

Vachek, Josef

Some less familiar aspects of the analytical trend of English

Brno studies in English. 1961, vol. 3, iss. 1, pp. 9-74

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/118002>

Access Date: 02. 03. 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.

SOME LESS FAMILIAR ASPECTS OF THE ANALYTICAL TREND OF ENGLISH

A Prefatory Remark, p. 9. — I. Some Remarks on the Analytical Character of English, pp. 9–12. — II. The Status of the Word in Modern English, pp. 12–23. — III. The “Possessive Case” of Modern English, pp. 24–31. — IV. The Compactness of the Modern English Sentence, pp. 31–44. — V. The Oppositions of Quantity and Quality in Modern English Vowels, pp. 44–53. — VI. The Oppositions of Voice and Tension in Modern English Paired Consonants, pp. 53–60. — VII. The Eclipse of the Modern English Neutral Consonant, pp. 60–62. — Notes, pp. 63–71. — Souhrn, pp. 72–74. — Резюме, pp. 75–78.

A PREFATORY REMARK

The present study is an attempt at a synthesis of a number of our earlier observations scattered over various periodicals (some of which may be difficult of access for an English or American reader). The observations, together with some new propositions added to them, have been brought here under a common, unifying perspective. It is hoped that this common perspective may allow the reader to perceive the unity of the trend underlying the seemingly too variegated phenomena discussed in the individual chapters, and at the same time justify the inclusion into the study, though in a thoroughly revised and enlarged form, of some materials with which, as such, a number of our readers may be familiar.

I. SOME REMARKS ON THE ANALYTICAL CHARACTER OF ENGLISH

It has long been regarded as more or less commonplace that the grammatical system of Modern English [further abbreviated as ModE] is prevalently analytical, as opposed to the grammatical system of the Old English [OE] period which was still essentially synthetic. But the whole range of facts covered by this formula has not always been fully realized.

Not infrequently, the opposition of analytical vs. synthetic grammatical means is conceived of too narrowly, i. e. as concerning only the morphological level of language (mainly its declension and conjugation). (1) And yet it is quite obvious

that the syntactic level of language is no less affected by the above-said opposition. As evidence of this may be recalled the well-known fact that the position of the word within the sentence context is grammaticalized to a much higher degree in analytical than in synthetic languages.

But the matter does not end there. One can go further than this, as some scholars have duly pointed out: their conception of the opposition of analysis *vs.* synthesis is so wide as to include differences of lexical (more specifically, onomatological) order. Thus, e. g., a denomination like Lat. *senex* is qualified by them as synthetic, while the corresponding ModE denomination *an old man* ranks as analytical. (2) The question is, naturally, whether one should accept such semantic extension of the opposed terms. In itself, of course, the possibility of the application to the lexical plane of the opposition of 'analysis *vs.* synthesis' can hardly be questioned. Undoubtedly, the flourishing of the well-known analytical category of 'phrasal verbs' of the type *give up, put off, own up*, replacing the synthetic simple verbs of the type *surrender, postpone, confess* (3), bears an eloquent testimony to the presence and intensity of analytical tendencies in English onomatology. Likewise, the abundant and multi-form possibilities of the so-called conversion of word-categories in ModE (such as *the shepherd* > *to shepherd s. o., to know how* > *the know-how* etc.) furnish additional evidence to the capital importance of the English sentence context. Admittedly, in analytical language systems it is quite common for the sentence context to act as sole indicator of, e. g., the case function of a nominal word-form. In ModE, however, the sentence context is charged with even more numerous and more responsible functions, being often the sole indicator of whether a given word-form belongs to this or that word class (whether, e. g., it is to be interpreted as a noun or as a verb). On the other hand, in languages whose systems are commonly labelled as synthetic (as, e. g., in most Slavonic languages) the sentence context hardly ever performs the function of a sole indicator of that kind. Obviously, such facts cannot but endorse the opinion of those who plead for the extension of the terms of 'analytical *vs.* synthetic language means' on to the lexical plane of language.

For all that, however, it must be admitted that research into the mutual relation of analysis and synthesis in the lexical plane of English will have to tackle, at least for some time to come, no small difficulties. With the highly mixed structure of the ModE stock of words and with many theoretical and practical problems of lexicological research still to be solved, it appears advisable, at least for the time being, to limit the application of the said dichotomy to the grammatical level of language, i. e. to morphology and syntax.

Even if one accepts this limited applicability of the two opposed terms, a fairly large number of problems calls for examination, despite the fact that in the grammatical plane of English the drift from the synthetic to the analytical type of grammatical structure is quite obvious. (4) Among the unsettled problems perhaps the best known is the vexed question of the number of declension cases in English, the numbers suggested ranging from one to six or seven. (5) But even if no generally accepted solution of this problem (and a number of others) has yet been agreed upon, (6) the involved facts and the general analytical tendencies underlying them are widely known and established beyond any doubt. On the other hand, the English analytical drift has some implications that are not quite evident to an average observer but stand out with reasonable clearness to those linguists who regard language as a system of systems. As this view of language is also held by the present writer, it will be found useful to state here, as briefly as possible, some basic principles which are involved in an approach of the kind.

If language is defined as a system of systems, (7) this naturally implies, first of all, the existence in language of a number of levels or planes, each of which is characterized by its own specific structure and its own specific problems (the most important planes being commonly denoted as phonic, grammatical, and lexical). But the systematic character of language certainly implies more than the fact that each of such planes constitutes a more or less (but, needless to say, never absolutely) balanced system. Even more characteristic of language is the circumstance that each of such planes is more or less closely interlinked with the other planes. As a matter of fact, it is only the existence of such mutual interrelations that can justify the above-mentioned definition of language as a system of systems. Obviously, the existence of such interrelations entails some important consequences, one of which is especially worth noting.

If all language planes are more or less interdependent, it logically follows that a change in one of the planes may call forth one or more changes in another plane (or in more planes) of the concerned language system. It is true, of course, that within the grammatical plane of language some interdependence of the levels of morphology and syntax has never been denied, and that numerous instances of this interdependence were displayed by many scholars. Still, consistent approach of language on the lines indicated here may discover more items of the kind (in our chapters II, III and IV an attempt is made at presenting some such interdependences as are often overlooked).

Even more interesting proves to be the question of the interdependence of the phonic and grammatical planes. Here again, it might be objected that the idea is hardly a new one — that, indeed, this kind of interdependence had been acknowledged long before language came to be regarded as a system of systems. Thus, e. g., it has long been a commonplace point of historical grammar of numerous languages that the reduction (and, ultimately, loss) of vowels in unstressed syllables made an essential contribution towards the rebuilding of the synthetic grammatical structure into a structure based on analytical principles. In such cases one obviously has to do with an impact of the changes in the phonic plane upon the structure of the grammatical plane. We willingly grant this; what we would like to stress, however, is that such interrelations of language planes cannot be interpreted as acting in one direction only. On the contrary, from time to time instances pointing to the opposite direction of influence may be detected in languages. In such cases the structure of the phonic plane appears to have been affected by changes, actual or even only imminent, in the "higher" planes of language (lexicological and/or grammatical).

Cases of the interdependence working this other way were decidedly unknown to pre-structuralist study of language, and even structurally-minded scholars may be said not to have paid due regard to them. In the Chapters V—VII of the present treatise an attempt is made at an examination of some specimens of such interdependence, affecting the systems of English vowel and consonant phonemes. Prior to its discussion, however, it is necessary to note, as briefly as possible, some essential points concerning our conception of language and of the development of the latter.

In the first place, in our opinion no conception of language (and, consequently, of the development of language) can be true to facts unless it takes into account the basic function of language, i. e. its task to act as a means of mutual understanding among the members of the given language community. In order to fulfil this task, language must possess adequate means so as to cope with all needs and wants of communication existing or arising within the community. As a matter of fact, one can say that, at least to a considerable extent, the development of language consists

in adapting the means of language to the ever-changing, ever-increasing tasks to be faced by language. For this reason, the student of language should never lose sight of the mutual interdependence of form and meaning in the examined language system.

In the second place, in tracing the development of language one should not overlook the part occasionally played in it by factors of external order, such as important political, economic, and cultural events. (8) Admittedly, the operation of such external factors becomes regularly and directly reflected in the lexical plane of language. In some, though much less frequent situations, such extra-linguistic factors may indirectly affect even the grammatical and/or phonic plane of the concerned language system. In instances of that kind one has to do with a particular kind of impact, by which the changing structure of the outside world (of the "extra-linguistic reality", as it is often called) enforces a change in the structure of the language system. Such impact can be clearly observed in the development of some languages: a classic specimen may be found in English, whose phonic and grammatical structure were subjected to changes that can be attributed, at least to some extent, to the indirect influence exercised upon English by French in the centuries following the important historical event known as the Norman Conquest and its political, economic and cultural consequences.

Finally, it should always be kept in mind that the primary, and the only indispensable, aspect of language is the spoken one, (9) that is, one should never forget that all forms of language become primarily implemented (or, made manifest) by sounds produced by the organs of speech and perceived by the organs of hearing. The necessary consequence of this fact is that the phonematic development of language must conform to the laws governing the activities of human articulatory mechanism and/or those of human auditory perception. In other words, no phonematic change can occur unless it is phonetically feasible (e. g., it is extremely unlikely that in any language a vowel might be capable of a direct change into a voiceless consonant). As a result of this, one has to admit that there is another important relation that should be taken into account by the student of language, viz. the one existing between the phonic plane of language on the one hand, and what might be called the material and technical pre-requisites of its implementation on the other. For this reason, we find it only too obvious that phonematics and phonetics should co-operate, for all the basic difference in their specific objectives.

So much for the three main principles that had to be touched upon here so that our approach to some major problems of language and its development might stand out with reasonable clearness. It should only be added that this approach is roughly identical with that of the Prague group, whose ideas, though necessarily modified in a number of points, have proved to be a reliable basis for actual research-work not only in the synchronistic but also in the diachronistic study of language. (10) It may only be added that the said approach may reveal some interesting implications of the analytical drift of English which, as such, are not quite evident to an average observer. It will be found that exactly these less obvious implications of that drift will be the subject of our attention in the following chapters.

II. THE STATUS OF THE WORD IN MODERN ENGLISH

The implication to be discussed at first (11) is of general character. It is concerned with the status of the word as a linguistic unit: it appears that this status in ModE is appreciably different from the status of the word in Slavonic languages (and in

synthetic languages, including Old English, in general). It appears, too, that the change in the status of the English word has been effected by the wholesale rebuilding of the grammatical structure of English from what was essentially a synthetic system into one that is prevalently analytical. Throughout our analysis we will combine the synchronistic and the historical methods of approach; Czech, and occasionally other Slavonic languages, will supply materials for synchronistic comparison.

In discussing the involved issues, it is imperative to lay down some preliminary remarks about the old problem of the existence of the word. In attacking the problem, one should carefully keep apart what may be called its semantic aspect and its formal aspect. Semantically, the existence of the word has always been regarded as more or less obvious; much less so, however, has always seemed the existence of the word if considered from the formal aspect. Not infrequently voices could be heard that acknowledged the word as a purely semantic category, not as a formal one.

Opinions of that kind were mostly voiced by some of the phoneticians of the last quarter of the nineteenth and the early part of the twentieth centuries (to give only one example out of many, let us recall Henry Sweet's practice, dividing transcribed utterances not into words but into what is called stress-groups). (12) After all, this kind of approach may not seem particularly startling in the writings of a phonetician of seven or more decades ago. Contrary to this, the present-day functionalist conception of language, regarding as the foremost task of language that of being the instrument of mutual communication, is very deeply aware of the close ties linking up what is casually denoted as form and function in language (i. e. the phonic make-up of the examined utterances on the one hand and the reference to some extra-linguistic reality on the other; it is perhaps unnecessary to emphasize that this reality, prior to its expression by means of language, has been mediated and organized by thinking). Consequently, to a functionalistically-minded student of language the acknowledgement of the word as a semantic category will necessarily imply, more or less, also its acknowledgement as a formal category.

It will, therefore, come as something like a surprise to find the word branded as a "pre-scientific term" in a paper written by a theoretician of grammar in the late nineteen-fifties. The author of the paper, F. Mikuš of Ljubljana (13), is convinced that all grammatical structure of language can be reduced to syntagmatic relations of the type 'determinans — determinandum'. In his opinion, it is only these relations that matter, and the question whether the terms of any such relation are expressed by separate words or by parts of one and the same word is formulated wrongly, as it is concerned with things that are irrelevant to the essence of language. Mikuš believes, e. g., that there is no substantial difference between the elements of the English verbal form *I sing*, French *je chante* on the one hand, and the elements of Latin *cant-ō*, Russian *пой-у*, Cz. *zpív-ám*, etc., on the other hand: in each of the two categories, so he argues, we have to do with the relation of a determinandum (*sing*, *chante*, *cant-*, *пой-*, *zpív-*) and a determinans (*I*, *je*, *-ō*, *-u*, *ám*).

It is, of course, obvious that here Mikuš underestimates the important difference marking off the instances of the two above-mentioned categories, although he is certainly not unaware of it. It is the difference in firmness with which the component elements of the discussed verbal forms cling to one another: while in the above-quoted Latin, Russian and Czech instances the two elements cannot be separated by any other inserted element, capable of existing independently of them, the elements composing the English and French instances can easily undergo such separation (see, e. g., *I very often sing*, *je le lui chante*).

There is, however, one point in which Mikuš's argument has proved most helpful —

it has revealed what is perhaps the most abundant source of misunderstandings among the scholars attacking the problem of the word. It is the lack of any universally accepted definition of the word, and the consequent application of this term by different scholars to different sections of the current of speech (*la chaîne parlée*). As a result of this lack of agreement, scholars like Mikuš see no essential difference between the sequences of *cant-ō* and *je chante*, and one can even find statements to the effect that French sequences like *je le lui ai dit* are to be regarded just as "synthetic" as Latin *dedi* or *dedissem*. (14) Most probably it was this lack of unanimity and the fact of many conflicting statements concerning the limits of words which acted as a major motive underlying Mikuš's nihilistic approach of the problem of the word. Unfortunately, no problem has ever been solved by pretending that it does not exist, especially an urgent one. And the urgency of the problem of the word cannot be seriously doubted: it is obvious from the important implications the solution of the problem has not only for linguistic theory but even for linguistic practice — if for no other reason, then for the approval or disapproval of the common graphical device which has long acknowledged the real or supposed word limits by introducing the spaces between written or printed words.

Incidentally, the fact that in most language communities the introduction of such spaces only took place in the course of their historical development, must have been motivated by the need to give some graphical expression to what was commonly recognized as a linguistic fact, i. e. as a fact not only of semantic, but also of formal order. — This argument, of course, could be opposed by insisting on the purely semantic function of those spaces in the written and printed contexts. Admittedly, we ourselves lay much stress on the ability of the written utterance "to speak quickly and distinctly to the eyes"; (15) one could easily show by a simple experiment how slow and indistinct the perception (and, consequently, the understanding) of a written utterance is due to become if the spaces should be abolished. We willingly admit this fact; but on the other hand we think it fair to insist on the presence, in the corresponding spoken utterance, of some acoustic features whose task is again to signalize word-limits, and so to enable the spoken utterance to speak quickly and distinctly to the ears. (16) Even if such acoustic signals do not function so automatically as, and are more manifold in character than, the optical signals of spaces between written or printed words, their existence is not open to doubt: without them a spoken utterance would be as slow and as indistinct to follow as its corresponding written utterance with space signals abolished. It appears, then, that the introduction of space signals into the written utterances must have been at least co-motivated by the presence of the acoustic signals marking off words in spoken utterances, or, to put the thing differently, that even the spoken word is not merely a semantic but also a formal phenomenon.

* * *

Conformably to what has been said above, the central issue to be tackled is the definition of the word. Quite a number of such definitions have been suggested by various scholars; three of the number will be commented here, however briefly. According to one of them the criterion of whether a section of speech current can or cannot be allotted the status of a word is its ability (or, respectively, inability) to function as a sentence. This solution of the problem of the word was proposed, among others, by the Anglo-American scholars L. Bloomfield and L. R. Palmer. (17, 18) It is, however, very doubtful whether the said criterion can really cover

all cases involved. Two objections may be raised against it, one of which is of practical, another of a general, theoretical character.

First, there is the problem of the so-called synsemantic speech elements, i. e. of elements whose meaning is essentially formal and which can refer to the extralinguistic reality only in an indirect manner, i. e. if they are attached to some autosemantic element (noun, verb, etc.). Do such synsemantic elements rank as independent words or not? One can certainly imagine practical instances of prepositions functioning as independent sentences (Palmer himself is quoting some such cases), but it is undoubtedly very hard to think of a sentence containing nothing but a conjunction (instances quoted by Bloomfield are not convincing enough), at least as long as one keeps within the limits of linguistic, not metalinguistic materials. And yet, hardly any linguist would venture to deny the word status of conjunctions.

It is a well-known fact that in metalinguistic materials sentences containing nothing but conjunctions may be easily found. Thus, e. g., *And* is answer to a question like *Which is the commonest copulative conjunction in English?* — Still, metalinguistic materials are by no means conclusive; one might prove by them, e. g., the word status of suffixes, phonemes etc. — see, e. g., answers to questions like *What is the ending of the English gerund?* or, *What is the high front checked vowel of Modern English?* The absurdity of such evidence is manifest — *Qui nimium probat, nihil probat.*

The other objection to Bloomfield's and Palmer's criterion is of more general, and perhaps more fundamental character. It is difficult to see why the word status of a section of speech current should be dependent on the ability of that section to function in the capacity of a sentence. In our opinion, those who insist upon this ability overlook the fact that the specific functions of the word and the sentence are basically different. As is generally admitted, the function of the word is essentially onomatological, i. e. the word is primarily used to name the facts of extralinguistic reality (facts in the broadest sense of the word, including the relations of such facts), while the *raison d'être* of the sentence is to predicate, i. e. to convey some information about that extra-linguistic reality, to word the speaker's approach of that reality. This functional distinction naturally does not exclude the possibility of a number of instances in which a word taken by itself can predicate, i. e., can act as a sentence. But it should certainly warn us against the unwarranted assumption that any word taken by itself must possess an independent predicational function. As a matter of fact, sentences consisting of one single word are cases more or less exceptional, just as words containing one single phoneme. And exactly as the occasional ability of the phoneme to act as an independent word cannot be included in the list of conditions guaranteeing its phonematic status, so the occasional occurrence in the capacity of a sentence cannot be entered into the list of conditions guaranteeing the word status of a section of speech current. So much, then, about the first of the three suggested word definitions with which we are concerned here.

The second of the three definitions was proposed by Vilém Mathesius almost half a century ago. (19) In his opinion, the word is the smallest section of the speech current which is not bound in any way upon other such sections. The natural consequence of this conception is that the words composing the sentence are, at least to a degree, separable from one another. In some languages they are even more or less able to exchange their places within the sentence (this happens, e. g., in many Slavonic languages and, in general, in languages of synthetic grammatical structure), in others they can at least be separated from one another by the insertion of another such section of the speech current (this can be found in analytical languages, such as, e. g., in English or French).

It will be noted that Mathesius' definition is purely formal, containing no reference to semantic factors. In this point it may be regarded objectionable, in view of what has been said above about the close ties linking up form and meaning in language. But this defect can be easily remedied, if the term "section of the speech current", found in Mathesius' definition, is brought into due relation to meaning. This can be effected by re-defining the word as "an utterance section that refers to some correlate in the extra-linguistic reality 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 section."

In this improved form the given definition appears to be able to cope with the most essential aspects of the problems of the word. But it would be naïve to suppose that it can remove all doubts and throw sufficient light on all aspects of the given problem. Conditions found in different languages are too multiform to allow of a straightforward application of one and the same formula to all of them. This proviso may already be seen to show through the very wording of the above-quoted definition. The wording had to be formulated so as to cover the facts both of the synthetic and of the analytical types of language structures. Undoubtedly, there is much to commend the cautious statement made not long ago by C. E. Bazell, the third of the scholars whose approach to the problem of the word shall be discussed here.

In one of his more recent papers concerned with our problem (20) C. E. Bazell urges that "it is impossible to give *general* criteria of word-unity, applicable *without modification* to each separate language" (italics of C.E. Bazell). In a sense, one can heartily subscribe to his assertion that "each language has its own special criteria" of word-unity, and that "the units which pass under the title of 'word' in different languages are not exactly the same sort of unit, though they are similar" (l. c., p. 28). As a matter of fact, what has been specified above in the improved form of Mathesius' definition constitutes hardly more than a major criterion of word-unity; the application of this criterion to concrete language situations will necessarily be subject to a number of modifications.

It appears, then, that Bazell's idea of the necessity to solve the problem of the word for each language separately is basically sound. It is, of course, necessary to follow his trend of thought further, and to try to find out the kinds of difference that can be ascertained in comparing individual languages, as well as to trace the motives underlying such difference. Undoubtedly, results of more definite shape can only be reached after mutual comparison of a large number of concrete languages of various types has been carried through. Such extensive investigation will naturally require collective cooperation of tens, if not hundreds, of scholars. At the present stage of the work hardly more can be done than attempts, however individual and isolated, at a comparison of those languages which the investigator feels more or less competent to handle. For all their limited scope, such attempts may prove not quite unfruitful, especially if they analyse languages of sufficiently different structural types. The preliminary results of such research appear to show that the solution of the problem of the word and the establishment of the criteria for finding out the limits of words in a given language is closely dependent on (if not wholly determined by) the structural situation existing in the system of that language. We believe these results to be in full agreement with Bazell's statement according to which "conformity to the private word-pattern of the individual language is,

so to speak, the final touch, presupposing that some general conditions of word status, common to all languages, have already been fulfilled" (l. c., p. 27).

In the following sections of this chapter we will try to show some interesting results that may be gained by a mutual comparison of Modern English and two Slavonic languages, Czech and Russian. The data from which we shall be drawing our conclusions mostly go back to the studies of other Czechoslovak scholars, among whom especially the names of V. Mathesius, B. Havránek, B. Trnka, V. Skalička, F. Kopečný, and J. Firbas should be gratefully mentioned. Virtually all of them base their work on the functionalist and structuralist principles held by the so-called Prague Linguistic Group.

* * *

Within the narrow limits of the present comment we must confine our observation to three or four points which appear to be particularly characteristic of the structural differences ascertainable between English and our two Slavonic languages. We do not pretend of submitting facts hitherto unnoticed; all of them are what may be called commonplace. All we can claim is the presentation of these facts in such connections and confrontations as are frequently overlooked.

The first of the points concerns the relation of the word to the word-group. Analyses of equivalent contexts in English and our Slavonic languages reveal that in the latter languages, whose grammatical systems are admittedly highly synthetic, the opposition of the word to the word-group is much more definite and clearcut than in English whose grammatical system is based on analytical principles. The difference is best illustrated by confronting English and our Slavonic languages in the matter of the so-called quotational compounds of the type *never-to-be-forgotten*, *out-of-the-world*, *stick-in-the-mud* etc. As is well known, in such compounds one is faced with a word-group that has been taken out of its semantic environment (in which it was performing some specific syntactic functions) and transferred to a different semantic environment in which its syntactic function has been altogether changed — it has come to be used there in such functions as might easily be performed by one single word unit. And it is certainly remarkable that exactly such single word-units must be used in translating such quotational compounds into our Slavonic languages in which, as far as our evidence goes, instances of quotational compounds are virtually non-existent. See, e. g., English *a never-to-be-forgotten event* — Cz. *nezapomenutelná událost*, R. *nezabyvaemyy sluchay*; E. *an out-of-the-world place* — Cz. *zapadlé místo*, R. *zakhlostnoe mesto*. If in our Slavonic languages such a quotational compound is rendered by a word-group, the members of this word-group regularly preserve their grammatical independence and do not become welded into a compound, see E. *ship-to-shore communication* — Cz. *spojení lodi s pobřežím*, R. *svyaz' sudna s beregom*; E. *the ten-fifty-two train* — Cz. *vlak odjíždějící v deset padesát dva*, R. *poezd otkhadyashchiy v desyat' chasov pyat'desyat' dva*.

As is well known, in some instances even a whole English sentence can be handled in the described manner: *He is a let-me-alone-with-your-nonsense companion* — Cz. *On je nedůtklivý společník*, R. *On shchekotlivyy tovarishch*; E. *He is an I-won't-to-be-opposed person* — Cz. *To je člověk, který nesnese odpor*, R. *Eto chelovek neterpyashchiy soprotivleniya*. The lengthiest instance of the type we have come across appears in Jerome K. Jerome's *Three Men in a Boat* — it extends over too printed lines: *There is a sort of Oh-what-a-wicked-world-this-is-and-how-I-wish-I-could-do-something-to-make-it-better-and-nobler expression about Montmorency...* In Czech and Russian the same idea can only be expressed by a dependent, non-adjectivized clause: *Mont-*

morencyho výraz jako by říkal: "Ach, jak špatný je tento svět...". Montmoransi kak budto govorit: "Akh, do chego zhe plokh etot mir...".

It will have been observed that the instances so far quoted occur in the capacity of adjectival attributes; one can, however, also find quotational compounds functioning as nouns, e. g. *the merry-go-round* — Cz. *kolotoč*, R. *karusel'*; a *never-do-well* — Cz. *ničema*, R. *negodyay*. (21)

A closer look at English quotational compounds will reveal their structural ambiguity. From the purely phonematic point-of-view, they hardly differ from the word sequences to which they owe their origins. But it will be readily admitted that the morphematic structure of quotational compounds is markedly opposed to the morphematic structural pattern of "normal" derived words or "normal" compounds, in both of which a regular kind of hierarchy of stems and affixes can be detected without much difficulty. The elements composing the morphematic patterns of quotational compounds, however, enter a hierarchy of a different kind, whose syntactic origin is still clearly felt in by far the greatest number of instances. — On the other hand, evidence can be given of their being no longer evaluated as word sequences but as word-units, however complex and extraordinary in more than one respect. Thus, e. g., in at least the more common quotational compounds the stress patterns of the original word-sequences have been re-arranged so as to suggest an idea of single word-units. While, e. g., in the non-compound sequences *I met* ¹*Jack in the box*, *I saw them* ¹*stick in the mud* we find each non-formal element of the word-group provided with its own stress, in the corresponding quotational compounds the number of such stresses is drastically reduced: ¹*jack-in-the-box*, ¹*stick-in-the-mud*. (22) — Another very important piece of evidence in the said direction is the ability of at least some substantival quotational compounds to annex the inflexional ending of the plural to the last, originally non-substantival element of the sequence, see cases like *merry-go-rounds*, *never-do-wells*.

At this moment it may be useful to point out an important difference ascertainable between English and Czech. It was said here earlier that in Czech (and, for that matter, in other Slavonic languages as well) hardly any quotational compounds may be found. This statement is perfectly true; yet it should be added that some of the Czech compounds reveal features that make them more or less resemble the compounds of the English quotational type. There is, that is to say, a group of Czech compounds, mostly technical terms, that have clearly originated from syntactic groupings, and are now positively regarded as single word-units. See, e. g., *zemětřesení* 'earthquake', *děkuvzdání* 'thanksgiving', *zmrtvýchvstání* 'resurrection', and a number of others. With the English quotational type *never-to-be-forgotten*, *stick-in-the-mud* they have in common the specific morphematic patterns reminding of their syntactic origins; in addition to this, they also show the re-arrangement of the original stress-patterns (each of the above Czech compounds has one principal stress only, the other of the original main stresses having been reduced to a secondary degree: ¹*zemětřesení*). The compounds, in addition to this, are also declinable (this is best seen in their Instrumental forms: *zemětřesením*, *děkuvzdáním*, *zmrtvýchvstáním*).

On the other hand, the examined Czech expressions differ from the English quotational compounds in some very important respects. First, as has already been observed, they usually represent technical terms; the type to which they belong is a traditional, non-productive one, which is in striking contrast with the English quotational compounds, most of which are *ad hoc* formations, and except for isolated instances like *the forget-me-not*, of hardly any terminological, traditional colouring. The most essential difference, however, is a formal one: the structural pattern of

the examined Czech compounds is decidedly nominal, their determined element being a verbal noun, while their determining element is a case form of some other noun or adjective. Contrary to this, the structural pattern of the English quotational compounds is very multifiform, sometimes containing even finite verb forms the absence of which in the examined Czech compounds is most conspicuous.

