 1124). Quite often, a kind of general accompanying circumstance is expressed by the supplementive clause (Milojević Sheppard 1992), such as in example (2). While the difference between the various interpretations is subtle and normally does not cause notable confusion for English speakers, it is worthy of mention in the context of translation into Slovene; as Slovene lacks a similarly semantically vague structure, at least one commonly used, it is interesting to observe how translators opt to bring out one or the other semantic nuance inherent to the original in the translated clause. Jagar (2015: 18–19) points out an example where a single original supplementive clause was understood and thus translated in two semantically different ways (as a manner/temporal clause) in two different translations of the same literary work.

Huddleston and Pullum (2002) distinguish between supplementive clauses with and without a subject, labeling the former “absolute constructions.” While absolute constructions exhibit no syntactic link to the

¹ In the continuation of the paper, the terminology suggested by Quirk et al. (1985) will be employed to refer to the type of clause discussed; therefore, the term “supplementive clause” will be used.

main clause, supplementive clauses without a subject of their own syntactically connect to the main clause—not by means of a subordinator, but rather by their missing subject being controlled by the subject of the main clause (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 1266). In example (1), the subject of the non-finite verbal form in the supplementive clause, *realising*, is *Ed*—the subject of the main clause (Ed is the one who realized he no longer had the premier’s support). In the following example, however, the supplementive clause contains its own subject:

- 2) *His hands gripping the door, he let out a volley of curses* (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 1265).

As already mentioned, Quirk et al. (1985) establish that supplementive clauses can be realized by participial or verbless clauses. Huddleston and Pullum (2002) further divide participial clauses into gerund-participial (otherwise also known as present-participial) and past-participial clauses, both of which can function as supplementive clauses. In the case of verbless clauses, it is possible to recover a missing form of the verb *be*, as well as the subject, if omitted (Quirk et al. 1985: 996):

- 3) *Too nervous to reply, he stared at the floor* (Quirk et al. 1985: 996).

In this example, it is possible to paraphrase the verbless supplementive clause both as *because he was too nervous to reply*, transforming it into a finite clause, or as *being too nervous to reply*, in which case the verbless supplementive clause is seen as a reduced non-finite clause (Quirk et al. 1985: 996). On the basis of such transformations, it can be clearly seen how with verbless clauses, the highest degree of syntactic compression is achieved out of the three types of (subordinate) clauses listed by Quirk et al. (1985)—finite, non-finite, and verbless.

Another source, Biber et al. (1999), describes supplementive clauses as both semantically and syntactically “loosely integrated clauses, marked off by comma in writing” (Biber 1999: 201), usually with an adverbial role, by means of which information contained by the clause is marked as subordinate (Biber 1999: 201). They can appear in initial, medial, or final position:

- 4) *Directed by Benjamin Twist, who, incidentally, is one of the names being mentioned as a possible successor to Nowozielski, the production is a delightfully theatrical retelling of Dicken’s <sic> famous novel.*
- 5) *The celebrated bust, looking like two dunces’ caps applied to her chest, was encased in a puce halter-necked sweater which left all but essentials bare.*
- 6) *She gazed down at the floor, biting her lip, face clouded* (Biber 1999: 201).

In example (6), it can be observed that it is possible for multiple supplementive clauses to appear after one another in one sentence, in this case a supplementive clause without a subject of its own and an absolute construction.

1.2 Supplementive clauses in Slovene

Milojević Sheppard (1992) discusses the so-called *polstavki* in English and Slovene, which can be defined as non-finite and verbless clauses in general. She dedicates a section of the article to supplementive clauses or *dodajalni stavki* as a subcategory of *polstavki*, highlighting that this type of clause is much more common in English than in Slovene and lists some possible translation strategies—among these, the use of the *prislovni polstavek* (i.e., a non-finite clause containing the *deležje*—a Slovene non-finite verbal form which will be discussed later in this section) is listed as the direct structural counterpart to the supplementive clause, but like in Mikolič Južnič (1992), the observation is made that this structure seems to rarely appear in Slovene, with certain types of *deležje* being especially stylistically marked. Milojević Sheppard (1992) further points to the fact that not all types of *deležje* and *deležnik* (another Slovene non-finite verbal form which appears in translations of English supplementive clauses, also discussed later) are possible with all types of verbs (as mentioned also in Toporišič 2000) but remarks that even when the construction of the *deležje* or the *deležnik* is formally possible, there seems to be a tendency in Slovene to avoid it and use a finite verb form instead.

