

Firbas, Jan

More thoughts on the communicative function of the english verb

Sborník prací Filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity. A, Řada jazykovědná. 1959, vol. 8, iss. A7, pp. [74]-98

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/100244>

Access Date: 01. 12. 2024

Version: 20220831

Terms of use: Digital Library of the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use, unless otherwise specified.

JAN FIRBAS

MORE THOUGHTS ON THE COMMUNICATIVE FUNCTION OF THE ENGLISH VERB

The present treatise forms the second instalment of a study dealing with some aspects of the shift from verbal to nominal expression within the structure of the English language. The first instalment entitled *Thoughts on the Communicative Function of the Verb in English, German and Czech (Brno Studies in English I, Prague 1959, pp. 39—63)* has provided a wider setting for the problems to be dealt with in the present paper. It has shown that in all the three examined languages the verb ranks below the noun in that it displays a definitely lower frequency as conveyer of the rheme proper.¹ In all the three languages this detracts from the communicative value of the verb and promotes the shift towards nominal expression.

The present study sets out to inquire into the shift from verbal to nominal expression in greater detail. It focusses its attention on English, constantly comparing it with Czech. This comparison will make it possible to ascertain the qualitative differences the two languages display in regard to the shift towards nominal expression.

As the starting, or rather zero, point from which the shift may be traced, it is proposed to regard the highest degree of communicative value a verb can possibly attain. The degree of communicative value of the verb depends on the total amount of functions the verb can perform in a sentence at the given moment of communication (spoken or written).² These functions can be specified as (i) grammatical, (ii) semantic, and as (iii) those performed within functional sentence perspective.³ Any disengagement of the verb from a function it could as a verb perform weakens its communicative value and contributes towards the shift away from verbal expression.

Let us now comment on the terminology used in reference to the mentioned threefold function of the verb. As to grammar, both the English and the Czech verb serve as conveyers of the categories of person, number, tense, mood, and voice. In addition, Czech having a fully developed system of aspects, the Czech verb functions as conveyer of the category of aspect; English having a fully developed system of expanded tenses, the English verb functions as conveyer of the category of actuality. Throughout this paper, the categories of person, number, tense and mood are referred to as primary, the other categories as secondary. This differentiation is vindicated chiefly by the fact that these four categories are the only ones that the copula *to be*, the simplest English conveyer of predicative categories, has been capable of conveying throughout the entire historical development of English.⁴ As two of these categories (those of person and number) may also be conveyed by the subject, we have abstained — except

in special cases — from qualifying the categories as 'predicative'. We have had to resort to this use, as it has proved desirable to avoid unnecessary and cumbersome qualifications. For, onomatologically, the formal expressions of the two mentioned categories, whether conveyed by the predicative verb or the subject, as a rule refer to (or, name) one and the same item of the extra-linguistic reality; this onomatological (or, naming) function,⁵ however, has to be taken into account also on the semantic plane and plays an important part in functional sentence perspective.

By the semantic content of the verb we understand the unspecified total amount of meaning conveyed by the verb. If wishing to specify, we distinguish between the lexical meaning (notional content) on the one hand, and the grammatical meaning on the other. The term 'lexical' is resorted to in all those cases in which reference to the non-grammatical, to the exclusion of the grammatical, meaning of the verb is made. (It is worth notice that the term 'grammatical meaning' covers also the meanings conveyed by the above-named categories and thus points to certain overlappings both in terminology and in functions.)

As to the terminology employed in regard to functional sentence perspective (to be further denoted as FSP), it is the same as that used in the first instalment. Besides explaining the terminology (see esp. pp. 39, 42—44), the first instalment offers also a summary of the main principles of the FSP theory as presented in our previous papers on FSP.⁶

It is to be expected that individual languages will differ in the degrees of communicative value they bestow on their verbs, and consequently in their intensity of the shift away from verbal to nominal expression. We are going to trace the shift as it manifests itself throughout the structures of English and Czech. In doing so, we shall arrange the language phenomena in scales indicating the channels through which the shift towards nominal expression may be realized. It will be found that the frequency and types of such channels in the two languages may reveal important quantitative and qualitative differences.

In this connection it should be stated once for all that we are aware that an exact final evaluation of the position of the shift towards nominal expression within the system of a language cannot be established without statistical analysis.⁷ This quantitative procedure, however, can only take place after sufficient systematic insight has been gained into the qualitative character of the phenomena to be numerically examined. The present paper is supposed to be a modest contribution towards such preparatory systematic qualitative analysis. Not being the first treatise dealing with nominal expression in English, it follows chiefly the paths opened up by V. Mathesius and J. Vachek. In the field of functional sentence perspective it is based also on results contained in papers offered by the present author.⁶

I

In tracing the shift towards nominal expression throughout the structure of English, and by way of comparison also throughout that of Czech, we think it appropriate to start with the inflexional systems of the English and the Czech verb. As we cannot deal with either of the two systems in full, we shall in each case confine ourselves to its groundwork trusting that it will reveal the characteristic trends within the entire system with sufficient clearness. We shall subject to the inquiry the tenses of the English indicative (active and passive, simple and

expanded), and the English conditionals (active and passive, simple and expanded) on the one hand, and the corresponding tenses and moods of Czech on the other. The verbs coming within the scope of our inquiry are ordinary notional verbs with no conspicuous signs of lexical weakening. In order to establish the shift towards nominal expression within the examined systems, we shall inquire into the varying extent to which the notional components (i. e. the non-auxiliary elements) of the predicative verb participate in conveying the four primary categories (those of person, number, tense, and mood⁸). Let us first turn to the inflexional system of the English verb. At the same time we beg the reader to remember that if not otherwise stated our comment concerns simple (not expanded), indicative (not conditional), active (not passive) forms, while expanded and/or conditional and/or passive forms are expressly denoted as such.

It is worth notice that in English it is only the notional component of 3rd sg. pres. (*Father/he calls*) that conveys all four primary categories, though functioning as sole conveyer of only two of them (i. e. those of tense and mood, the categories of person and number being conveyed also by the noun/pronoun serving as subject). As to the notional components of the other present forms (*I call, we call, etc.*), they no longer convey the categories of person and number, but merely those of tense and mood; and so do the notional components of *all* preterite forms (*he called, they called*).

Before proceeding further, we should offer an important word of explanation. By the 'conveying (indicating)' of a category, we understand — for the purposes of this paper — its formal expression by a verbal component (or even by a non-verbal component for that matter), auxiliary or notional. As a member of a higher unit, e. g. of the entire verbal form or perhaps even of the entire sentence, however, a verbal component is induced to co-operate in expressing, i. e. in co-expressing, even those categories which it virtually does not convey, but which are conveyed by the other members of the unit. Towards such categories co-expressed by it only on account of its forming part of a higher unit, the component assumes a neutral⁹ relationship. Thus *called* in *sisters/they called* is neutral toward the categories of person and number, which it does not virtually convey, but nevertheless co-expresses as a member of the unit 'noun/pronoun called'. It might be added that within a unit a component is to be considered a co-conveyer of a category not only if it conveys the category parallelly with another component (cf. *he calls*), but also if only its co-occurrence with another component brings about the formal expression of a category or categories (cf. e. g. the unit *I/... have/has called* below, in which only the co-occurrence of *have/has* and *called* gives formal expression to the category of tense [present perfect] and simultaneously also to that of mood [indicative]). — After this explanation we may resume our examination.

A further reduction in the extent to which the primary categories are conveyed by the notional components is displayed by the present perfect (*I have called*) and the past perfect (*I had called*). As has been just explained, the notional components (i. e. the past participles) of these forms do not function as sole conveyers of tense and mood, but only as co-conveyers of these categories (neither the auxiliaries *has/have* and *had* on the one hand, nor the notional components on the other, being able — by themselves — to convey them adequately). The same holds good for the future and for the future perfect, and for the present and past conditionals (*I shall call, I shall have called, I should call, I should have called*), although the share the respective notional components (the infinitives and past participles) have in conveying the primary categories seems to be still smaller than that of the notional elements of the present perfect and the past perfect. (In conveying tense and mood, the auxiliaries *shall/will* and *should/would*, and *shall/will have* and *should/would have* seem to depend less on the co-operation of the notional components; they have to come to serve as virtually self-sufficient signals of the future tenses and of the conditionals, respectively.) Without the notional components,

however, they cannot possibly produce the impression of such formal completeness as is achieved when the notional component is clearly no conveyer of the primary categories, cf. e. g. the instance *I should be calling* discussed below. It follows that the infinitives and the past participles, which serve as notional components of the mentioned forms, have still to be regarded as co-conveyers of tense and mood, though not such evident ones as the past participles of the present and past perfects.

The zero degree of the extent to which the primary categories are conveyed by notional components is reached in the expanded and passive forms. In these forms it is the non-notional components that function as sole conveyers of the primary categories. It should be noted that they show certain formal completeness within the discussed forms. That the expanded and passive forms still remain within the inflexional system of the verb is due to the fact that the participles function as co-conveyers of secondary categories — the category of actuality and/or that of voice. Nevertheless, as they no longer function as conveyers, or at least as co-conveyers, of primary categories, and as the non-notional elements with which they occur have assumed the above-mentioned formal completeness, the participles of the discussed forms necessarily remind one of predicative adjectives.¹⁰ Though they cannot be identified with pure adjectives (the latter evidently functioning outside the inflexional system of the verb), within the entire system of the language they no doubt come to stand very near the sphere of adjectives.¹¹

Let us now turn our attention to the inflexional system of the Czech verb, and examine the extent to which the notional (i. e. the non-auxiliary) components of the Czech predicative verb participate in conveying the four primary categories. If not otherwise stated our comment concerns indicative (not conditional), active (not passive) forms, while conditional and/or passive forms are expressly denoted as such.