This, of course, by no means implies that verbal components are unknown in Czech compounds. Although they are not particularly frequent, a number of them can be registered (see, e. g., *kazimír* 'peace-breaker', *neznaboh* 'atheist', *virtichvost* 'flatterer'). But such compounds fall short of the quotational type, because the verbal components in them are confined to bare stems (*kazi-*, *nezna-*, *vrti-*). On the other hand, there is a number of Czech compounds in which the verbal component can really be identified with a finite verb form, mostly with the imperative (see, e. g., *tlučhuba* 'braggard', *držgrešle* 'miser'). Even such compounds, however, cannot be classified as really quotational because they are not formally identical with the word-sequences from which they have originated (the groups being *tluč hubou* 'beat about with your mouth', *drž grešli* 'hold the penny'). The reason why the latter component part of the compound changed its form is obvious — this was done in order to make the compound declinable, i. e. to make its ending conform to that of the paradigm to which it was to be assigned. Consequently, it appears that it is exactly the effort to make such compounds declinable which can be denoted as the ultimate cause of the virtual lack of quotational compounds in Czech (and most probably in other Slavonic languages as well). It is hardly a matter of mere coincidence that English, which has totally discarded its original richness in inflexional paradigms, has at the same time become so favourably disposed towards the rise of quotational compounds.

Out of the very few instances of genuine quotational compounds that can be found in Czech we want to discuss one which presents some interesting features. It is the noun *budižkničemu* ('good-for-nothing', literally 'be-to-nothing'). The comparison of the Czech compound with its semantic (and partly also formal) English equivalent is not devoid of interest. It shows that while the English expression may take on the plural ending (*he is one of the silliest good-for-nothings I have ever met*), the Czech word is very often undeclinable, standing so in sharp contrast to the compounds of the type *tlučhuba*, *držgrešle* analysed above. The frequent lack of declension in the Czech word *budižkničemu* is very symptomatic: it stigmatizes that word as belonging to the grammatical periphery of the language system of Czech, while the English quotational compounds have clearly succeeded in getting appreciably nearer the grammatical centre of their own language system. (23)

To turn back to our main issue, we can draw the following conclusion from our above analysis. All facts discussed here show conclusively that the English quotational compounds should be classified as a transitional category: although they possess some of the typical features of the word, by a number of other features they still remind one of a word-group. It is equally clear that in Czech (and most probably also in other Slavonic languages and synthetic languages in general) no such transitional category can be ascertained; there the border-line separating the categories of words and word-groups stands out with much greater clearness than the analogous border-line in an analytical language like English. And of course there can be no doubt that this difference in clearness of the two border-lines must be reflected in some differences in the definitions of the word formulated for the compared languages.

* * *

But the difference described above is not the only one of the kind that can be established between English on the one hand and Czech and Russian on the other. (24) An analogous difference in the distinctness of border-lines can be found between the word on the one hand and the sentence on the other. The nature of the difference can be demonstrated, among other things, by the comparison of the uses of prepositions in English and our two Slavonic languages. While in the latter the preposition can only govern a noun (or a nominal phrase), in English, as is commonly known, it can govern whole clauses, especially the relative ones; see, e. g., instances like *He will go to where I was last year. I do not object to what you say. In Britain tickets may be obtained from what are called the ticket-agencies.* Etc. etc. In the Slavonic languages, as far as we are aware, a preposition can never govern a clause, at least not directly. Thus, e. g., the second of the above English instances would have the following Czech and Russian equivalents: *Nemám nic proti tomu, co říkáte* — *Ya ne vozrazhayu protiv togo chto vy govorite.* — In the other two instances the Czech and Russian sentence patterns are more different from those found in English but again in none of them a preposition governs a clause: *Pojede tam, kde já jsem byl loni* — *On poedet tuda gde ya byl v proshlom godu. V Británii lze lístky dostat v tzv. předprodejích* — *V Velikobritánii bilety možno poluchit v t.-naz. biletnykh agentstvakh.*

The existence in English of this use of prepositions may seem rather striking at first sight, because it does not seem to be in accordance with one of the leading tendencies of that language, viz. with its trend towards nominal expression. But the contradiction is only an apparent one, as will be shown by the following consideration. The fact that the preposition, usually governing a noun, governs a clause considered as one whole, naturally results in establishing relatively close links between any two neighbouring members of that clause, links that are not quite unlike those uniting the elements of a quotational compound. Still, in such a clause the compactness of the whole is distinctly smaller than in the compound, as can be inferred from the absence of modifications of stress-pattern, such as have been observed above in the type *jack-in-the-box, stick-in-the-mud.* It is also worth noting that an English clause, even if forming a compact whole, is unable to take on the ending of the plural which, as was shown above, may be added to many quotational compounds without any difficulty.

On the other hand, it is certainly remarkable that in some circumstances the English clause, even if not governed by a preposition, may become so compact as to furnish a basis of derivation effected by means of a suffix. Specimens of the kind are provided by the often-quoted instances *the I don't knowish expression of his face,* and even *the man I saw yesterday's hat.* (25) However rare such formations may be, they are none the less worthy of notice: the very fact of their existence necessarily presupposes a specific kind of condition within the English grammatical system. This kind of condition may be worded in the following manner: Like the border-line between the categories of the word and the word-group, also the border-line between the categories of the word and the sentence stands out less clearly in English than in Czech (and, for that matter, in Russian), although, as has been pointed out above, the degree to which this latter border-line has been obscured is appreciably less conspicuous than the degree ascertainable in the former border-line.

Incidentally, it is worth mentioning that the different structural relations of the word and the sentence in English and our Slavonic languages appear to be correlated with the difference of what may be termed the amount of semantic independence of the word within the sentence. By the latter term we mean the ability of the word, taken out of its syntactic context, to convey a clear, unambiguous information of

the particular meaning to which it refers. If we compare, with this view in mind, an English sentence of medium length with its Czech or Russian equivalent it will be readily found that the Czech and Russian words, if taken out of their syntactic contexts, convey a much clearer idea of their semantic content than their English counterparts. This can be demonstrated on a common conversational utterance like *Be so kind as to pass me the salt, please*, compared with its Slavonic equivalents *Bud'te tak laskav, prosim, a podejte mi sůl — Bud'te tako lyubeznyy, pozhaluysta, i podayte mne sol'*. The majority of the English words, taken by themselves, are much more ambiguous than their Czech and Russian counterparts (cp., e. g., *be — bud'te, bud'te; kind — laskav, lyubeznyy; pass — podejte, podayte*).

It has long been a commonplace of English philology that the full meaning of any English word can only be established with the help of the syntactic context in which the word is placed; the phenomena of the so-called conversion of word-categories in English, showing the immense importance of the syntactic context in that language, have already been referred to above (see p. 10). In Czech and Russian, on the other hand, the role of the context, though also present, plays a decidedly lesser part, which is in conformity with the notorious fact that the importance of the conversion of words in the Slavonic languages is all but negligible. Last but not least, one should recall the relatively high degree of the ability of Czech and Russian words to exchange their places within the sentence without a fundamental change of their meaning; in the semantically equivalent English sentence an analogous exchange of places would be far more difficult to carry out, if possible at all.

All the facts discussed here appear then to corroborate our diagnosis concerning the difference in clearness with which the grammatical categories of the word and the sentence are delimited within the respective English and Slavonic grammatical systems. This difference, obviously, will also have to be reckoned with in defining the word in these languages.

* * *

So far we have been comparing English and our Slavonic languages with regard to the distinction between the word and some linguistic categories of an order higher than the word (word-group, sentence). It is now time to turn our attention down the scale, i. e. to the distinction existing in the compared languages between the word and a category of a lower order, i. e. morphemes, especially affixes. It will be found that, here again, conditions in English are strikingly different from those found in Czech and Russian.

To begin with, let us once more recall the above-quoted instances of the type *the I don't knowish expression of his face* and *the man I saw yesterday's hat*. In the preceding section of the present chapter such instances were commented upon as evidence pointing to the relative obscurity of the border-line delimiting the categories of word and sentence in English. They can, however, serve equally well as evidence of the relative obscurity in that language of another important border-line, viz. the one delimiting the categories of word and affix. Anyone familiar with Czech or Russian is clearly aware of the fact that no instances of the above type can be established in these two languages. The reason of the absence of this type in them is not only the clear-cut border-line found in Czech and Russian between the categories of word and sentence but also an equally clear-cut border-line between the categories of word and affix.

In our two Slavonic languages (and most probably in any language of synthetic grammatical structure) affixes are bound to function within the limits of the word

only; the joining of an affix to a word-group or even to a sentence is quite unthinkable there. In English, on the other hand, such joining is perfectly legitimate provided that some semantic conditions have been complied with (see the well-known specimens of the type *the ex-Prime Minister, the Anti-Corn Law League, old maidish*, etc., to which may be added the notorious instances of the so-called Group-Genitive like *Jacob and Esau's quarrel, the King of England's rights and privileges*, etc.; in the latter cases, and in all instances of the Possessive Case, 's does not function as a case ending but rather as a suffixal element. (27) Clearly, in English the affixes are much less constrained in their functioning than in Czech or Russian, and although in the vast majority of instances they function within the limits of one word, a number of cases can be found in which they become combined with higher units. In our opinion this fact furnishes convincing evidence for the statement that the mutual relation of English words and affixes is much looser than the analogous relation in Czech or Russian, and that, consequently, the border-line marking off the two English categories is again less distinct than the one marking off their Slavonic counterparts.

* * *

All that has been said here so far amounts to the ascertainment in the structural make-up of English of a markedly liberal approach to some traditional grammatical distinctions which in Czech and Russian (and probably in synthetic languages in general) are rather meticulously observed. To this may be added another interesting liberal feature of English which is again basically alien to our Slavonic languages. It concerns the amalgamation of parts of existing words (or, better, of parts of word-stems) for the purpose of denoting new meanings (or new shades of meaning). Traditional linguistic nomenclature denotes such amalgamation by the term 'blending' (see, e. g., *brunch* < *breakfast* + *lunch*, *smog* < *smoke* + *fog*, *chortle* < *chuck* + *snortle*, etc.). The fact itself has, of course, been known for decades, but its linguistic importance does not seem to have been fully realized so far. In our opinion, the process of blending is most remarkable not only for its deliberate violation and negligence of morphematic limits existing in the source words from which the new, blended word arises, (28) but especially for its flat dismissal of the formal and semantic lexical limits marking off the two source words.

It should be emphasized that the process of blending differs fundamentally from the processes giving rise to 'trunk words' (e. g., *pants* < *pantaloons*, *bus* < *omnibus*, *flu* < *influenza*) and to clippings going back to the amalgamation of initial letters or syllables of a number of subsequent word-units (as, e. g., *UNO* < *United Nations Organization*, *radar* < *radio detection aviation and ranging*, *taxi-cab* < *taximeter cabriolet*). In the latter two processes — which, incidentally, are by no means unknown to Czech and especially to Russian —, one has to do with an activity that is purely mechanical. It is prompted partly by the need to effect a radical structural assimilation of the complex naming units (many elements of which are manifestly of non-native character) to the make-up of the native word-stock (29) and partly by the economic motive, intent on saving the speaker's and the listener's time. It should also be noted that the onomatological unit resulting from the clipping of initials refers to the same extra-linguistic reality as was referred to by the full, unclipped word-sequence. In cases of blending, however, we are not faced with a mechanical process but with a deliberate, semantically motivated amalgamation of the source words.

This can be seen both on the formal and on the semantic level. Formally, the blend does not arise by a mechanical addition of the initial elements of the source

words but, as a rule, by an intimate welding of the initial part of the one and the final part of the other. The welding is often so intimate that it can hardly be realized by one who is not versed in the theory of language. Semantically, the meaning of the newly formed blend is not simply equal to the sum of the meanings of the two source words; although it combines some of the semantic features of the two, the resulting meaning is entirely new — as a matter of fact it was exactly the novelty of the experience which has led the English speakers to coin the blend.

It is certainly symptomatic that in Czech and Russian (and most probably also in other languages of synthetic grammatical structure) formation of words by blending is virtually unknown. (30) In our opinion the reasons of this absence can only be accounted for by the theory that in the Slavonic languages (and, for that matter, in synthetic languages in general) it is not only the borderlines separating words from other language categories that stand out with extraordinary lucidity, but that also formal and semantic limits marking off individual lexical units from one another are remarkably clearcut, certainly much more so than in English.

We have come to the end of our comparison of some aspects of the status of the word in English, Czech and Russian. The results of our analysis, however casual and by no means detailed, have brought us to the conclusion that the word in Czech and Russian constitutes a category which is definitely more clearcut and more strictly delimited than the word in English. In conformity with C. E. Bazell's thesis, this difference will have to be reflected in the respective definitions of the word in the examined languages. At the present stage of research it would undoubtedly be premature to attempt to formulate something like a definite wording of such definitions. The only thing that in our opinion can be said for certain is that the definition of the word in the grammatical system of English will have to be worded in more elastic, less committing terms than the definition of the word in the grammatical systems of Czech and Russian.

There is, however, an even more important conclusion that can be drawn from our above analysis. Our examination has also revealed that the differences ascertained between the status of the word in English and in our two Slavonic languages are ultimately reducible to the differences of types of their grammatical structures — analytical in the case of English, synthetic in the case of Czech and Russian. It will have been noted that this conclusion has been obtained by applying the method of synchronistic comparison of the three languages. But the differences of the status of the word are not an exclusive matter of synchronistic analysis. Even a casual comparison of OE and ME contexts shows very clearly that the OE word undoubtedly possessed a more definite status with more clearcut formal and semantic limits than its ModE descendant. There is no trace in OE of quotational compounds, of prepositions governing whole clauses, of affixes joined to word-groups or even to sentences, and of course cases of blending are equally unknown there. There can be no doubt that the absence in OE of such features testifies to a more definite and more strictly delimited status of the OE word than is the status of its ModE counterpart. And it is equally obvious that the relatively very definite status of the OE word is closely connected with the grammatical structure of OE, which was essentially still synthetic. And finally, the conclusion appears inescapable that the progressive weakening of the status of the word in English must have gone hand in hand with the progressive re-building of the grammatical structure of English on analytical lines. A detailed history of this process will of course have to be worked out by further research.

III. THE "POSSESSIVE CASE" OF MODERN ENGLISH

In the preceding chapter mention was made of the relatively loose connection existing in English between the basis of the word and the affixes. An interesting illustration of this loose relation is supplied by the well-known Possessive Case of ModE, which will be the subject of our attention in the present chapter. (31)

As is commonly admitted, the so-called Possessive Case is the sole remnant of the OE synthetic inflexion of nouns that has been preserved in ModE. The "ending" of this case 's is, of course, a direct descendant of the OE genitival ending *-es*, found in masculine and neuter *a*-stems. We can safely denote it as the sole synthetic case form that has survived from the original OE paradigm, which was wholly synthetic; the ModE plural ending *-(e)s* (<OE *-as*) cannot be regarded as really synthetic because it refers only to number, not to a particular case.

All scholars discussing the ModE Possessive Case are unanimous in regarding it as an integral part of the substantival paradigm. And yet, the relation of the Possessive Case form to that paradigm is much more complicated than one might suppose at the first glance. Complications may be perceived both from the formal and from the semantic viewpoint.

* * *

Seen from the formal point-of-view, the synthetic Possessive Case strikes the observer as a unique exception to the rules now prevailing in the ModE substantival paradigm which, as is commonly admitted, is otherwise built exclusively upon analytical lines. It is true, there is one important formal feature in which the Possessive Case agrees with decidedly analytical cases of ModE, viz. its more or less fixed place of occurrence in the sentence: The Possessive Case, that is to say, regularly functions as an attribute and so usually stands before the governing noun. Besides, it may be pointed out as a specific feature of the Possessive Case that its "ending" can be joined not only to the substantival basis but also to a group of two co-ordinated substantives, under the proviso that such a group refers to a single idea (see well-known instances of the so-called 'group genitives' like *Smith and Brown's office*, *father and mother's wedding-day*, etc.); sometimes one may even find it joined to more extensive word-groups including a dependent clause (see, e. g., *the man I saw yesterday's son*). (32) It will be readily seen that this loose connection of the "ending" with the word-basis cannot be met with in any other item of the morphological system of ModE (there are, e. g., no instances like **cat and dogs*, **it come and goes*, etc.).

It was exactly on account of the instances of group genitives that B. A. Ilyish (l. c. p. 100) formulated his thesis that the ModE ending of the Possessive Case is being reevaluated into what he called "an auxiliary particle denoting possession", and that, further on, he even went so far as to quote this 's as an illustration of the fact that new words can emerge in analytical languages owing to the emancipation of former suffixes (he admits, it is fair to state, that the phenomenon is isolated in English). To put the thing differently, Ilyish tries to fit the Possessive Case into the scheme of the ModE analytical declension by interpreting the former as a sort of periphrastic form. (33) To this it may be observed that the Soviet scholar was perfectly right in his ingenious diagnosis that a sort of reevaluation has been taking place in the ModE Possessive Case. On the other hand, he obviously seems to have gone too far in regarding the final 's as something like an auxiliary word: it would be the only postpositive auxiliary in the ModE morphological system, and the only

one of non-syllabic character in the standard literary language. In our opinion, instances of group genitives and the like call for a different interpretation.

We believe that instances of the kind can only point to two fundamental facts. The one is that in ModE the opposition "word *vs.* word group" appears to be distinctly less marked than in languages characterized by synthetic grammatical structure (such as, e. g., Czech or Russian). It has been shown above in Chapter II that this fact is responsible for a number of striking structural features of ModE (among other things, for the presence in ModE of the so-called quotational compounds). — The other fundamental fact is, in our opinion, that by its relatively high degree of independence the ModE final 's ranks rather with derivative affixes than with inflexional endings. (34) It will be recalled that, like the final 's, the ModE derivative affixes are often joined to word-groups referring to a single idea (see, e. g., *an ex-King of Iraq*, *John Bullish*, *dog-in-the-mangerism* etc.); (35) as has been noted earlier in this chapter, this is a kind of liberty never enjoyed by ModE inflexional endings.

The affixal status of ModE 's is perfectly obvious in ModE word-groups of the types *at the baker's*, *from my uncle's*, *St. Paul's* and the like, in which it is no longer charged with a possessive function; in instances of this kind Ilyish himself admits the suffixal status of 's (l. c. p. 100). It may be of use to recall here a small orthographical detail: in the type *St. Paul's* (and similarly *Foyle's*, *Harrod's* etc.) the apostrophe is very frequently omitted. This is undoubtedly due to the loss of possessive associations, formerly adhering to 's (for details, see R. W. Zandvoort, *A Handbook of English Grammar*², Groningen 1946, p. 82, and especially his paper *More Notes on the Genitive in the Amsterdam Review English Studies* 26, 1944, pp. 1—6).

All that has been said here so far points to the conclusion that from the formal viewpoint the ModE Possessive Case ranks more probably as a derived than as an inflected form. If this is so, the very term "Possessive Case" does not seem particularly appropriate: much nearer to the mark appears to be the term "Possessive Form" which, therefore, we are going to use in the following lines.

* * *

So far we have analysed the Possessive Form from the formal viewpoint. If we now examine it from the semantic point-of-view, we find that the results of this latter examination yield results perfectly tallying with those of the former. As is generally known, in the course of the historical development of English both the scope of applicability and the semantic reference of the Possessive Form have come to be considerably narrowed. As regards the scope of applicability, it is clear that in OE the synthetic genitive in *-es* could be formed from any noun of the concerned morphological category (i. e., from masculine and neuter *a*-stems), while in ModE the formation of the Possessive Form is substantially limited — it can be met with, in principle, in only one semantic category of nouns, viz. in those denoting animate beings. (36) As regards the semantic reference, it is commonly known that during the historical development of English the old synthetic genitive has lost virtually all its functions (37) except that of expressing possession (in the widest sense of the word, including, e. g., also instances of the subjective genitive, such as *the mother's love of her children*, and the like). It should be particularly stressed that no trace has been left in ModE of the original adverbial objective functions of the old case form, such as existed in OE constructions of the type *fultumes biddan*, 'to ask for help', *wæteres weorpan* 'to throw water' etc. It appears obvious that these facts of semantic order point in the same direction as the above-noted facts of formal order:

the semantic limitations of what has been left in ModE of the old synthetic genitive indicates clearly that the ModE Possessive Form has considerably loosened the ties that were originally tying it up with the substantival paradigm. If, in addition to this, one recalls what has been said above about the high amount of independence enjoyed by the final 's-element of the Possessive Form, one and only one conclusion appears inevitable, viz. that the ModE Possessive Form is no longer a constituent part of the substantival paradigm. Moreover, it appears to be gradually acquiring adjectival character, and has already covered a great part of the road (but certainly not the whole of it) leading towards full adjectivization.

A couple of remarks are needed to clear up some of the implications of the thesis just formulated. It is not open to doubt that the ModE Possessive Form is closely allied, both in form and in meaning, to the possessive pronouns of the attributive series *my, your, his . . . their*; this alliance is evidenced by parallelisms like *his coat — John's coat, her coat — Mary's coat*. The postpositive combination of *John's* is again closely parallel to *of mine* (cf. *this friend of mine — this friend of John's*). The above comparison reveals that like the possessive pronouns the Possessive Form allots a thing (in the widest sense of the word) to a particular person or persons, and that, like them, it precedes the governing noun; if it follows that noun, it is joined to it — again like the possessive pronoun — by the prepositional *of*. The above parallelisms, incidentally, are highly instructive: they furnish an additional argument for the existence of the centrifugal tendency driving the Possessive Form away from the substantival paradigm. Admittedly, hardly anybody would venture to regard the possessive pronouns *my/mine, your/yours . . . their/theirs* as component parts of the respective pronominal paradigms *I (me), you . . . they*. And it would likewise be most inappropriate to treat the Possessive Form in an analogous manner — all our above observations show that the relation of that form to the paradigm of the corresponding noun has been loosened accordingly, even if the process has not been fully completed yet.

In some languages, e. g. in Czech, the semantic affinity of possessive pronouns and possessive forms is also underlined by additional grammatical means: both grammatical categories are differentiated in gender so as to exhibit grammatical concord with their governing nouns (cf. Czech possessive pronouns masc. *můj*, fem. *má*, ntr. *mé*, 'my' — possessive forms masc. *Janův*, fem. *Janova*, ntr. *Janovo* 'John's').

Another interesting feature of the centrifugal process by which the Possessive Form is being driven away from the substantival paradigm, is observable in the instances which in traditional grammatical terminology go by the label of the 'plural Possessive Case'. In at least some such instances the process of adjectivization has, to all appearances, advanced even further. The instances in question may be seen, in O. Jespersen's words, "in such more or less set phrases, as may be considered compounds", such as e. g. *schoolboy's clothes, girls' friendships, a lovers' quarrel*. It is also worth noting that Jespersen stamps as artificial such distinctions in spelling as may be observed between the written word groups *a bird's nest — birds' nests, a printer's error — printers' errors* and the like (see *Essentials*, p. 216). Though Jespersen himself does not draw the conclusion himself, it appears obvious that in cases of that kind the adjectival character of the Possessive Form has become so manifest as to render the distinction of number virtually non-existent. (39) (Here again, it may be of some interest to point out that the Possessive Form of such constructions is best rendered in Czech by an adjective: *chlapecké šaty, dívčí přátelství, mlénecký spor, ptačí hnízdo — ptačí hnízda, tisková chyba — tiskové chyby*.)

Speaking about cases like *a bird's nest — birds' nests* we should recall E. Kruisin-

ga's thesis denying the existence of the plural Possessive Form altogether. (40) In his opinion, the forms *girls'*, *brothers'* and the like should be regarded as identical, both from the formal and from the semantic viewpoint, with the forms spelt *brother's*, *girl's*. In Krusinga's own words "the attributive genitive does not distinguish number any more than the attributive noun stem". (41) Krusinga, too, believes that the final 's in forms like *men's*, *children's* should be evaluated as a sort of suffix; its use in such cases is explained as due to the fact that the members of the oppositions *man* — *men*, *child* — *children* and the like have, from the formal point of view, become so widely differentiated that their mutual relation must be taken for suppletory.

Should Krusinga's theory prove true, the adjectival status of the ModE Possessive Form would be established beyond any doubt. Still, there appear to be some indications pointing to the effect that the process of adjectivization, though undoubtedly well advanced, cannot be regarded as completed. We shall pay some attention here at least to two points which seem especially worth it.

The first is the absence in English of combinations like **the Smithsonian's case*, though combinations of the types *Smithson's case* and *the Smithsonian case* are quite common. The non-existence of the type provided by the asterisk reveals that the Possessive Form has not yet completely severed its traditional alliance to the proper name denoting the "possessor" (in the widest sense of the word); as such a proper name regularly lacks the definite article, the Possessive Form traditionally refrains from using it, too. It should be observed that combination of the type **the Smithsonian's case* could very well co-exist with combinations belonging to the category of *the Smithsonian case*, as there might be a distinct semantic difference between the two. The difference might consist, that is, in the presence *vs.* absence of the possessive element in the semantic content of the two adjectives. As, however, combinations of the former, asterisked type have not yet emerged in ModE, the adjectivization of the Possessive Form can hardly be taken for a fully accomplished fact.

The other obstacle standing in the way of a full adjectivization of the Possessive Form is the presence of the indefinite article before a Possessive Form followed by an "uncountable" noun, such as *a man's blood*. In such combinations, that is to say, the indefinite article clearly belongs to the Possessive Form, not to the uncountable noun. One might perhaps argue that the suffix 's is added not to the bare substantival form *man* alone, but to the word-group *a-man* considered as a whole. Then, however, it would be difficult to account for the difference in status of the articles in combinations like *a man's blood* — *a man's hat*. It cannot be reasonably doubted, that is, that in the latter type of combination the article must be referred to the governing noun *hat* (which, naturally, is "countable"); to all appearances, the instance *a man's hat* is perfectly parallel to instances of the type *a new hat*, *an expensive hat*, and the like. With instances of this latter type in the background, and with the regular absence of indefinite articles (and articles in general) before uncountable nouns, the article in the word-group *a man's blood* can hardly fail to be referred to the Possessive Form. And as long as this state of things persists, the process of adjectivization of the Possessive Form can hardly be taken for completed.

We are thus faced in ModE with an interesting attempt at a reevaluation of a grammatical form whose old function has almost died down both formally and semantically, and whose new function is being gradually crystallized in a process that is fighting its way through against obstacles of both formal and semantic character.

* * *

It now remains to examine the above-established process in a broader historical setting. We are faced thus, very naturally, with the question of the sense of the whole process. In other words, what were the historical causes that called it forth?

The answer to this question is not very difficult to find. It is implicitly contained in B. A. Ilyish's ascertainment that the "genitival ending 's'" represents today, as he puts it, "the only remnant that has been preserved, in the analytical structure of the present-day language, of the old system of cases", and thus "is subjected to revaluation carried out in conformity with the norms of analytical language thinking" (op. cit. p. 100). One should, in fact, realize here that the reshaping of the English grammatical system, in which the old synthetic inflexion was entirely discarded and replaced by a new inflexional system built up on an essentially analytical basis, meant a profound and thoroughgoing arrangement. That this was indeed so is revealed by the fact that alone in the productive types of the OE declension of nouns (i. e., in the *a*-, *ō*- and *n*-stems) there existed some forty case forms, the majority of which were differentiated by a system of distinctly unequivocal inflexional endings. All this richness was gradually done away with (except for a very small number of adverbial or lexicalized survivals), and its place was taken by a complex analytical system of means combining prepositional constructions with grammaticalized word-order. (42) The only really important survival of the old grammatical order was to become the form of the synthetic genitive singular of the *a*-stems (as has been shown above, the plural ending *-(e)s* denotes number only, not a particular case).