Toporišič defines the *deležje* and *deležnik* in *Enciklopedija slovenskega jezika* (Encyclopedia of the Slovene language 1992), where he states that the *deležje*² is a non-finite verbal form ending in *-oč/-eč*, *-aje*, *-ši* or in *-no/-to* that cannot be inflected. On the other hand, he described the *deležnik* as an adjectival form of a verb that can be inflected and declined for grammatical person. Due to its adjectival nature, it closely resembles the English participle. The following examples and their translations³ illuminate their distinct syntactic nature:

7a) **Boječ se**, da je ne bi odpodili, se je deklica približala skupini na travi (Toporišič 2000: 632).

7b) **Fearing** being sent away, the girl approached the group.

² Toporišič (1992) and several other authors, for example Mikolič Južnič (2013), also refer to it as “adverbial participle” due to its adverbial nature, but the terms *deležnik* and *deležje* will be used in this paper.

³ Translations provided by the authors of the paper. Both translations structurally resemble the original sentences.

8a) V samoti iz oči mi solza lije, zatorej pesmi, **tebi v čast zložene**, iz krajev niso, ki v njih sonce sije (Toporišič 2000: 632).

8b) In solitude, tears fall from my eyes and songs **composed in your honor** are not from places where the sun shines.

In example (7a), the clause in which the *deležje* appears functions as an adverbial that expresses a state that is simultaneous to the action in the matrix clause. Both the lack of an inflectional ending and the simultaneity it conveys are characteristic of the *deležje* ending in *-č* (Toporišič 2000: 403). On the other hand, the *deležnik* in example (8a) is entirely adjectival in nature and the clause that features the *deležnik* functions as a postmodifier of the nominal headword *pesmi*. Moreover, the inflectional ending *-e* has been added to the stem, signifying the third-person feminine singular form.

Despite the evident distinction between these two forms, the *deležje* and *deležnik* have not always been approached so systematically. For example, Bajec et al. (1971: 211–13) do not distinguish between them, but simply refer to both as *deležnik*; the term *deležje* does not appear at all. The lack of distinction between *deležje* and *deležnik* gives rise to discrepancies, as it does not account for the fact that they are two forms characterized by significant syntactic and morphological differences, which is why this article will employ the classification and terminology used by Toporišič (2000).

2. Aim of the study and methodology

The general aim of this study is to analyze and present the different ways in which English supplementive clauses are translated into Slovene in works of fiction. A point of interest is the frequency of the appearance of the *deležje* and the *deležnik* in the translations. Mikolič Južnič (2014) argues that it is possible to conclude that the use of the adverbial participle *deležje* is very limited in contemporary Slovene and that translators often seek alternative ways to translate similar structures from other languages, for example from English, where they are common. She makes this claim, which is tested in the present paper, on the basis of several contrastive studies of non-finite verbal forms in Slovene and other European languages; studies focussing specifically on the topic of the translation of supplementive clauses from English into Slovene, however, are not numerous—beside Milojević Sheppard (1992), some undergraduate theses by students at the Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana deal with the topic—for example, Rogelj (2007) and Jagar (2015), who take the approach of analyzing the translations of English supplementive clauses into Slovene in works of fiction, as is done in the present article as well.

Since there appears to be a general consensus among the users of contemporary Slovene that the *deležnik* and especially the *deležje* seem archaic (cf. Mikolič Južnič 2014), one of the aims of this article is to establish

empirically whether there is a difference in the occurrence of these structures between older and newer translations; Jagar (2015) compared two translations of the same literary work, *Great Gatsby*, one from 1970 and one from 2007, and came to the surprising conclusion that translations including the *deležje* or the *deležnik* were three times more frequent in the newer translation. It is also due to these unexpected findings that another study of the kind seems appropriate.