We find that all present forms (*volám, voláš ...*^{11a}) can evidently serve as sole conveyers of the primary categories. The same applies to the 3rd persons of both sg. and pl. of the preterite (*volal-/a/o, volali/y/a*),¹² and perhaps even to the 2nd pers. sg. preterite forms with the proclitic *-s* (*volal-s, /as/os*). If, however, the auxiliary *jsi* is used (*volal jsi*), a reduction in the extent to which the primary categories are conveyed by notional components can be observed. The *l*-form, i. e. the notional component, can no longer appear as sole conveyer of the primary categories. In fact, it serves as co-conveyer of only two primary categories — those of number and tense —, being neutral to the primary categories of person and mood. (As to number, the notional component of *volal jsi* conveys it quite adequately, yet parallelly with the auxiliary. As to tense, neither the notional component nor the auxiliary would be able — by itself — to indicate it adequately.) This holds good for all the remaining preterite forms (with the exception of the alternative form of *volali jsme, my volali* — and analogously *já volal* for *volal jsem* —, in which the notional component might be interpreted as neutral to person, co-conveyer of number, and sole conveyer of tense and mood).¹³

A further reduction in the extent to which the notional components participate in conveying the primary categories seems to be displayed by the present and past conditionals.¹⁴ True, in conveying tense and mood, the auxiliaries *bych, bys ...*, *byli bychom, byli byste ...* evidently depend less on the co-operation of the notional component than *jsem, jsi ...* do in conveying the preterite. This is because *bych* and *byl bych ...* virtually serve as self-sufficient signals

of the present and of the past conditional respectively. Still, the discussed auxiliaries cannot be interpreted as genuine sole conveyers, for without the notional components they cannot produce the impression of formal completeness.¹⁵

The zero degree of the extent to which the primary categories are conveyed by notional components is all but reached by the passive (*jsem volán, -a, -o, byla bych volána*). In them, through the endings -, *a, -o, -i, -y, -a*, the notional component functions only as co-conveyer of number. Owing to this and to the fact that the notional component serves as co-conveyer of the secondary category of voice, the Czech passive voice forms still function within the inflexional system of the verb. Like the English participles in the passive and in the expanded forms, however, they come to stand near the predicative adjectives.¹⁶

The zero degree of the extent to which the primary categories are conveyed by notional components is reached by the future tense forms (*budu volat, budeme volat*), whose notional components convey none of the primary categories. Owing to the formal and semantic pattern of the future tense,¹⁷ however, its notional component does not come to stand so near the nominal sphere within the language system as the notional component of the passive form does.

We hope to have shown that both the English and the Czech discussed verbal forms may be grouped in such a way as to form a scale in which the notional components are being gradually disengaged from the function of conveying the primary categories; i. e., in other words, in a scale in which the notional components gradually cease serving as co-conveyers of these categories, the function of conveying them being shifted on to the auxiliaries, or — as is the case in English — sometimes even remaining unfulfilled altogether.¹⁸ The English and the Czech scales, however, reveal some important differences in the quantity and in the quality of the phenomena they comprise. These differences will come perhaps best to light if the initial, medial and final sections of the two scales are compared. The first sections contain notional components that as simple verbal forms perform the function of sole conveyers of the primary predicative categories; in the second we find verbal forms with notional components functioning as co-conveyers of the mentioned categories; in the third, finally, can be found verbal forms with notional components disengaged from the function of conveying the mentioned categories.

Let us start our comparison by taking the initial sections of the two scales first. As has been already pointed out (cf. 76, 2, 1),¹⁹ in standard English the notional component of the verb hardly ever appears as sole conveyer of all the four primary categories. The notional component of the Czech verb, on the other hand, does so quite frequently (cf. 77, 4, 1). It follows that whereas the initial section of the Czech scale is fairly occupied, its English counterpart would virtually be empty but for the occasional subjectless verbal forms found in colloquial English (which have been excluded from our observation through the above-stated qualification of 'standard'). Further proofs of this important difference between the structures of English and Czech will be adduced later on.

The final sections of the two scales present a very different picture. In Czech it is only the future tense that contains notional components fully disengaged from conveying the primary categories (cf. 78, 3, 1). In English, on the other hand, it is the entire passive voice inflexion and the entire system of expanded tenses that present such notional components (cf. 77, 2, 1). Moreover, it should be noted that with Czech perfective verbs, futurity is expressed by means of their present tense forms (*zavolám, zavolají*). This in fact further diminishes the

number of items found in the final section of the Czech scale, for the present forms, though expressing futurity, function as sole conveyers (cf. 77, 4, 1) and so must be placed in the initial section of the scale.

At this point, one might object that the Czech passive voice forms (cf. 78, 2, 1), and to a certain extent even the Czech conditionals (cf. 77, 5, 1), come to stand so near the final section that they actually strengthen it. The fact is, however, that Czech tends to abstain from the use of the passive, and in those cases in which it does resort to it, frequently prefers the so-called reflexive (*zavolá se, zavolali se*) to the ordinary passive (*bude zavolán, byli zavoláni*). As the 'reflexive passive' is active in form, it is again due to strengthen the initial and medial sections of the scale. As to the Czech conditionals, even in writings that should pass muster as standard the past conditional is replaced by the present conditional.²⁰ This may not be a very weighty argument; it might, however, betray a tendency to reduce the number of forms containing more than one auxiliary (cf. the archaic pluperfect *byl jsem volal*). Such reduction of auxiliaries would be in conformity with the tendency to diminish the number of items in the final section of the scale.

No such diminishing tendencies can be observed either with the English passives or with the English expanded forms. Both are firmly established at the end of the scale. As for the English future tense forms, they may be replaced by other means as well; all of them, however, with one exception (the occasional present tense form, see the examples below) are quite unmistakably in accord with the tendency to relieve the notional component from conveying the primary categories. (Just cf. *I am going to discuss it tomorrow, He is to undergo an examination next week, Mary is coming next Friday, We leave for Prague next month*.)²¹ On the other hand, it has to be admitted that the English future perfect, which comes to stand very near the final section of the scale (cf. 76, 4, 7), is not very often used; the past conditional, however, is fairly frequent.

Last but not least, the Czech preterite forms contribute towards the strengthening of the initial and medial sections of the scale. As has been shown above, with some preterite forms the notional components have passed over to the group of sole conveyers (cf. 77, 4, 2), with others they remain among co-conveyers (cf. 77, 4, 4).²² If this observation is correct, it discloses a process which cannot but result in a further strengthening of the initial and medial sections of the scale.

We have proceeded far enough to attempt some final comment on the examined English and Czech scales. Within its respective language system, each provides channels which lead to nominal expression. The established quantitative and qualitative differences between the two scales, however, show that the English and Czech structures differ in their treatment of these channels.²³ Whereas English tends to widen them, Czech tends to narrow them down.

In regard to the quantitative and qualitative aspects of the English scale, the following summarizing statement may be offered. The gradual disengagement of the notional component from conveying the primary categories, which goes hand in hand with a gradual loosening of the grammatical ties between the notional and the non-notional components of the verbal form, has its formal and semantic consequences. From these two latter points of view, it manifests itself as a tendency to dissociate the notional content from the primary categories, i. e., to give separate word-forms to the notional content on the one hand, and to the primary categories on the other. As we shall be able to show further on, this

dissociating process results in important consequences on the FSP plane, thus appearing as an essential factor in the very act of communication.

We should now turn our attention to those English predicative verbal forms with which the function of conveying the four primary categories remains unfulfilled (cf. note ¹⁶). The problem concerns the categories of person and number.

These two categories may be conveyed parallelly by the subject and the predicative verb. In consequence, the subject and the predicative verb may appear as co-conveyers of person and number and in this respect exhibit the phenomenon of concord. Both in Czech and in English, however, there are cases in which no concord in person and number between the subject and the predicative verb can arise. It is worth pointing out that in the two languages the absence of such concord is of different character and leads to different results. In Czech, the absence of concord is due to the fact that the verb may dispense with the subject; this results in the verb appearing as sole conveyer not only of the categories of tense and mood, but also of those of person and number (*Odešel* 'He left'. *Sedíme a píšeme* 'We are sitting and writing'. Cf. p. 77.). On the other hand, in English — at least in standard, non-colloquial speech —, the notional form of the predicative verb can hardly ever appear in the absence of a subject (cf. p. 76, 2, 1). Nevertheless, no concord in person and number can arise²⁴ when the verbal form conveys neither the category of number nor the category of person. This is so when these two categories are being conveyed by the subject alone; i. e., when in fact the function of conveying them has been shifted from the verbal form on to the subject, the verbal form itself appearing neutral (cf. 76, 3, 7) towards them. This holds good especially when the subject is a noun and occurs together with a verbal form that remains invariable throughout the paradigm both in the singular and in the plural (e. g., *The man stole the purse*, *The man had stolen the purse*). It is evident that under the circumstances the verbal form is incapable of conveying all the four primary categories (though not of co-expressing them, see *bid.*), for the noun — the conveyer of the categories of person and number — can hardly be regarded as a component of an analytic verbal form. (The personal pronoun, on the other hand, seems to have become such a component, although it appears to have retained a certain amount of independence; for serving to express the subject by means of a separate word, the pronoun comes to occur on the same level as the noun.²⁵) In this connection, the question even arises whether it is legitimate to regard such verbal forms as finite in the proper sense of the word, i. e. as forms that are limited as to number and person.²⁶ For though such verbal forms enter into a union with elements adequately conveying the categories of number and person and accordingly co-express these categories, there is no doubt that by themselves such verbal forms utterly fail to specify the number and person in question. All this induces us to make the following observation. The view that it is, so to speak, a prerogative²⁷ of the verb to convey all the four primary categories fully applies to the Czech verb; it also applies to the English verb in so far as it is compared with other English parts of speech (in the sense that the latter are never capable of conveying all the four primary categories); it is not, however, applicable to the English verb in the sense that it would pertain to each form of the English verbal inflexion.

The above notes, called forth by verbal forms not conveying all the four primary categories, reveal one noteworthy phenomenon, and at the same time raise an important question. The forms that do not fulfil the function of conveying

all the four primary categories are manifestations of what has been termed above the dissociating tendency.

In its realization this tendency leads towards a reduction of the amount of formal expression given to one particular semantic element (which in its turn refers to an item of extra-linguistic reality).²⁸ Thus in *The man stole the purse*, the form *stole* no longer conveys (though, of course, co-expresses, cf. p. 76) the semantic elements of person and number; these are already indicated by the form *man*.