The situation that resulted in English after the breakdown of the old synthetic grammatical order was by no means favourable to a continued existence of one synthetic case form within a declension system built up entirely on an analytical basis. The situation urgently needed clarifying. In principle, two solutions of the problem offered themselves: either a total dismissal of the old synthetic form, or its semantic revaluation, resulting in its removal from the nominal declension system and in its endowment with a different function, such as would not collide with the established rules of the analytical order. The solution ultimately adopted by the English language system consisted in a combination of both above-indicated possibilities: The old synthetic case form was preserved for one of the typical genitival functions, and so became revaluated into what we call the Possessive Form and what we have found to be tending to completely sever its links with the substantival paradigm and to establish itself as an adjectival form. In the other semantic functions, originally performed by the old synthetic genitival form, the latter came to be replaced by an analytical *of*-construction. (43)

There is, however, another question that must be raised in this context, viz. why the old synthetic genitive in its possessive function escaped the usual replacement by the *of*-construction. The answer to this question may be given as follows. In the first place, the abandonment of the replacement may have been due to the ever-increasing tendency (ascertainable in the development of most languages), aiming at a differentiation of various semantic functions that were previously covered by one genitival form common to all of them. But besides, and that is even more important, one should again recall the existence in English of the system of possessive pronouns with which the old possessive genitive had many features in common, both semantic and formal (especially one should recall its usual position before the governing noun) and which could thus exercise a particularly strong preserving influence on its synthetic form.

Another remark may be useful concerning the revaluating process of the old synthetic genitive into the Possessive Form, characterized by strong adjectival

colouring. We have ascertained that the old form, contradicting the new regulations of the grammatical system, could only uphold its place in the language at the cost of altering its semantic and grammatical content, in connection with the centrifugal process carrying the case form away from its original paradigm. It may be worth while to add that cases of analogous upholding of grammatical forms in language at the cost of their grammatical and semantic revaluation are by no means rare in language development. To quote another specimen of that kind of process, it is well known that impersonal constructions of the OE type *mē is cealde* have given way to personal constructions of the ModE type *I am cold*. Only two instances of such impersonal constructions have managed to survive, viz. OE *mē þynceþ* and EME *mē sēmeþ*; the ModE respective forms *methinks* and *meseems*, descended from them, clearly reveal that in these two instances again the survival of the constructions was only made possible through grammatical revaluation. The ModE (archaic) forms *methinks* and *meseems*, that is to say, are no longer regarded as verbal constructions but as adverbs, and possibly even as interjections. (44) — Similar remarks might be applied to other grammatical survivals, as e. g. to the archaic, lexically isolated ModE adverb *whilom*, in which the OE ending of the Dative plural *-um* is supposed to persist, disguised as an adverbial affix, etc.

* * *

A very interesting parallel to the ModE Possessive Form may be found in the Southern and Western dialects of Czech. It is the absolute possessive adjective ending in *-ovo*, *-ino* (e. g. *Janovo* 'John's', *tatínkovo* 'Daddy's', *Mariino* 'Mary's', *maminčino* 'Mummy's'). Unlike other Czech adjectives (and unlike the possessive adjectives of Standard Czech and of other Czech dialects), the Southern and Western Czech absolute dialectal possessives in *-ovo* and *-ino* show no grammatical concord with governing nouns, concord which is otherwise obligatory in Czech: cf. dial. Czech *tátovo klobouk* 'father's hat', *tátovo louka* 'father's meadow', *tátovo kolo* 'father's bike' — Std. Cz. *tátův klobouk*, *tátova louka*, *tátovo kolo*. Similarly in plural: dial. Cz. *tátovo klobouky* 'father's hats', *tátovo louky* 'father's meadows', *tátovo kola* 'father's bikes'; in Std. Cz. grammatical concord is again observed, cf. *tátovy klobouky*, *tátovy louky*, *tátova kola*.

As Std. Cz. adjectives (and the adjectives of other dialectal regions of the Czech language) meticulously observe the grammatical concord with their governing nouns, it may be inferred that by abandoning this grammatical concord the Southern and Western dialectal Czech absolute possessives have lost their adjectival status. Being derived from nouns denoting the possessor (e. g. *tátovo* from *táta* 'father', *Mariino* from *Marie* 'Mary'), the absolute possessives very naturally become revaluated into a kind of genitival form of the paradigms of their basic nouns. After the revaluation the dial. Cz. *-ovo/-ino* functions as an inflexional ending, comparable to the ModE 's. (45)

The dialectal Czech absolute possessive and the ModE Possessive Form have a number of features in common. From what has been said above here is evident that both forms are free from grammatical concord that would link them to their governing nouns. Besides, both forms occupy analogous places in the sentences of their respective languages; they are regularly situated not behind the governing noun but before it, or predicatively (cp. *that hat is Father's — ten klobouk je tátovo*). Finally, the most important analogy of the two forms lies in the fact that each of the two is opposed, in its respective grammatical system, to a genitival form in the

full sense of the word (in English, to an *of*-construction, in Czech, to a form whose inflexional ending contains a single vowel, e. g. *tát-y*, *Mari-e*). These full-sense genitival forms are also capable of performing, under some specified circumstances, the possessive functions usually performed by their competitor forms but, in addition to this, they may be used in a number of other functions from which the competitor forms are wholly excluded (especially in the function of an adverbial object, see instances like *I am afraid of Father*, *Bojím se tát-y*).

On the other hand, there are some important differences between the two compared possessive forms. First, unlike the ModE's, the Czech dialectal ending *-ovo/-ino* can only be joined to the basis of a single noun, not qualified by any other expression. In other words, the Southern and Western Czech dialects present no analogues of ModE instances like *my father's house*, *Smith and Brown's office*, *the man I saw yesterday's son*. This difference is a natural consequence of the fact discussed above in Chapter II, viz. that the limits of the categories of word and affix are much more definite and clearcut in Czech than in ModE. Clearly, this difference is ultimately due to the fundamental difference in grammatical structures of the two languages, the structure of ModE being essentially analytical, while that of Czech is prevalently synthetic. The thing is too obvious to necessitate further discussion.

Another divergent feature, however, is ascertainable in our two possessive forms that is also reducible to the difference in grammatical structures of our two languages and which, at the same time, reveals a distinction of fundamental importance. As has already been shown here above, the ModE Possessive Form, once an integral component part of the nominal paradigm, is now standing outside that paradigm, and discloses a very strong trend towards adjectivization. It is, of course, still very close to that paradigm, as it is, to an appreciable degree, functionally parallel with the *of*-construction (regarded by many scholars as a genuine component part of that paradigm), and also its formal resemblance to genuine component parts of the nominal paradigm (cf. *father's* — *father*, *fathers*) is too obvious to be reasonably doubted. For all that, in view of its synthetic structure the ModE Progressive Form is clearly excluded from the ModE nominal paradigm, built on analytical principles. (46) Keeping this fact in mind, one arrives at the conclusion that the ModE Possessive Form has come to occupy its present-day position in the ModE grammatical structure through the operation of what may be called a centrifugal force, and the tendency directed towards the full adjectivization of the Possessive Form may justly be regarded as evidence of the centrifugal drift being still in action.

If we now turn our attention to the Czech dialectal absolute possessives ending in *-ovo/-ino*, we find that, despite the analogy of their position in the ModCz grammatical system to that of the ModE Possessive Form in the grammatical system of ModE, the dynamic potency of the Czech form is exactly opposite to that of its ModE counterpart. As is well known, the dialectal Czech absolute possessive of the type *tátovo* did not originally belong to the declensional paradigm of its basic noun *táta*. On the contrary, it originally belonged (as it still belongs in ModCz and in a majority of Czech dialects) to a system of its own adjectival paradigm *tátův* (m.) — *tátova* (f.) — *tátovo* (n.). In the course of its development, however, an overall generalization of the ending *-ovo/-ino* took place in all forms of the adjectival paradigm. This generalization amounted to the factual abolition of that paradigm and in the establishment of a closer relation between the absolute possessive form in *-ovo/-ino* and the nominal paradigm of the noun denoting the possessor. The relation has indeed become so close that nowadays the absolute possessive appears to function almost as a variant of the genitive singular of that nominal paradigm

(with the proviso, of course, that the applicability of the new variant is subject to a number of limitations of both semantic and formal character). The lesson to be drawn from the history of the Czech dialectal absolute possessive is, then, that it has come to occupy its present-day position in the grammatical structure of the concerned dialects through the operation of a distinctly centripetal force. Again, some facts of the ModCz grammatical system, especially the progressive abolition of the so-called indefinite adjectives, (47) may be regarded as evidence of the centripetal drift being still in action.

It remains to be pointed out that just as the analytical structure of the ModE grammatical system was a mighty factor in deciding the centrifugal development of the ModE Possessive Form, so the synthetic structure of the Czech grammatical system played a no less important part in the centripetal development characteristic of the dialectal Czech absolute possessive. With the unquestioned domination of the synthetic principle and with the formal identity of the stems of the absolute possessive and of the noun denoting the possessor, the speakers simply had no other choice left but to reevaluate the unchanging *-ovo/-ino* into an inflexional ending. And as the meaning of the absolute possessive covered a part of the semantic field typical of the genitive case, the ending *-ovo/-ino* became interpreted as a variant for the possessive function of the usual genitival ending.

Summing up the findings of the present chapter we may safely conclude that the above lines may claim to have shown that also morphology, though relatively the most stabilized language plane (especially in cultured languages), reveals the presence of some problems of its own, the solution of which is an urgent structural task that must be tackled in spite of the high degree to which the grammatical systems of such languages have usually been normalized. In addition to this — and this appears even more important — our observations have disclosed a very important part played in such solutions by the general structural type of the concerned grammatical system. Only if the general structural situation in ModE is taken into account, one can comprehend the seeming paradox that it is exactly the preservation in ModE of the synthetic “Possessive Case” that supplies a weighty piece of evidence in favour of the essentially analytical character of the ModE grammatical system. Viewed in this light, the “Possessive Form” certainly deserves to be included in the survey of less known aspects of the analytical trend of English.

IV. THE COMPACTNESS OF THE MODERN ENGLISH SENTENCE

It was already pointed out in Chapter I that the difference in the synthetic and analytical grammatical structure is also reflected in syntax: it is generally admitted that the position of the word in the sentence context is grammaticalized to a much higher degree in analytical than in synthetic languages. This is a natural consequence of the well-known fact that the order of the words in analytical languages is relatively much more fixed than in languages with synthetic grammatical structures. But the highly fixed word-order is not the only syntactical feature that reflects the analytical grammatical structure of ModE. It appears that another such feature may be discovered in the relative compactness of the ModE sentence considered as a whole; this compactness stands out especially if the ModE sentence is compared with the sentence of ModCzech, whose grammatical structure, as has been repeatedly shown

here, is essentially a synthetic one. In the present chapter we want to discuss the difference of ModE and ModCzech sentences in this point at some length. (48)

If we are to grasp the essence of the implied difference in all its aspects, we must turn our attention to one outstanding feature characterizing the ModE sentence as a whole. It is the familiar ModE tendency to word its predications nominally rather than verbally (see, e. g., G. O. Curme (49) who points out the preference of English for saying *The matter is under consideration, After dinner we had a quiet smoke, I got a good shaking up*, etc., instead of *The matter is being considered, After dinner we smoked quietly, I was shaken up thoroughly*, etc.). The nominal tendency is brought into particular prominence if the structure of the ModE sentence is confronted with that found in Modern Czech, whose outspokenly verbal trend was often opposed to the nominal trend of ModE by the late V. Mathesius. More than once he stressed the significant part played in good Czech style by the finite verb form, and pointed out that this style is strikingly averse to complicated nominal constructions, so frequently found in the good style of English. (50) Moreover, in his lectures (51) he duly emphasized the important role played in ModE by what he called complex condensation phenomena. By this term he meant the introduction into the sentence of a nominal element or phrase enabling that sentence to do without a subordinate clause the use of which would otherwise be indispensable. As a specimen of such a process of complex condensation one may quote the well-known English proverb *Barking dogs rarely bite*. Its comparison with an equivalent Czech proverb *Pes, který štěká, nekouše* [=A dog that barks does not bite] proves that the English participle acts here as a means of complex condensation, enabling the sentence to do without a dependent adjective-clause, actually found in the Czech equivalent of the proverb.

A more detailed examination of English and Czech materials, undertaken from the indicated angle, may throw some light on the place and importance attaching to nominal (and also verbal) constructions in English and Czech. An attempt at an examination of that kind is given below: within the narrow limits of the present chapter we shall, naturally, often have to confine ourselves to pointing out the existing problems and to leave their definite solution to further research. (52)

* * *

A great many instances of complex condensation cases may be found especially in literary contexts, rather pretentious both from the point of form and contents. To turn to a specialized context first, in A. L. Morton's well-known *History of England* (53) the following simple sentence can be found:

The French plan, viewed in retrospect, might seem to have been designed with the purpose of ensuring a German victory (orig. p. 524).

In the Czech version of the book, on the other hand, the idea is expressed by a complex sentence:

Francouzský plán, když jej zkoumáme retrospektivně, vypadá, jako by byl určen k zajištění vítězství Německa (transl. p. 383).

It will be noted that two nominal constructions of the English sentence have been replaced in Czech by dependent clauses.

If the above examples are submitted to closer analysis, they will be seen to give ample justification to Mathesius's term of complex condensation. If, that is to say, a sentence dispenses with a subordinate clause, this undoubtedly results in closer cohesion of its elements; such cohesion is equivalent to a greater condensity of the whole sentence structure. The importance of the fact exceeds the limits of theoretical

linguistics: it involves some consequences for the practice of reading, and listening to, English contexts. Obviously, in deciphering an English sentence of the above category the reader's (or listener's) attention can and must be concentrated so as to grasp the sentence as one compact whole, grouped around one single nexus of subject and predicate. The relations of at least some sentence elements to this central nexus must necessarily be of rather complex character. (54) Consequently, the term of complex condensation proves to be a very apt designation of the factor lying behind the above-mentioned complex character of the English sentence.

In his lectures Mathesius laid special stress on the part played in English complex condensation cases by three types of nominal forms derived from verbal bases, viz. by participles, infinitives and gerunds. (55) Their important role can be assessed, at least approximately, on concrete language materials by comparing ModE literary contexts with the equivalent Czech contexts translating them. We therefore attempted a comparison of that kind by confronting Chapter XVII of Morton's book with the Czech translation of the same chapter (the compared passage takes up pp. 324—344 of the original text, and pp. 383—397 of the Czech translation).

The results of our examination may be summarized as follows: In the English original were found altogether 168 cases of complex condensation employing the three word-types enumerated above and rendered by Czech dependent clauses in the translation. (The word-types will be referred to as means of condensation or, for short, condensers.) Out of the total number of 168 there were 66 cases using infinitives, 38 cases employing present participles, further there were 42 instances of past participles, and 22 instances of gerunds. Contrary to this, the Czech version presented only 75 cases of complex condensation of ModE dependent clauses of the original, the ascertained condensers being infinitives in 33 instances, indefinite present participles (the "přítomné přechodníky" of Czech grammars) in 8 instances, definite present participles ("přičestí přítomná") in 18 instances, and definite past participles ("přičestí minulá trpná") in 16 instances; gerunds, as is commonly known, do not exist in Czech. It should be added that, naturally, the chapter contained also other condensers than the three types emphasized by Mathesius (e. g. verbal nouns, adverb-phrases etc.). But even if these other types of condensers are included in our census, the above-established ratio of 168 : 75 will not be substantially affected: it will be replaced by that of 199 : 108, again in favour of English. — It should be added that the quoted figures are even more convincing in view of the fact that the Czech translators have often preserved the sentence structure of Morton's book with conscientiousness almost bordering on slavish imitation, with the result that their translation contains more condensers than good and clear Czech style can absorb. Another translator, possessed of finer feeling for the requirements of Czech style, would have probably resorted to Czech dependent clauses as equivalents to English condensers more often than our translators have ventured to do.

So much for our specimen analysis of a specialized context; a priori one might expect that in narrative prose the difference concerning the use of condensers in ModE and ModCz will be less pronounced. It will be readily admitted, that is, that conceptual thinking, lying behind specialized contexts, favours the use of nominal constructions to a much higher degree than rough-and-ready, more emotionally coloured, and so necessarily less accurate thinking lying behind narrative prose. In other words, one would expect to find the ModE narrative prose more verbally-minded than the above-analysed specialized prose. It is certainly most interesting to find that this expectation is by no means borne out by concrete language facts. And it is certainly symptomatic that the said expectation is most bitterly disappointed in comparing

pieces of English narrative prose with such Czech translations as have been provided by highly skilled translators, delicately responsive to all grammatical and stylistic values of both English and Czech. In such translations, that is, English condensers are most frequently rendered by dependent clauses.

Among the English literary works that may claim to have obtained such a high-ranking translation we want to single out Katherine Mansfield's story *At the Bay* (the Czech version is entitled *V zátoce*). (56) Our analysis of the first six chapters of the story (pp. 7—33 of the English original, pp. 326—348 of the Czech translation disclosed no less than 83 instances of condensers which the translators did not hesitate to render by finite verb forms. Among the condensers found in the English text the participial constructions occupy the foremost place. It is fair to state that also contrary cases have been ascertained in the text, i. e. those in which an English finite verb form corresponds to a Czech nominal expression. Such contrary cases, however, are relatively scarce; altogether we ascertained no more than 18 (out of that number not a single instance was found to employ a Czech indefinite participle form; there were, of course, some instances of definite participles — 2 present, 2 past active and 3 past passive).

As already stated, the foremost place among the English condensers employed in K. Mansfield's text is occupied by participial constructions. In 41 cases (that is to say, in almost one half of the total number of the established condensation cases) it is the form of the present participle that acts as condenser. It deserves to be noted that the Czech finite verb form translating the English present participle is not necessarily brought into a hypotactical relation to the finite verb of the principal clause. As a matter of fact, the mutual relation of the two finite verb forms is not infrequently shaped as paratactical. At least one specimen (to which further could be added) of such notable difference in the structures of English and Czech wordings of the same content should be quoted here:

But the old sheep-dog, not looking up, wagged past, flinging out his legs from side to side (orig. p. 10).

Ale starý ovčácký pes se po ní ani neohlédl, plouhal se dál a motal nohama sem tam (transl. p. 328).

Clearly, one has to do here with something more deep-reaching than a mere difference in syntactical forms: what is involved here are two different ways in which the two languages tackle the realities of the outside world. In Czech one may observe the tendency to dissociate the reality to be expressed into a series of actions or processes, which may be mutually either co-ordinated or subordinated. In English, on the other hand, a contrary tendency is at work, viz. one that envisages the same reality as a single, basic action or process, absorbing all other potential actions or processes as its elements or concomitant circumstances. A more detailed examination of the different ways in which English and Czech cope with the task of framing the sentence might provide a hardly insignificant contribution to the comparative characterology of these two languages as regards the mutual relations of language, thought, and reality in the two language communities. Such an examination, however, would extend far beyond the limits of the present chapter.

The difference of approach to one and the same extra-linguistic reality by the two language systems discloses another interesting aspect which also calls for some comment. Even a superficial examination of the Czech version of K. Mansfield's story, and even a passing comparison of that version with the English original is bound to show convincingly that Czech predicative finite verbs have a notable preponderance over their English opposite numbers not only in regard to number but

also in regard to significance. In his time, V. Mathesius laid stress on the important part played in English predication by what he called verbal phrases, i. e. by combinations of verbs of general meaning and nominal elements (nouns, adjectives or adverbs) that act as qualifiers specifying that general meaning. Such verbal phrases often express in English what in Czech is denoted by the form of a finite verb alone. (57) To quote only a few commonly known specimens of such verbal phrases: the English combination *he got hold of* translates a sole Czech finite verb form *zmočnil se*; similar pairs are *we are taking a rest* — *odpočíváme*, *get ready* — *připrav se!* etc. (the list, needless to say, might be extended indefinitely). The comparison of members of such word pairs shows unmistakably that what might be called the semantic centre of gravity within the Czech predication lies in the verbal form; in the English predication, however, the centre is shifted on to the nominal element.

The established difference makes one thing clear, viz. that the Czech finite verb form is endowed with very strong dynamism. It should be realized that the Czech finite verb fulfils two important tasks at a time. Apart from containing the semantic centre of gravity it also serves as an unmatched instrument of predication. Contrary to this, the English finite verb form appears to be much less dynamic in character. This is partly due to the above-mentioned frequent shift of the semantic centre of gravity from the finite verb on to the nominal element of predication, and partly to the fact that the English finite verb form frequently ceases to be the unmatched instrument of predication, being often reduced to something that very closely resembles a copula. (58) For this basic difference, too, there is some evidence in our material drawn from K. Mansfield's story. Let us quote at least one of the most typical cases (for the benefit of the English reader the Czech finite verb forms with no adequate English verbal counterparts have been italicized):

And she gave her strange neighing laugh and grimaced at the other women (orig. p. 27).
Zařehotala se jako kuň a ušklibla se po ostatních ženách (transl. p. 342).

The reduced dynamism of the ModE finite verb is doubtlessly responsible also for those cases in which an English sentence dispenses with the finite verb form altogether, however vague its meaning might be. The Czech translators again felt it necessary to provide the sentence with a finite verb:

Black hair, dark blue eyes, red lips, a slow sleepy smile, a fine tennis player, a perfect dancer, and with it all a mystery (orig. p. 26).

Měl černé vlasy, tmavomodré oči, rudé rty, usmíval se vládně a ospale, hrál dobře tenis, skvěle tančil a při tom všem vypadal záhadně (transl. p. 340—341).

The nominal tenor of the English sentence, diametrically opposed to the verbal sentence tenor typical of Czech, also glimmers through the English sentences using a mere copula (the Czech equivalents employ finite verbs of full meaning). Such is the case of the framing clause in the following complex sentence:

Her lack of vanity, her slang, the way she treated men as though she was one of them, and the fact that she didn't care twopence about her house and called her servant Gladys "Glad-eyes", was disgraceful (orig. p. 25).

Nic na sebe nedbala, mluvila nevybíravě, k mužům se chovala, jako by k nim patřila, na domácnosti jí ani zbla nezáleželo, své služce Elišce říkala Pampeliška — hanba mluvit (transl. p. 340).

One interesting point attaches to the comparison of the above sentence and its Czech equivalent. The basic tenor of the English sentence is undoubtedly nominal, despite the fact that the sentence includes no less than four dependent clauses with their finite verb forms. Similarly, the basic tenor of the Czech equivalent sentence

remains verbal, although the sentence is concluded by a verbless nominal predication (*hanba mluvit*). It should be added that also the extra-linguistic reality to be expressed is again worded paratactically in the Czech sentence, being dissociated into a number of parallel-actions or processes; in the English text, on the other hand, the same extra-linguistic reality is worded so as to be framed within one principal clause, modified of course by a number of dependent clauses incorporated into it. Here again the translators wisely conformed to the well-known tendency of Czech, observed in simple narrative style, to favour paratactical sentence structure. But the problems involved in following paratactical and hypotactical tendencies found in Czech and English narrative styles would claim a separate treatise and cannot be developed in the present chapter.

Our tentative conclusion gained from a passing review of Czech materials obtained by translating English prose pieces, specialized as well as narrative, amounts to an ascertainment of totally opposed attitudes to means of complex condensation, and of equally opposed degrees of dynamism of the finite verb forms in the two languages. The validity of this conclusion can be tested on materials gained from the opposite source, viz. from English translations of Czech original prose. To take up narrative prose first, we undertook a cursory examination of the English version of K. Čapek's *Letters from England*. (59)

Although the translator made every possible effort — justifiable in this case — to preserve the sentence structure of the original text, so typical for the Czech author's individual style, even he could not altogether ignore the nominal tenor of the English sentence, and not infrequently he had to yield to it. Let us observe, e. g., the condensation effected by gerund in the following specimen:

Je ti někdy úzko, jak se cítíš osamělý ve středu těchto vlídných a ochotných lidí (orig. p. 123).
Sometimes you have a sense of uneasiness at feeling so lonely in the midst of these kind and courteous people (transl. p. 174).

The absence of the copula, too, can be attested:

Jejich zamlklost je taková, že ani nenadávají veřejně na vládu, na vlak nebo na daně; je to celkem neveselý, uzavřený lid (orig. p. 122).
Their taciturnity is such that they do not even publicly abuse the Government, the trains or the taxes; on the whole, a joyless and reticent people (transl. p. 173).

As an example of a specialized Czech context translated into English one may quote here an essay by Dr. Zdeněk Wirth, a prominent Czech historian of fine arts; it analyses the *vedute* of Prague dating from the period that extends from the late 15th century down to the present day. (60) As it happens, Dr. Wirth's Czech style has a strongly nominal turn, in conformity with the very special nature of the theme discussed, and with the elaborate manner in which the author's arguments are presented. Despite this, however, not a few instances can be found showing that the style of the English version of the essay is still more nominal. Here is at least one of them:

Výsledek, k němuž tehdy dospěl vývoj renaissanční krajiny od středověkých tuhých bočních kulís a vysokého nadhledu, od neumělé perspektivy a jednotného koloritu, dá se shrnout asi takto: ... (orig. p. 33).

The results attained by the Renaissance development of landscape from stiff laterals and high view from above, from inartistic perspective and uniformity of colouring, may be summarised thus: ... (transl. p. 37).

The absence of the copula is also evidenced (see the parenthesized passage):

Je-li přepis původní technikou, zvolenou portretistou města jako vlastním interpretem kresby — je to v nejdokonalejší formě u Hollara, pak u Pucherny, Prouta a u moderních našich grafiků — můžeme jej považovati za rovnocenný projev umělcův (orig. p. 19).

If there is an original copy in the technique chosen by the portraitist of the town as an accurate interpretation of the drawing — as in the most complete form with Hollar, Pucherna, Prout and with our modern graphics — we must consider it of equal value with the work of the artist (transl. p. 20). (61)

All our materials, taken from both Czech and English sources, thus obviously point to the conclusion that the very moderate amount of predilection enjoyed by nominal constructions in Czech is clearly due to the strong amount of dynamism present in the Czech finite verb, and, vice versa, that the obviously nominal tenor of English sentences is causally linked with the greatly reduced dynamism of finite verb forms in English. (62) The conclusion holds good not only for narrative prose, the style of which is justly regarded as unmarked, i. e. not burdened by specialized functions. Even in specialized contexts, whose style — definitely of marked character—necessarily tends to be more nominal, the above ascertained tendency favouring nominal expression appears more outspoken in English than in Czech.

* * *

If this is so, then we find ourselves faced with a problem of historical perspective: do the different degrees of dynamism, established in ModE and ModCz finite verb forms, represent a state of things inherited from the earlier stages of the two languages or have we to do here with a result of some previous processes ascertainable in the course of their respective developments?

A fully satisfactory answer to this question cannot be given, naturally, without thoroughly investigating the historical evidence to be collected from various stages of development of the two languages. Needless to say, such investigation is altogether outside the scope of the present lines. At present hardly more can be done than a tentative ascertainment of some of the main points of the development in the two languages, and of the general trend the development has so far followed in them. Our main concern here is naturally the development of English, and therefore its problems should be discussed first.

Again, even a cursory examination of OE prose texts (the texts of OE poetry, involving some special problems, cannot be considered here) appears to reveal that in the OE period verbal constructions used to play a more important part than they do in ModE. Dependent clauses, especially the relative ones, were obviously plentiful. Further, the number of condensers in OE was fairly limited: no less than six condensers known from ModE were non-existent in the old period. There was no gerund (present or past, active or passive), no past infinitive, and no pre-present participle (equivalent to ModE *having seen*). True, there was the dative absolute construction but its character was manifestly bookish: it usually translated the Latin ablative absolute. (63) Thus the only OE condensing element unknown to ModE was the inflected infinitive (sometimes referred to as the gerundive) which, later on, became merged with the common infinitive category. — Clearly, the limited number of condensers in OE seems to endorse the view of the predominantly verbal tenor of the OE sentence.

One would expect this verbal tenor to stand out with particular clearness in the comparison of OE texts with their ModE translations. If this expectation is disappointed in most cases, this should be attributed to the scrupulous approach to OE language materials, which seems to be typical of many modern translators. The result of that approach is a particular aesthetic effect which might be denoted as primitive monumentality.