Four original English works of fiction and their translations into Slovene dating back to a few different decades are analyzed in this article—Erin Morgenstern's *The Night Circus* (2011) and the translation by Neža Kralj (2012), J.K. Rowling's *Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone* (1997) and the translation by Jakob Kenda (1999), George Orwell's *1984* (1949) and the translation by Alenka Puhar (1967), Oscar Wilde's *The Picture of Dorian Gray* (1890) and the translation by Rapa Šuklje (1965). Supplementive clauses from one or two randomly chosen chapters of each book and their Slovene translations are identified and analyzed. The study is therefore limited in terms of the extent of the material analyzed; however, it is intended to give hints regarding the tendencies in translation which can be researched further in the future, ideally in a corpus study. It should also be considered that, as pointed out by Milojević Sheppard (1992), several different factors affect the use of the *deležje* in translation, among which are also the personal style of each individual translator and the greater or lesser striving to mimic the style of the original. Nevertheless, in spite of the small sample, the selection of different literary works with different authors and translators chosen for this study prevents the results from being purely a consequence of one specific translator's idiosyncrasies.

3. Results and discussion

For the purposes of the study, 120 supplementive clauses from four different novels have been analyzed. First, they will be considered from the points of view of their syntactic structure and the construction that was used to translate them. Additional emphasis will be placed on the translations featuring a *deležje* or *deležnik*, as they are of special interest to the research. Thereupon a closer examination of concrete examples from the primary texts will follow. Altogether 120 supplementive clauses have been identified and analyzed across the four novels (table 1). The large majority of them are supplementive clauses without a subject of their own (in the continuation: regular supplementive clauses); they constitute more than 80 % of all clauses.

| | |
|---|-----|
| All clauses analyzed | 120 |
| Regular supplementive clauses | 97 |
| Absolute constructions | 19 |
| Verbless | 10 |
| Translated with a <i>deležje</i> or <i>deležnik</i> | 15 |

Table 1: Examples across all works combined

Less prominent but nevertheless significant are the translations with a *deležje* or *deležnik*. These Slovene non-finite forms were used to translate 12.5% of all clauses, which is a fairly substantial amount, especially considering that they are only employed in the examples taken from the older translations, so the ones published in 1965 (table 2) and 1967 (table 3), respectively.

| | |
|---|----|
| Clauses analyzed | 39 |
| Regular supplementive clauses | 35 |
| Absolute constructions | 1 |
| Verbless | 3 |
| Translated with a <i>deležje</i> or <i>deležnik</i> | 8 |

Table 2: Examples from *The Picture of Dorian Gray* (1890) and Šuklje's translation (1965)

| | |
|---|----|
| Clauses analyzed | 26 |
| Regular supplementive clauses | 17 |
| Absolute constructions | 8 |
| Verbless | 3 |
| Translated with a <i>deležje</i> or <i>deležnik</i> | 7 |

Table 3: Examples from *1984* (1949) and Puhar's translation (1967)

As a result of the turbulent historical development of the *deležje* and *deležnik* forms, it is unsurprising that the examples from the more recent translations do not feature a single *deležnik* or *deležje*. This reaffirms the findings of many researchers in this field who state that these forms are

slowly slipping out of use.⁴ However, Mikolič Južnič (2013: 91–92) proposes another explanation for their absence. She argues that these non-finite structures may be used even more sparingly by translators due to their wish to combat interference of the original language where such constructions are more common than in the target language, which is also true in the case of English and Slovene. The result is hypercorrection—the *deležnik* and *deležje* forms are employed less frequently in translations than in original Slovene texts.