The fact that the English verb does not consistently assert the prerogative of conveying all the four primary categories raises the question whether this does not imply a weakening of the grammatical function of the English verb — a weakening which lowers the communicative value of the verb and thus contributes to the shift towards nominal expression. In our view, this question cannot be answered without at least broaching the problem of the grammatical centre of the sentence. In his lectures on English syntax,²⁹ A. I. Smirnitiskiy voices the opinion that such centre is to be seen in the subject ('*podlezhashchee*') (137 ff.). He believes that in grammatical importance the subject predominates over the predicate. The predicate is said to be subordinated to the subject, as the latter determines what the former is to refer to. As opposed to this, the subject is not subordinated to any member of the sentence (neither to the predicative verb nor to any other member); in fact, it is the non-subjective sentence elements (i. e. other elements than those constituting the subject) that depend on the subject through the predicative verb. Smirnitiskiy is fully aware that his conception necessarily implies the indispensability of the subject within the sentence, and that consequently one has to account for those sentences which stand without a subject. As is well known, such sentences are fairly frequent in Russian — and, one may add, even more frequent in Czech; they can even be found in English though on a much smaller scale and outside the sphere of the literary standard.

In dealing with the suggested problem, Smirnitiskiy resorts to his dichotomy of the '*sub'ekt*' and '*predikat*' on the one hand, and of the '*podlezhashchee*' and the '*skazuemoe*' on the other. (The terms '*sub'ekt*' and '*predikat*' refer to extra-linguistic, i. e. non-linguistic, elements brought into mutual relation by the speaker's mind; we shall refer to them as the "extra-linguistic subject" and the "extra-linguistic predicate" respectively.³⁰ The terms '*podlezhashchee*' and '*skazuemoe*' denote the words, or groups of words, expressing the aforesaid extra-linguistic elements in actual speech, i. e. within the sentence; we shall render them respectively by "linguistic subject" and "linguistic predicate", or simply by "subject" and "predicate".) Smirnitiskiy points out that the non-linguistic subject need not always find expression in its linguistic counterpart, but is often indicated only by the verbal form or merely by the context. Hence, there may be sentences without the linguistic subject; but there are none without the non-linguistic one. In other words, in the light of the extra-linguistic reality there are no subjectless sentences.

Smirnitiskiy's observations are no doubt of great theoretical value; in our opinion, however, they hardly warrant the conclusion that the subject is to be regarded as the grammatical centre of the sentence, for non-linguistic phenomena should be kept apart from the linguistic ones. After all, Smirnitiskiy himself is very well aware of this, for he not only admits the existence of syntactically subjectless sentences (see above), but also accounts for his theory, viz. that the

subject is to be considered the grammatical centre of the sentence, in syntactic terms. It should be noted that he considers the predicative verb to be the grammatical centre of a subjectless sentence. He regards it as such, however, merely on account of the absence of the subject. For only in the absence of the subject can the verb appear independent of any other sentence element. In other words, Smirnitskiy is of the opinion that the subject must be taken for the very element that is always in compliance with the criterion of independence on any other sentence element, and that it is eminently fitted to serve as the grammatical centre of the sentence. But even this syntactic explanation does not seem quite satisfactory.

In studying Smirnitskiy's interesting remarks on the subject of the sentence (which cannot possibly be dealt with in full), one cannot help raising the question whether the mutual relation of the subject and the predicative verb has been sufficiently taken into account. Departing from Smirnitskiy's correct observation (p. 134) that the most important categories of predication are those of tense and mood, we come to the following conclusion.

Whilst the subject can function as co-conveyer — or sometimes, as in English, even as sole conveyer — of the primary categories of person and number, the other two primary categories, viz. tense and mood, are adequately conveyed exclusively by the predicative verb. On the other hand, however, it is a prerogative of the predicative verb (the English verb included, with the provisos stated on p. 80) to be capable of conveying all the four primary categories. Or, to put it differently, whereas the subject cannot convey tense and mood, the predicative verb is capable of conveying not only these two categories but also person and number. This may frequently induce some languages, e. g. Czech and Russian, to dispose of the subject and resort to subjectless verbal sentences. As it is the act of predication that calls the sentence into being, this should testify to the fact that the subject cannot be considered the grammatical centre of the sentence. At this point, however, it may be argued that there are verbless sentences, i. e. sentence structures in which the predicative verb has been disposed of. This objection may be met as follows.

Beside the predicative verb there are other forms of predication and it is these forms that come to be used in verbless sentences. In any case, however, these non-verbal forms of predication cannot perform the function of adequately conveying the predicative categories of tense and mood. Within the system of language, they can only co-exist with the genuine conveyers of predicative categories, the predicative verbs. They merely comply with the requirement of language to furnish every type of sentence with a predicate. This endorses our opinion that the subject cannot be considered the grammatical centre of the sentence, and shows that such centre has to be sought for in the predicate — the only sentence element that does not show fluctuation.³¹ The means best fitted for, and most appropriate to, constituting the grammatical centre of the sentence is then the predicative verb. This brings us back to the question (raised on p. 81) whether the fact that the English verb does not consistently convey the four primary categories causes a weakening of its communicative value and a consequent shift towards nominal expression in English. The answer to this question will be given in the closing paragraph of the present chapter.

The observations offered in the present chapter concerned both the starting points and the limits of the shift towards nominal expression in English. The starting points are to be sought in the tendency to dissociate the notional compo-

ment from the primary categories, i. e. to give separate word forms to the notional content on the one hand, and to the primary categories on the other. This tendency, however, is a preliminary to further stages in the shift towards nominal expression — to stages at which the conveyer of the notional content is being disengaged even from indicating the secondary categories, the predicative verb eventually performing only grammatical functions (those of conveying the primary and secondary categories). The gradual loss of lexical meaning naturally lowers the communicative value of the predicative verb.

A certain loss of the communicative value of the English verb can also be observed on the grammatical level. The grammatical importance of the verb, however, remains high enough, for even the English verb serves as the only adequate conveyer of the two most essential predicative categories, those of tense and mood, and therefore as the most fitted grammatical centre of the sentence. As we shall be able to point out later, these characteristic features of the verb set up limits to the shift towards nominal expression. The way throughout the system of the language towards these limits is rather long. Another section of this way will be studied in the second chapter of the present treatise.

II

In tracing the shift towards nominal expression we have so far kept within the conjugational system without taking into consideration the variety of types the notional verb can display. We cannot, however, leave this variety entirely unconsidered. For it is to be expected that in regard to the shift towards nominal expression the various types may function — in accordance with their specific character — either as promotive or as retardative (sometimes even inhibitory) factors. In order to illustrate this statement, we will briefly inquire into those English types which A. G. Kennedy³² has termed 'verb — adverb' combinations, and which may be exemplified by such items as *bear out*, *own up*, *blot out*, *button up*, *bubble over*, *fall down*, etc. (p. 9). A comparison of these verbs with their Czech counterparts will enable us to comment upon other verbal types.

Before attempting, however, any such inquiry, or comparison, we think it essential to be clear on the second (postpositive) element of the mentioned combinations. Following J. A. Zhluktenko³³ and J. Peprník,³⁴ we do not find it correct to interpret it as an adverb in all cases. It cannot be considered as such if it combines with the basic verbal element (i. e. the first element) to form a new lexical unit. In this case it changes (as in *bear out*, *own up*), or at least adds some new significant shade (intensity, aspect³⁵, as in *blot out*, *own up*) to, the meaning of the basic element (cf. Peprník 210); according to Zhluktenko and Peprník, it becomes a verbal formative and can be best described as a separated prefix (cf. ib.). On the other hand, it does function as an adverb if it leaves the meaning of the basic element fundamentally unaffected (as *bubble over*, *fall down*), and in consequence could be removed from the sentence — obviously at the expense of the semantic completeness of the entire sentence, but without distorting the meaning of the basic verbal element (ib.).

It is extremely difficult, in fact impossible, to draw an exact dividing line between the cases in which the postpositive element serves as 'a separated prefix', and those in which it functions as an adverb, as the two groups gradually pass into each other. According to Peprník (p. 210), the more general the meaning of the basic verbal element appears to be, the greater seems to be the necessity for a separated prefix to specify it (cf. *I put it down to his influence*); and vice versa, the more specified the meaning of the basic verbal element appears to be, the greater the probability of the postpositive element to be interpreted as an adverb (cf. *She put the pot down on the ground*).

Accepting Zhluktenko and Peprník's term 'separated prefix' for the purposes of the present paper, we wish to point out that we do not dare to go the length of denying the post positive element denoted by it the status of a separate word.³⁶ As we cannot think of a better one, we

find the term suitable — with the proviso just stated — because (i) it does justice to the extraordinarily close union into which the denoted element enters, (ii) takes into account the separate forms of the concerned elements, (iii) comes in convenient when a comparison is drawn between the denoted element and the inseparable prefix.

Having explained the difference between the 'verb — separated prefix' combination on the one hand, and the 'verb — adverb' combination^{36a} on the other, we propose to continue tracing the shift towards nominal expression. We shall concentrate first on the former type, then add some comment on the latter.

From what has so far been set forth, it may be gathered that the 'verb — separated prefix' combination constitutes a lexical unit that may substitute for the ordinary verb in its predicative functions. If that is so, we have to ask how the forms of the 'verb — separated prefix' combination are affected by the dissociating tendency. Approaching the 'verb — separated prefix' combination from the suggested angle, we find that in contrast with the ordinary verb it contains a component — the 'separated prefix' — that functions neither as sole conveyer nor as co-conveyer of any genuine³⁷ primary or secondary category. It follows that the separated prefix is disengaged even from conveying secondary categories, the role of conveying the categories (both primary and secondary) having been taken up only by the basic verbal element. As a component of a higher unit — of the 'verb — separated prefix' combination —, the separated prefix, of course, at least co-expresses the categories conveyed by the basic verbal unit (cf. pp. 76 ff.). This phenomenon is, however, too weak to establish any firm grammatical ties between the basic verbal element and the separated prefix. The ties by which the elements are being linked up are predominantly lexical in character. (The conspicuous weakness of the grammatical ties seems to account for A. G. Kennedy's and other scholars' interpreting the postpositive element in all cases as an adverb.)