Still, our method of comparing the original text and the translation can assert itself here, too: it will reveal the predominantly verbal character of OE if it is applied in proper setting. We have in mind here the achievements of those OE translators from Latin who were led not by the ambition to keep to the Latin original as closely as possible, but by an earnest desire to transmit to the reader the subject matter of the original in the most accessible and most intelligible manner. The wording of such a good OE translation is often consistently verbal, while the Latin original abounds in nominal constructions. As a specimen of such independent translational procedure we are quoting here a sentence from the Alfredian translation of the well-known story of Cadmon, together with the corresponding sentence from Bede's Ecclesiastical History, its Latin prototype (both quotations are taken from Mossé, l. c., p. 241f.):

Bede: At ille suscepto negotio abiit et mane rediens, optimo carmine, quod iubebatur, compositum (sic!) reddidit.

Alfred: þá hé þá hæfde þá wisan onfongne, þá éode hé hám tó his húse, ond cwóm eft on morgenne, ond þý betstan léope geglenged him ásong and ágeaf þæt him beboden wæs.

It will be noticed that two Latin nominal constructions were replaced in OE by dependent clauses characterized by their own finite verbs. Moreover, it is well worth pointing out that the finite verb forms were resorted to in spite of the presence in the OE grammatical system of the dative absolute and the present participle; the two forms obviously stood in a very close relation to the two nominal constructions of the Latin original, and yet the translator did not avail himself of them. This can hardly be due to a mere chance.

It was only in the course of the future development of English that due pre-requisites came to be established for strengthening the nominal tendencies within the domain of the English sentence. The most essential of the pre-requisites was undoubtedly the rise of new condensers, so typical of Modern English. Thus gerund came to crystallize as a distinct category by the end of the 14th century, but its differentiation according to tense and voice was deferred until the close of the 16th century. (64) Similarly, the rise of the pre-present participle and of the past infinitive presupposes the establishment of the pre-present tense as a paradigmatic entity within the verbal system of English. The same must apply, naturally, to the rise of the passive pre-present participle.

The facts so far considered seem to suggest a plausible hypothesis: the increasing importance of the part played by condensers in English went most probably hand in hand with the decreasing dynamism of the English finite verb form (65) (it will be agreed that our above remarks concerning the state of things in OE have made the conclusion of the comparatively high dynamism of the OE finite verb form fairly probable). Further studies will have to test our hypothesis by detailed investigation into the state of things typical of the EME, ME, and EModE periods (66) and — which should not be overlooked — to assess the degree of influence exercised by French and Latin in the process of nominalization of the unmarked English style in the course of centuries. Some amount of such influence appears to be undoubted, (67) but probably it only strengthened and accelerated the operation of tendencies that had been proper to the language even before it became submitted to such external influence. (68) It is commonly known, e. g., that the birth of the pre-present tense, denoted above as a necessary prerequisite for the rise of some of the condensers, was being prepared by a number of non-paradigmatic *ad hoc* constructions, fairly common in OE. (69)

Turning now to Czech, we are asking how the dynamism of its finite verb form appears when viewed from historical perspective.

The answer to the question is suggested by a number of clues. One of them is provided by what we know about the history of Czech definite participles ("přechodníky"). Living elements of OCz, in the course of later development they have been relegated to the sphere of bookish style, (70) and thus have more or less become signals of the marked stylistic sphere of ModCz. Another clue can be derived from the fact that Czech has added no item to its inventory of condensers throughout the course of its history (English, as has been shown above, has greatly enriched its corresponding inventory); on the contrary, it has lost one item that originally belonged to it, viz. the present passive participle. (71) Thus the nominal tendencies in the Czech sentence, seen in historical perspective, clearly follow a decreasing line. Obviously, the pre-requisites for a successful operation of such tendencies have by no means been improved (rather, they have deteriorated) in the course of centuries. One may suppose, accordingly, that the verbal tendencies in the Czech sentence have kept their positions intact (or rather, that they have even strengthened them) in the course of development. In other words, the dynamism of the ModCz finite verb form is probably just as strong as it was in OCz (and possibly even stronger).

However plausible the above suggestion may appear, it needs verifying because some facts seem to contradict it. It might be argued, that is, that by the loss of four of its tenses (aorist, imperfect, pluperfect, and "second" future) Czech has greatly reduced the dynamism of its finite verb forms. Indeed, it cannot be doubted that the remaining three tenses preserved in ModCz (present, preterite, and future) make up a poorer scale for the classification of verbal actions, as far as their setting in time is concerned, than did the OCz scale comprising seven tense categories.

Still, the objection must be denoted as unfounded. It should be recalled, first of all, that two of the lost tenses, pluperfect and second future, had periphrastic forms. From this it follows that in these two tenses the semantic centre of gravity did not rest in the finite verb form, which acted more or less as a copula, but in the other element of the periphrasis, which in OCz continued to be regarded as a nominal form (*byl jsem viděl* 'I had seen', *budeš viděl* 'you will have seen'). The cancellation of these two tenses thus did not result in weakening the position of simple finite verb forms, to which strong dynamism undoubtedly attached. On the contrary, the cancellation contributed efficiently to a further restriction of the strongholds held by nominal constructions and by the dynamically weak finite verb forms included in them. — As for the loss of the other two tenses, aorist and imperfect, one cannot deny that it really did affect the system of simple finite verb forms. But the semantic difference between the two tenses may be said to have concerned rather aspect phenomena than the setting in time of the action or process predicated, so that the function of the Czech verb to express that setting in time was in no way affected by the disappearance of the two tenses from the Czech grammatical system. Needless to say, the semantic difference formerly covered by the two tenses could be easily expressed in Czech, from that time on, in terms of differences of verbal aspect.

One should realize here that by the dynamism of the finite verb form is meant the ability of the finite verb form to express the predicated action or process in its totality. This totality is not limited to the setting in time of that action or process; it also includes the quantitative features, i. e. the so-called phenomena of verbal aspect (implying, among other things, whether the concerned action or process takes place once or repeatedly, further its perfective or imperfective character, etc.). And it is exactly the richness of simple finite verb forms, standing at the disposal of Czech

for the purpose of expressing aspect differences, that yields an additional proof of the high degree of dynamism characteristic of the Czech finite verb.

In English the situation is, of course, altogether different. In the absence of any system of simple finite verb forms for the expression of aspect differences, the English grammatical system either takes recourse to periphrases employing various lexical means (such as *used to*, *came to*, *would*, and the like) or simply charges the context of the sentence with the task of bringing about the intended shade of aspect (72) — thus, e. g., the form *I saw* may have, in various contexts, either the perfective or the imperfective meaning. Obviously the task of expressing aspect differences is shifted here from the finite verb form on to the contextual, i. e. syntagmatic, factors — a fact testifying again to the reduced degree of dynamism in the ModE finite verb form, which by itself is unable to express differences of verbal aspect. — Incidentally, it is sometimes asserted that the OE finite verb was still able to express such differences, though to a limited extent: it is said to have often used the prefix *ze-* to denote perfectivity. (73) If this theory is valid, it might yield additional support to our theory that the OE finite verb form possessed a higher amount of dynamism than its ModE counterpart.

Our thesis concerning the strong dynamism of the Czech finite verb form might be liable to another objection. Drawing all consequences from what has been said above of the loss of pluperfect and second future in Czech, one might justly point out that out of the three tense forms left in ModCz only one, the present tense, has a simple form (e. g. *vidím* 'I see'). In the other two tenses, the preterite *viděl jsem* 'I saw' and the future *budu vidět* 'I shall see', the semantic centre of gravity again appears to have been shifted on to the nominal element (on to the infinitive *vidět* or the past active participle *viděl*, respectively).

One is certainly justified to ask whether the verbal dynamism, if typical of only one of ModCz tense forms, could be given much prominence in characterizing Czech finite verb forms. Nevertheless, our formula may be safely upheld. Apart from the fact that the present tense, being the unmarked, basic element of the tense system, counts for its most important member, there are some other facts to be considered.

First, as regards the form of the future, it should be recalled that by the side of the periphrasis *budu vidět*, the meaning of which is imperfective, there also exists a simple perfective form *uvidím*, equally applicable to a future action. Further it is worth recalling that the form *budu vidět* prevailed, in the course of development, over the OCz form *budu vida* (*vida* being the form of the indefinite present participle) whose nominal character was still more conspicuous than that of *budu vidět*, as the nominal element *vida* was bound to agree with the subject of the sentence in gender and number. Needless to say, the infinitive form *vidět* was not subject to concord regulations and its nominal character was thus less apparent. (74)

The other case, that of the preterite *viděl jsem*, is even more interesting. In the 3rd person — which, as is generally admitted, presents the case of pure unmarked predication — the copula has disappeared (sg. *on viděl*, pl. *oni viděli*); not infrequently the copula is also omitted in the 1st person (*já viděl*, *my viděli*). Obviously the form of the active past participle *viděl*, nominal by descent, has been revaluated in ModCz into a finite verb form. This theory is borne out by one interesting fact. The negative element *ne-*, which in Czech verbs is regularly prefixed to the finite verb form, in the preterite tense is not joined with the copula, as might be expected and as was still the case in OCz *nejsem viděl*, but exactly with the form of the (so-called) participle: *neviděl jsem*. The differentiation of this *l*-form — now a finite verb form — according to gender (cf. the forms masc. *viděl*, fem. *viděla*, ntr. *vidělo*, concurring

with their subjects) is admittedly an isolated phenomenon in the verbal system of Czech; it is supported by the equally differentiated pronouns *ten — ta — to* 'the', *on — ona — ono* 'he/she/it' which often stand in close syntactical relations with the *l*-forms. The formal abolishing of gender differences in the plurals of the two pronouns, effected in popular dialects, was matched there by a parallel abolishing of the differences in the endings of the *l*-forms. (75)

To turn to English again, it is worth noting that from what has been said above about the loss of four tense forms in the history of Czech a lesson may be drawn for the proper understanding of the development that has occurred in English and, generally, of the situation now prevailing in that language. The development of the tense system in English, if evaluated from the indicated angle, shows convincingly how fallacious would necessarily be any conclusion establishing a sort of direct proportion between the increase or decrease in verbal dynamism in a language and the rise or loss, respectively, of a certain number of paradigmatic tenses that may be observed in that language. The increase in the number of tenses from two in OE to six (and possibly twelve, if continuous tenses should be included in the number) in ModE certainly cannot be taken for a sign of the increased dynamism of English finite verb forms. As a matter of fact, the newly arisen tenses added nothing whatever to that dynamism, because all of them were expressed by periphrastic forms, and it has been shown earlier in this chapter that in any such form the semantic centre of gravity rests in the nominal element. Further, it is well known that the finite auxiliaries found in such tense forms are often omitted, especially in colloquial and popular speech: *Have you got it? > Got it?, I am travelling in wool > Travelling in wool* (especially in introducing oneself, in telegraphic style and the like). The new tense forms may even be said to have considerably diminished the dynamism of English finite verb forms: it will be easily seen that with the rise of the new tenses the old simple forms, present and preterite, found themselves reduced to a minority in the system which used to be wholly dominated by them.

* * *

What has been said here so far does not imply, naturally, that English should be incapable of expressing, if need be, the dynamic character of the predicated action or process, or, *vice versa*, that Czech should be unable to word exact conceptual thinking in specialized contexts whose preference for nominal constructions has often been noted. The aim of the above arguments only was to document the existence of the two opposed syntactical tendencies, the one being typical of English, the other characterizing Czech, and to point out some interesting connections ascertainable between the two tendencies and some other features of the two language systems involved.

It will be of interest to find out what means each of the two language systems employs if faced with the task of expressing extra-linguistic reality in the style that, so to speak, runs counter to the tendency typical of the respective language system. To take up Czech first, the ability of that language to avail itself of rich nominal inventory in specialized contexts (i. e., in the marked style) has often been pointed out. (76) Not to mention other categories (such as verbal nouns, some special sorts of substantives and adjectives), the condensers discussed in the opening paragraphs of the present paper can be amply made use of. No doubt, the amount of their use in Czech may lag behind the corresponding amount ascertainable in English; this, however, detracts nothing from the ability of Czech to express the conceptual content

in a satisfactory manner, no matter how high the level of abstraction may be. One point deserves emphasizing here: the Czech condensers are genuine nouns, in no way fundamentally different, either in form or in function, from other Czech nouns belonging to the concerned morphological category (thus, a participle behaves as any other adjective, a verbal noun as any other noun of the concerned paradigm, etc.). (77)

English, when placed in an analogous situation, has to face a different task, viz. how to give due prominence to the dynamic character of the action or process to be depicted in words. With the more or less formal character of its finite verb, English must look for some other device enabling it to transmit to the listener or reader some idea of the dynamism and intensity of the predicated action or process that has to be depicted as vividly as possible. Strange to say, it finds such device exactly in its own means of condensation which, unlike Czech condensers, are able (at least to a degree) to express the setting in time of the actions or processes implied by the condensers used. The differentiation according to time of the English infinitive and gerund forms, as opposed to the non-differentiated character of the Czech infinitive and verbal noun forms, can hardly be due to a mere chance. (78) The effective part played by English condensers in imparting to the English sentence some amount of dynamism is greatly facilitated by the fact that, thanks to the reduced importance of the finite verb in English, the attention of the listener or reader is attracted rather by the condensers than by the more or less formal predicative verb. It should also be noted that after having acquired grammatical features originally typical only of verbal forms (such as tense and voice) the English condensers, so to speak, necessarily overstep the limits originally imposed on them by their nominal character (it has been shown above that in Czech such overstepping is absolutely unthinkable). — It is, of course, true that English condensers provide only for one part of the tasks performed in Czech by the dynamically potent finite verb; they inform only of the setting in time of the predicated action or process, but do not give any primary indication as to its quantitative side, i. e. of the phenomena falling under the heading of verbal aspect. But for all that, even the setting in time alone is able to impart to the English sentence something of that lively and vivid character which, by general consent, the Czech sentence acquires from the presence of its finite verb form.

The conclusion arrived at in the preceding paragraph is singularly confirmed by another piece of evidence, gained from the analysis of the materials discussed in the present chapter. In the Czech original we sometimes find a nominal construction not containing any noun derived from a verbal basis; still, its English translation is often worded so as to include a nominal element of that category (such as are usually found to act as condensers). Two specimens of such translational approach are given below (both are again drawn from P. Selver's translation of the Letters from England):

Jaká škoda toho krásného hnoje! (orig. p. 52).

What a pity to waste such splendid manure! (transl. p. 80).

Když se jednou přednormanským Britům povedlo postavit náramné chrámové lodi s dřevěným stropem, zůstali na tom i v gotice, patrně z pravěké konservativnosti (orig. p. 71).

When the ancient Britons had once contrived to build enormous church naves with a wooden ceiling, they kept to it in Gothic as well, evidently prompted by a primitive conservatism (transl. p. 95).

In the above two quotations no cases of condensation are involved — as a matter of fact, no Czech finite verb corresponds in them to the supposed condenser in English

(the infinitive form *to waste* in the first instance, in the second, the past participle *prompted*). The only reason that can justify the emergence of the ascertained nominal forms in the English translations is obviously an effort to impart a more vivid and lively character to the English context. — Sometimes such a nominal form can even occur in a sentence containing a predicative finite verb, especially when the meaning of the latter is so vague and general as to demand a complement concretizing its meaning. The increase of concreteness in the finite verb must clearly result in the increase of its dynamism. Thus, a Czech sentence like *Předseda pokračoval* is often translated into English as *The chairman went on to say* (the final infinitive form being a specimen of the concretizing element just referred to).

Thus the analysed examples appear to endorse our theory that, to some extent at least, the setting in time observable in ModE condensers is capable of making up for the distinctly reduced dynamism of ModE finite verb forms.

* * *

By way of concluding the above arguments, let us add two final remarks which may be of some importance.

In the first, we should like, once again, to touch the problem of interdependences between the analytical structure of language and the reduced dynamism of the finite verb form (together with the preference for nominal constructions) and, *vice versa*, between the synthetic language structure and the strong dynamism of the finite verb form (together with the lack of preference for nominal constructions). From what has been so far presented in this chapter it seems manifest that such interdependences do exist. Undoubtedly they do, (79) the connection between the compactness of the Modern English sentence and the analytical character of the grammatical structure of ModE is only too obvious. One should be warned, however, against accepting such interdependences with uncritical and oversimplifying naivety. English and Czech seem to represent exceptionally clearcut antipodal types of such interdependences. In some languages, however, the interdependence is likely to present a more complicated aspect. In general it may be expected that the style of specialized contexts will always be characterized by a comparatively high amount of nominal constructions even in those languages whose finite verb forms display an imposing degree of dynamism. Russian and Latin seem to be specimens of languages presenting such a more complicated state of things: the comparatively strong amount of dynamism of the finite verb appears to be accompanied there by a surprising predilection for using nominal elements in building up sentences. When studying concrete languages, one should thus beware of aprioristic conclusions regarding the interdependence: a careful examination of the particular language structure, along with all its complexities, can alone yield a satisfying solution of the problem. — For the above reasons we refrain from deriving far-reaching typological conclusions from the results of our analysis, relatively limited in scope, although we are fully aware of the importance of typological research work done in this field (see, e. g., V. Skalička, *Problém druhého slovesa [The Problem of the Additional Verb]*, *Český časopis filologický* 1, Prague 1943, pp. 9–14).

The other remark wants to register a number of important contributions devoted to the problems of the English infinitive and gerund. The author of the papers, Prof. I. Poldauf, (80) tries to find out the onomatological differences between the infinitive and the gerund, as well as between these forms on the one hand, and the dependent clauses on the other. Poldauf's arguments are full of highly interesting

observations, and his onomatological evaluation of the infinitival and gerundial functions, as well as his assessment of the place occupied by the infinitive and the gerund in the structure of English and in those of some other languages, are undoubtedly sound. Unfortunately, Poldauf does not always pay sufficient attention to the problems of the sentence (taken as a whole) of which the infinitive (or the gerund) forms a part, i. e. he sometimes fails to evaluate the condensing function of the infinitive and the gerund. In our opinion, full justice can only be done to the problem of the English infinitive and gerund if also their syntactic functions, viz. their ability to serve as a means of complex condensation, is fully taken into account.

V. THE OPPOSITIONS OF QUANTITY AND QUALITY IN MODERN ENGLISH VOWELS

In the preceding chapters we hope to have shown how thoroughgoing and manifold are the consequences of the English analytical drift for the 'higher' levels of language, morphological, syntactical and lexical. Already in Chapter I, however, we called our readers' attention to the less obvious fact that also the structure of the phonic level of language may reflect the influence of the analytical drift because the needs and wants of the grammatical system affected by that drift may call forth the necessity of bringing about some kind of phonic change (or, in other situations, of preventing a change that appears imminent). Instances of such influence will be discussed here in Chapters V, VI, and VII.

First of all, we want to treat of a highly interesting structural change permeating the whole system of English vowels. (81) On the face of it, the issue appears to be strictly phonematic: it is the problem of the functional hierarchy of quantitative and qualitative oppositions found in ModE vowels, and therefore it will have to be tackled by phonematic methods. It will be found, however, that the solution of what seems to be a purely phonematic problem has again been strongly co-determined by the needs and wants of the grammatical plane of language.

The peculiar character of quantitative differences of English vowels has always attracted the attention of linguists and phoneticians alike. Ever since the times of Henry Sweet and E. A. Meyer it has been commonly admitted that differences in vowel-length play a much less important part in English (82) than in languages like Czech, Finnish, Latin or Old Greek. In these languages vowel-length alone is regarded as essentially responsible for differences like *i* — *i:*, *u* — *u:*, *e* — *e:*, etc., and as solely relevant from the phonematic, functional viewpoint (see inst. like Czech *mile* 'kindly' — *míle* 'a mile'; *hole* 'sticks' — *holé* 'bare [ntr.]' etc.). If, in addition to this, the members of such pairs differ also in quality (if, e. g., they participate in the difference *lax vs. tense*), such difference is regarded as concomitant, secondary, less stable, and therefore phonematically irrelevant. In ModE, on the other hand, it is exactly the quantitative differences which appear very unstable, being usually conditioned by the phonematic surroundings of the concerned vowels. Much more stable are the qualitative differences invariably accompanying them; for this reason it has become almost generally accepted that from the functional viewpoint the quantitative differences are not really relevant in ModE. What phonematically matters in it, is (in the opinion of virtually all linguists) the manner in which the following consonant becomes joined to the preceding vowel; in other words, there appears to be a correlation of close *vs.* open contact (83) (Sievers's "stark- *vs.* schwachgeschnittener Akzent"). Some English phoneticians speak here

of an opposition of free *vs.* checked vowels; the free members of the opposition, such as *i:*, *u:* (or, more exactly, *ri*, *vu*), are regarded as unmarked members of the correlation, while the checked members, such as *i*, *u* (or rather, *ɪ*, *ʊ*) constitute their marked counterparts. Similar conditions can be found, e. g., in Mod. German and Mod. Dutch. (84)

The ascertained ModE state of things is particularly interesting if confronted with the conditions found in Old English. (85) Admittedly, at that early stage the English vocalic system was characterized by the presence of a genuinely quantitative correlation, not unlike that of Czech or Finnish. Any OE long vowel phoneme had its short counterpart in the system of language, and *vice versa*. Although some of the details have not yet been sufficiently cleared, (86) the existence of a quantitative correlation in OE vowels may be regarded as proved by word-pairs like *man* 'man' — *mān* 'crime', *dæl* 'dale' — *dāl* 'part', *is* 'is' — *īs* 'ice', *col* 'coal' — *cōl* 'cool', etc. (87) The fact that the correlative opposition was really one of quantity, and not one of contact, is also evidenced by the OE syllabic division of the type *e-ze*, *claw-u* and the like; in a language characterized by contact oppositions these words would have been syllabically structured as **eʒ-e*, **claw-u* etc. (88)

The comparison of OE and ModE "long" and "short" vowels from the phonematic viewpoint reveals that at some moment of the development of English the old, purely quantitative opposition of vowel phonemes must have become revaluated into that of contact, typical of ModE. We will attempt to trace here, though in very rough outlines, the main stages of the phonematic development of our opposition and, if possible, to establish the point at which the above-said important revaluation took place.

* * *

In examining the oppositions of vowel-length from the functional standpoint one cannot overlook the close link existing between long vowels and diphthongs. Both share the function of a syllable-bearer and under certain circumstances both may provide the basis for the so-called "polytony", i. e. for the occurrence of functional oppositions consisting in differences of pitch (such as *are*, or respectively were, found in ancient Greek, Serbo-Croatian, Lithuanian etc.). Twenty years ago it was pointed out by phonematicists (89) that the existence in a given language of polytonic oppositions is dependent on the presence of bimoric long vowel-phonemes in that same language. It has also been shown (90) that the existence of such bimoric vowel-phonemes is also a necessary pre-requisite for the existence of bimoric, biphonematic diphthongs. In those languages where the "long" vowels lack bimoric character, the diphthongs cannot, strictly speaking, be evaluated as bimoric, and their monophonematic interpretation becomes very probable.

The latter kind of situation can be met with in ModE whose *i-* and *u-*diphthongs share with ModE "long" vowels their "free" character, and thus also call for an analogous phonematic interpretation: neither *i:*, *u:*, *ə:*, *a:*, *ɔ:* nor *ei*, *ai*, *au*, *ou* can be evaluated as bimoric entities, and from the functional viewpoint it is most feasible to regard all of them as monophonemes. (91) The biphonematic interpretations of the said ModE long vowels and diphthongs, such as have been proposed especially by American scholars, are at variance both with obvious phonetic facts and with what is known about the phonematic development of English. (92)

To turn now to OE, the bimoric character of its long vowels and diphthongs is evidenced by a number of facts. The most interesting of them are the contractions after the loss of intervocalic *-h-* (such as **teʒan* > *teohan* > *tēon*, **slaʒan* > *sleahan* >

> *slēan*, **sihīþ* > Angl. *sīþ*, WS. *siehp* etc.), (93) and of course the results of the operation of the so-called West Gmc rhythmical law, demonstrated by word-pairs like Nom. sg. *ziefu* — *ār*, Nom. Acc. pl. *fatu* — *hūs*, pret. *nerede* — *dēmdē* etc. Such facts prove the quantitative equivalence in OE of a long vowel to two short vowels. — If in addition to this, we examine the OE “long diphthongs” *ēa*, *ēo*, *īo* we find that in earliest OE they must have been evaluated as biphonematic and bimoric groups, consisting of *æ* + *a*, *e* + *o*, *i* + *o* respectively. This is shown by the fact that the phonic structures of these diphthongs can be deduced from their PGmc sources **au*, **eu*, **iu* by applying to the latter those sound-laws which regularly govern the development of the independent short vowels composing such diphthongs (e. g., **a* in **au* changes into *æ* in a way perfectly parallel to the development of **a* in other positions; **-u* behaves in the same way as unstressed *-u* outside the diphthongal groups, etc.). (94) For earliest OE, then, the bimoric character of OE long vowels appears fairly certain, and it must have remained so throughout the OE period, despite some phonological changes that were due to obliterate it to some extent.

One such change was the early revaluation of the OE biphonematic diphthongs *ēa*, *ēo*, *īo* (and, of course, of the newly-arisen *īe*) into monophonemes. As was rightly realized by A. I. Smirnitckiy (l. c. 83), this change was heralded by the failure of OE *ēa* [= *æa*] to conform to the sound-law according to which *æ* was to be velarized into *a* under the influence of a following velar vowel (cf. OE alternations of the type Gen-sg. *dæzēs* ‘of the day’ — NAcc. pl. *dazas* ‘days’). This sound-law was often violated in Late OE (and this ultimately resulted in the phonematic split of the Early OE phoneme *æ/a*), but in the Early OE period the alternation *æ/a* was still living, so that its neglect in the diphthong *ēa* must have become reflected in the phonematic relations of OE vowels. Naturally, the phonematic revaluation of OE *ēa* into a monophoneme must have been reflected also physiologically and acoustically: the revaluation was most probably manifested by the prevalence of the glide originally joining the two component parts of the diphthong over the component parts themselves: from then on, the diphthongs were mainly identified by the zonal extent and the direction of the glide, not by any exact phonematic identification of their initial and final points. (95) It is alone this new principle of identification that can account for the use of the digraphs *ea*, *eo*, *io*, *eo* (and *ie*) also in those cases where the scribes wanted to put down the “short diphthongs”, due to “breaking” and some other processes. Whatever phonematic value these “short diphthongs” had, the gliding character of their articulation is hardly open to doubt. (96) Besides, the assumption of an essentially gliding articulation of the diphthong *īo* is fairly compatible with its change into *ēo* in West Saxon and also the ultimate monophthongization of all OE diphthongs on the eve of the ME period goes much better with the assumption of their gliding, monophonematic character than with the idea of bimoric and biphonematic diphthongal groups.

The other change that somewhat blurred the bimoric character of OE long vowel phonemes was the well-known lengthening of short OE vowels before the “lengthening groups of consonants” (e. g. in *findan* > *fīndan*, *cild* > *cīld*) at the close of the 8th or at the beginning of the 9th century (see Luick, HG § 268). The results of the change are of considerable importance for the establishment of mutual relations binding OE short and long vowel phonemes: they show that each short OE vowel phoneme had its long, qualitatively identical counterpart in the system. On the other hand, the change undoubtedly contributed to the undermining of the correlation of vocalic quantity in English by diminishing the number of word-positions

in which the correlation could be utilized (or, in phonematic terms, by reducing the functional load of that correlation). Even if in some instances the results of the change were restored by analogy (so that in LME word-pairs can be found in which the opposition of quantity is relevant also before the lengthening groups, cp. *wind* sb. — *wīnd* vb.), the extent of the reduction cannot be underrated, the more so that from the beginning of the 11th century a complementary process was taking place, viz. the shortening of long vowels before non-lengthening groups of consonants — see, e. g., *fēdde* > *fedde*, *twēntiz* > *twentiz*, *dūst* > *dust*, etc. (cp. Luick, HG § 352).