While the results, as already mentioned, correspond to the majority of research on the topic, they contradict Jagar's (2015) findings. It should be noted that Jagar (2015) only compares two translations; the more frequent appearance of the *deležnik* and the *deležje* in the newer translation could therefore be merely an idiosyncratic choice. Moreover, these forms still appear in the older translation as well, albeit only in three of twenty-five clauses. Jagar (2015) herself also mentions the fact that Toporišič (2000) treats these forms neutrally (and does not discuss the frequency of their use) as a possible reason for their relatively high occurrence in the newer translation. As an idea for future research, it would be interesting to examine some other translations by the same translator (Tomaž Metelko) and thus determine if the use of the *deležnik* and the *deležje* is indeed a feature of their personal style.

3.1 Translation of non-finite supplementive clauses

In the continuation, the paper will take a more detailed look at the different translation strategies applied by the translators confronted by English supplementive clauses. For each approach, an example will be provided and expounded.

3.1.1 Translation of regular supplementive clauses

An evidently natural translation strategy for regular supplementive clauses was to transform the sentence containing a main and a supplementive clause

⁴ For example, Jesenšek (1998) offers detailed research into the evolution of the forms of *deležnik* and *deležje* ending in *-č* and *-ši* respectively. He traces their development from their origins in the proto-Slavic language, stating that they can be found even in the Freising Manuscripts, although the usage was already somewhat limited even back then and over the course of time, much of the rich Old Church Slavonic vocabulary has been lost. The nineteenth century saw a revival of these structures, however, the excessive linguistic purism that had promoted them ultimately led people to renounce the anachronistic language and the end of the twentieth century also marked a significant decline in the usage of *deležje* and *deležnik* in the Slovene standard language, restricted almost entirely to written language (Jesenšek 1998).

into one containing two finite clauses linked by means of copulative coordination, syndetic in some cases and asyndetic in others:

1a) *Harry went back to the kitchen, **still staring at his letter*** (en3).⁵

1b) *Harry se je odpravil nazaj v kuhinjo **in pri tem še vedno strmél v pismo*** (slo3).

In *Harry Potter*, the majority of regular supplementive clauses analyzed were translated using copulative coordination; this structure appears in the translations of all the other works as well (table 4). Milojević Sheppard (1992) observes the same tendency in the translation of supplementive clauses into Slovene and points out that the frequency of this translation choice is not surprising if the proximity of supplementive clauses to copulative coordination is considered.

| | |
|---|----|
| Clauses analyzed | 30 |
| Regular supplementive clauses | 27 |
| Regular supplementive clauses | 3 |
| Verbless | 0 |
| Translated with a <i>deležje</i> or <i>deležnik</i> | 0 |

Table 4: Examples from *Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone* (1997) and Kenda's translation (1999)

Another option was to translate the supplementive clause with a non-restrictive relative clause, with the subject of the main clause (in example 2): *Uncle Vernon*, translated as *stric*) acting as the antecedent of the relative pronoun *ki* in the translation:

2a) *"Storm forecast for tonight!" said Uncle Vernon gleefully, **clapping his hands together*** (en3).

2b) *"Za ponoči napovedujejo nevihto!" je veselo rekel stric, **ki si je mel roke*** (slo3).

The proximity of relative clauses, non-restrictive by nature (Cf. Milojević Sheppard 1992), to non-restrictive relative clauses makes the latter an unsurprising translation choice; Sovre (1939; as cited in Gabrovšek 2019) establishes that the Slovene non-restrictive *ki* is very vague in meaning as its only function is connecting two clauses together and suggests that non-restrictive relative clauses are consequently not proper relative clauses at all. The translation strategy in (2) is therefore very close to the translation with copulative coordination, with both structures sharing with the English supplementive clauses a vital feature of these, semantic indeterminacy.

⁵ The complete list of sources is provided at the end of the article.