The fact of the grammatical tie being virtually restricted to only one part of the 'verb — separated prefix' combination (i. e. to the basic verbal element which may contain auxiliaries) accounts for a certain degree of relative independence (or shall we say 'autonomy') within the combination of each of the two components, i. e. of the basic verbal element and of the separated prefix. (Needless to say, any feature that contributes to the relative independence of one of these two elements automatically raises the degree of 'autonomy' of the other.) This relative independence is in accordance with the dissociating tendency, which becomes especially apparent if the function of the basic verbal element is taken up by one of those highly common and lexically weak verbs, such as *take*, *keep*, etc.³⁸ In such cases, which are very frequent, the relatively independent basic verbal element comes to resemble rather closely the semantically weak verb that as a kind of copula quite predominantly serves as conveyer of the primary and secondary categories (cf. *He made a call*, *He was making a fresh start* on the one hand with *He made out a prescription*, *He was making up a prescription* on the other). (That the weak basic verbal element does not come up on the same level with the semantically weak verb is due to the above-described semantic tie within the 'verb — separated prefix' combination. Its existence prevents the conveyer of the primary and secondary categories [the basic verbal element] to be dissociated from the conveyer of notional content [the separated prefix] to such a high degree as can be observed with the semantically weak verb [e. g. *make*] followed by a nominal element [e. g. *a call*] functioning outside the verbal inflexion.)

From these observations it follows that the 'verb — separated' prefix combinations with a semantically weak basic element display a definitely more marked shift towards nominal expression than the ordinary notional verbs. This is best illustrated by the forms of the simple act. ind. both in the present and in the past tense.

It will be remembered that with ordinary notional verbs it was the simple act. indic. present and the simple act. ind. past that displayed the lowest degree of the shift towards nominal expression (see p. 76). It was so because within these tenses one and the same form served as conveyer of tense, mood (sometimes also of person and number) and of notional content. With the 'verb — separated prefix' combinations, the situation is different. This particular verbal structure has another notional component at its disposal — the separated prefix, which can considerably relieve the basic notional component of its lexical duties. This is most evident when the basic verbal element is lexically weak. In this way, aided by its own relative independence, the basic verbal element may come very near the status of dissociated conveyer of primary and secondary categories. (Cf. *They fraternize with everybody, He rose early, Finally he recovered, with They get on very well with everybody, He got up early, Finally he got round.*)

What has been stated about the present and past tenses could be repeated, with due modifications, about the entire inflexional system of the 'verb — separated prefix' combinations. Recalling what has been said earlier in this paper about the English scale of verbal forms (cp. pp. 76—77 with 78—79), we may safely state that the shift towards nominal expression will be even more marked in all those forms of the 'verb — separated prefix' combination that have not received our attention in the preceding paragraph. It may not be without interest to add that a survey of the forms of the 'verb — separated prefix' combinations (especially of those containing a weak basic verbal element) would reveal an interesting fact. If the basic verbal elements come near serving as mere conveyers of primary and secondary categories, they are as a rule well suited to this role as their notional component is usually monosyllabic³⁹ (cf. *put* in *They had put down the rebellion*). This prevents the semantically weak section (including also the auxiliaries) of the predicate from becoming overburdened with long words.

In the preceding paragraphs we have examined the relatively independent character displayed by the basic verbal element and by the separated prefix in relation to the consequences it may have for the shift towards nominal expression. These consequences will become especially evident if a comparison is drawn between the English 'verb — separated prefix' combination on the one hand and the Czech verb with inseparable prefix on the other.

Such a comparison is being invited by the fact that at least with regard to translating from English into Czech, the usual Czech counterpart of an English 'verb — separated prefix' combination is a verb with an inseparable prefix (*bear out — potvrdit, own up — přiznávat se, blot out — vymazat, button up — zapnout, zapínat, etc.*). Furthermore, it is very significant that whereas in Czech the type of the verb with inseparable prefix is highly productive, in English it is no longer 'a large and vital factor in the development of the English vocabulary'⁴⁰ and shows gradual diminution of frequency (ib.). A highly productive type in English, on the other hand, is the 'verb — separated prefix' combination (and in fact the 'verb — postpositive element' combination in general) which is constantly gaining ground in the language.⁴¹ These facts, too, invite a comparison between the Czech verb with inseparable prefix and the English 'verb — separated prefix'

combination. For the benefit of the English reader it may be useful to recall that the Czech verbal prefixes are always inseparable, i. e. they are neither separable (as the German verbal prefixes may be) nor separated.

The inseparability of the prefix in Czech impedes the tendency towards dissociating the primary and secondary categories. Unmistakably belonging to the notional component, the prefix shows no signs of relative independence. On the contrary, (i) the grammatical, (ii) the lexical, and (iii) FSP functions performed by it raise the communicative value of the entire notional component. This is especially so when the notional component is capable of functioning as sole conveyer of the primary and secondary categories. As has been shown already, the tendency to dissociate these categories is altogether inhibited in such cases.

From the grammatical point of view, the inseparable prefix in Czech raises the communicative value of the verb in that it plays a very significant part within the system of verbal aspects. If the inseparable prefix occurs together with a form capable of separate existence as an imperfective verb, the resulting verbal form is perfective (*po-dívá se, roz-dělít, s-chýlí, při-spět, s-počítat*).⁴² There are only a few verbal groups, all small in number, that do not follow suit.⁴³ It should be added that apart from prefixes, even suffixes come into play as indicators of verbal aspect, turning perfective verbs into imperfectives (cf. *vypítí — vypijeti, sebrati — sbíráti — sbírávati, rozdati — rozdávati — rozdávatí*).⁴⁴

Although the verbal aspects in Czech and the verbal aspects in general raise a host of questions and problems,⁴⁵ for our purposes it will suffice to state the following: the productive means of signaling aspect (inseparable prefixes, and suffixes) form part of the notional component of the predicative verb, rendering it sole conveyer of the secondary category of aspect; the notional component gains thereby substantially in grammatical importance.

The English verb does not display a developed system of aspects. True enough it exhibits, e. g., a system of expanded tenses which in some cases appear to overlap the sphere covered in Czech by the aspects, and employs some of the separated prefixes, esp. *up* and *out*, to impart a perfective meaning to the 'verb — separated prefix' combination. Nevertheless, the grammatical category conveyed by the expanded tenses (in contrast with the simple tenses) seems to be best denoted as that of 'actuality', whilst the perfective meaning of the separated prefixes has to be treated rather as a lexical phenomenon than a grammatical category.⁴⁶ These observations might seem to entitle us to regard the mentioned phenomena as disposed of and to lead us to resume our discussion of the Czech inseparable prefixes. Yet they involve some issues that are not without relevance to the inquiry into the grammatical function of the Czech prefixes.

It does not seem inappropriate to argue that in the course of historical development, the category of 'actuality' and the perfective meaning of some of the separated prefixes have come to be used in English in order to strengthen the gradually weakening position of the verb within the system of the language. Owing to the intensive English shift towards nominal expression, however, this strengthening tendency remains confined within certain limits. Let us just recall that in expressing the secondary category of actuality, the notional component of the expanded tense form appears merely as co-conveyer of this category. This is also one of the causes that make the notional component of the ModE expanded tense form stand rather close to the sphere of adjectives (cf. p. 77). As to the separated prefix, it is its failure to form a genuine grammatical tie with the basic verbal element that detracts from the force of the above-mentioned strengthen-

ing tendency. All this goes to prove that, lexically and grammatically speaking, the degree of communicative value displayed by the verb depends on how closely the lexical and grammatical ties coexist with each other within the verbal form. The closest coexistence will naturally occur within a synthetic (one-word) verbal form, which welds the notional component and the conveyer(s) of the (primary and secondary) categories into one compact whole. In this connection, the important part played by the Czech inseparable prefix in raising the communicative value of the verb becomes especially evident. For the function of the inseparable prefix is not merely grammatical, but also lexical (semantic), which facilitates the above-mentioned coexistence of ties. This statement makes it imperative to inquire into the lexical function of the Czech inseparable prefix.

It is only in a few small non-productive groups in which the Czech inseparable prefix performs no lexical functions, i. e. conveys no lexical meaning, but acts solely as a grammatical means marking out the perfective aspect. In all other cases it enlarges the semantic content of its verb. This is particularly evident with the perfective verb⁴⁷ (see more about it on p. 88). But in comparison with the unprefixing verb, even an imperfective verb gains in vividness if it contains an inseparable prefix (cf. *chyliti* — *s-chylovati*).^{48, 49} From the point of view of the entire language system, the lexical significance of the Czech inseparable prefix is further increased by the wide possibilities displayed by the prefix in combining with verbs; this very increase appears to be a very powerful retardative factor in regard to the shift towards nominal expression. A comparison of Czech with English will help to clarify the matter.

Comparing the Czech inseparable prefixes with their English separated counterparts, we find that the latter are much more limited in their range of applicability than the former. As has already been pointed out (p. 85), they combine predominantly with monosyllabic verbs (of Germanic origin). This means that a considerable number of verbs is more or less denied the possibility of combining with separated prefixes. (The range of applicability of the Czech inseparable prefixes, on the other hand, is virtually unlimited.) Yet, as is well known, the 'verb — separated prefix' combinations are on the increase, new formations, or rather *old* formations with *new* meanings, constantly springing into being. This increase in new meanings, especially with such highly frequent monosyllables as *get*, *make*, *put*, *take*, *keep*, etc., etc., makes the combinations more and more dependent on the context, i. e. on the rest of the sentence, for exact interpretation of their meanings.⁵⁰

With the Czech verb containing an inseparable prefix, however, the matter is different. Owing to the wider range of applicability of its inseparable prefix and the fuller semantic content of its verbal base, such Czech verbs are as a rule less dependent on the context than the English 'verb — separated prefix' combinations. (Cf. the dependence on the context of the combination 'put on' in the following sentences (it is well set off by the semantically full Czech verbs): *He put on his shoes* (*Obul se*), *He put on his coat* (*Oblékl si kabát*), *He put on an air of innocence* (*Předstíral nevinmost*), *They put on a new play* (*Uvedli novou hru*), *He put on flesh* (*Ztloustl*), *She put on coals* (*Přiložila*), etc.) As the rest of the sentence on which a verb may depend for its exact meaning can obviously be described as non-verbal, any degree of the described dependence accordingly contributes to the shift away from the verbal expression within the system of language.⁵¹

Having touched upon the grammatical and semantic functions of the Czech

inseparable and of the English separated prefix, we still have to add some comment from the functional sentence perspective point of view (cf. p. 75 and note⁶). In order to do so, we must concentrate on those Czech verbs which become perfective owing to the special relation existing between the inseparable prefix and the remaining (non-prefix) part of the verb (cf. p. 87).⁴² Leaving aside the second instance sphere^{51a}, we can easily see that as a rule the inseparable prefix of the described perfective verbs tends to convey a more or less distinctly higher amount of communicative dynamism than the non-prefix part. This is not only the case when the non-prefix part is thematic (as *-kroutil* after *u-, vy-, pře-* in *Tak dlouho tím ten chlapec kroutil, až to ukroutil/vykroutil*. 'The boy went on twisting it until he twisted it off/out'⁵²) but also when it is non-thematic (as *trhal* after *roz-* in *Tak se zlobil, že roztrhal všechny dopisy*. 'He was so angry as to tear up all the letters'). In either case it is the semantic content of the prefix conveying a specification of the outcome of the action that attracts the hearer's/reader's special attention.⁵³ And it is a perfective verb of the described type that is deliberately chosen by the speaker/writer if he wishes to induce the described reaction on the part of the hearer/reader.⁵⁴ It follows that the inseparable perfective prefix plays a not insignificant part in the act of communication.