It will have been noted that, but for the occasional interference of analogy, the two processes would have resulted in entirely eliminating quantitative oppositions in those English vowels which were followed by any group of consonants closing the syllable. For all such interference, however, enough margin was left throughout the OE period for the assertion of the quantitative correlation of vowels — oppositions like *man* — *mān*, *dæl* — *dǣl*, *is* — *īs*, *col* — *cōl*, quoted above, persisted virtually unaffected. And it may be safely stated that this quantitative opposition continued to be based on the bimoric conception of the long vowel, because all through the OE period no conclusive evidence can be given of its replacement by some other conception.

* * *

A glance at the Early ME vocalic system of East Midlands (by about 1200) reveals that no basic change can be registered in the quantitative opposition of English vowels. The quantitative correlation still persisted and again no conclusive evidence can be given for the change of its bimoric conception. A large number of important shifts had undoubtedly occurred. In East Midlands of 1200 the correlative partners were no longer the descendants of the OE vowels *æ* — *ǣ*, *o* — *ō*, *e* — *ē*, *i* — *ī*, *u* — *ū*, but the EME vowels *a* — *ā*, *e* — *ē*, and possibly also *i* — *ī*, and *u* — *ū*, (97) while the vowels *o*, *i*, *ū* had no correlative counterparts. The correlation, however, persisted despite the narrowing of its scope. Soon after 1200 the vitality of the correlation was demonstrated by the change of *ā* > *ǣ* which, though abolishing the correlative pair *a* — *ā*, provided another, that of *o* — *ǣ*, symmetrical with *e* — *ē*, and therefore structurally very significant.

In the first half of the 13th century the scope of the correlation was still more narrowed in view of the lengthening of short *a*, *e*, *o* in open stressed syllables (see, e. g., *maken* > *māken*, *speken* > *spēken*, *hopen* > *hōpen*). This change amounted to virtual neutralization of quantitative oppositions in open stressed syllables. Nevertheless, it never did away with the correlation of quantity altogether, as there was still left a number of word-positions in which the correlation could assert itself (see word pairs like *on* — *ǫn*, *el* — *ēl* etc., *red* — *rēd*, *beste* — *bēste*, *bot* — *bōt* etc.). The number of such word-pairs was to increase considerably after the ultimate loss of the final unstressed *-e* [=ə] in the 14th century. This change called forth pairs like *met* — *mēt*, *pop* — *pōp*, *or* — *ōr* etc., which meant a marked reinforcement of our correlation in the latter half of ME. — Incidentally, at that time the scope of our correlation was widened through the acquiring by the long *ā*-vowel of phonematic status; this led to the emergence of word-pairs like *hat* — *hāt*, *mad* — *mād* etc. — up to then the *ā*-vowel, due to the lengthening of *a* in stressed open syllables, had been a mere allophone of the short *a*-phoneme.

The point that needs particular stressing in this connection is that there never was a period in OE or EME in which the correlation of quantity might have been non-existent, as was mistakenly supposed by A. Martinet. (98) In his opinion, 12th

century English achieved what he calls isochrony, i. e. the state of things resulting from the elimination of vocalic quantity as a phonematic feature. In Martinet's opinion the only exception to the rule of isochrony was the preservation in ME of the pairs *i* — *ī* and *u* — *ū*. He believes that exactly the isolated position of *ī* and *ū* in an otherwise entirely isochronic system of vowel phonemes was to give an impetus to the diphthongization of the vowels, and so to the well-known "Great Vowel Shift" (op. cit., p. 253). Our above analysis, however, reveals that the two vocalic pairs were by no means the only exceptions to isochrony in English. As a matter of fact, there had always been a number of pairs of phonemes which could function, at least in some positions, by virtue of their quantitative oppositions alone.

It is true, the existence of a tendency drifting towards isochrony since the OE period cannot be denied, but it never achieved its aim: the forces propping the correlation were strong enough to preserve it, though on a narrowed scale. Besides, it should be pointed out that the very pairs of vowels quoted by Martinet as the sole bearers of the quantitative correlation left in ME had in fact ceased to be really correlative in the territory of Midlands, while other pairs of vowels, overlooked by Martinet (such as *e* — *ē*, *a* — *ā*, later replaced by *o* — *ō*), did preserve their correlative partnership all over the territory.

The existence of the quantitative correlation of vowels in EME can thus be taken for proved. Was the opposition involved in it really one of bimoric *vs.* monomoric character? It appears that this question can be answered in the affirmative. Evidence for this assertion can be drawn from the so-called new ME *i*- and *u*-diphthongs, going back to OE tautosyllabic groups "vowel + *ȝ*, *w* or *ȝ* (later > *w*)". As is well known, shortenings took place in the first diphthongal elements of those new diphthongs which had arisen from OE groups "long vowel + *ȝ* or *w*" (e. g. *cāȝ* > *kēi*, *snāw* < *snou* and the like, cp. Luick, HG § 373). These shortenings can best be accounted for on the assumption that EME diphthongs were bimoric groups in which each of the two component parts counted for one mora (and one only, because trimoric diphthongs never existed in English). As one of the moras had to be allotted to the second component, going back to the OE consonantal *ȝ* or *w*, only one mora was left for the first diphthongal component. If the latter was originally a long, i. e. bimoric vowel, it had to "give up" one of its moras, in other words, to become shortened. It should be stressed that this kind of shortening occurred in all EME diphthongal combinations, irrespective of the quality of the long vowel (see, e. g., *twēzen* > *twēi-en*, *grōwan* > *grōw-en* etc.). The universality of the process testifies to the universal validity of the bimoric nature of ME diphthongs. Besides, it should be recalled that such bimoric diphthongs co-existed in the language with long vowel phonemes with which they shared not only the function of syllable bearers but also some prosodic and rhythmical functions. This co-existence can be taken as a further proof of the bimoric character of EME long vowel phonemes, to which the short vowel phonemes were then obviously opposed as monomoric.

Moreover, in the new EME diphthongs clear tendency stands out to identify their component parts with independent short vowels coexisting with them in the language. This tendency sometimes leads to results worthy of notice. In the diphthongs *ēi*, *eu*, *ou* there were difficulties with the identification of the first component parts as no independent short vowels *e*, *o* existed in the ME system of vocalic phonemes. It was undoubtedly for this reason that the three diphthongs were soon (in the latter half of the 13th century) to be replaced by *ī*, *iū* and *ū*, respectively. Obviously, in all these cases the components *e* and *o* were superseded by those items of the short (monomoric) vocalic inventory which were qualitatively closest to them, i. e.

by *i* and *u* respectively. In other words, the monophthongization of *ei* > *i* and *ou* > *u* should be interpreted, respectively, as *ei* > *ii* > *i* and *ou* > *uu* > *u*. Our thesis concerning the bimoric character of EME vowels is thus obtaining fresh support.

In deciding between the monophonematic and biphonematic evaluation of a diphthong the above-noted identification (or lack of identification) of diphthongal component parts with short, independent phonemes of the language plays a major part. (99) This holds good for the study not only of present-day languages but also of their historical development. Therefore, the criterion of identification could not be ignored by scholars inquiring into the phonematic nature of diphthongs in Early English. It led, e. g., A. I. Smirnitskiy (l. c., p. 84f.) to the conclusion that our EME diphthongs must be interpreted as monophonemes. He argued that EME *a* in *daies*, *lawe*, although placed in an open syllable, was not lengthened into *ā*; from this he deduced the monophonematic character of EME *ai*, *au*, and analogously of all other EME diphthongs of the involved category.

This conclusion, however, is not convincing, because — apart from some chronological difficulties — the position of *a* in *daies*, *lawe* cannot be identified with that of *a* in, say, *lady*, *maken*. The difference lies in the nature of the phoneme intervening between the *a*-vowel of the stressed syllable and the unstressed vowel of the syllable that follows. In *daies*, *lawe* the intervening phoneme was a monomeric vowel, united with the preceding stressed vowel into a bimoric (and biphonematic) diphthong, and only after this diphthong was placed the limit of the syllable. As the bimoric diphthongs *ai*, *au* acted as syllable bearers, equivalent to long vowel phonemes, no lengthening could occur, because no additional mora can be added to a bimoric group. Opposed to this, in *lady*, *maken* the syllable limit still lay between *a* and the following simple consonant. (100) Here the monomeric syllable bearer could be, and actually was, lengthened, because the adding of another mora was there technically feasible. Still, even though the *a*- in bimoric *ai*, *au* could not be lengthened, its mora safely guaranteed the preservation of its independent phonematic status within such diphthongs (and the same must have applied to other diphthongs of the ME period).

Obviously, the criterion of parallel development is only of value if applied to comparable contexts. For the same reason, one cannot endorse Smirnitskiy's argument deducing the monophonematic value of ME diphthongs from the merger of a number of such diphthongs (such were the mergers of *ei* and *ēi*, of *eu* and *iū*, etc.). As was shown above, however, such mergers were due to the very opposite cause, viz. to the bimoric and biphonematic character of the diphthongs concerned. There is, in fact, only one change which apparently does not fit into the scheme outlined here, viz. the relatively early change of *ei* > *ai* (as in *wēi* > *way*, *reīn* < *rain* etc., see Luick, HG § 408). We will discuss this change later on; here we only want to point out that, apart from this single change, (101) the application of the criterion of parallel development also confirms our evaluation of EME diphthongs as bimoric and biphonematic.

Instances of parallel development of first diphthongal component parts and of independent short vowels corresponding to them can occasionally be detected in later history of English. Karl Luick registers the changes of the diphthongs *ei* and *ui*, known to have taken place between the 16th and 18th centuries, as the latest instances of the kind (HG § 544). He shows, e. g., that until the middle of the 18th century *u*- in *ui* was developing along the same lines as the short, independent ME *u*, so that by the indicated time-limit *ui* duly became *ei*. It was only after that date

that the ModE spelling pronunciation *oi* prevailed (see, e. g. ME *juint* > 18th cent. *joint* > ModE *joint*; cp. Luick, HG § 544). (102) — On the other hand, the EModE development of ME diphthongs *ai*, *au*, *ou*, *iu* reveals that from about 1500 they lack such parallelism. According to Luick's theory — a fairly probable one — the first three diphthongs extended the duration of their first components at the expense of the second, which were ultimately bound to disappear (in the latter half of the 17th century). Luick also points out that the development of the lengthened first components of *ai*, *ou* followed the same lines as that of the original ME long vowels *ā*, *ō* (while the development of *au* followed a more complicated pattern, see Luick's HG § 514ff). (103) If Luick's theory is valid we must conclude that on the eve of the EModE period our three diphthongs ceased to be evaluated as biphonematic groups and, in view of their later monophthongization, must have been regarded as monophonematic entities. Until their monophthongization, they probably constituted gliding diphthongs.

Our arguments of the preceding paragraphs reveal that the full revaluation of ME *i*- and *u*-diphthongs into monophonemes cannot have been completed so early as is sometimes supposed. But it is equally certain that the first steps towards such revaluation must have been taken relatively early, at the time when EME *ei* passed into *ai* (i. e., at about the close of the 13th century), and that instances pointing to the abandonment of the above-discussed parallel development were to become more numerous by about 1500. Since, however, instances of such parallelism had not entirely died down by that time, and were even to emerge or persist by the middle of the 18th century, one conclusion seems inescapable. Throughout the indicated period there appears to have gone on a fight between two opposed phonematic conceptions of diphthongs, the old one, biphonematic and bimoric, which manifested itself in cases of parallel development, and the new one, monophonematic and increasingly "amoric" (i. e., no longer classifying vowels and diphthongs according to the number of moras contained by them), evidenced by lack of such development. In the long run, the fight (which most probably took the form of differences in dialects of the older and the younger generations) became decided in favour of the monophonematic conception.

* * *

One of the factors that contributed to the victory of the monophonematic and amoric conception shall have our closer attention. It was the inability of the ME diphthongs to become dissociated, in the spoken context, into their component parts. The OE relations of the type *dæz* — *dæ-zes* were replaced by the ME relations of the type *dai* — *dai-es*, and finally, *dai* — *dai-z*. The shift of the syllabic limit, responsible for this change, was placed by K. Luick far back into the EME period. If his inference is correct, this shift may have been the earliest step taken in the new direction. — With the ultimate dropping of the unstressed final *-e* in the middle of the 14th century the old biphonematic and bimoric conception of English diphthongs suffered a severe blow. Nevertheless, it persisted by tradition as long as there existed independent short vowels with which the diphthongal component parts could be identified. Behind the scene, however, conditions were being prepared for a definite shift of balance in favour of the monophonematic, amoric conception. Perhaps the most important part was played here by the re-arrangement of mutual relations of English short and long vowel phonemes.

It will be recalled that in OE each short vowel phoneme had its corresponding long counterpart. In the EME period, however, some sound changes were to disturb

this correspondence. Among other things, there was the early 13th century lowering of short *e* and *o*, which qualitatively differentiated them from \bar{e} and \bar{o} , their former counterparts (see Luick, HG § 378). Somewhat later occurred a corresponding lowering of *i* and *u*; according to Luick (HG § 380) it took place in the 14th century south of the Humber, while in Northumbrian it must have been accomplished by the end of the 13th century, because Nth. *i* and *u* participated in the process of lengthening of short vowels in open syllables ($i > \bar{e}$, $u > \bar{o}$). Some scholars, such as H. C. Wyld (104) and B. Trnka (105), believe that south of the Humber the articulation of *i* and *u* of open syllables were also lengthened into \bar{e} and \bar{o} respectively. The scarcity of ModE evidence for this change is explained away by Wyld as due to analogical levelling. To this should be added B. Trnka's observation that, among other things, the ME short stem vowels in forms like *sick*, *must*, going back to EME *sēk*, *mōste*, are best explained by the early shortening of their stem vowels \bar{e} , \bar{o} into what were their relatively closest short counterparts.

Whatever may have been the date on which the short vowels *i*, *u* were lowered sufficiently to become correlative partners of \bar{e} or, respectively, \bar{o} , one thing may be taken for granted: as early as in the 12th century the articulations of *e* and *o* must already have been lowered too much to be acceptable as outcomes of the shortening of EME \bar{e} or, respectively, \bar{o} . This is also shown by the 13th century lengthenings of $e > \bar{e}$, $o > \bar{o}$, which clearly prove the establishment of a correlative relation between the members of these pairs. As a result of these correlative regroupings, \bar{e} and \bar{o} must have tended to enter new correlative partnerships, preferably with *i* and, respectively, *u*, which were qualitatively best fitted to become the short counterparts of the former long vowel phonemes, the more so that the quality of the latter pair, *i* and *u*, cannot have remained unaffected by the earlier lowering of *e* and *o*, their closest neighbours in the system of short vowels. As a result of these changes, by the early part of the 13th century the Midland and Southern long vowel phonemes \bar{i} and \bar{u} had become excluded from the correlation of quantity. This fact was duly stressed by B. Trnka (l. c., p. 164) who also acutely realized that this exclusion of \bar{i} , \bar{u} , leading to their diphthongization, was in fact the ultimate motive of the well-known "Great Vowel Shift". To this we want to add that the isolation of \bar{i} and \bar{u} had its say also in the above-established fight of the two conceptions of diphthongs in ME.

There can be no doubt that the new LME diphthongs *ri* and *vu*, going back to \bar{i} and, respectively, \bar{u} , must have constituted glide vowels, functionally evaluated as monophonematic wholes. The validity of this assumption is proved by the subsequent development of these diphthongs (into $ei > \bar{e}i > \bar{a}i$ or, respectively, $ou > \bar{o}u > \bar{a}u$) which was anything but parallel to the development of the independent phonemes that might have been considered as potential candidates for the phonematic identification with the supposed components of the new diphthongs. It can be safely assumed that the new diphthongs substantially contributed to the shifting of balance in favour of the monophonematic conception of English *i*- and *u*-diphthongs. Indeed, it appears that in EModE the only two remaining diphthongs of the old, biphonematic type were the descendants of ME *ui* and *qi*, both confined to words of foreign provenance (such as *quint*, *joy*, *toy*) or of emotional colouring (*boy*, *ahoy*). The replacement of *ui* by *qi*, alluded to above, left *qi* as the sole surviving specimen of the old diphthongal type among the English *i*- and *u*-diphthongs. Its survival may be satisfactorily explained by the signal-like character of *qi* in foreign and emotionally coloured words, referred to above. (106)

The gliding *i*- and *u*-diphthongs were to experience a noteworthy expansion in the

further history of English, as will be realized from the fact that they have replaced all ME long vowels — the only really long monophthongal vowels of the Southern British standard, *a:*, *æ:*, *o:*, were to arise from other sources during the former half of ModE. — It remains to be noted that the EModE abundance of gliding, monophonemic *i-* and *u-*diphthongs, coupled with virtual absence of the former type of biphonemic, bimoric *i-* and *u-*diphthongs, and with the scarcity of long monophthongal vowel phonemes, could not but lead to the amoric evaluation of “long” vowel phonemes of ModE. As a result of this, the two distinctly present groups of English vowel phonemes, the short and the long (including the diphthongs), had to be evaluated on a basis of some other correlating principle. The best means that could be employed was the opposition of contact referred to above. (107)

* * *

Here a question naturally emerges, when and how the new correlating principle became introduced into English. The time of the introduction can be estimated quite unambiguously: the opposition of contact must have co-existed with the opposition of monomeric *vs.* bimoric quantity, the former being a concomitant phonic feature of the latter. It took some time before the opposition of contact acquired the status of the mark of correlation. This important change must have taken place simultaneously with the victory of the amoric and monophonemic conception of English diphthongs, i. e. soon after the beginning of the EModE period. Less easy to answer is the question of how and when contact differences emerged in English as purely phonetic facts, prior to their becoming functionally relevant.

One thing is clear: the acquiring by English short vowels of close contact with the following consonants implies the shifting of syllable limits, such as *gla-des* > *glad-es*, *li-fap* > *liv-eth*, *ste-de* > *sted-e* etc. This shift appears to have been analogous to the above-mentioned shift of *da-ies* > *dai-əs*, which, according to Luick, took place in the former half of the 12th century. On the other hand, the shift in instances like *gla-des* cannot have taken place before the lengthening of short vowels in open syllables had been accomplished, because close contact is incompatible with an open vowel. This means that the *terminus a quo* for the establishment of contact opposition as a phonetic phenomenon must have been the middle of the 13th century, at least south of the Humber. (108) The date of the *terminus ad quem*, in its turn, is supplied by the ultimate loss of the final unstressed *-e* after the consonant entering the contact, i. e., for Southeast Midlands, roughly the middle of the 14th century (cf. Luick, HG § 473, Horn-Lehnert, LL § 305). Although, for a time, the contact opposition was merely a concomitant feature of the still existing correlation of quantity (a monomeric *vs.* a bimoric vowel), there can be no doubt that the presence of the contact opposition, though only concomitant, had its share in the ultimate abolishment of the quantitative correlation of vowels in English: In other words, the existence of the contact opposition meant for the language system a new possibility of potential development, a possibility held in reserve to be made use of in case of emergency. As has been shown above, such a case was really to occur at the beginning of the EModE period.

* * *

The last question to be considered in this connection is that of the motive responsible for the shift of syllable limits in the EME period. That motive, we believe, is not

very far to seek: it was again closely connected with the distinct drift of the English language system from the synthetic type of grammatical structure, still characteristic of OE, to that of the analytical structure, to be fully acquired by English in its EMod period. It will be noted, that is, that in a considerable part of the English vocabulary the shifting of syllable limits amounted to a phonetic underlining of grammatical limits separating the stem from the suffixes or endings (see instance like *dai-as*, *drink-est*, *drink-əp]-as*, *giv-ing*, *giv-en* etc.). In other words, the shifting of syllable limits has contributed to what A. Martinet aptly calls "la concentration de l'énergie sur les parties lexicales du mot"; (109) this concentration is typical of Modern West European languages with admittedly analytical structures of grammatical systems. The underlining of morphematic limits is the more remarkable that it concerns mainly short words of domestic origin, belonging to the most representative stratum of the English vocabulary, to its innermost core, common to all speakers of the language.

In this connection, a question might be raised why the phonetic underlining of grammatical limits was not effected in all words that used to be characterized in ME by a vacillation of short and long stem vowels. It is well known, that is, that in a fairly large number of words it was the long, not the short vowel, that came to be generalized (see, e. g., *dale*, *tame*, *yoke* etc.). Although it is hardly possible to give a definite answer to this question, one fact emerges with sufficient clearness: A wholesale generalization of short stem vowels would have resulted in a complete dismissal from such words of the correlation of contact. This would have meant a serious impoverishment of the phonematic inventory of English, because this correlation was found most useful in building up word and sentence contexts. It appears thus that the interests of the grammatical plane found themselves to be contradictory to those of the phonic plane, and that the matter could only be settled by a sort of compromise.

Another point appears to be worthy of notice. The number of instances in which the long stem vowel became shortened is not confined to words like *black*, *glad*, *lock*, and the like, in which the long and short vowels originally used to vacillate. Undoubtedly, words like *book*, *dead*, *head*, *red* etc. should also be considered in this connection. As is well known, the shortening of long stem vowels in these and similar words has never been satisfactorily explained. It does not seem improbable that the shortening of their stem vowels may, too, reveal a tendency to phonetically underline the grammatical limits existing between the stem and the suffix (see, e. g., *book-ing*, *dead-en*, *head-ing*, *redd-en* and the like). It is certainly remarkable that most of such shortenings did not take place until the 15th and 16th centuries — at that time, as has been shown above, the opposition of contact had come to be firmly rooted in the phonic plane of English, if not as a phonematic, then certainly as a phonetic fact.

Our analysis of the development of the quantitative correlation of English vowels appears to have disclosed, once again, a highly interesting specimen of the interdependence of the planes composing the system of language, and particularly of the influence exercised on the structure of the phonic plane by the structural needs of the grammatical plane. Obviously, the existence of the correlation of contact in ModE vowels is one of the most remarkable less familiar aspects of the analytical trend of English.

VI. THE OPPOSITIONS OF VOICE AND TENSION IN MODERN ENGLISH PAIRED CONSONANTS

In our last two chapters we want to comment on two interesting instances of the traces the analytical drift has left in the system of ModE consonants. (110) The operation of the drift to be discussed in the present chapter shows positive interference of the analytical drift in that system. The interference is reflected in what is traditionally denoted as the opposition of voice in paired consonants of the type *d — b*, *t — d*, *s — z*, and the like. A comparison of the said opposition in English

with an analogous opposition found in some Slavonic languages (especially Czech, Slovak, and Russian) will reveal some interesting differences which appear to be due to the differences ascertainable in the "higher" levels of the concerned languages.

First of all, some comment is necessary on the phonematic status of the above-noted opposition in the examined languages. While there has always been full agreement that in the Slavonic languages one has to do with the genuine functional oppositions of "voiceless *vs.* voiced" character (or, to use the terms of the Prague group, with "the correlation of voice") (111), students of the phonematic structure of English have recently (112) arrived at the conclusion that oppositions of English consonantal pairs like *p - b*, *t - d*, *k - g*, *f - v*, *s - z*, and the like, must be functionally evaluated as "tense *vs.* lax" (or, in Prague terms, as cases of the correlation of tension; in historical grammars, this opposition is usually referred to by the terms "fortis *vs.* lenis"). This qualification is borne out by the well-known fact that the opposition of the tension is much more stable in the articulatory and acoustic make-up of concrete English contexts than the opposition of voice. As was shown in detail by D. Jones and other phoneticians, (113) the latter opposition often becomes more or less neutralized in word-final, and sometimes even in word-initial, positions, while the opposition of tension regularly persists unimpaired. Differences of voiceless *vs.* voiced character in the examined English consonantal pairs are evaluated only as concomitant (or, redundant) features that certainly help to identify the concerned phonemes but are not essential for their phonematic classification.

What has so far been said about the state of things in ModE becomes even more interesting if confronted with the situation prevailing in OE. The reconstruction of the OE phonematic situation in the concerned points is comparatively easy, in view of the relative consistency of the OE spelling, based mostly on regular correspondence of phonemes and graphemes. (114) As is well known, already in Early OE words like *plōz*, *burz*, containing an etymological -z, were often spelled as *plōh*, *burh*. Such spellings clearly indicate a devoicing of the originally voiced fricatives; the same kind of devoicing is evidenced by spellings like *lif*, *hlāf*, with -f going back to an earlier voiced fricative -b. It should be noted that the devoicing had occurred in those word-positions in which the energy of articulation must have been perceptibly weakened. And it is exactly the occurrence of the changes of *z > h*, *b > f* in such word-positions that may be regarded as evidence for the thesis that the relations of *z - h*, *b - f* and the like must have been evaluated as oppositions of voice, not as those of tension. Where the actual opposition of tension is involved, the difference of the opposed sounds in word-final positions is usually preserved (i. e. no neutralisation occurs), and if any change does take place in such word-positions characterized by the weakening of articulatory energy, it is the change of a tense fricative into its lax counterpart, such as *f > v*, *s > z*, etc. Recently, this has been convincingly shown by W. Horn and M. Lehnert in their treatment of English phonological development in unstressed words and final syllables ("druckschwache Wörter und Endsilben") since the Early ME period. (115)

Analogous evidence of the presence of voice correlation in OE consonants is furnished by occasional Early OE spellings like *lamp*, *hēafut*, *kyninc*, standing for regular *lamb*, *hēafod*, *cyning*. (116) The change of the voiced explosive into its voiceless counterpart occurred mainly in unstressed syllables and in those stressed syllables in which the final consonant was separated from the stressed vowel by an intervening *l* or nasal. Clearly, the change again occurred in word-positions characterized by markedly weakened articulatory energy. — The fact that in

other OE monosyllables final *-b*, *-d*, *-g* are not recorded as *-p*, *-t*, *-k*, respectively, is attributed by Luick to their supposed phonetic qualities *-b̥*, *-d̥*, *-g̥* which in his opinion continued to be phonematically identified with the respective voiced sounds *b*, *d*, *g*, found in other positions. This theory, however, does not sound particularly convincing, especially in view of the undoubted changes of *-z > -h*, and *-b̥ > -f*. It appears more probable that the OE writings in *-b*, *-d*, *-g* are due to morphematic analogy, so well known from the written systems of modern Slavonic languages (such as Czech, Slovak, Russian, etc.). This explanation might be supported by the notorious tendency of the OE spelling not to change the graphical make-up of the morpheme even though its phonetic (and sometimes also phonematic) structure might be altered, cp. *hlāf* — *hlāfas*, *rīs* — *rīsan*, *wez* — *wezas* etc.

So much for the state of things in OE. Since, as has been shown above, the functional opposition of ModE consonants like *p* — *b*, *f* — *v* etc. is one of tension, one is faced with the problem of how and why the reevaluation of the opposition of voice into that of tension can have taken place. K. Luick, too, though he did not realize the problem in its full complexity, was struck by the contradiction existing between the ModE forms like *field*, *wind* on the one hand, and the corresponding occasional OE (and regional ME) forms ending in *-t* on the other. In other words, Luick did not overlook the fact that in a great majority of instances (and especially in the East Midlands whose dialects were to become the basis of the Southern British norm of ModE) the word-final voiceless lenis, whose existence in OE he took for granted, not only failed to be replaced by a voiceless fortis, occasionally evidenced by some OE writings, but that this supposed voiceless lenis sound was evidently to give way to a voiced (or at least partially voiced) lenis. Luick tried to account for this surprising fact by a number of partial explanations, the most important of which was his suggestion of levelling due to analogy, especially operating in such sandhi situations in which the supposed lenes had preserved their voiced character („die stimmlose Lenis war durch Ausgleich wieder beseitigt worden,“ HG § 713).

Luick's explanation is obviously too mechanical; in our opinion, the real motives of the process undoubtedly lay deeper. They can only be detected by taking into consideration the conditions prevailing in the entire system of English during the critical period. It is only by keeping to this principle that one can hope to establish a theory covering all involved facts.