The direct Slovene structural counterpart to English supplementive clauses, the *prislovni polstavek* including a *deležje*, appears fairly frequently in the translation of *The Picture of Dorian Gray* (in seven of thirty-nine clauses, or in seven of thirty-five regular supplementive clauses), but there is no variety in terms of the different types of the *deležje*—the only type used is the *deležje* ending in *-e* (*deležje na -e*):

3a) “You must introduce me now,” cried Lord Henry, **laughing**. (en4)

3b) “Pri priči naju moraš seznaniti,” je vzkliknil lord Henry **smeje se**. (slo4)

It has been noticed that in the case of a large percentage of the translations including a *deležje* in the translation of *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, the *deležje* is formed with the verbs *smejati se* (to laugh) or *smehljati se* (to smile), indicating that it is more natural to form the *deležje* with some verbs than with others. Moreover, as stated by Toporišič (2000, 403), the *deležje* ending in *-e* most often functions as an adverbial of manner, which is also the case in example (3).

It has also been observed that while in the English original, the supplementive clause is always separated from the main clause by a comma (as included by Biber [1999] in the very definition of supplementive clauses), the use of the comma in the Slovene translations is less consistent—the comma is in fact never used in the cases where the *prislovni polstavek* (i.e., adverbial non-finite clause) consists of only the *deležje* without any arguments, as in example (3). In *Slovenski pravopis* (Slovene orthography 2001), the vague rule is listed that a *deležje* without any arguments should be marked off by a comma if it is understood as a *polstavek* (non-finite clause), otherwise not. On the basis of this, it could be concluded that the translator of sentence (3) did not want to present *smeje se* as a clause and therefore as a separate action but rather as an adverb which describes the character of the action expressed by the finite verbal form, despite the fact that *laughing* in the original is a clause; *Slovenski pravopis* (2001) states that adverbs which are a *deležje* by origin are not marked off by a comma.

The *deležje* appears in the translation of *1984* as well (in four of twenty-six clauses, or in four of seventeen regular supplementive clauses). There is no variety as to the type of the *deležje* in this translation either, with the only type used being the *deležje* ending in *-č* (*deležje na -č*):

4a) *His small but childish handwriting straggled up and down the page, **shedding first its capital letters and finally even its full stops: [...]*** (en2).

4b) *Z majhno, a otroško pisavo je čečkal gor in dol po papirju, **izpuščajoč najprej velike začetnice, nato pa tudi ločila: [...]*** (slo2).

There are two instances altogether where the translation of a regular supplementive clause includes the *deležnik*, one in the translation of *The Picture of Dorian Gray* and one in the translation of *1984*:

5a) *Winston walked over to the window, **keeping his back to the telescreen.*** (en2)

5b) *Winston je odšel k oknu, **s hrbtom obrnjen proti telekranu.*** (slo2)

The low occurrence of the *deležnik* in comparison with the *deležje* in translations of regular supplementive clauses is unsurprising considering the adjectival nature of the *deležnik* and the adverbial nature of the *deležje* which corresponds to the adverbial nature of supplementive clauses.

This rare translation solution is exhibited even more transparently in *The Picture of Dorian Gray*:

6a) *[A]nd now and then the fantastic shadows of birds in flight flitted across the long tussore-silk curtains that were stretched in front of the huge window, **producing a kind of momentary Japanese effect, and making him think of those pallid, jade-faced painters of Tokyo [...]*** (en4).

6b) *[I]n zdaj pa zdaj je prek zaves iz težke svile, ki so zastirale orjaško okno, prhnila fantastična senca ptice v letu, **spominjajoča na japonske slike, da je moral za trenutek pomisliti na blede tokijske slikarje z zadastimi obrazi [...]*** (slo4).

The above English example contains two supplementive clauses, but their order was rearranged in the Slovene translation. However, the most interesting aspect of this sentence is the fact that the second supplementive clause was translated by means of a clause that features the *deležnik* (*spominjajoča*) and functions as a postmodifier in a nominal phrase. It thus fulfills an adjectival role, which contrasts the supplementive clause that is adverbial in nature. As a *deležnik*, this non-finite verbal form can also be inflected and the inflectional suffix -e has been added to the stem to signify the third-person feminine singular form, so it is in agreement with the nominal headword.

In the translations of *Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone* and *The Night Circus*, none of the translated supplementive clauses include the *deležje* or the *deležnik*.

7a) *"How horribly unjust of you!" cried Lord Henry, **tilting his hat back and looking up at the little clouds [...]*** (en4).