Of course, it must be admitted that the position (and function in general) of the inseparable prefix within the sequence of sentence elements cannot be identified with that of a separate word. This is due to the close grammatical and lexical ties existing between the prefix and the non-prefix part of the verb. Owing to these ties, the possible high degree of communicative dynamism, though separately conveyed by the prefix, eventually raises the communicative dynamism (to be further denoted as CD) of the entire word-form. Needless to say, this very fact remarkably strengthens the communicative value of the Czech perfective verb of the described type and again considerably impedes the shift towards nominal expression within the system of the Czech language.

Turning now our attention to the English separated prefix, we find that outside the second instance sphere, it usually conveys a distinctly higher degree of CD than the basic verbal element to which it belongs. In contrast with the Czech inseparable perfective prefix, however, it seems to add relatively little CD to the non-prefix part (the basic verbal element). This is no doubt due to the relative independence (the 'autonomous' character) of each of the components of the 'verb — separated prefix' combination, and to the consequent loosening of the grammatical and lexical ties between them. Within the system of the English language, all this brings the separated prefix nearer the sphere of adverbs and prepositions, which may be homonymous with the prefix but function outside the inflexional system of the verb. Moreover, in conformity with the basic distribution of CD, the separated prefix may show a further rise in CD if its separation from the basic element is increased by an intervening word or group of words.

Winding up our inquiry into the Czech verbs with inseparable prefixes on the one hand, and into the English 'verb — separated prefix' combinations on the other, we can state the following: whereas the Czech type retards, or sometimes even inhibits, the shift towards nominal expression, the English type rather promotes it. Promotion of the shift is also favoured by the fact that it is difficult to draw an exact dividing line between the 'verb — separated prefix' combinations and the 'verb — adverb' combinations. For the greater uncertainty there is about the closeness of the lexical tie between the basic verbal element and the postpositive element, the more evidently each of them comes to function outside the

inflexional system of the verb. This certainly covers a large number of cases where in consequence a certain amount of semantic content ceases to be conveyed by the verb and is passed on to another, non-verbal element of the sentence. As a result of this, what could often be expressed by an inseparable prefix in Czech is conveyed in English by an element that is no longer lexically or grammatically tied up with the basic verbal element into one verbal form. (Cf. the following English instances with their Czech translations: *He pulled out his watch*, *Vytáhl hodinky*; *Stanley pushed back his chair*, *Stanley odstrčil židli*; *They'd go off into the bush together*, *Zajdou si spolu do lesa*.⁵⁵) Therefore, in a way, even pure 'verb — adverb' combinations contribute to the shift, although, as a rule, their basic verbal element is of somewhat greater semantic weight than that of the 'verb — separated prefix' combinations.

III

In mapping out the shift towards nominal expression in English, we have so far been tracing the tendency to dissociate the notional content of the verb on the one hand and the primary and secondary categories on the other, as it is manifested in the groundwork of the English verbal inflexion in general and with 'verb — postpositive element' combinations in particular. Continuing the delineation of the shift, we cannot describe all its forms and stages in equal detail. Wishing, however, to cover — even if with varying intensity — as much as possible of the entire field, we have decided to resort at least to a very brief survey of some important forms and stages of the shift not to be specially dealt with in this paper. This very brief survey, forming the close of the present treatise, however, will provide a suitable frame for the phenomena to be discussed in the third instalment of our series on the communicative function of the English verb.⁵⁶

It has perhaps been gathered from the previous pages that the intensity of the shift towards nominal expression increases in that the tendency of dissociation affects not only the primary, but also the secondary categories. It obviously follows that this tendency attains full realization where not only the conveyers of the primary, but also those of the secondary categories have been completely relieved of lexical meaning. It is only at this stage of the shift that the nominal tendency within verbal predication has been fully embodied in fact: the finite verb performs only its grammatical function of predication, while the predicated lexical meaning is expressed entirely by non-verbal elements. As a matter of fact, it is perhaps only the copula *to be* that reaches this stage, but there are a large number of verbs in English that have more or less approached it.⁵⁷ As has been established by V. Mathesius and other scholars, the described nominal tendency within verbal predication is one of the characteristic features of English.⁵⁸ It becomes especially conspicuous if English is compared with another language (e. g. with Czech) in which the nominal tendency within verbal predication is by far not given such full play.⁵⁹

Reviewing the section of the shift we have so far covered, we may sum up the offered observations as follows. The gradual growth of the tendency to dissociate the (primary and secondary) categories is directly proportioned to the gradual growth of the intensity with which the finite verb is being deprived of its lexical content. From the FSP point of view, these two tendencies bring about a gradual weakening of the amount of CD conveyed by the finite verb, which (within the

basic instance levels) tends to become a purely transitional element. Some of the phenomena resulting from the mentioned grammatical, lexical and FSP interrelations will be dealt with in the third instalment of our series on the communicative function of the English verb.

The indicated trend towards nominal expression, however, continues. As the total communicative value of the finite verb has come to depend merely on grammatical functions, the next steps to be taken seem to consist in dispensing with the services of the verb altogether. A condensator, chiefly an infinitive, participle or gerund, is frequently used to make a sentence 'do without a subordinate clause the use of which would otherwise be indispensable'.⁶⁰ (Just cf. the items *sitting* — *seděl*; *play* — *hráli*; *your coming* — *přicházíte* in *Sitting under the tree, he watched the children play* — *Seděl pod stromem a díval se, jak si děti hrály*; *I am surprised at your coming so late* — *Překvapuje mě, že přicházíte tak pozdě*.) Even the mentioned condensators, however, do not represent the final stage of the indicated trend. Though virtually nominal in character, they still possess grammatical features that necessarily remind one of the predicative verb: they are capable of giving partial formal expression to the primary predicative category of tense (expressing at least the relative concepts of simultaneousness and of priority (cf. *to call* — *to have called*, *calling* — *having called*) and full formal expression to the secondary category of voice (cf. *to call* — *to be called*, *calling* — *being called*). The final stage of the trend is reached by verbless (purely nominal) sentences,⁶¹ in which the services of the verb are dispensed with altogether, the predicative function being taken over entirely by non-verbal elements. (Cf. *Another silence. Then he overtook her*.⁶² — *Cheers. Loud cries of 'No'. Vehement cheering*.⁶² — *All a mistake*.⁶³ — *Wonderful thing that!*^{63, 64})

We have traced the indicated trend down to its final stage. At the same time, however, we have come up against the limits of the shift towards nominal expression. This requires a word of explanation. It is true enough that verbless sentences exist both in English and in Czech (in the former even on a larger scale than in the latter).⁶⁵ It follows, however, from what has already been put forth (on pp. 82—83) that it is absurd to think that within a reasonably long and normal English or Czech utterance, they could oust the verbal expression altogether.⁶⁶ This is impossible because both in English and in Czech the predicative verb functions as a grammatical centre, most adequately conveying those categories whose linguistic expression is of paramount importance for the interrelation of language, thought and reality. (It is naturally the predicative categories, first and foremost those of tense and mood, that we are referring to.) In other words, it can be said both for English and for Czech that if it were not for the predicative verb, which serves as the principal and most adequate indicator of the correlation of what is being thought and the extralinguistic reality,⁶⁷ neither the verbless sentences nor the condensators⁶⁸ (both of which are only inadequate indicators of the mentioned correlation) could assert themselves. It also follows from the above that the ultimate limits imposed upon the shift towards nominal expression are to be sought for primarily on the grammatical level. The intensity, however, with which the shift can come up to these limits depends on the interrelations ascertainable between the grammatical, lexical and FSP levels. This brings us to the second part of our brief summarizing survey, in which we intend to comment on the shift from the FSP point of view.

Within the system of FSP the verb can convey any degree of CD ranging between that of theme proper and that of rheme proper. Not only in English,

but also in German and Czech, a tendency is at work to remove the verb from the rheme proper end of the indicated gamut and to establish it within the transitional section of this gamut. It is obvious that this tendency reduces the communicative value of the verb and has its share in the shift away from verbal expression. The degree to which the mentioned tendency attains realization depends on the structure of the language in question. A case in point is, for instance, the neutrality displayed by the English verb in regard to positiveness or negativeness. The following note will show how — owing to special interplay of the grammatical, lexical and FSP levels — this phenomenon raises the number of English instances in which the verb is barred from functioning as a rhematic element.

As J. Vachek has shown, the English verb is, by itself, neither positive nor negative; "the negative or positive quality is imparted to it only by the contextual presence or absence of a negating word in the sentence in question".⁶⁹ In contrast with Czech the English finite verb form may quite legitimately occur within a negative sentence without explicitly expressing the notion of negativeness. As is generally known, the English sentence may, for instance, be rendered negative through the mere combination of the negating particle with a non-verbal element (cf. e. g. the following English and Czech instances: *She did nothing, Nedělala nic; She had no children, Neměla děti*). From the grammatical, semantic and FSP points of view, this means a considerable decrease in the communicative value of the English predicative verb. Grammatically speaking, the verb forfeits the possibility of being linked up with other negated sentence elements in what might be called after V. Mathesius 'negation concord'.⁷⁰ Semantically speaking, the decrease in the communicative value of the English verb under the described circumstances is most evident when the verb performs, or has come very near performing, the function of a mere conveyer of primary and secondary categories. All this affects the FSP of the sentence. As the negating word is a special semantic-contextual means that (within the first instance levels) renders the element with which it occurs rhematic (and sometimes even turns it into rheme proper), its occurrence with a non-verbal element excludes the verb from the rheme of the sentence. In consequence, the verb becomes shifted into the transitional part of the sentence; it may even become a purely transitional element if it serves as a mere conveyer of the primary and secondary categories.⁷¹

Another case in point revealing the influence exercised upon FSP by the structure of English is the fixed position of the English verb. As we have shown in our *Thoughts on the Communicative Function of the Verb in English, German and Czech* (see p. 74), the fixed position does not render the English verb insusceptible to FSP; in certain circumstances, however, it contributes to a further lowering of the communicative value of the English verb, and in this way also to the promotion of the shift. This happens in all those cases in which the co-operation of the means of FSP permits the basic distribution of CD to render an element following the verb more dynamic than the verb itself.⁷² As regards the relation of the fixed position of the verb to FSP within emotive word-order, the question has been dealt with in connection with the FSP of OE and ModE questions in *Some Thoughts on the Function of Word-Order in Old English and Modern English*,⁶ pp. 90 ff. Further comment on this relation will have to be deferred to another occasion. Here it should only be noted that the tendency to fix the position of the verb even within emphatic word-orders also promotes the shift towards nominal expression: being only exceptionally able to be shifted into an emphatic

position, the English verb is regularly deprived of another possibility to raise its communicative value. A full treatment of the questions suggested in the present paragraph, however, has to await further research. Their solution would undoubtedly throw further light on the effect exerted by FSP, in view of the comparatively fixed word-order, on the shift towards nominal expression in English.