In his well-known compendium of diachronistic phonematics, (117) A. Martinet rightly insists on the presence in any language of two opposed forces the co-operation of which can more or less account for the development of language. One of these two forces is the necessity to satisfy all communicative and expressive needs and wants of the given language community, while the other one may be denoted as inertia, i. e. an effort to reduce to the lowest possible limit any bodily or mental activity connected with speaking. It appears that the co-operation of these two tendencies may suggest an adequate solution of our problem. There can be no doubt that the devoicing of paired consonants in word-final positions (such as seems to have been typical of OE) is one of the ways in which the factor of inertia asserts itself in many languages: by its assimilative character it certainly contributes to what is commonly called "economy of articulation". But the factor of inertia in Martinet's conception can only assert itself if its operation does not endanger the basic function of language. And since this basic function of language can be defined as that of acting as a means of communication and expression, the operation of the factor of inertia is necessarily controlled by the communicative and expressive function of language.

Such control is especially essential in those cases in which the impending sound

change may considerably restrict the functional load of some particular phonematic opposition. And this is exactly what is due to happen in the event of the devoicing of paired consonants in word-final positions. This change is bound to lead to the neutralization of the opposition of voice in such positions, and so to increase the number of homonyms in the lexical plane of the concerned language, and possibly, somehow to affect its grammatical plane as well. In the concrete case of English, the devoicing of its voiced paired consonant phonemes threatened not only to make homonymous the members of word pairs like *back* — *bag*, *let* — *led*, *cap* — *cab*, etc., but also to wipe away the phonematic signals of the categorical distinction of nouns like *use*, *house*, *belief* on the one hand and verbs like *use*, *house*, *believe* on the other. If, in addition to this, one realizes that in English contexts the majority of words are monosyllables among which the percentage of homonyms (118) is always the highest, it will become apparent that the increase of homonyms called forth by the devoicing of word-final paired consonants might indeed render the main task of the English language, i. e. mutual communication and expression, markedly more difficult than before the devoicing.

To this it might be objected that the difficulties caused by the numerical increase of homonyms should not be overestimated; it has been generally admitted by linguists that sentence context may, and generally does, make up for the ambiguity of meaning in homonymous words. In principle this is undoubtedly true, but it should be kept in mind that the ModE sentence context is burdened by a relatively high number not only of stylistic, but mainly of grammatical functions. It is utilized for the signalling of morphological and syntactical categories in words which, except for their positions in the sentence context, are entirely homonymous. Thus, it is commonly known that a word like *while* can function either as a substantive or as a verb, or even as a conjunction, according as it is placed in this or other position within the sentence. Or, a word-group like *this day* may be morphologically evaluated as a nominative case in some sentence situations, but as an accusative case in others; syntactically, only its position in the sentence may decide whether it stands for a subject, an object, an attribute or an adverbial. Obviously, the English sentence context has already been burdened by a considerable number of tasks, and therefore one can easily understand that any further addition to this number may have been found unfeasible. In other words, it appears probable that the devoicing of word-final paired consonants was not found particularly compatible with the communicative and expressive function of the English language seen as a structural whole, i. e. as a system of systems.

* * *

Here it must be recalled that in some languages the devoicing of word-final paired consonants is tolerated, although it also increases the number of homonyms. Such is the case of Slavonic languages like Czech, Slovak or Russian, in which the opposition of voice in the paired consonants has been phonematically neutralized in word-final (and in some other) positions, as is shown by word pairs like Czech (and also Slovak and Russian) *plod* 'fruit' — *plot* 'fence', Cz. *vez* 'take by carriage (imp.)' — *ves* 'village', Slk. *vied* 'of sciences (gen. pl.)' — *viet* 'of sentences', Russ. *bog* 'god' — *bok* 'side' etc. — Members of each of these pairs end in one and the same phoneme, i. e., respectively, in *-t*, *-s*, *-t* and *-k*. (119) If it is asked why the devoicing of such final consonants was tolerated in these languages, one is naturally led to suppose that, unlike in English, the process of devoicing in Czech, Slovak and Russian must

have been fairly compatible with the laws obtaining in the grammatical and lexical planes of these languages.

A closer examination of the conditions typical of Czech, Slovak, and Russian reveals that such an assumption may be regarded as fully justified. It will be readily admitted that in these three languages the sentence context is much less burdened than in English. As a rule, it is not charged with the function of distinguishing word-categories (which in Slavonic languages are regularly characterized by special suffixes and/or sets of inflexional endings); in most cases, it does not distinguish declension cases either, these being again mostly differentiated by inflexional endings. Last but not least, since the positions of sentence elements within the sentences of Slavonic languages are demonstrably much less fixed than in English, the Slavonic word-orders may also be regarded as relatively free from acting as main signals of syntactic values. All these facts considered, the word-orders of Czech, Slovak, and Russian appear to have been fairly well capable of taking on an additional function, that of distinguishing a certain number of new homonymous word pairs, due to the devoicing of word-final paired consonants.

It should be added that the Slavonic word-orders had no special difficulty in performing this new task, inasmuch as the numbers of homonyms added to the concerned languages through the discussed process of devoicing had been relatively low, certainly much lower than the analogous number that might have been added to English. This may be safely inferred from the well-known circumstance that the contexts of the Slavonic languages contain a considerably lower percentage of monosyllables than the English contexts (see above Note 118). As the number of homonyms is regularly the largest among monosyllables, it will be found obvious that Slavonic languages are much less exposed to homonymy than English, and therefore can easily afford a certain rise in its percentage.

* * *

Let us now turn again to the phonematic development of English, faced with the above-described situation. As it did not appear feasible to increase the number of homonyms in English, and so to overburden the English context beyond its functional capacity, it was necessary for the functional oppositions of the type $p - b$, $t - d$, $f - v$, and the like, to remain preserved. Such preservation, however, could not be effected by maintaining (or, perhaps, by restoring) the voiced pronunciation of b , d , v etc. The English articulatory habits, noted for slackness and general lack of muscular exertion, were averse to such integral restoration of the differences of voice in word-final positions, in which the force of inertia had been making itself felt very strongly since the OE period (one should recall the OE and EME devoicings referred to above). Under such circumstances the best, and perhaps the only possible manner in which the concerned type of opposition could be maintained consisted in its revaluation: the correlation of voice came to be revaluated into that of tension.

The process involved in the revaluation can be specified as follows: differences of voice, which by themselves were no longer functionally dependable (at least in some important word-positions), were relegated to the status of concomitant (or, redundant) features, while differences of tension, much less susceptible to being suppressed by the influence of phonic environment, were promoted to the rank of phonematically essential features, i. e. — to use the terminology of classical phonology — to function as a new mark of correlation. This new hierarchy of the two features, tension and voice, is convincingly proved by some observations made by phone-

ticians of English. Here belongs the (at least partial) devoicing of ModE paired consonants in word-initial positions. It is true that the process of devoicing in such positions may have been, too, indicated by the operation of the factor of inertia. But one should not overlook the remarkable fact that the functional importance of oppositions like *p-/b-*, *t-/d-*, *k-/g-*, etc. is preserved even in those cases where the opposition of voice has been fully replaced by that of tension (see, e. g., Torsuev, l. c.). This fact furnishes clear and convincing evidence of the new hierarchy.

To sum up, the real motives of the functional revaluation of the opposition of voice into that of tension was the incompatibility of the above-discussed process of devoicing with the structural situation of English envisaged as a system of systems. As regards the analogical levelling, considered by Luick to have been the main source of the voiced character of the ModE final consonants in words like *wind*, *field*, one can admit the operation of such levelling, but certainly not as a motive of the revaluating change, but merely as an instrument that helped to carry it through. (120)

The last question to be answered in this connection is at what time the discussed revaluation may have taken place. All that has been said here so far seems to indicate that the critical period must have been about the close of the 14th century. At that time the dialect of Southeast Midlands (on which the Southern British standard was to become principally based) (121) had lost its vowels of unstressed syllables. This change not only raised the problem of the devoicing of paired consonants which had become word-final through that loss, but at the same time also introduced a high percentage of new monosyllables into actual English contexts. At that time, too, the suffixes and endings originally distinguishing nouns and verbs had become lost with the result that, from then on, these two grammatical categories (and others as well) could be identified with the help of the sentence context alone; analogous comment could be made on the distinction of declension cases. Finally, at that time foundations were laid for the fixation of word-order, so typical of ModE. (122)

* * *

Our survey of the circumstances connected with the revaluation of the English correlation of voice may also throw some interesting light on the development of the three Slavonic languages under our consideration (and probably of some of the others as well). There can hardly be any doubt that the above-described English historical situation that raised the problem of the devoicing of final paired consonants had an interesting parallel in an historical situation ascertainable in the development of our three (or more) Slavonic languages. Just as in English the need of devoicing arose after the loss of vowels in unstressed syllables, so in Czech, Slovak, and Russian analogous need could only emerge after the loss of unstressed semivowels *ɤ*, *ɥ* (the "weak yers", as they are conventionally called in Slavonic linguistics), see e. g., PrimSlav. **plodɤ* > CzSlkRuss *plod* 'fruit'.

It is worth pointing out that in Slavonic languages the "weak yers" disappeared also in some other, non-final positions, with the result that the paired consonants, originally separated by them, became assimilated (see, e. g., PrimSlav. **sude* > Russ. *zde(s')*). (123) The interesting point is that in OldCz. manuscripts words of this type are often recorded in writing as if no assimilation had taken place: *sde* 'here', *dchoř* (> *dčhorč*) 'polecat', etc. On the basis of such writings it is usually taken for granted that the concerned groups of consonants really remained unassimilated for some time, possibly up to the end of the 13th century. (124) On purely physiological grounds, however, the existence of unassimilated consonant groups, though not impossible, does not seem particularly probable. (125) If the assumption of an immediate assimilation of voice after the loss of "weak yers" is correct, then the OCz writings of the type *sde*, *dchoř* may reflect not the differences of voice but those of tension. In other words, in *sde* the letter *s* may refer to a voiced, but fortis consonant, while the letter *d* in *dchoř* may represent a voiceless lenis. If this was so, the spellings may be interpreted as reflecting the following historical situation: After the loss of "weak yers", Czech (and most probably also Slovak, Russian, and perhaps other

Slavonic languages as well) was faced with the possibility of preserving the differences of phonematic pairs like *p - b*, *t - d*, *f - v* in neutralizing positions at the cost of the functional reevaluation of the voice correlation in consonants into that of tension. The subsequent history of Czech, Slovak, and Russian reveals that this possibility, so amply utilized in the phonematic development of English, was never resorted to. The cause of the different directions taken by the development in English and in the discussed Slavonic languages was suggested above — it appears to have been grounded in structural differences of the examined languages, envisaged as systems of systems.

The two above-discussed kinds of solution, the English and the Slavonic, must not be regarded as the only methods applicable to the situation described. It is true, of course, that what has been presented here as the Slavonic type of solution will necessarily have its parallels in many Slavonic idioms (i. e., languages and dialects), while the English type will more or less appeal to at least some of the Germanic idioms. The Slavonic parallels will be easily accounted for by close structural relationship of most of the Slavonic idioms; similarly, the various Germanic idioms reveal some important analogies to the English structural pattern, though the relationship is definitely less striking than in the Slavonic case. There are, however, other methods that can be applied in the situation of the discussed type. Let us point out here at least the French solution, which prevented the increase of homonyms by propping up the opposition of voice by way of emphasizing the voiced articulation of word-final paired consonants. (126) This solution was made feasible by some specific features of French, especially by the rising pattern of the French word and sentence rhythm as well as of the French articulatory effort in actual utterances. It is this rising pattern that enables French speakers to apply the energy of articulation indispensable for the genuinely voiced articulation of a word-final paired consonant. Here the French pattern of articulation strikingly differs from the corresponding patterns of both English and Czech (and most of the other Slavonic languages), in which the word-final consonant is particularly subject to the operation of the tendency of inertia referred to above.

Another remark may not be wholly devoid of interest. A remote parallel to the French solution can also be met with among the varieties of Czech. It is, among other things, the case of a dialect in Northeastern Bohemia, noted by a number of Czech scholars. (127) In this dialect words containing a final voiced paired consonant, such as *dub* 'oak', *vid'* 'see!' are pronounced with genuine voiced *-b*, *-d*, to which is added a voiced off-glide, so that the pronunciation of such words is described as "almost dissyllabic", viz. *duba*, *vida* (see Frinta, l. c.).

There is one point in which the dialectal solution of the given problem is particularly noteworthy. It shows how oppositions of voice can be preserved in word-final positions even in such idioms as lack the rising pattern of word and sentence rhythm (and of the articulatory effort) which has been singled out here as typical of French. The method applied in such idioms consists in the addition of another syllable (or, quasi-syllable), which will bring the concerned words in harmony with the falling pattern of word and sentence rhythm (and of articulatory energy), so typical of Czech. It should be noted that the off-glide *-ə*, in spite of its "almost syllabic" character, obviously lacks phonematic status. It is, of course, an item of syntactic phonematics, i. e., it acts as a signal of word-limits within the sentence. (This functional evaluation of *-ə* is corroborated by the fact that, following the rule of the association of contrasts, such *-ə* is also added to words ending in a voiceless paired consonant — Frinta, l. c., registers a pronunciation or the type *sukə!*) Undoubtedly, more detailed examination of these and analogous dialectal facts might bring new interesting materials throwing still more light on our problem. (128)

The above very sketchy outline could do no more than point out very briefly another case of interdependence ascertainable between the phonic and the "higher" language planes. The present writer's intention was to make a special point of showing in this chapter that even the features of consonant phonemes should not be simply dismissed as purely acoustico-physiological phenomena of an entirely mechanical order. In reality, they, too, are intimately connected with the higher planes of language.

Besides, the above lines may be hoped to have revealed another thing with sufficient clearness: the fact that the different treatment of the oppositions of voice and tension in English and Czech paired consonants is closely linked with, and obviously due to, differences in the structural make-up of the two language systems, one of them essentially analytical, the other prevalently synthetic. In other words, the phonematic fact that the mark of correlation of ModE paired consonants is tension, not voice, must also be entered into the list of less familiar aspects of the analytical trend of English.

VII. THE ECLIPSE OF THE MODERN ENGLISH NEUTRAL CONSONANT

The present chapter, the last in the series, will discuss yet another instance of influence exercised upon the English consonantal system by the analytical drift of English. Unlike the instance discussed in the preceding chapter, the instance to be analysed here will reveal a case of what may be called negative interference in the phonic plane by the needs and wants of the "higher" planes of language. It will be seen, that is to say, that the situation in the grammatical structure of English at a given moment was such as not to demand a certain change in the phonic plane, while in an analogous Czech (and also Slovak, Ukrainian and Upper Sorabian) situation the change was effected because the situation of the grammatical structures of these languages was such as to necessitate that change.

The changes are concerned with the neutral consonant phoneme (129) of ModE and with its analogues in Czech, Slovak, Ukrainian, and Upper Sorabian, i. e. with the phoneme *h*. The ModE *h*-sound implementing it differs from its Slavonic opposite numbers by its voicelessness (the Czech, Slovak, Ukrainian and Upper Sorabian *h*-sounds being voiced), but the origin of all these laryngal consonants may be denoted as parallel: they all go back to velar fricatives — voiceless χ or voiced γ , as the case may be —, from which they primarily arose through assimilation to the neighbouring vowel or vowels. The assimilatory process was undoubtedly called forth by the fact that in regard to articulation a laryngal fricative resembles a neighbouring vowel more closely than does a velar fricative: as a matter of fact, the English (and, for that matter, the German) voiceless initial *h*- has often been described by phoneticians as a voiceless beginning of the following vocalic articulation (so that, e. g., ModE [*ha*:t] might also be transcribed as [*aa*:t]). (130)

This close articulatory kinship of the English *h* and the neighbouring vowel resulted in the well-known early contractions of the type Prehist. OE **fōhan* > OE *fōn* and, later on, in the ever-increasing tendency to discard the *h*/ χ -phoneme of English altogether. (131) Compared to this, the Slavonic *h*-phonemes show no sign of any tendency aimed at their abolishment. The fact is the more striking, since a voiced *h*-sound might be regarded as particularly susceptible to assimilation by, and consequently to absorption into, the neighbouring vowel. A closer inquiry into the

causes of this stability reveals an interesting result: during the articulation of the Czech *h*-sound the shape of the glottis becomes particularly adjusted — it is characterized by a specific position of both the vocal chords and the cartilages. (132) Obviously, it is exactly this particular shaping of the glottis which safeguards the Czech (and most probably also the Slovak, Ukrainian, and Upper Sorabian) *h*-sound against mechanical assimilation by, and consequently absorption into, its vocalic neighbourhood, while the absence of such particular shaping must have essentially contributed to the above-mentioned contractions, amounting to the ultimate loss of the intervocalic *h*-sound in English (and in some other Germanic languages).

* * *

The above-ascertained facts raise another question, viz. that of the motivation of the specific shaping of the glottis in the articulation of the *h*-phoneme in Czech (and most probably in the other enumerated Slavonic languages). In our opinion, this problem can be satisfactorily tackled by taking into consideration the above-noted fact of mutual interrelation and interdependence of the planes of language. If the problem of, e. g., the Czech phoneme *h* is viewed from this angle, it cannot be overlooked how deeply rooted that phoneme has become in the morphological system of Czech. This will be realized from the fact that Czech morphological oppositions of the types Nom. *vraχ* 'murderer' — Gen. *vraha*, Nom. *nehet* 'finger-nail' — Gen. *nextu*, Nom. *stuha* 'ribbon' — Gen. pl. *stux*, are perfectly equivalent to the oppositions of the respective types Nom. *krap* 'crab' — Gen. *kraba*, Nom. *drobet* 'morcel' — Gen. *droptu*, Nom. *huba* 'mouth' (vulg.) — Gen. pl. *hup*. If, owing to assimilation and consequent absorption, the intervocalic *-h-* should have become dropped, the resulting forms **vraa* > **vrá*, **neet* < *nét*, **stua* < **stva* (?) would have stood out as most inorganic exceptions within their morphological paradigms, the more so that the grammatical system of Czech is still very firmly based on synthetical lines, which have been preserved in it virtually intact for a long series of centuries. (133)

It appears, thus, that the rise of the peculiar articulation of the Czech *h*-sound may have been motivated by the underlying tendency to preserve a clear phonematic make-up of the words containing intervocalic *h*'s, so that any danger of obscuring the paradigmatic classification of such words might be forestalled. It remains to be noted that what has been said here about the Czech morphological situation is also applicable to that of the other Slavonic languages enumerated above, as their grammatical systems, too, have preserved their synthetical structures up to the present period. Consequently, a theory appears justified that the preservation of the intervocalic *-h-* in those languages was prompted by the same motive as in Czech.

The validity of the above-outlined theory is borne out by the situation in Old English, where, as already stated, the intervocalic, voiceless *h*-sound became fully assimilated by, and finally absorbed into, its vocalic neighborhood. Obviously, in OE the phoneme *h* (more exactly, *h/χ*) had not taken such a firm root as its opposite member had in Czech; this might explain the realization of contractions like **seohan* > *sēon*, **eohes* > *ēos*, **scōhes* > *scōs*, and the like. Still, one should account for the fact that forms like *weorpan*, *dæzes*, *stānes* etc., paradigmatically closely allied to **seohan*, **eohes*, **scōhes*, etc., apparently did not intervene to preserve the phonematic make-up of the forms containing the intervocalic *-h-*.

The explanation of that fact, in our opinion, is not very difficult to find. Although the OE grammatical system was still essentially synthetic (its thorough reshaping

on analytical lines was to be effected only in the Middle English period), its synthetic character had already been perceptibly weakened in a number of points. Historians of English (134) have pointed out that as early as in OE, the soil was being prepared for the ensuing victory of the analytical principle. Already in OE, grammatical relations were being increasingly expressed by means of auxiliary words; the syncretism of the OE declension types resulted in underlining the importance of the stem at the expense of the inflexional endings, which again had to cede many of their functions to less vulnerable auxiliary expressions. Under such circumstances the impoverishment of this or that paradigm by one or two items not only could not be prevented by the pressure of the old morphological system, but was rather in full agreement with the disintegrating forces already at work in it. It was clearly for this reason that no tendency towards any articulatory differentiation from its vocalic vicinity can be discovered in the development of *h* in English.

* * *

It appears, therefore, that both in English and in Czech (and, for that matter, in a number of other Slavonic languages) a highly interesting interdependence can be ascertained between the development of the phoneme *h* (or, *h/χ*), and the development of the corresponding morphological system. This fact in itself is most significant: it endorses our thesis proposed above in Chapter I (p. 11) asserting the existence of instances in which the morphological plane of language can affect the structure of the phonic plane of that same language. But our evidence goes even further than this. If, that is to say, the above-established interdependences prove true, then the impact of the morphological system of language is reflected not only in the phonematic structure of the phonic plane, but even in the phonetic implementation of that structure. In other words, the needs of the morphological system can obviously decide how some of the sounds implementing the crucial phonemes should be articulated. Although in English this impact is effected only negatively (while in the Slavonic languages we find its decidedly positive operation), there can be no doubt that we are faced here with one of the most striking of the unfamiliar aspects of the analytical trend of English: the very weak structural position of the ModE *h*-phoneme is, at least to a considerable degree, ultimately due to the thoroughgoing reshaping of the English morphological system on analytical lines.

By way of concluding our examination pursued in the above seven chapters, we believe to have given some evidence not only of the mutual interdependence linking various planes of language, but also of the necessity of regarding the analytical trend of English not as a purely morphological affair but rather as a principle which, though manifested mainly on the grammatical level, affects all planes of language and whose operation, from time to time, may even become felt in the phonic plane. The validity of our conclusions appears to be corroborated by our ascertainment of parallel (but, of course, opposite) interdependence usually found in Czech, a language of prevalently synthetic grammatical structure. There is little doubt that research in other languages, if undertaken from a viewpoint analogous to that of ours, might yield results not devoid of interest.

(1) See, e. g., the explanation of the term *analytical* presented by the *Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English*⁴ (Oxford 1951): "using separate words instead of inflexions". Similarly *synthesis* is defined there as "preference of composition & inflection to use of prepositions etc."

(2) Cf., e. g., A. I. Smirnitckiy, *Drevne-angliyskiy yazyk* [*The Old English Language*], Moscow 1955, p. 212.

(3) The fact of replacement (typical especially of American English) was duly pointed out and penetratingly commented upon by G. Kirchner, *Die zehn Hauptverben des Englischen im Britischen und Amerikanischen* (Halle 1952; reviewed by J. Vachek in *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* 76, 1955, col. 432ff).

(4) This does not mean, of course, that synthetic language means do not exist in ModE alongside of analytical ones; it only means that the former are no longer productive in ModE. On the mutual relation of the two kinds of means in ModE see B. Trnka's valuable paper *Analysis and Synthesis in English*, *English Studies* (Amsterdam), 10, 1927, pp. 138—144. — Some comment on the process leading from synthesis to analysis in English may be found in P. Sgall's paper *K vývoji deklinace substantiv v angličtině* [*On the Development of the Declension of Nouns in English*], *Studie a práce lingvistické* 1 (Prague 1954), pp. 162—170, and in his monograph *Vývoj fleze v indoevropských jazycích, zejména v češtině a v angličtině* [*The Development of Inflection in Indo-European Languages, especially in Czech and English*], Prague 1958. Sgall's approach to the problem is one of historical typologist's; viewing the process in its broad outlines, he necessarily loses sight of interdependence of facts belonging to various language planes (it will be seen that exactly this interdependence is our main concern in the present treatise).

(5) Cf. I. Poldauf's *Mluvnice současné angličtiny II* [*Grammar of Present-Day English*], Prague 1958, p. 137; B. Trnka, *Rozbor nynější spisovné angličtiny* [*An Analysis of Present Day Standard English*], Prague 1954, pp. 25f. For a detailed discussion of the problem (and of the analytical structure of English grammar in general) see G. Weber, *Der Bau der englischen Sprache* (Palaestra 192, Leipzig 1934), critical rejoinder by O. Jespersen in *Literaturblatt f. germ. u. rom. Phil.* 56, 1935, pp. 161—163.

(6) One of the problems of the ModE system of declension cases, that of the so-called Possessive Case, will be discussed further below (Chapter III).

(7) The term was used by V. V. Vinogradov in one of his lectures held in Prague in 1957 (the lecture was reviewed by K. Horálek in *Slovo a slovesnost* 18, 1957, p. 98).

(8) This fact was duly emphasized in the Soviet linguistic discussion of 1950 (see *Soviet Literature* 1950, No. 9, p. 14).

(9) This detracts nothing from the importance of the "written language" which, though a secondary, derived norm of language, performs important cultural functions and tends towards a relatively high degree of autonomy (see J. Vachek, *Some Remarks on Writing and Phonetic Transcription*, *Acta Linguistica* 5, 1945—1949, pp. 86—93, and especially the same author's *Two Chapters on Written English*, *Brno Studies in English* 1 (Prague 1959), pp. 7—38).

(10) Some of the ideas of the Prague group were aptly summarized by B. Trnka et al. in the paper *Prague Structural Linguistics*, *Philologica Pragensia* 1, 1958, pp. 33—40 (for the Russian version of the paper, *K diskussii po voprosam strukturalizma*, see *Voprosy yazykoznaniiya* 6, 1957, No. 3, pp. 44—52). — See also J. Vachek's *Dictionnaire de linguistique de l'École de Prague* (Utrecht-Anvers 1960).

(11) The present chapter is an enlarged version of our lecture delivered at the Cambridge University on 26 February 1959.

(12) H. Sweet, *Elementarbuch des gesprochenen Englisch* (Oxford 1885).

(13) F. Mikus, *En marge du Sixième Congrès International des Linguistes*, *Miscelánea homenaje a André Martinet*, vol. I (Tenerife 1957), pp. 159—221.

(14) L. Tesnière, *Synthétisme et analytisme*, *Charisteria Guilelmo Mathesio quinquagenario...* oblata (Prague 1932), pp. 62—64.

(15) See J. Vachek's papers referred to above, Note 9.

(16) The existence of such signals was duly pointed out in the discussion of a number of linguists and phoneticians (L. Bloomfield, D. Jones, V. Mathesius, P. Passy and others) concerned with the phonetic independence of the word; see *Le Maître Phonétique* 1931—1932.

(17) See L. Bloomfield, *Language* (New York 1933), esp. p. 178ff.

(18) L. R. Palmer, *An Introduction to Modern Linguistics* (London 1936), esp. p. 78f.

(19) See V. Mathesius's Czech paper *O potenciálnosti jevů jazykových* [*On the potential character of language phenomena*], *Věstník Královské české společnosti nauk* 1911.

(20) C. E. Bazell, *Historical Sources of Structural Units*, *Miscelánea homenaje a A. Martinet*, pp. 19—29.

(21) As we are concerned here with quotational compounds as a living, productive type of English word-formation, we leave aside a small number of instances of technical terms characterized by archaic syntagmatic flavour, such as the *forget-me-not* (Cz. *pomněnka*, Russ. *nezabudka*).

(22) Cf. D. Jones, *Everyman's English Pronouncing Dictionary*¹¹, London 1956, pp. 261, 447.

(23) It is fair to point out that a small number of genuine quotational compounds can be found in Czech surnames, originally nicknames, such as *Skočdopole* ('Spring-in-the-field'), *Osolobě* ('Sprinkle-with-salt-for-you') etc. Such surnames are regularly inflected (see, e. g., the datives *Skočdopolovi*, *Osolobovi*) and take on the feminine endings commonly used in Czech for denoting women (*paní Skočdopolová*, *paní Osolobová* 'Mrs. S., Mrs. O.'). This peculiar fact can be accounted for by the well-known specific character of proper names, which, being used for the purpose of identifying certain individuals, become exempted from the common semantic and formal links tying up the corresponding appellatives to some objects of extra-linguistic reality (cf., among others, Allan H. Gardiner, *Theory of Proper Names*, Oxford 1954; P. Trost, *Zur Theorie des Eigennamens*, Omagiu lui I. Jordan, Bucuresti 1958, pp. 867–869; V. Blažár, *Poznámky k morfejmatickej struktúre slova* [Notes on the morphematic structure of the word], *Recueil Linguistique de Bratislava* 1, 1948, pp. 179–189, with a detailed summary in French; cf. also F. Trávníček, *Vlastní substantiva* [Proper Nouns], *Sborník prací filoz. fakulty Brněnské university A6* (Brno 1958), pp. 5–9, with summaries in Russian and French). This being so, the language user does not apply to the proper names the strict formal grammatical rules valid for the appellative word-stock of the language.