7b) *"Kako grdo krivičen si!" je vzkliknil lord Henry, **potisnil klobuk v zatilje in se ozrl v nebo, v majhne oblačke [...]*** (slo4).

The above example is noteworthy due to its syntactic structure. The original English sentence consists of a matrix clause and two subordinate supplementive clauses that are coordinated by means of a copulative conjunction. The translation, on the other hand, does not include a single subordinate clause. As such, it is a compound sentence and encompasses three main clauses that are connected with copulative coordination and are thus on the same constituent level (Quirk et al. 1985: 918). A similar transformation can be observed in the following example:

8a) *“Don’t you like it?” cried Hallward at last, stung a little by the lad’s silence, **not understanding what it meant** (en4).*

8b) *“Kaj ti ni všeč?” je nazadnje vzkliknil Hallward. Fantov molka je malce prizadel, **saj ni vedel, kaj pomeni** (slo4).*

In this translation, the original supplementive clause has been transformed into a separate compound sentence, but in this case the coordinates are not linked by a copulative conjunction, which is by far the most frequent solution, but rather form an explanatory coordination. Although this structure does not appear very often, its occurrence is unsurprising, as it is in the nature of both the supplementive clause and the clause in explanatory coordination to provide additional information about the matrix clause. Moreover, the occurrence of different types of coordination in translations of supplementive clauses testifies to the fact that supplementive clauses can imply different types of semantic relationships with the matrix clause.

9a) *He lay and watched his birthday tick nearer, wondering if the Dursleys would remember at all, **wondering where the letter-writer was now** (en3).*

9b) *Harry je odšteval minute do svojega rojstnega dne in se spraševal, če se bodo Dursleyevi sploh spomnili nanj. **Le kje je zdaj tisti, ki mu pošilja pisma?** (slo3).*

In example (9), the first supplementive clause was translated using copulative coordination, but the second one (in bold) was transformed into a separate sentence and translated as free indirect speech. Several cases where an original supplementive clause was translated as a separate sentence have been identified; it could be argued that such an approach somewhat undermines the sense of accompanying circumstance characteristic for supplementive clauses.

10a) *He rips the envelope from her coat, **leaving the pin clinging steadfastly to its button** (en1).*

10b) *Z njenega plašča strga kuverto. **Bucika trmasto obvisi na gumbu** (slo1).*

In the above example, the supplementive clause was also translated with a finite independent clause, which is, as already mentioned, not an infrequent solution, but appears especially often in Kralj's translation of *The Night Circus* as eleven of twenty-five clauses are transformed in such a way (table 5). As this construction is used more rarely in other works included in this research, its prevalence in *The Night Circus* can probably be attributed to the translator's idiosyncrasies. This translation approach slightly alters the flow of the prose as the resulting sentences are choppier than in the original text. Nevertheless, it is one of several valid solutions to the problem of translating supplementive clauses. Moreover, example (10a) is also particularly significant due to its syntactic structure as the supplementive clause contains another participial clause. It is worth noting that while *the pin* is the object of the verb *leaving*, it is at the same time also the subject of its own non-finite clause, which is reflected in the Slovene translation.

| | |
|---|----|
| Clauses analyzed | 25 |
| Regular supplementive clauses | 18 |
| Absolute constructions | 7 |
| Verbless | 4 |
| Translated with a <i>deležje</i> or <i>deležnik</i> | 0 |

Table 5: Examples from *The Night Circus* (2011) and Kralj's translation (2012)

Some other, miscellaneous translations, which present interesting and unique ways of translating supplementive clauses were also identified:

11a) [...] *they reached the rock, where Uncle Vernon, **slipping and sliding**, led the way to the broken-down house* (en3).

11b) *Ko so končno prispeli, jih je stric **preko spolzkih skal** gnal navzgor v kočo* (slo3).

In example (11), the translation is quite free, as the two supplementive clauses, consisting of only a predicator each, were transformed into a prepositional phrase into which a piece of information mentioned earlier in the sentence was also incorporated (the rock). The direct translation back into English would thus be *over slippery rocks*.