We have come up to the close of the second instalment of our series of papers dealing with the function of the English verb in the very act of communication. In the present instalment, we have mostly examined this function in regard to the grammatical and lexical levels, only briefly touching upon the level of FSP. The function of the verb on the FSP level, however, has already been treated of in the first instalment (see p. 74) and will be taken up again by another one which is to follow.

NOTES

¹ A term used in the analysis of functional sentence perspective. Cf. p. 75.

² Like the previous instalment, even the present one deals only with written communication.

³ This threefold approach has been suggested to us by F. Daneš's paper *Vedlejší věty účinkové přirovnávací se spojkou „než aby“* (*Consecutively Coloured Comparative Subclauses Introduced by the Conjunction NEŽ ABY*), *Naše řeč* 38/1955, esp. p. 20. Cf. also L. Doležel, *Základní typ epické věty u B. Němcové a M. Pujmanové* (*The Basic Type of Narrative Sentence as Found with B. Němcová and M. Pujmanová*), *Naše řeč* 41/1958, esp. p. 23.

⁴ This wording still holds good even for Modern English, although the Mod. E. copula *to be* is no longer fully (i. e. in all its forms) capable of conveying all these four categories. It is, however, fully capable of conveying the two most essential predicative categories, i. e. those of tense and mood. The problem of the most essential predicative categories will be taken up later (see p. 82).

⁵ On the onomatological (naming) function of endings see V. Skalička, *Vztah morfolgie a syntaxe* (*The Relation of Morphology and Syntax*), *Slovo a slovesnost* 18/1957, pp. 66 ff.

⁶ *Poznámky k problematice anglického slovního pořádku s hlediska aktuálního členění větného* (*Some Notes on the Problem of English Word-Order from the Point of View of Actual Sentence Analysis* [i. e. of FSP]), *Sborník filosofické fakulty brněnské university* 1956, A-4, pp. 93–107. *K otázce nezákladových podmětů v současné angličtině, Příspěvek k teorii aktuálního členění větného* (*On the Problem of Non-Thematic Subjects in Contemporary English, A Contribution to the Theory of Functional Sentence Perspective*), *Časopis pro moderní filologii* 39/1957, pp. 22–42 and 165–173; *Some Thoughts on the Function of Word-Order in Old English and Modern English*, *Sborník filosofické fakulty brněnské university* 1957, A-5, pp. 72–87; *Bemerkungen über einen deutschen Beitrag zum Problem der Satzperspektive*, *Philologica Pragensia* 1/1958, pp. 49–54. Cf. also *K vyjadřování aktuálního členění v angličtině* (*On Functional Sentence Perspective in English*), published in *O vědeckém poznání soudobých jazyků* (*On the Research into Contemporary Languages*), Prague 1958, pp. 250–252. The first two Czech papers are provided with extensive English summaries.

⁷ On the relation between qualitative and quantitative language phenomena, see B. Trnka, *Kvantitativní lingvistika* (*Quantitative Linguistics*), *Časopis pro moderní filologii* 34/1951, pp. 66–74.

⁸ The indicative form is to be interpreted as a non-marked member within the system of modal forms. This, however, does not mean that the kind of modality conveyed by the indicative lacks formal expression. The indicative does not convey a merely logical implication of the relation of objective fact between the subject and predicate, but marks this relation out formally, grammatically. See L. Ďurovič, *Modálnost* (*Modality*), Bratislava 1956, pp. 11 ff.

⁹ 'Neutrality' is an important concept for the interpretation of English structure. On the neutrality of the English verb towards negation, see J. Vachek, *Obecný zápor v angličtině a v češtině* (*Universal Negation in English and Czech*), *Facultas Philosophica Universitatis Carolinae Pragensis*, Prague 1947, p. 70.

¹⁰ Cf. what G. O. Curme has to say on the matter in *A Grammar of the English Language II*,

Boston 1935, p. 68. "Our two participles, present and past, though often true verbs in force, frequently remain adjectives in function, so that they, *like any adjective*, can serve as *predicate after a copula*. 'He is working in the garden'." (Italicized by the present author.)

¹¹ This is remarkably borne out by the following instance. 'By this time Lottie was very red in the face and breathing heavily'. (*Collected Stories of Katherine Mansfield*, Constable, London 1948, p. 214.) The copula *was* is being shared by the pure adjective and the *ing*-component of the expanded form, which testifies to a similarity in function between the two.

^{11a} The forms illustrating the groundwork of the Czech inflexional system are those of the verb *volati* 'to call'.

¹² As we are examining the extent to which the notional components participate in conveying the *primary* categories, no account is taken of the secondary category of gender. But see note ¹⁶.

¹³ The problem of the Czech preterite is very complicated. Cf. p. 79 and note ²².

¹⁴ The reduction may not be so quite apparent with the 3rd sg. and pl. of the present conditional. In these forms the notional components can function as sole conveyers of number (if occurring subjectless), cf. *volal by*, *volali by*.

¹⁵ It might be argued that *jsme* in *volali jsme* produces an analogous impression of formal completeness. Yet this completeness is not accompanied with sufficient completeness in meaning. *Jsme* cannot be interpreted as sole conveyer of the category of tense, for the tense expressed by the entire form is not the present (which the form *jsme* conveys when functioning 'on its own'), but the preterite. Cf. the observations on *has/have* on p. 76.

¹⁶ In the passive, in the preterite and in the conditionals, the endings also convey the secondary category of gender. A differentiation of this category, however, both in the singular and in the plural, is consistently carried out merely in writing. In the spoken language, the situation is different. As we are concerned with written communication only (cf. note ²), let us just mention in passing that the written endings *-i* and *-y* have one and the same counterpart in the spoken standard ([*-i*]). Moreover, in colloquial spoken Czech, the ending [*-i*] is used throughout the plural for all three genders. — As the category of gender is also conveyed by the endings of adjectives, it may be asked whether this fact does not affect the notional components of the passive, of the preterite and of the conditionals, in that it places them nearer the predicative adjectives. Such an interpretation, however, would be applicable only to the notional component of the passive, not to the *l*-component contained by the preterite and by the conditionals. Whereas the former is entirely neutral to tense and mood (cf. J. Gebauer—F. Trávníček, *Příruční mluvnice jazyka českého* [*A Handbook of Czech Grammar*], 6th ed., Prague 1939, § 505), the latter is capable of functioning even as sole conveyer of all the four primary categories. In this way, the *l*-component becomes most closely connected with the core of the inflexional system of the Czech verb.

¹⁷ On the less apparent nominal character of the notional component of the Czech future tense form, see J. Vachek, *Some Thoughts on the So-Called Complex Condensation in Modern English*, *Sborník filosofické fakulty brněnské university* 1955, A-3, p. 71.

¹⁸ For cases in which the function of conveying the four primary predicative categories remains unfulfilled, see the closing part of the present section (pp. 80 ff.).

¹⁹ In order to facilitate quick reference to relevant observations made on previous pages, we have resorted throughout the present comparison (pp. 78—80) to giving not only the page, but also the paragraph and the line on which the statement in question begins.

²⁰ Cf., e. g., M. Grepl, *Vývoj spisovné češtiny za obrození a jazyková teorie* (*The Development of Standard Czech in the Time of National Revival and the Theory of Language*), *Sborník filosofické fakulty brněnské university* 1958, A-6, p. 74.

²¹ Czech may also occasionally use the present to express futurity (*Jedu zítra do Prahy*, 'I am going to Prague tomorrow').

²² This would testify to a tendency gradually transferring the Czech preterite into the sphere of synthetic forms, and is in agreement with J. Vachek's interpretation put forth in *Some Thoughts...* (note ¹⁷), p. 71. F. Kopečný goes the length of considering the Czech preterite synthetic. See his *Povaha českého preterita* (*The Character of the Czech Preterite*), *Naše řeč* 34/1950, pp. 85—89; *Základy české skladby* (*Fundamentals of Czech Syntax*), Prague 1958, pp. 93—95; *Problém českého „přičestí minulého činného“ v historii českého mlouvnictví* (*The Problem of the Czech 'Past Participle Active' in the History of Czech Grammatical Thought*), *Sborník v šest na akademii Aleksandr Teodorov-Balan po slutshai devetdeset i petchata mu godishnina*, Sofia 1955, pp. 293—300. Kopečný's views have been opposed by F. Trávníček in *K českým opsaným tvarům slovesným* (*On the Czech Periphrastic Verbal Forms*), *Slovo a slovesnost* 19/1958, pp. 1—16. Cf. further Kopečný's reply and Trávníček's rejoinder in the *Slovo a slovesnost* 19/1958, pp. 277—282, and 20/1959, p. 80, respectively.

²³ These differences between English and Czech have been well prepared in the course of historical development; cf. J. Vachek's paper *Some Thoughts...* (note¹⁷), esp. pp. 68 ff., which also deals with the Czech and English attitudes towards nominal expression as seen in the light of historical perspective.

²⁴ See R. W. Zandvoort, *A Handbook of English Grammar*,⁵ Groningen 1953, § 746.

²⁵ Cf. G. O. Curme, *A Grammar of the English Language II*, (note¹⁰), p. 7.

²⁶ Cf. H. C. Wyld's *Universal Dictionary of the English Language*, London 1936, entry *finite*.