(24) More comment on some aspects of the problem of Czech quotational compounds may be found in our paper *K otázce tzv. citátových složenin v češtině* [On the Problem of the so-called Quotational Compounds in Czech], *Slovo a slovesnost* (Prague) 21, 1960, pp. 110–117.

(25) See, e. g., O. Jespersen, *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles* 6, London 1946, pp. 282ff.; B. A. Ilyish, *Sovremennyy anglijskij jazyk*², Moscow 1948, pp. 99 f.

(26) In his paper quoted above, Note 4, B. Trnka duly stresses what he calls the 'sentence feeling' of the English speaker. The term implies that the English speaker is accustomed to concentrate his attention upon sentences taken as wholes, not upon separate words composing those sentences (as happens commonly in Czech and presumably in other synthetic languages).

(27) On this point, see here below (Chapter III).

(28) The troubles entailed by the attempts to dissociate blendings into traditional "morphemes" have recently been admitted by Fred W. Householder, Jr, *On Linguistic Primes*, *Word* 15, 1959, pp. 231–239 (see esp. pp. 237–238).

(29) On the difference between native and non-native elements of the word-stock, examined from the synchronistic point-of-view, see V. Mathesius, *Zur synchronischen Analyse fremden Sprachguts*, *Englische Studien* 70, 1935, pp. 21–35.

(30) The instances *bezvolky* 'unintentionally' (< *bezděky* + *nevolky*) and *hrůzlivý* 'awe-inspiring' (< *hrůzný* + *strašlivý*), quoted by V. Šmilauer, *Tvoření slov* [Word Formation], *Hovory o českém jazyce* (Praha 1940), p. 112, do not disprove our above statement. First, both these words are literary expressions which have never entered the common language; second, in each of the two instances the resulting blend does not show any essential semantic difference from its two source words (which, in their turn, are again virtually synonymous). Under these circumstances the isolated instances of Czech blends are rather a stylistic than a semantic affair.

(31) This chapter is an enlarged and thoroughly revised version of our paper *Notes on the English Possessive Case*, *Časopis pro moderní filologii* – supplement *Philologica* 7, 1955, pp. 11–15.

(32) See B. A. Ilyish, *Sovremennyy anglijskij jazyk*², pp. 99f.; W. S. Allen, *Living English Structure* (London 1947), pp. 17f.

(33) It will be of some interest to note that a similar conclusion was arrived at by H. E. Palmer, *Grammar of Spoken English* (Cambridge 1924), p. 36, where, however, the problem was not envisaged (as it was by Ilyish) in the due historical perspective.

(34) The high degree of independence characteristic of the ModE possessive final 's (as opposed to the dependent status of the ModE inflexional ending -s found in the plural of nouns) is also clearly revealed by the opposition of the forms *wife's* – *wives*, in which the alternation -/v- has replaced the earlier phonematic uniformity, presenting -v- in both forms. (Cf. I. Poldauf, *Srovnávání s mateřštinou při vědeckém studiu jazyků* [A Comparison with the Mother Tongue in the Scientific Study of Languages], *Sborník Vysoké školy pedagogické v Olomouci* 1 (Praha 1954), p. 54.

(35) See O. Jespersen, *A Modern English Grammar* 6, pp. 325, 336, 489. — It will have been observed that, should Ilyish's evaluation of ModE 's become accepted, one would have no other choice but to evaluate the suffixes -ish, -ism, etc., in analogous manner. This, of course, would be contrary to obvious facts.

(36) Instances of the 's-form found in expressions denoting time, measure, weight, and value (such as *one minute's walk, half a mile's distance, one shilling's worth of stamps*) do not contradict the above statement; in them, the 's-form is clearly no longer a matter of grammar but rather a purely phraseological and idiomatic affair.

(37) With the exception, of course, of those surviving in the idiomatic turns referred to above (see Note 36).

(38) O. Jespersen, *Essentials of English Grammar*^a (London 1946), p. 139. — Jespersen's qualification of such "set phrases" as compounds is, however, clearly unjustified, in view of the possibility in English of word groups like *schoolboys' Sunday clothes, girls' intimate friendship*, etc., in which parts of the supposed compounds are separated by an inserted word element. Only in the third instance, *a lovers' quarrel*, the elements hold together more tightly in the singular but again they can be separated from one another in the plural: *lovers' passionate quarrels*. It will be certainly admitted that no English compounds exhibit such formal difference between the singular and the plural. — On the problem of compounds see V. Mathesius, *Obsahový rozbor současné angličtiny na základě obecně jazykozpytném* [*A Functional Analysis of Contemporary English on a general linguistic basis*], Prague 1961.

(39) In this connection it may be of use to quote an interesting remark by G. O. Curme (*A Grammar of the English Language* III, Boston 1931, p. 83): "We often feel the classifying genitive that precedes its governing noun as an adjective, as one can see by the fact that the preceding adjective modifies the governing noun, not the genitive: *obvious printer's* (or *printers')* errors." Curme, however, failed to derive further consequences from his clever observation.

(40) E. Kruisinga, *A Handbook of Present Day English*^b, II/2 (Groningen 1932), pp. 5 note, 8, 39, 60, and especially 87ff.

(41) There can be no doubt that the absence of number in the above cases might explain the interesting fact pointed out by Jespersen (*Essentials*, p. 138f.), viz. that "the genitive plural of those words in which it is not distinct from the genitive singular is used very seldom indeed", so that phrases like *the husbands of my aunts, the jewels of our friends*, etc. are preferred to wordings like *my aunts' husbands, our friends' jewels*, etc.

(42) For detailed discussion of the general character of these changes see G. Weber's book referred to above in Note 5.

(43) It is commonly taken for granted that "the *of*-combination has so far prevailed that there are very few cases where a genitive [i. e., Possessive Form, J. V.] cannot be replaced by it" (O. Jespersen, *Essentials*, p. 43). For all that, there exists a fine semantic difference between the 's-form and the *of*-construction; it was ably formulated by E. G. Rappoport, *Postelog 's i predlog kak oformiteli attributivnykh otnošeniy v angliyskom yazyke* [*The Postposition 's and the Preposition of as Bearers of Attributive Relations in English*] (*Inostrannye yazyki v shkole* 1950, No. 1, pp. 32ff): the 's-form expresses indissoluble unity of the governed and governing nouns, whereas the periphrastic form is regularly devoid of such meaning. — A useful survey of the situations in which each of the two forms is particularly preferred may be found in R. W. Zandvoort, op. c., p. 92.

(44) The preterite forms *methought* and *meseemed* can hardly be used as arguments invalidating the above interpretation: both of them are even more archaic than the present tense forms *methinks* and *meseems*, and therefore can be regarded as virtually non-existent in ModE linguistic consciousness.

(45) For more details about that revaluation and about some other features of the absolute possessives see J. Vachek, *K problematice českých posesivních adjektiv* [*On the Problems of Czech Possessive Adjectives*], *Studie práce lingvistické* 1 (= B. Havránek volume, Prague 1954), pp. 171—189.

(46) It is worth pointing out that B. A. Ilyish, despite his clever observations, stopped short of the conclusion that the ModE Possessive Form no longer belongs to the nominal paradigm. His treatment of the problem clearly shows that in his opinion the forms ending in 's still enjoy the status of a case — as a matter of fact, it is exactly this supposition that enables Ilyish to regard 's as equivalent to the prepositional *of*, and consequently to evaluate the final 's as a formally independent auxiliary word (see above, p. 24).

(47) More details of this progressive abolition can be found in our paper referred to above, Note 45.

(48) The present chapter is a thoroughly revised version of our earlier paper entitled *Some Thoughts on the so-called Complex Condensation in Modern English*, *Sborník prací filosofické fakulty Brněnské university A 3*, 1955, pp. 63—77.

(49) G. O. Curme, *A Grammar of the English Language* III (Boston 1931), p. 22.

(50) See, e. g., his treatise *Řeč a sloh* [*Speech and Style*] in the volume *Čtení o jazyce a poesii* 1 (Prague 1942), pp. 11ff., and his paper *O nominálních tendencích v slovesné predikaci novo-*

anglické [On Nominal Tendencies in ModE Verbal Predication], *Sborník filologický* 4 (Prague 1913), pp. 325ff.

(51) Their main ideas were summarized in V. Mathesius's posthumously published book *Obsahový rozbor* (see above, Note 38).

(52) Some of the involved problems are tackled in the papers of J. Firbas and J. Hladký, included in the present volume.

(53) A. L. Morton, *A People's History of England* (London 1948). Translated into Czech under the title *Dějiny Anglie* (Prague 1950) by Sárka Nováková and Dr Radovan Tesář.

(54) And thus, they may not always be easy to grasp; yet the involved difficulty is outweighed by the fact that the reader's (or listener's) attention need not be scattered on a greater number of nexuses of potential dependent clauses.

(55) Cf. his *Obsahový rozbor* (see above Note 38). On the problem of condensers found in Modern Czech see his treatise *Řeč a sloh* (cp. above Note 50), pp. 87 — 91.

(56) Katherine Mansfield, *The Garden Party and other stories* (Leipzig-Albatross 1941). Translated into Czech under the title *Zahradní slavnost* (Prague 1952) by H. Skoumalová and Aloys Skoumal.

(57) See V. Mathesius, *Nebojte se angličtiny!* [*Don't be afraid of English*], Prague 1936, p. 70 f.

(58) This idea is further developed in J. Firbas' paper included in the present volume and in his other papers quoted therein.

(59) Karel Čapek, *Anglické listy* (23rd ed., Prague 1947). Translated into English under the title *Letters from England* (London 1947) by P. Selver.

(60) Zdeněk Wirth, *Praha v obrazech pěti století* (Prague 1932). Translated into English under the title *Prague in Pictures of Five Centuries* (Prague 1933) by F. P. Marchant.

(61) Slight inaccuracies of the translations are not noted here if they do not interfere with the issues discussed in this chapter.

(62) In another of his papers entitled *Obecný zápor v angličtině a v češtině* [*Universal Negation in English and Czech*] (provided with a detailed English summary), Prague 1947, the present writer pointed out that also the problem of the so-called double negation in Czech negative sentences expressing universal statements (opposed to single negation in English sentences of analogous kind) can be successfully tackled if all consequences are derived from the unequal amount of dynamism characterizing the finite verb form in the two languages. The small amount of dynamism, typical of ModE finite verb forms, is also amply evidenced by the materials collected in G. Kirchner's book *Die zehn Hauptverben* (see above, Note 3). — It should perhaps be added that the reduced amount of dynamism of ModE finite verbs is compensated for by the increased amount of dynamism of ModE nouns (and especially adjectives, cp. V. Mathesius, *Obsahový rozbor*, Note 38). — The fact that we are stressing the dynamism of ModE finite verb forms makes clear that in our analysis we are primarily concerned with the verb as an instrument of predication, not with the verb as a lexical unit.

(63) See, e. g., F. Mossé, *Manuel de l'anglais de moyen âge* I (Paris 1945), p. 141.

(64) Cf. B. Trnka, *On the Syntax of the English Verb from Caxton to Dryden* (Prague 1930), pp. 82f.

(65) The degree to which the dynamism of the finite verb has sunk in ModE is strikingly revealed by G. O. Curme (l. c., p. 22) who believes that the preference for nominal predications in ModE should be attributed to "a tendency to more concrete forms of expression". In his opinion, "a noun seems nearer to popular feeling than the more abstract verb". If Curme is right, then the ModE finite verb form has completely lost all dynamism, and the relation of noun and verb has been altogether reevaluated; the former opposition of entities of static *vs.* dynamic order (such as is still manifest in Czech) is believed to have been replaced by the opposition of entities of concrete *vs.* abstract character. It seems rather doubtful, however, whether the process may have reached the advanced stage Curme seems to take for granted.

(66) The first tentative analysis of the kind was undertaken by a young Brno Anglicist O. Tichá in her thesis in which she compared the instances of complex condensation found in the synoptical gospels of the Authorized Version and in the modernized texts of the same gospels contained in the ModE translation provided by Dr. Moffat. The results of her examination, mentioned in J. Hladký's paper, confirm our above hypothesis.

(67) See B. Trnka's remarks on the influence of Old French on the rise of the English gerundial form (l. c., p. 92), as well as on the rise of the absolute participial construction which, in his opinion, was modelled on analogous Old French and Latin phrases (l. c., p. 88).

(68) Cf. the theses of V. N. Yartseva (in her paper *O vnutrennikh zakonakh razvitiya yazyka v svete trudov I. V. Stalina po yazykoznaniiyu* [*On Inner Laws of Language Development in the Light of J. V. Stalin's Linguistic Papers*], Izv. AN SSSR, odd. lit i yaz., 11, Moscow 1952, pp. 193ff) to the effect that only such structural features or elements are taken over from a foreign

language "as do not contradict the structure of the language taking them over, or — more exactly — as become easily incorporated into the grammatical system of that language" (see p. 195).

(69) See F. Mossé, l. c., p. 150.

(70) See J. V. Bečka, *O přechodníku v současné beletrii* [On the Indefinite Participle in Contemporary Czech Fiction], Naše řeč 25 (Prague 1941), pp. 129ff.

(71) The extant remnants of the category, like *vědomý* 'conscious', *vidomý* 'seen', have been reevaluated into isolated adjectives.

(72) It is hardly necessary to explain why we do not mention the categories of Continuous and Simple Tenses in this connection: the difference of the actual vs. non-actual processes or actions which is denoted by them does not fall under the heading of aspect in ModE.

(73) Cf. F. Mossé, l. c., p. 148. — Some scholars, however, are opposed to this view (see, e. g., H. Pilch, *Das ae. Práfix ze-*, Anglia 71, Tübingen 1953, pp. 129ff.).

(74) Incidentally, there may be some connection between the less apparent nominal character of the Czech infinitive and the fact that of all Czech condensers the infinitive appears to be most popular. — The historical development of the syntactical function of the Czech infinitive was commented upon by F. Trávníček, *K předmětnému infinitivu* [On Objectival Infinitive], Naše řeč 38 (Prague 1954), pp. 71ff.

(75) For these and some other reasons, F. Kopečný goes so far as to assert the synthetic character of the Czech preterite tense form (see his paper *Povaha českého preterita* [The Nature of the Czech Preterite], Naše řeč 34 (Prague 1950), pp. 85—89).

(76) See especially B. Havránek's paper *Úkoly spisovného jazyka a jeho kultura* [The Functions of the Standard Language and its Culture], contained in the volume *Pražský lingvistický kroužek, Spisovná čeština a kultura jazyka* [Prague Linguistic Circle, Standard Czech and the Culture of Language], Prague 1932, pp. 32ff. (see esp. p. 49); also V. Mathesius, *Řeč a sloh* (esp. p. 55).

(77) Cf. V. Mathesius, *Nebojte se angličtiny*, p. 74f.

(78) The only Czech condenser showing differentiation in time, the participle, is gradually acquiring a bookish tint in ModCz (see above, Note 70); its eclipse is also documented by the loss of the present passive participle, also commented above (see Note 71).

(79) The nominal tendencies of French were discussed by H. Mannhart in *Zeitschrift für neuere Sprachen* 1944, pp. 103ff. (see brief notice by V. Šmilauer in *Český časopis filologický* 3 (Prague 1945), p. 171).

(80) I. Poldauf, *Infinitiv v angličtině* [The Infinitive in English] (with a detailed summary in English), *Časopis pro moderní filologii* 36 (Prague 1954), pp. 9—23; Same, *O konkurenci infinitivu a gerundu v angličtině* [On the Rivalry between the Infinitive and the Gerund in English] (again with an English summary), *ČMF* 37, 1955, pp. 203—223; Same, *Děj v infinitivu* [Action in the Infinitive, Slovo a slovesnost 20, 1959, pp. 183—202. — Another important treatise on problems of complex condensation was written by J. Nosek, *Několik poznámek k polovětným vazbám v angličtině XVII. století* [Some Remarks concerning Semi-Sentence Constructions in 17th Century English] (with a detailed summary in English), *Acta universitatis Carolinae*, Prague 1954, vol. 7, pp. 23—26. Dr. Nosek gives an acute analysis of (especially) infinitival and participial constructions of EModE, without, however, confronting them with any non-English equivalents, and thus does not face the problems pointed out in the present chapter.

(81) The main ideas of the present chapter were outlined in our paper *Notes on the Quantitative Correlation of Vowels in the Phonematic Development of English*, *Mélanges F. Mossé* (Paris 1959), pp. 437—449, of which the present wording is a thoroughly revised and enlarged version.

(82) If not otherwise stated, this term refers to the Southern British standard.

(83) These very apt terms are used in *Janua Linguarum I* ('s-Gravengahe 1956), p. 24; N. S. Trubetzkoy, *Grundzüge der Phonologie* (Prague 1939) speaks of "Silbenschnittgegensätze". Oddly enough, in *Preliminaries to Speech Analysis* (Cambridge, Mass., 1952), Jakobson-Fant-Halle interpret the English long vowels as geminates (*ti, uu, əə*) or as groups of a vowel + *ə* (*aə, oə*), see p. 43f. This evaluation is obviously inadequate, overlooking the opposition of contact. — A different opinion of the ModE vocalic opposition was voiced, most recently, by M. Renský, *Funkce slabiky v jazykovém systému* [The Function of the Syllable in the System of Language] *Slovo a slovesnost* 21, 1960, pp. 86—95. He is rather inclined to a different phonematic evaluation of ModE vocalic oppositions, suggesting the possibility of interpreting them as implementations of a correlation of vocalic tension (*lax vs. tense*). It seems, however, that from the purely phonetic viewpoint the opposition of tension is less stable and, as a consequence, less functionally relevant, than the opposition of contact.

(84) Cp. N. S. Trubetzkoy, *Die phonologischen Grundlagen der sogenannten "Quantität" in den verschiedenen Sprachen*, in *Scritti in onore di A. Trombetti* (Milano 1936), pp. 155—176, esp. 165f.; see also his *Grundzüge*, p. 176.

(85) By this we mean the West Saxon standard, described by H. Sweet, F. Mossé and others.
(86) Such as the phonematic status of OE *a/æ*, of the "short diphthongs" *ea*, *eo*, *io*, *ie* etc. Cp., e. g., A. I. Smirnitckiy, *Voprosy fonologii v istorii angliyskogo yazyka* [Phonematic Problems in the History of English], in *Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta* 1946, pp. 81—90, esp. 81ff.

(87) For more instances see B. Trnka, *Some Remarks on the Phonological Structure of English*, Xenia Pragensia (Prague 1929), pp. 357—364, esp. p. 360.

(88) See K. Luick, *Historische Grammatik der englischen Sprache*, Leipzig 1914—40, § 372.

(89) *Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Prague* 4, 1931, pp. 164—182.

(90) See *Mélanges J. v. Ginneken* (Paris 1937), pp. 25—33; although this view is opposed by Trubetzkoy (see *Grundzüge*, p. 137), it appears fully endorsed by concrete facts.

(91) See J. Vachek, *Über die phonologische Interpretation der Diphthonge mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Englischen*, *Facultas philosophica univ. Carolinae Pragense* 33 (Prague 1933), pp. 87—170.

(92) See, among others, G. L. Trager — B. Bloch, *The Syllabic Phonemes in English*, *Language* 17, 1941, pp. 223—246; G. L. Trager — H. L. Smith, Jr., *An Outline of English Structure* (Norman, Okla. 1951); the authors of *Janua Linguarum* I, see above, Note 83; most recently M. Adamus in *Germanica Wratislaviensia* II, Wrocław 1959. — To this cf. J. Vachek's analysis quoted above in Note 91 and his paper *Valeská škola a strukturalistická fonologie* [The Yale Group and the Structuralist Phonematics], *Slovo a slovesnost* 11, 1949, pp. 36—42. — The findings of P. Menzerath, *Der Diphthong* (Bonn-Berlin 1941), summarized in his statement "daß ein Diphthong aus nur zwei Vokalen und aus sonst nichts besteht" (p. 9) cannot invalidate our thesis either. Menzerath's main argument is based on microtomy of sound traces in talking films. Thus, e. g., by gradually eliminating the beginning and end of the sound trace of Modern German [ai] he tries to prove the non-existence of the glide joining the two component parts of the diphthong. He indeed finds that even the most radically reduced sound trace, if turned into sound, is still identified by the listener as a diphthong, not as a glide. But the argument is not convincing: any member of a given community approaches the phonic facts to which he is listening with a pre-established system of phonic values, known to him from his own language. Any phonic fact that deviates from this pre-established system is adapted to this system by overlooking the differences that may exist between that phonic fact and the norm. Menzerath himself admits this when he gives an account of his experiment in which the synthetic diphthong [ea] was interpreted by the listeners as [ja]. Seen in this light, the first of the two above-mentioned Menzerath's experiments may even serve as argument for the existence of monophonematic gliding diphthongs in German (and, analogously, in English). If, that is to say, a relatively very short medium section of the sound trace of that diphthong, left after the elimination of the initial and final components of the latter, proved sufficient for the identification of the diphthong, this fact may certainly be regarded as evidence to the effect that what matters most in such diphthongs is not the quality of their component parts but rather the extent of the difference ascertainable between the component parts (or, in traditional terms, the direction and the zonal extent of the monophonematically evaluated 'gliding diphthong'). For it is exactly in this medium section of the concerned sound trace that this most essential quality of the monophonematic diphthong must obtain the most obvious prominence.

(93) Cp. K. Luick, *HG* §§ 242ff., 304. — For a phonematic analysis of the English contraction of vowels after the loss of *-h* see J. Vachek, *On the Interplay of Quantitative and Qualitative Aspects of Phonemic Development*, *Zeitschrift f. Angl. u. Amer.* (Berlin) 5, 1957, pp. 5—28 (esp. pp. 25f.)

(94) See K. Luick, *HG* § 119, and especially A. I. Smirnitckiy (see above Note 86). — The change of PrimGmc **ai* > OE *ā*, contradictory to the above scheme, had its specific phonematic motivation, cf. Y. Krupatkin, *On the Development of Germanic ai in Anglo-Frisian*, *Philologica* (supplement to the *Časopis pro moderní filologii*, Prague) 9, 1957, pp. 49—50. The background, however, of oppositions like *i* — *ī*, *u* — *ū*, *e* — *ē* etc. makes the bimoric character of OE *ā* abundantly clear.

(95) In other words, the OE "long diphthongs" became gliding diphthongs ("Bewegungs-diphthonge", to use the term coined in our paper of 1933, quoted above, Note 91).

(96) An able survey of opinions and problems involved is presented by R. Quirk — S. M. Kuhn, *Some Recent Interpretations of Old English Digraph Spellings*, *Language* 29, 1953, pp. 143—156. (See also *Language* 31, 1955, pp. 390—401.) — It should also be noted that an assumption of a non-gliding character of OE short diphthongs would necessarily imply the highly improbable assumption of semi-moric vowel phonemes (the assumption would be necessitated by the unquestionably monomoric character of the "short diphthongs" of OE).

(97) Although in Southeast Midlands *i* and *u* were not lengthened into *ē* and *ō* respectively,

they were subject to such lengthening in Northeast Midlands (see H. Kurath's paper quoted below, Note 121). — Besides, the correlative partnership of $i - \bar{e}$, and $u - \bar{o}$ looks probable in the light of some shortening processes (to be discussed here below).

(98) A. Martinet, *Économie des changements phonétiques* (Berne 1955), pp. 246ff.

(99) The importance of this criterion for the study of phonematic development was emphasized by J. Vachek (see his treatise quoted above, Note 91, esp. pp. 153ff.) and J. Ružička, *Zum Problem der Diphthonge*, *Linguistica Slovaca* 4–6, 1946–1948, pp. 23–38.

(100) See K. Luick, *HG* § 372.

(101) And apart from the territorially restricted dialectal change of $\zeta u > au$, the importance of which upon the development of ModE was relatively slight.

(102) See also W. Horn — M. Lehnert, *Laut und Leben* [further quoted as LL], Berlin 1954, § 185. — It should be asked, however, why the influence of spelling managed to assert itself. In our opinion, this happened because the diphthong ζi was felt as synchronically foreign, and therefore eminently fitted to serve as a signal emphasizing the foreign character of the words originally containing ui (cp. V. Mathesius, *Zur synchronischen Analyse fremden Sprachguts*, quoted above, Note 29, and R. E. Zachrisson, *Notes on the Pronunciation of Greek v and French oi in Loan-Words*, *Neusprachliche Studien*, Marburg a. d. Lahn 1925, pp. 141–150).

(103) The development of ME iu was less complicated: originally a falling diphthong, it passed over into a rising one ($i\bar{y} > \bar{i}u$), which, in its turn, changed into $\bar{j}u$: by the first half of the 18th century.

(104) H. C. Wyld, *A Short History of English*³ (London 1937), p. 128.

(105) B. Trnka, *Fonologická poznámka k posunutí dlouhých samohlásek v pozdní střední angličtině* [A Phonematic Remark on the Great Vowel Shift of Late ME], *Časopis pro moderní filologii* 29, 1946, pp. 162–165.; for the English version of the paper see *Mélanges F. Mossé*, (Paris 1959), pp. 433–436.

(106) For a more detailed comment on this and other issues see J. Vachek's treatise quoted above, Note 91. It should be added that some phoneticians regard ζi as a gliding diphthong (e. g., D. Jones, *An Outline of English Phonetics*³, Cambridge 1956, § 437f.). — It appears, however, that in view of the considerable qualitative difference of its beginning and end, the ModE ζi can hardly claim the status of a gliding diphthong. And even if ζi possessed this status, one could hardly deduce from this any conclusion concerning its phonematic value. Clearly, a monophonematic evaluation of ζi seems highly improbable not only on account of the qualitative gap existing between its initial and final stages, but also on account of its structural isolation among the ModE i - and u -diphthongs which do not include any opposite number to ζi (a kind of * $e\bar{u}$). All this appears to speak rather for a biphonematic evaluation of ModE ζi .

(107) The existence in the Southern British standard of biphonematic "centring" diphthongs $i\bar{a}$, $e\bar{a}$, $u\bar{a}$, (and, possibly, $\bar{o}\bar{a}$) does not contradict our above argument. Their \bar{a} was originally a mere transitory sound linking the preceding long vowel to the following consonant $-r$, so that phonematically \bar{a} was included in the vowel phoneme which it linked to this $-r$. After the loss of $-r$ in the 17th century the sound \bar{a} actually obtained phonematic status, and so the centring diphthongs became biphonematic. But they could not be evaluated as bimoric because by that time the evaluation in terms of moras had ceased to exist in English. (See also J. Vachek, *Phonemic Remarks on the 'Short Mixed Vowel' of Modern English*, *Sborník prací filosofické fakulty brněnské university A 4*, 1956, pp. 81–92, on the tendency directed at the elimination of centring diphthongs from ModE).

(108) The earlier date of the syllable shift in cases like *dai-es*, as opposed to the later date of the shift in cases like *glad-es*, is easily explained by a close phonetic relationship of a vowel and the following \bar{i} (or \bar{u}). Thus groups like ai , au tend to become amalgamated into closer wholes more readily than groups consisting of a vowel + consonant. Moreover, the latter type of group lacks bimoric character and so lends itself less easily to amalgamation.

(109) A. Martinet, *Économie*, p. 170.

(110) The two chapters constitute revised and enlarged versions of parts of our paper entitled *Notes on the Development of Language Seen as a System of Systems* (*Sborník prací filosofické fakulty brněnské university A 6*, 1958, pp. 94–106); a brief account of Chapter VI was read at the Eighth International Congress of Linguists (see its Proceedings, Oslo 1958, p. 418–419), and at the Lomonosov University in Moscow (in May 1958).

(111) See, e. g., N. S. Trubetzkoy, *Grundzüge*, p. 139ff.

(112) See, e. g., *Preliminaries to Speech Analysis*, Cambridge (Mass.) 1952, pp. 36ff.

(113) Cf., e. g., D. Jones, *An Outline of English Phonetics*³ (Cambridge 1956), §§ 373, 789 et pass.; also G. P. Torsuev, *Obuchenie angliyskomu proiznosheniyu*³ (Moscow 1956), esp. p. 110f.