3.1.2 Translation of absolute constructions

Mezeg (2020) states that the Slovene *polstavek* is characterized by an unexpressed subject which is the same as the subject of the main clause; it has therefore been interesting to observe how translators approached the translation of English absolute constructions, as these have an overtly

expressed subject which does not correspond to the subject of the main clause—a structure practically nonexistent in modern Slovene.⁶

In the following example, the absolute construction was transformed into a finite clause, with the subject of the absolute construction functioning as the direct object of the new clause:

12a) *Winston Smith, his chin nuzzled into his breast in an effort to escape the vile wind, slipped quickly through the glass doors [...]* (en2).

12b) *Winston Smith je imel brado zakopano v prsi, da bi ušel strupenemu vetru, ko je stopil skozi steklena vrata [...]* (slo2).

In some other cases, the absolute construction was translated with a prepositional phrase, within which the postmodifier to the complement to the preposition is in the form of a relative clause:

13a) *Dudley won, so Harry, his glasses dangling from one ear, lay flat on his stomach [...]* (en3).

13b) *Zmagal je Dudley, in tako je Harry z očali, ki so mu bingljala na enem ušesu, hitro legel na trebuh [...]* (slo3).

In the following sentence, four coordinated absolute constructions have been identified (the third one being elliptic); they were translated as four relative clauses. The relative pronoun *katerih* was omitted in the translation in the second, third, and fourth clause, as was the finite verb in the second and third clause:

14a) *Were there always these vistas of rotting nineteenth-century houses, their sides shored up with balks of timber, their windows patched with cardboard and their roofs with corrugated iron, their crazy garden walls sagging in all directions?* (en2).

14b) *So že od nekdaj stale te vrste trohnečih hiš iz devetnajstega stoletja, katerih stene so podprte z lesenimi bruni, okna izdelana z lepenko in strehe z valovito pločevino, varovalne mreže pa visijo na vse strani?* (slo2).

3.1.3 Translation of verbless supplementive clauses

In the following example, the verbless supplementive clause in medial position was translated as an initially placed free predicative (*povedkov*

⁶ This type of verbless clause, however, was quite popular in early twentieth-century prose, in particular in works by Ivan Cankar. The structure with a nominative subject had an alternative with an accusative object (cf. Lipovšek 2001).

prilastek) containing the *deležnik* and was as such not marked off by a comma:

15a) *He sat back in his chair, slightly ashamed of himself, and laid down his pen* (en2).

15b) *Nekoliko osramočen se je naslonil nazaj in odložil pero* (slo2).

The higher occurrence of the *deležnik* in translations of verbless supplementive clauses is logical since these clauses mostly have at their core an adjective and thus match the adjectival nature of the *deležnik* to a higher degree than non-finite supplementive clauses.

A few instances where the verbless supplementive clause was translated using the *deležje* have also been identified:

16a) *Suddenly he began writing in sheer panic, only imperfectly aware of what he was setting down* (en2).

16b) *Nenadoma pa je začel panično pisati, zavedajoč se le na pol, kaj piše* (slo2).

There is also one case where the supplementive clause is verbless and an absolute construction at the same time; it was translated with a prepositional phrase in which the subject of the original absolute construction acts as complement to the preposition:

17a) *The girl stares at the teacup, her eyes wide* (en1).

17b) *Deklica strmi v skodelico s široko razprtimi očmi* (slo1).

4. Conclusion

It has been observed that English supplementive clauses can be translated into Slovene in a variety of structurally and semantically different ways. Among these, copulative coordination stands out as the most common translation solution. Translations including the Slovene non-finite verb forms *deležje* and *deležnik* do not make up for a particularly large percentage of all translations in any of the four works of fiction analyzed; however, a correlation between the occurrence thereof and the date of translation has been established—the *deležje* and the *deležnik* only appear in the two older translations dating back to the 1960s, a time when the usage of these forms reached its peak according to some sources. These findings are therefore unsurprising and confirm the observations made by several researchers in the field that the *deležje* and the *deležnik* are a distinctly infrequent translation solution in modern Slovene. Contemporary translators seem to favor more natural alternatives over the direct structural counterparts of supplementive clauses.