²⁷ Cf. F. Kopečný, *Fundamentals of Czech Syntax* (note²²), p. 41, and F. Kopečný, *Dvě poznámky k přísudku v češtině (Two Notes on the Predicate in Czech)*, *Naše řeč* 33/1949, p. 130.

²⁸ This applies even to such semantic elements which allow of a high degree of abstraction and in consequence are apt to constitute the semantic content of a grammatical category. — On the differences between lexical and grammatical abstraction, see I. Poldauf, *Podíl mluvnické a nauky o slovníku na problematice slovesného vidu (The Shares of Grammar and Lexicology in the Problems of Verbal Aspect)*, *Studie a práce lingvistické I*, Praha 1954, esp. pp. 200—206.

²⁹ Edited posthumously (Moscow 1957) by V. V. Passek under the title *Sintaksis anglijskogo jazyka (A Syntax of the English Language)*.

³⁰ A thoroughgoing investigation into the relations between the linguistic and the non-linguistic reality is one of the tasks of contemporary linguistics. Cf. J. Nosek, *Towards a Systematic Approach in the Theory of English Syntax*, *Philologica* 7/1955 (Supplement to the *Casopis pro moderní filologii* 37/1955), p. 71.

³¹ Cf. J. Nosek, l. c., p. 74.

³² In *The Modern English Verb—Adverb Combination*, Stanford University Publications, University Series, Language and Literature, Vol. I, No. 1, Stanford, California 1920.

³³ J. A. Zhluktenko, *O tak nazyvajemych 'složnykh glagolach' tipa STAND UP v sovremennom anglijskom jazyke (On the So-Called Compound Verbs of the Stand-Up Type in Contemporary English)*, *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 1954, No. 5, pp. 105—113.

³⁴ J. Peprník, *Problematika složených sloves (On the Problems Concerning the Compound Verbs)*, *Sborník Vysoké školy pedagogické v Olomouci, Jazyk a literatura II*, pp. 207—222.

³⁵ On the problem of aspects, see further below p. 86 ff.

³⁶ Following J. Vachek, we define the word as 'an utterance element that refers to some meaning and that, acting as one indivisible whole, can more or less freely change its position with regard to other elements of the utterance, or at least can (again acting as one indivisible whole) be separated from those elements by the insertion of some additional, more or less freely interchangeable utterance elements'. (See J. Vachek, *Two Chapters on Written English*, *Brno Studies in English I*, Prague 1959, p. 32, note 21.

^{36a} As the preceding explanation has shown, the term 'verb-adverb' combination is used here, of course, in a definitely narrower sense than in Kennedy's monograph.

³⁷ Subscribing to V. Mathesius' view that English has no fully developed system of aspects (cf., e. g. V. M.'s paper *On Some Problems of the Systematic Analysis of Grammar*, *Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Prague* 6, p. 102), we do not consider the possible perfective meaning of the separated prefix (as e. g. in *up and out*) as evidence of a genuine grammatical category of aspect. See also pp. 86 ff. Cf. also M. Jindra, *K otázkám slovesného vidu se zvláštním zřetelem k češtině a angličtině (Some Remarks concerning Problems of the Verbal Aspect with Special Regard to the Czech and English Languages)*, *Universitas Carolina* 1956, *Philologica* Vol. 2, No 1, esp. pp. 97, 101—2.

³⁸ For numerous instances of 'verb — separated prefix' combinations of this type, see G. Kirchner, *Die zehn Hauptverben des Englischen*, Halle (Saale) 1952.

³⁹ Cf. A. G. Kennedy, op. cit., p. 29.

⁴⁰ A. G. Kennedy, op. cit., p. 11.

⁴¹ See G. Kirchner, op. cit., p. XIII.

⁴² Cf. I. Poldauf, *Mechanismus slovesných vidů v nové češtině (The Mechanism of Verbal Aspects in Modern Czech)*, *Český časopis filologický* 1/1942-43, p. 2. See also his papers *Spojování s předponami při tvorbě dokonavých sloves v češtině (Prefixation in the Formation of Perfective Verbs in Czech)*, *Slovo a slovesnost* 15/1954, p. 49; and *The Shares ...* (note²⁸), p. 211.

⁴³ See, e. g., I. Poldauf, *Prefixation...* (note⁴²), p. 49.

⁴⁴ See B. Havránek and others, *Učebnice jazyka českého pro I. třídu gymnasií (A Text-Book of the Czech Language for the Use of First Forms of Grammar Schools)*, 3rd ed., Prague 1953.

⁴⁵ See especially A. Dostál, *Studie o vidovém systému v staroslovenštině (A Study in the Church Slavonic System of Aspect)*, Prague 1954, esp. pp. 7—57; F. Kopečný, *Fundamentals of Czech Syntax* (note²²), esp. pp. 97—105; I. Poldauf's studies (note⁴²); B. Trnka's studies, *O podstatě vidů (The Essentials of Aspect)*, *Casopis pro moderní filologii* 14/1928, pp. 193—197;

Přspěvky k syntaktickému a frazeologickému vývoji slovesa TO HAVE (Studies in the Syntactical and Phraseological History of the Verb TO HAVE), Facultas Philosophica Universitatis Carolinae Pragensis, V, Prague 1924, esp. pp. 3—12, and *On the Syntax of the English Verb from Caxton to Dryden, Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Prague* 3, Prague 1930, esp. pp. 32—43. In all these studies further references can be found.

⁴⁶ Cf. V. Mathesius, *On Some Problems* ... (note ³⁷), p. 102.

⁴⁷ See, e. g., F. Kopečný, *Fundamentals of Czech Syntax* (note ²²), p. 98.

⁴⁸ Cf. I. Poldauf, *The Mechanism*... (note ⁴²), p. 3.

⁴⁹ These facts have been pointed out by other scholars (see notes ⁴⁷, ⁴⁸); they have had, however, to be recalled here for the sake of the comparison in hand.

⁵⁰ Cf. G. Kirchner, *Die zehn Hauptverben* ... (note ³⁶), p. XIV ff.

⁵¹ The forms of the shift towards nominal expression called forth by the increasing semantic dependence of the English verb on the context are so manifold that they would require a special study.

^{51a} The terminology employed here in regard to FSP is the same as that used in the first instalment (cf. p. 75).

⁵² Formed after B. Havránek and others, *A Text-Book*... (note ⁴⁴), p. 126.

⁵³ See B. Havránek and others, *A Text-Book*... (note ⁴⁴), p. 125.

⁵⁴ Cf. F. Kopečný, *Fundamentals of Czech Syntax* (note ²²), p. 98, and V. Mathesius, *Čeština a obecný jazykozpyt (The Czech Language and General Linguistics)*, Prague 1947, p. 197.

⁵⁵ With capitalization in *He* and *They*, quoted from the following respective pages and lines of the *Collected Stories of Katherine Mansfield* (note ¹¹), and of Katherine Mansfieldová, *Zahradní slavnost*, transl. by Hana Skoumalová and Aloys Skoumal, Vyšehrad, Prague 1952: 210.05/331.17, 211.30/333.12, 228.12/351.03.

⁵⁶ *Further Thoughts on the Communicative Function of the English Verb* to be published later (probably in the *Brno Studies in English*, Vol. II).

⁵⁷ See G. O. Curme, *A Grammar of the English Language III*, Boston 1931, p. 26 ff. Cf. also J. Macháček, *A Contribution to the Problem of the So-Called Copulas in Modern English*, *Philologica Pragensia* II/59, pp. 14—20.

⁵⁸ V. Mathesius, *O nominálních tendencích v slovesné predikaci novoanglické (On Nominal Tendencies in New English Verbal Predication)*, *Sborník filologický* 4/1913, pp. 325—339; J. Vachek, *Some Thoughts*... (note ¹⁷); J. Vachek, *Lingvistická charakteristika současné angličtiny (A Linguistic Characterology of Contemporary English)*, Prague 1958, pp. 101—111; M. Deutschbein, *Neuenglische Stylistik*, Leipzig 1932, pp. 137 ff.

⁵⁹ See note ⁵⁸ and also R. Barák, *Nominální tendence anglické predikace (Nominal Tendencies in English Predication)*, *Cizí jazyky ve škole* 2/1958, pp. 145—152.

⁶⁰ See J. Vachek, *Some Thoughts* ... (note ¹⁷), p. 63.

⁶¹ V. Mathesius, *Poznámky o tak zvané anglických větách neslovesných (Notes on the So-Called Ellipsis and on English Verbless Sentences)*, *Sborník filologický* 2/1911, pp. 215—234. See also J. Peprník, *Nominální věty v moderní anglické próze (Nominal Sentences in Modern English Prose)*, A Summary of a Doctoral Dissertation, *Časopis pro moderní filologii* 34/1950—1951, pp. 40—41.

⁶² V. Mathesius, op. cit., p. 219.

⁶³ V. Mathesius, op. cit., p. 225.

⁶⁴ We are well aware that verbless sentences are often resorted to as a special stylistic device. The fact, however, that English employs them on a larger scale than Czech (see the main text below) seems to be in connexion with the general character of English, which gives the shift towards nominal expression far greater play than Czech.

⁶⁵ See J. Vachek, *A Linguistic Characterology*... (note ⁵⁸), p. 90, and J. Peprník, op. cit., p. 41.

⁶⁶ On the primitive character of verbless sentences and on their dependence on the context, see F. Trávníček, *Neslovesné věty v češtině I (Verbless Sentences in Czech I)*, Opera Facultatis Philosophicae Universitatis Masarykianae Brunensis, No. 31, Brno 1930, p. 6.

⁶⁷ Cf. A. I. Smirnitckiy, *A Syntax*... (note ²⁹), p. 134.

⁶⁸ This is not at variance with the statement on the strikingly high frequency of condensators in English. On the contrary, it rather corroborates it. The frequent use of English infinitives, gerunds and participles as partial conveyers of predicative categories is doubtlessly due to their capability of performing this function. This is to say that though not fully and adequately, the English infinitives, gerunds and participles are capable of at least partially indicating the mentioned principal correlation of thought and reality. All this bears out the paramount importance of a fully adequate expression of this correlation.

⁶⁹ See *Universal Negation*... (note ⁹), p. 70.

⁷⁰ Cf. V. Mathesius, *Double Negation and Grammatical Concord, Mélanges van Ginneken*, Paris 1937, pp. 79 ff.