Works cited

- Bajec, Anton, Rudolf Kolarič, and Mirko Rupel. 1971. *Slovenska slovnica*. Ljubljana: Državna založba Slovenije.
- Biber, Douglas, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad, and Edward Finegan. 1999. *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. London: Longman.
- Gabrovšek, Dejan. 2019. Tipologija nestavčnočlenskih nematičnih dopolnil v slovenščini. *Jezikoslovni zapiski* 25.2: 83–96.
- Huddleston, Rodney D. and Geoffrey K. Pullum. 2002. *The Cambridge grammar of the English language*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Jagar, Urša. 2015. Prevajanje dodajalnih stavkov v dveh prevodih romana Veliki Gatsby. Diplomsko delo. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta.
- Jesenšek, Marko. 1998. *Deležniki in deležja na –č in –ši: razširjenost oblik v slovenskem knjižnem jeziku 19. stoletja*. Maribor: Slavistično društvo.
- Lipovšek, Frančiška. 2001. Some aspects of the absolute construction in English and Slovene. *Vestnik* 35.1/2: 257–68.
- Mezeg, Adriana. 2020. Definicija polstavka in njegova raba v sodobni prevodni slovenščini (na gradivu prevodov iz francoščine). *Slavistična revija* 68.2: 265–82.
- Mikolič Južnič, Tamara. 2013. Neosebne glagolske oblike v prevodni in izvorni slovenščini: primer deležja. In *Slovenski prevodi skozi korpusno prizmo*, ed. Špela Vintar, 70–93. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta.
- Morgenstern, Erin. 2012. *Nočni cirkus*. Trans. Neža Kralj. Tržič: Učila International (slo1).
- . 2011. *The night circus*. New York, NY: Doubleday (en1).
- Milojević Sheppard, Milena. 1992. Polstavki v angleščini in slovenščini. *Vestnik* 26.1–2: 224–37.
- Orwell, George. 1984. 1961. New York, NY: The New American Library 1961 (en2).
- . 1984. 1967. Trans. Alenka Puhar. Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga (slo2).
- Rogelj, Tinkara. 2007. Supplementive clauses in English and their Slovene translations. Diplomsko delo. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta.
- Rowling, J. K. 1997. *Harry Potter and the philosopher's stone*. London: Bloomsbury (en3).
- . *Harry Potter in kamen modrosti*. 2003. Trans. Jakob Kenda. Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga (slo3).
- Toporišič, Jože. 1992. *Enciklopedija slovenskega jezika*. Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba.
- Toporišič, Jože. 2000. *Slovenska slovnica*. Maribor: Založba obzorja.

- Toporišič, Jože et al. 2001. *Slovenski pravopis*. Ljubljana: Inštitut za slovenski jezik Frana Ramovša, ZRC SAZU.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.
- Wilde, Oscar. 1965. *Slika Doriana Graya*. Trans. Rapa Šuklje. Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba (slo4).
- . 1908. *The Picture of Dorian Gray*. Leipzig: B. Tauchnitz (en4).

POVZETEK

ANGLEŠKI DODAJALNI STAVKI IN NJIHOVE PREVODNE USTREZNICE V SLOVENŠČINI

Pričujoči članek obravnava angleške dodajalne stavke in njihove možne prevodne ustreznice v slovenščini. Predstavljeni so različni tipi ter značilnosti angleških dodajalnih stavkov, izpostavljeni pa sta tudi dve slovenski neosebni glagolski obliki – deležje in deležnik. Opravljeni sta podrobna analiza ter primerjava primerov iz različnih leposlovnih del, prevedenih v slovenščino v različnih desetletjih 20. oz. 21. stoletja, na podlagi katerih so podana opažanja o raznovrstnih pristopih prevajalcev k prevajanju tega tipa stavkov. Raziskano je tudi, ali so določene prevajalske rešitve s časom postale bolj ali manj pogoste.