⁷¹ The decrease in the communicative value of the English verb is not so marked in cases where the negating *not* (*I do not call*) occurs within the verbal form. A comparison with Czech, however, would show that a certain amount of decrease is observed even here. This is due to the relative independence of the English negating *not* of the entire verbal form; the item *not* has to be regarded as a separate word, while its Czech counterpart *ne-* (*nevolám*) serves as an inseparable prefix (see J. Vachek, op. cit., p. 54). For lack of space, we cannot deal with this problem in greater detail.

⁷² Cf. the degrees of CD of the *hundreds of times* and *stokrát* in the following instances: *Největší překvapení cestovatele je, najde-li v cizí zemi to, o čem stokrát četl, nebo co stokrát viděl* (K. Čapek, *Anglické listy*, Borový, Prague 1947, p. 9); *The greatest surprise for a traveller is when he discovers in a foreign country what he has read about or seen in pictures hundreds of times* (K. Čapek, *Letters from England*, transl. by Paul Selver, Bles, London 1945, p. 10). The semantic relation between *hundreds of times/stokrát* and the verb *seen/viděl* is such as to allow the item coming second to attain a higher degree of CD; consequently, in English it is *hundreds of times*, but in Czech *viděl* that becomes rheme proper of the respective sentence. — For the mentioned relation between the adverb and the verb and for more comment on the quoted instances, see our *Thoughts on the Communicative Function of the Verb...* (see p. 74), pp. 14 ff. and 27, respectively.

DALŠÍ MYŠLENKY O KOMUNIKATIVNÍ FUNKCI ANGLICKÉHO SLOVESA

Článek zkoumá anglický posun od vyjadřování slovesného k vyjadřování jmennému a přičítá také k poměrům českým. Nulový stupeň tohoto posunu jeví ty případy, v nichž sloveso v aktu sdělení plní maximálně možný počet kvalitativně nejzávažnějších funkcí. Autor přitom zkoumá slovesné funkce z hlediska větné stavby mluvnické a sémantické, jakož i z hlediska funkční větné perspektivy. Z tohoto posledního hlediska plní sloveso kvalitativně nejzávažnější funkce tehdy, vystupuje-li jako nositel vlastního jádra. Z hlediska sémantického je funkce slovesa kvalitativně tím závažnější, čím větší kvantum významu je sloveso schopno tlumočit. Z hlediska gramatického pak jeho kvalitativní závažnost stoupá s počtem gramatických kategorií, které je schopno vyjadřovat. Jakékoli snížení kvality slovesné funkce nebo dokonce vyvážení slovesa z jisté funkce oslabuje komunikativní hodnotu slovesa a přispívá tak k posunu od slovesného vyjadřování.

Autor se pokouší podat půdorys posunu především v oblasti gramatické a sémantické. Zjišťuje, že se jak v angličtině, tak v češtině otvírají možnosti posunu k jmennému vyjadřování, ale že oba jazyky se od sebe kvalitativně liší ve stupni i způsobu jejich realizace.

Tak se v angličtině s daleko větším důrazem než v češtině uplatňuje tendence formálně vydělovat a neopakovat jednotlivé významové prvky (ať už gramatické nebo lexikální). Významová složka anglického slovesného tvaru se velmi intenzivně uvolňuje z funkce nositele čtyř základních kategorií (osoby, čísla, času a způsobu). Tak proti češtině je angličtina bohatá na slovesné tvary, v nichž významová složka přestala být nositelkou uvedených čtyř kategorií. Tím se významová složka dostává do blízkosti oblasti neslovesné. Tendence vydělovat a neopakovat jednotlivé významové prvky jde tak daleko, že někdy není anglický predikační slovesný tvar schopen vyjádřit osobu a číslo a přestává tak být verbem finitem v pravém slova smyslu. Přesto je však třeba zdůraznit, že i v angličtině zůstává sloveso nejadekvátnějším nositelem predikačních kategorií času a způsobu a tím i gramatickým centrem věty.

Posun k jmennému vyjadřování je v angličtině podporován i výběrem slovesných typů. Zvláště pozoruhodné k posunu přispívá velmi produktivní typ slovesných kombinací typu *stand up*, a to zejména tehdy, tvoří-li základní složku takových konstrukcí jedno z hojně se vyskytujících sémanticky slabých sloves, jako *get, make, put, take* atd. Postpositivní částice tu je do značné míry nositelkou lexikálních funkcí, vůbec se však formálně nepodílí na nositelství gramatických kategorií. To vede k oslabení komunikativní hodnoty slovesa, a to z hlediska jak lexikálního, tak funkční perspektivy větné. Náhorně to vysvětlit zvláště se srovnání popsaných slovesných kombinací s českými předponovými slovesy.

Při dalším posunu k jmennému vyjadřování se sloveso stává pouhým vyděleným nositelem gramatických kategorií; lexikální význam přechází na složky neslovesné. Přes tzv. větné kondensátory (hlavně přechodníky, infinitivy a gerundia) vede posun k větám neslovesným, v nichž je komunikativní hodnota slovesa nulová. Věty neslovesné však — i když

jsou v angličtině hojnější než v češtině — svou predikační neadekvátností ukazují na meze dané posunu k nominálnímu vyjadřování. Tyto meze jsou dány potřebou, aby v promluvě byl dostatečný počet predikačních slovesných tvarů, které jsou jedinými nositeli dvou nejzávažnějších predikačních kategorií (času a způsobu).

Naznačený posun má v angličtině také své důsledky v rovině funkční větné perspektivy. Semantické vyprazdňování anglického slovesa a jeho pevné postavení v slovním pořádku véde k tomu, že se anglické sloveso v daleko větší míře než sloveso české stává prostou složkou přechodovou. Je tedy zřejmé, že zřetelný posun k jmennému vyjadřování je v anglickém jazykovém systému způsoben zřetelným oslabováním komunikativní hodnoty anglického slovesa jak v oblasti gramatické a lexikální, tak i v oblasti funkční perspektivy větné.

ДАЛЬНЕЙШИЕ МЫСЛИ О КОММУНИКАТИВНОЙ ФУНКЦИИ АНГЛИЙСКОГО ГЛАГОЛА

Предлагаемая статья рассматривает сдвиг от глагольного способа выражения к именованному выражению в английском языке; она имеет в виду также положение в чешском языке.

Нулевую ступень в сдвиге от глагольного выражения к номинальному являют собою такие случаи, в которых глагол в акте сообщения выполняет в высшей степени возможное количество качественно наиболее значимых функций. При этом автор исследует глагольные функции с точки зрения грамматического и семантического строения предложения, а также с точки зрения функциональной перспективы предложения. С последней точки зрения глагол выполняет качественно наиболее значимую функцию тогда, если он выступает в качестве собственного ядра высказывания. С семантической точки зрения функция глагола тем значимее, чем больше количество значений, которые могут быть охвачены глаголом. Наконец, с грамматической точки зрения качественная значимость глагола увеличивается по мере того, как увеличивается количество грамматических категорий, которые он способен выражать. Любое понижение качества глагольной функции или даже упразднение определенной функции глагола ослабляет коммуникативную ценность глагола и способствует, таким образом, сдвигу от глагольного выражения.

Автор пытается исследовать явления сдвига прежде всего в грамматической и семантической областях. Он устанавливает, что как английская, так и чешская языковые системы располагают определенными возможностями сдвига к номинальному выражению, однако оба языка в качественном отношении отличаются друг от друга именно в степени и способе их реализации.

Так, в английском языке с гораздо большей силой, чем в чешском, имеет место тенденция формально выделить и не повторять отдельные значимые элементы (либо грамматического, либо лексического характера). Значимая составная часть английской глагольной формы весьма часто упраздняется из функции носителя четырех основных категорий (лица, числа, времени и наклонения). Таким образом, в отличие от чешского английский язык богат глагольными формами, в которых значимая составная часть перестала быть носителем указанных четырех категорий, и попадает в непосредственную близость к неглагольной области. Стремление к выделению и неповторению отдельных значимых элементов доходит иногда до того, что английская предикативная форма не способна выразить лицо и число и перестает быть, следовательно, определенной глагольной формой в настоящем смысле слова. Следует, однако, подчеркнуть, что английский глагол остается наиболее адекватным носителем предикативных категорий времени и наклонения и, тем самым, также грамматическим средоточием предложения.

Сдвиг к номинальному выражению в английском языке поддерживается также подбором глагольных типов. Особенно наглядно сдвигу способствует весьма продуктивный тип глагольных комбинаций типа stand up, особенно тогда, если основной компонент таких конструкций представлен одним из часто встречающихся семантически слабых глаголов, как-то get, make, put, take и т. д. Постпозитивный элемент в значительной степени является носителем лексических функций, однако он вовсе не принимает участия в формальном выражении грамматических категорий. Это влечет за собой ослабление коммуникативной ценности глагола, как с лексической точки зрения, так с точки зрения функциональной перспективы. Выказанный факт наглядным образом подтверждается в особенности при сравнении описанных глагольных комбинаций с чешскими приставочными глаголами.

При дальнейшем сдвиге к номинальному выражению глагол превращается в одного только выделенного носителя грамматических категорий; лексически значимое содержание же переходит при этом на неглагольные элементы. Через посредство так наз. конденсаторов предложения (главным образом деепричастий, инфинитивов и герундиев), осуществляется сдвиг к неглагольным предложениям, в которых коммуникативная ценность глагола является нулевой. Неглагольные предложения, однако, — хотя они в английском языке встречаются чаще, чем в чешском — благодаря своей предикативной неадекватности свидетельствуют о пределах сдвига к номинальному выражению. Они обусловлены потребностью наличия в высказывании достаточного количества предикативных глагольных форм, которые и являются единственно адекватными носителями двух наиболее важных, значимых предикативных категорий (времени и наклонения).

Отмеченный сдвиг в английском языке ведет также к определенным последствиям в плоскости функциональной перспективы предложения. Ослабление семантической нагрузки английского глагола и его прочное местоположение в порядке слов влечет за собой то обстоятельство, что английский глагол в гораздо большей мере, чем чешский глагол, становится простой переходной частью высказывания. Очевидно, что явный сдвиг в английской языковой системе к номинальному выражению вызывается отчетливым ослаблением коммуникативной ценности английского глагола, как в грамматической и лексической областях, так и в области функциональной перспективы предложения.

Неревел Роман Мразек