(114) Problems of the OE spelling are discussed in the second part of J. Vachek's paper *Two Chapters...* (see above, Note 9).

(115) W. Horn — M. Lehnert, LL § 441. — Incidentally, it should be recalled that also the Prim. Gmc voicings of the type $f > \delta$, $s > z$ etc. (popularly known as changes covered by Verner's Law) seem to suggest that the correlation characterizing the PrimGmc consonants was one of tension, not voice. Recently, I. D. Andreev voiced the opinion that already in Late IE the opposition of stop consonants must have been one of tension, not voice (see his paper *Periodizacija istorii indoevropskogo prazykyka* [The Establishing of Periods of Primitive Indo-European], *Voprosy yazykoznanija* 1957, No 2, pp. 3—18). But his theory, although ingeniously worked out, is hardly compatible with the situation in PrimGmc (and, to a lesser degree, in Armenian).

(116) See K. Luick, *HG*, § 653. It is hardly necessary to add that the mutual relation of the OE consonants $p-b$, $t-d$, $k-g$ was not analogous to that of $f-\delta$, $s-z$, etc.: in the former couples one had to do with separate phonemes, in the latter with variants of one and the same phoneme.

(117) André Martinet, *Économie*, esp. p. 94.

(118) In ModE contexts the percentage of monosyllables usually ranges from 60 to 80 per cent. according to the contents and style of the concerned context (the corresponding figures for Czech oscillate between 30 and 40 per cent). — On homonymy in English see, e. g., B. Trnka, *Bemerkungen zur Homonymie*, *Travaux du CLP* 4, pp. 152—156.

(119) Cf. Olaf Broch, *Slavische Phonetik* (Heidelberg 1911), § 199.

(120) What actually happened in that levelling was the functional reevaluation of the word-final voiceless lenis, which had arisen from the voiced lenis after the loss of ME vowels of unstressed syllables, not into a voiceless fortis (as had occurred in Czech, Slovak, and Russian) but into a lenis admitting of a concomitant voiced articulation, preserved in some sandhi situations.

(121) See Hans Kurath's important observations in his paper *The loss of long consonants and the rise of voiced fricatives in Middle English*, *Language* 32, 1956, pp. 435—445 (esp. pp. 442f.).

(122) It may be of use to recall here that in OE, still characterized by the opposition of voice, (1) the monosyllables were in the minority, although the prevalence of polysyllables was not so outspoken there as in Modern Slavonic languages (see J. Krámský, *Příspěvek k fonologické statistice staré a nové angličtiny* [A Contribution to Phonematic Statistics of Old and Modern English], *Časopis pro moderní filologii* 23, 1942, pp. 376—384); (2) grammatical categories, and sometimes also declension cases, were regularly distinguished by specific sets of suffixes and inflexional endings; and (3) the word-order was much less fixed than it was to become in the later periods of the development of English.

(123) Cf. O. Broch, *Slav. Phon.*, § 197.

(124) See Jan Gebauer, *Historická mluvnice jazyka českého I* (Prague-Vienna 1894), p. 325; Bohuslav Havránek, *Neasimilované párové souhlásky znělé a neznělé v staré češtině* [Non-assimilated Voiced and Voiceless Paired Consonants in Old Czech], *Slovanský sborník věnovaný F. Pastrnkovi* (Prague 1923), pp. 102—11.

(125) This fact was duly noted by W. Vondrák, *Vergleichende slavische Grammatik*², Göttingen 1924, p. 462f.

(126) Otto Jespersen states expressly, as early as 1904: "Am ausgeprägtesten findet sich der Stimmklang bei [b, d, g] im Französischen..." (*Lehrbuch der Phonetik*, Leipzig-Berlin 1904, § 103); see also D. Jones, *Outline*³, § 577.

(127) Jan Gebauer, *Hist. mluvn.* I, p. 325; A. Frinta, *Novočeská výslovnost* [Modern Czech Pronunciation], Prague 1909, p. 83; B. Havránek, *Československá vlastivěda 3, Jazyk*, p. 141. It should be added that F. Bartoš, *Dialektologie moravská* [Dialects of Moravia], Brno 1886—1895, registers this type of pronunciation as fairly common in wide regions of Moravia (esp. in its south-eastern and western parts).

(128) The above-mentioned Czech dialectal development does not contradict our theory asserting that the structural situation in the Czech language system envisaged as a structural whole admits of a rise in new homonyms, and is therefore not opposed to neutralizations of the opposition of voice in word-final positions. The contradiction is only a seeming one: we said expressly that the Czech structural situation admits the rise of new homonyms, not that it enforces it. The structure of the language, as we take it, is essentially a regulative factor in language development. In other words, all that the structure of language can do is to exercise the right of control. I. e., it can prevent the realization of changes which might be contrary to the interest of its structure (this very fact obviously happened in English), but it does not necessarily further the realization of those changes which, though they might be in agreement with its tendencies, are not vitally essential to its functioning. For this reason, one can hardly be surprised to find in the domain of Slavonic language communities isolated specimens of what has been termed here the French solution of our problem (such specimens may also exist in some West Ukrainian and in some Serbian dialects, cf. O. Broch, *Sl. Phon.*, § 54).

(129) Cf. *Proceedings of the Third International Congress of Phonetic Sciences* (Ghent 1938), p. 40: "Un phonème laryngal fonctionne come consonne neutre. La position des organes pour.. [ce phonème].. est à peu près celle du repos."

(130) See, e. g., D. Jones, *Outline*⁸, §§ 777—778.

(131) The operation of this tendency is followed in detail in another of our papers (J. Vachek, *Foném h/χ ve vývoji angličtiny* [*The Phoneme h/χ in the Development of English*], *Sborník filos. fakulty brněnské university A 1*, 1952, pp. 121—135). Among other things, we pointed out in it that from the functional viewpoint the sounds *h* and *χ* were mutually complementary and therefore constituted allophones of one and the same phoneme; the conclusion we arrived at was that the beginnings of the process discarding this phoneme reach far back into the past. Already in the earliest history of English this tendency is reflected by some changes, the most striking of which is exactly the above-mentioned loss of the intervocalic *h* (apart from **fōhan* > *fōn*, see also **eahu* > *ēa*, **seohan* > *sēon*, etc.), which goes back to the very beginning of the English literary tradition. This loss distinctly reduced the number of word-positions in which the phoneme *h/χ* could occur: from then on, it could be found medially before consonants only (as in *bōhte*, *hiehra*, etc.). When, in the later stages of its development, the phoneme *h/χ* became abolished in additional word-positions, its functional load came to be limited very palpably. As a consequence, the phoneme began to be regarded as an insufficiently exploited — one might almost say, sumptuous — item of the phonematic system of English. In the paper referred to we tried to show in some detail that in ME and ModE this irregular, unsteady status of the phoneme *h/χ* led to further changes, resulting in the abolishment of its palatal allophone *χ'* (from the end of the 14th century onwards) and ultimately of its velar allophone *χ* as well (starting from the 15th century). As a result of this, in present-day English the only remnant of the formerly so frequent phoneme is the initial prevocalic *h*-, while in most of the popular dialects the abolition of the *h*-phoneme is virtually complete. — For comment on a number of general aspects of the tendency, see our paper *On the Interplay...*, quoted above, Note 93. (In the same paper a brief account may be found of an analogous, though less efficient, tendency operating in German.)

(132) The phonetic fact that by the side of the voiceless *h*-sound also a voiced *h* exists (sometimes as an allophone of the voiceless *h*) was stressed by E. A. Meyer many years ago, v. his paper *Stimmhaftes H*, *Die neueren Sprachen* 8, 1900—1901, pp. 261—263. The problem of how the voiced *h* of Czech is articulated was dealt with, after the pioneering work by Purkinje and Czermak, by B. Hála and B. Honty, *La cinématographie des cordes vocales à l'aide du stroboscope et de la grande vitesse*, *Otolaryngologia Slavica* 3, 1931, pp. 1—13 (esp. p. 10).

(133) On the morphological type of Czech see also V. Škalička, *Vývoj české deklinace* [*The Development of Declension in Czech*], Prague 1936.

(134) See, e. g., A. C. Baugh, *A History of the English Language* (London 1952), p. 205.

Některé méně známé stránky anglické analytičnosti

I. Několik poznámek o novoanglické analytičnosti

Analytičnost není záležitostí jen morfologickou, ale projevuje se i v jiných jazykových plánech. Naše pojednání chce ukázat na některé méně známé stránky a souvislosti novoanglické analytičnosti. K jejich poznání vede pojmání jazyka jako systému systémů. Z takového pojetí jazyka plyne, že změna v jednom jazykovém plánu může mít důsledky i pro strukturu plánů ostatních. V kapitole 2.—4. se hovoří o některých důsledcích novoanglické analytičnosti ve „vyšších“ jazykových plánech (morfologickém, syntaktickém a lexikálním), v kapitole 5.—7. je pak řeč o zvláště zajímavých případech, v kterých anglická analytičnost působí na strukturu plánu zvukového, jež proměňuje tak, aby lépe odpovídal potřebám této analytičnosti.

II. Povaha slova v nové angličtině

Problém slova nejlépe řeší upravená definice V. Mathiesiuse. Slovo je podle ní úsek zvukového proudu řeči, který odkazuje na nějaký korelát v mimojazykové skutečnosti a který je jako celek oddělitelný od jiných takových úseků, ať už se toto vzájemné oddělování děje výměnou jejich míst ve větě nebo vsunutím nějakého dalšího úseku téhož druhu. Je však třeba akceptovat i tezi C. E. Bazella, podle níž shoda s vlastním slovním vzorcem daného jazyka je jakoby konečnou úpravou slovní definice v tomto jazyce, úpravou, ke které se přistupuje poté, když bylo vyhověno obecným podmínkám, které pro uznání slovního statu platí ve všech jazycích.

V kapitole se podrobně ukazuje, že charakter takových konečných úprav je v těsném vztahu k strukturám osobitostem toho kterého jazyka a zvláště s celkovým rázem jeho gramatické stavby. Dovojuje se to podrobným srovnáváním českých (a zčásti i ruských) kontextů s kontexty anglickými. Ze srovnání vyplývá, že v angličtině, jejíž mluvnická stavba je v podstatě analytická, je proti češtině a ruštině, jazykům převážně syntetickým, značně oslabena mez, která slovo jako gramatickou kategorií odděluje od sousloví (s tím je spojena podrobnější analýza tzv. citátových kompozit v angličtině, češtině a zčásti i v ruštině) a že obdobné oslabení lze v angličtině konstatovat i pro mez oddělující od sebe slovo a větu, popř. slovo a morfém, hlavně afix. Konečně se rozborem slovtvorného a pojmenovávacího postupu známého pod termínem „blending“ ukazuje, že se angličtina od češtiny a ruštiny liší i tím, že formální a sémantické kontury vyznačující slova jako lexikální celky oddělující je v lexiku od sebe navzájem vystupují v ní s menší výrazností a jasností než v obou slovanských jazycích.

Budou se tedy diferenční definice slova v angličtině a v češtině (popř. ruštině) od sebe dosti značně lišit. V angličtině bude třeba tuto definici formulovat pružněji, způsobem méně apodiktickým a více tolerujícím než v češtině a v ruštině. Ještě závažnější je pro nás ovšem jiný závěr, plynoucí z této kapitoly: rozdílná povaha slova v angličtině a v češtině (popř. ruštině) vyplývá ze zásadní rozdílnosti gramatických struktur analytické a syntetické.

III. Novoanglický „přivlastňovací pád“

Novoanglický tzv. přivlastňovací pád, z historického hlediska jediný zbytek staroanglické syntetické deklinace, nelze ani po stránce formální ani po stránce významové dnes již hodnotit jako skutečný deklinací pád. Podrobným rozбором se dovozuje, že v dnešní angličtině, jejíž mluvnická soustava je v podstatě analytická, je „posesivní pád“ postupně přehodnocován v posesivní tvar povahy adjektivní, i když přirozeně tento proces není ještě zdaleka ukončen. (Ukazuje se také, že zakončení posesivního tvaru —'s nelze dnes už pokládat za pádovou koncovku, ale spíše za odvozovací příponu.) Přitom zůstává novoanglický posesivní tvar stále v blízkosti substantivního paradigmatu, a to již proto, že ve většině případů lze jeho význam vyjádřit i vazbou s *of*, jejíž příslušnost k onomu paradigmatu lze stěží popírat.

Zajímavou českou paralelou k anglickému posesivnímu tvaru je nářeční jihozápadní ustrnulé posesivum typu *tatínkovo*, *maminčino* (užívané ve všech rodech a pádech a v obou číslech). Z hlediska české syntetické mluvnické soustavy platí dnes toto ustrnulé posesivum téměř již za druhotvar genitivního pádu základního substantiva (*tatínek*, *maninka*). Mezi anglickým posesivním tvarem typu *father's* a českým nářečním ustrnulým posesivem typu *tatínkovo* je však zásadní rozdíl v tom, že anglický tvar se dostal na své místo v gramatické soustavě anglické působením síly odstředivé, kdežto české nářeční ustrnulé posesivum naopak zaujalo své místo

v české gramatické soustavě působením tendence dostředivé. I dnešní vnitřní dynamika anglického tvaru je odstředivá, dynamika korespondujícího tvaru českého pak odstředivá.

Je zase třeba zvláště upozornit na to, že rozdíl v hodnocení a dynamičnosti obou tvarů je opět dán rozdílem v zásadní analytičnosti mluvnické soustavy anglické a zásadní syntetičnosti mluvnické soustavy české.

IV. Kompaktnost novoanglické věty

Od věty české se věta anglická liší zvláště výrazně větší měrou tzv. komplexních kondenzací. Tímto termínem rozumíme s V. Mathesiusem takové užití jmenného prvku nebo jmenné vazby, které ušetří jinak nutnou větu vedlejší. Jako kondenzační prostředky (kondenzory) slouží zvláště často jmenné tvary od slovesného základu (v angličtině zvláště participia, gerundy a infinitivy), v češtině infinitivy, participia a podstatná jména slovesná). Srovnání korespondujících kontextů anglických a českých jasně ukazuje, že v angličtině je obliba kondenzorů znatelně větší než v češtině. S tím patrně souvisí i skutečnost, že české *verbum finitum* má zřetelně vyšší dějovou dynamičnost než *verbum finitum* anglické.

Při historickém pohledu zjišťujeme, že v průběhu vývoje češtiny počet kondenzorů poklesl, kdežto v angličtině pozoruhodně vzrostl; ukazuje se také, že dějová dynamičnost anglického slovesa od doby staré do nové zřetelně poklesla, kdežto české určité sloveso v průběhu svého vývoje na dynamičnosti spíše získalo.

Z konstatovaného stavu věci ovšem nijak neplyne neschopnost angličtiny vyjádřit dynamičnost děje vůbec nebo neschopnost češtiny formulovat pojmové myšlení, svou podstatou vysoce jmenné. Oba jazyky si tu dovedou vypomoci: čeština různými kategoriemi jmenných výrazů, angličtina pak časovou a slovesně rodovou rozrůzněností svých kondenzorů.

Není pochyby o tom, že existuje závislost mezi syntetičností mluvnické stavby, malou oblibou kondenzorů a značnou dějovou dynamičností verba finita, a naopak mezi analytičností mluvnické stavby, velkou oblibou kondenzorů a utlumenou dějovostí finitního tvaru. Nelze ovšem pojímat tyto závislosti mechanicky: v jednotlivých jazycích může jít o spojitosti spletitější, vyžadující bedlivého zřetele k specifickým příslušným jazykové soustavě.

V. Protiklady kvantitativní a kvalitativní u novoanglických samohlásek

Podle názoru dnes vcelku obecného nejsou novoanglické samohlásky od sebe odlišovány korelací kvantity, ale korelací kontaktu (někdy označovanou jako korelace slabického řezu). Naproti tomu v staré angličtině byla plně rozvinuta ryze kvantitativní samohlásková korelace, založená na protikladu dvojmorovosti proti jednomorovosti. Tato korelace se plně uplatňuje i v pozdní staré angličtině; v době rané středoanglické se v důsledku různých hláskových změn značně omezují funkční zatížení staré korelace, ale ona sama jako instituce trvá dále. Morové pojetí kvantity je v té době ještě dosvědčováno paralelním vývojem prvních dvojháskových slozek a samostatných krátkých samohlásek, jež se s těmito složkami kvalitativně shodují.

Když se zásada paralelního vývoje začíná porušovat (prvý závažný doklad takového porušení je změna *rŕa* > *ai*), znamená to prvé počátky nového, amorového hodnocení dvojhásek a pak i dlouhých samohlásek. Nicméně s novým hodnocením koexistovalo až do doby rané novoanglické tradiční morové pojetí samohláskové délky; obojí pojetí spolu po celou dobu středoanglickou nepochybně bojovalo o konečné vítězství. Rozhodnutí ve prospěch pojetí amorového padlo v rané nové angličtině, kdy bylo amorové hodnocení vydatně posíleno vznikem nových amorových dvojhásek v průběhu změny známé pod názvem "Great Vowel Shift", jež počátek spadá do konce doby středoanglické. Staré, morové hodnocení samohláskové délky bylo v té době už značně oslabeno středoanglickým zánikem posttonických redukovaných samohlásek a ještě dřívějším přesunem slabikové meze v případech j. *dæ-zes* > *dai-zs* atp.

Protiklad kontaktu nahradil protiklad kvantity po stránce fonologické počátkem doby rané novoanglické. Foneticky ovšem existoval již dříve jako průvodní rys kvantitativního protikladu (stal se jím někdy mezi pol. 13. a pol. 14. století). Nás tu zvláště zajímá skutečnost, že vznik nového hodnocení samohláskových protikladů je těsně spjat s postupující analytičností anglické gramatické soustavy (prospěval této analytizační tým, že zřetelněji zdůrazňoval meze oddělující kmen od ohýbací přípany).

VI. Protiklady znělosti a napjatosti u novoanglických párových souhlásek

Jiný zajímavý případ vlivu, jež vykonává analytizační anglické mluvnické stavby na strukturu zvukového plánu, poskytuje srovnání anglických a českých párových fonémů obvykle

označovaných jako znělé, resp. neznělé. (j. *p — b, t — d, s — z* atp.), Zatímco v češtině (a obdobně i v slovenštině, ruštině apod.) byly na konci slov párové znělé souhlásky v důsledku neutralizace vystřídány neznělými, byly v angličtině protiklady tohoto typu v takových polohách zachovány, a to za cenu přehodnocení protikladu znělostního v napjatostní. Rozdílný vývoj tu byl zase dán potřebami „vyšších“ plánů příslušných jazyků. V kapitole se podrobně dovozuje, že z anglické analytičnosti vyplývající přetížnost anglického kontextu, zastávajícího již řadu gramatických funkcí, nedovolovala jeho další zatížení, ke kterému by bylo došlo vznikem nových homonymních slovních dvojic. Naproti tomu při poměrně malém funkčním zatížení českých (slovenských, ruských atd.) větných kontextů, přirozeně vyplývajícím ze syntetičnosti mluvnické stavby v těchto jazycích, bylo jejich pověření dalšími úkoly zcela dobře únosné.

Teorie zde formulovaná může vrhnout nové světlo i na tzv. neasimilované stč. souhláskové skupiny, j. v slovech *sde, dchoř*. Není vyloučeno, že takové způsoby psaní svědčí o přechodném stavu, který se projevil v době, kdy čeština byla postavena před možnost přehodnotit znělostní souhláskový protiklad v napjatostní. Tzv. definitivní asimilace (s výsledkem *zde, tchoř*) by pak znamenala definitivní utvrzení znělostního protikladu v češtině.

VII. Zanikání novoanglické neutrální souhlásky

Při postupné likvidaci novoanglické neutrální souhlásky *h* hrál velmi důležitou úlohu její zánik v poloze mezisamohláskové (neznělé *h* se tu asimilovalo k svému samohláskovému okolí a bylo jím nakonec pohlceno). Zajímavé je, že české — a stejně i slovenské, ukrajinské a hornolužické — znělé *h* v obdobné situaci nebylo asimilováno, tím méně pak pohlceno svým samohláskovým okolím, ač by jeho znělost takové změně byla zvláště příznivá.

Důvod různého vývoje anglického a slovanského je patrně v tom, že slovanské *h* je mnohem pevněji zakořeněno v důsledně syntetické tvaroslovné soustavě slovanské, než bylo *h* doby staroanglické, v níž ke změnám intervokalického *h* docházelo. Snaha zachovat české (a asi vůbec slovanské) *h* vedla patrně také k jeho specifické artikulaci, jež toto *h* zabezpečuje před mechanickou asimilací ze strany jeho samohláskového okolí. V angličtině takové snahy nebylo, protože tu syntetická stavba mluvnické soustavy jevila už jistě sklony k analytičnosti (jež pak v době středoanglické ovládla pole úplně). Ukazuje se tedy, že i tu je různost hláskového vývoje těsně spjata s rozdíly v gramatických strukturách srovnávaných jazyků.

J. V.

Некоторые менее известные стороны английского аналитизма

I. Несколько замечаний по поводу английского аналитизма

Аналитизм — это не только дело морфологии, ибо он отражается и в других планах языка. Предлагаемое исследование ставит себе целью указать некоторые менее известные стороны и связи новоанглийского аналитизма. Их познание достигается таким образом, что язык понимается как система систем. Из подобного понимания языка вытекает, что изменение в одном плане языка может повлечь за собой последствия также в структуре других планов. В главах 2—4 речь идет о некоторых последствиях новоанглийского аналитизма в „высших“ языковых планах (морфологическом, синтаксическом и лексическом), в главах 5—7 рассматриваются особенно интересные случаи, когда английский аналитизм воздействует на структуру звукового плана, преобразуя его таким образом, чтобы тот лучше соответствовал потребностям этого аналитизма.

II. Характер слова в новоанглийском языке

Проблема слова лучше всего постигнута в уточненном определении В. Матезиуса. Согласно этому определению слово представляет отрезок звукового потока речи, направленный на какой-либо коррелят во внеязыковой действительности и отделяемый как целое от других подобных отрезков, пусть это взаимное отделение происходит за счет обмена их местоположениями в предложении или же за счет вставления какою-нибудь дальнейшего отрезка того же рода. Необходимо, однако, считаться также с положением Ц. Э. Базеля о том, что совпадение с собственной формулой сущности слова в данном языке является своего рода конечной адаптацией определения слова в соответствующем языке, адаптацией, которая делается после того, как были удовлетворены общие условия, имеющие для признания статуса слова силу применительно ко всем языкам.

В главе подробно объясняется, что характер таких конечных адаптаций находится в тесной связи со структурными особенностями того или другого языка, в частности же с общим характером его грамматического строя. Обосновывается это путем детального сопоставления чешских (частью и русских) контекстов с английскими контекстами. Из сопоставления явствует, что в английском языке, грамматический строй которого является, в сущности, аналитическим, в отличие от чешского и русского языков, преимущественно синтетических, в значительной степени стирается грань, отделяющая слово — как грамматическую категорию — от словосочетания (с этим связан более подробный анализ т. н. цитатных композитов в английском, чешском и отчасти также в русском), и что аналогичное стирание грани в английском языке можно наблюдать также между словом и предложением, эвент. между словом и морфемой, главным образом аффиксом. Наконец, на основании анализа словообразовательного и номинативного приема, известного под термином „блендинг“, устанавливается, что английский язык отличается от чешского и русского также тем, что формальные и семантические очертания, выделяющие слова как лексические целые и отделяющие их в лексике друг от друга, выступают в нем менее ярко и отчетливо, чем в обоих славянских языках.

Следовательно, адаптированные и дифференциальные дефиниции слова в английском и чешском (эвент. русском) языках в довольно значительной мере будут отличаться друг от друга. Применительно к английскому, названную дефиницию надо будет сформулировать более упруго и менее аподиктически, чем в чешском и русском, с учетом специфики английского языка. Еще важнее, конечно, для нас другой вывод, вытекающий из этой главы: различная природа слова в английском и чешском (эвент. русском) обусловлена принципиальным отличием грамматических структур, аналитической и синтетической.

III. Новоанглийский „притяжательный падеж“

Новоанглийский т. н. притяжательный падеж, с исторической точки зрения единственный остаток древнеанглийского синтетического склонения, в настоящее время ни

с формальной, ни со смысловой стороны нельзя расценивать как фактический деклинационный падеж. При помощи подробного разбора делается заключение о том, что в современном английском языке, грамматический строй которого в сущности аналитический, „притяжательный падеж“ постепенно переоценивается в possessивную форму адъективного характера, несмотря на то что этот процесс, естественно, далеко еще не завершен. (Отмечается также, что окончание possessивной формы 's можно теперь считать уже не падежным окончанием, а скорее производящим суффиксом.) Притом новоанглийская possessивная форма все время остается в близости парадигмы существительных, хотя бы уже потому, что в большинстве случаев ее значение может выражаться и посредством оборота с предлогом *of*, принадлежность которого к указанной парадигме не вызывает никаких сомнений.

Интересную чешскую параллель английской possessивной формы представляет диалектное неизменяемое притяжательное прилагательное типа *tatínkovo*, *mamínčino* (употребляющееся во всех родах и падежах, и в обоих числах). С точки зрения чешской синтетической грамматической системы подобные неизменяемые притяжательные прилагательные воспринимаются почти как разновидность родительного падежа основного существительного (*tatínek*, *mamínka*). Однако между английской possessивной формой типа *father's* и чешским диалектным застывшим possessивным прилагательным типа *tatínkovo* имеется принципиальное различие в том, что английская форма попала на свое место в грамматической английской системе под действием центробежной силы, в то время как чешская диалектная неизменяемая possessивная форма заняла свое место в чешской грамматической системе под действием центростремительной тенденции. Также нынешняя внутренняя динамика английской формы является центробежной, динамика же соответствующей чешской формы — центростремительной.

Опять таки следует отметить, что различие в оценке и динамике обеих форм вызвано различием между принципиальным анализмом английского грамматического строя и принципиальным синтетизмом чешского грамматического строя.

IV. Компактность новоанглийского предложения

От чешского предложения английское предложение особенно ярко отличается большей степенью т. н. комплексных конденсаций. Под этим термином мы понимаем, вслед за В. Матезиусом, такое употребление именного элемента или именного оборота в пределах предложения, которое замещает соответствующее придаточное предложение. В качестве конденсационных средств (конденсаторов) особенно часто используются именные формы глагольных основ (в английском языке, главным образом, инфинитив, причастия и герундий, в чешском же инфинитив, причастия и отглагольное существительное). Сопоставление соответствующих английских и чешских контекстов наглядно вскрывает несомненно большее тяготение к употреблению конденсаторов в английском, в отличие от чешского. С этим различием обоих языков стоит в связи, по-видимому, то обстоятельство, что чешская определенная глагольная форма обладает отчетливо более высокой динамичностью действия, нежели английская.

Историческое развитие обоих языков показывает, что в чешском языке, в ходе его развития, численность конденсаторов понижалась, в то время как в английском языке заметным образом возрастала; оказывается, далее, что динамичность действия, выражающаяся английским глаголом, с древнего времени по настоящее явно понижилась, между тем как динамичность чешской определенной глагольной формы скорее увеличилась.

Из установленного положения дел, конечно, отнюдь не вытекает неспособность английского языка выражать динамичность действия вообще, или же непригодность чешского языка для формулировки понятийного мышления, в высшей степени номинального по своему существу. Оба языка располагают особыми средствами: чешский язык использует различные категории именных выражений, английский же использует временное и залоговое разнообразие своих конденсаторов.

Нет сомнения, что существует определенная взаимосвязь, с одной стороны, между синтетизмом грамматического строя, редким употреблением конденсаторов и значительной динамичностью действия, присущей определенной глагольной форме, а, с другой стороны, между анализмом грамматического строя, весьма частым употреблением конденсаторов и ослабленным значением действия в определенной глагольной форме. Эти взаимосвязи, однако, нельзя воспринимать механически: в отдельных языках

нередко имеются более сложные связи, которые всегда следует рассматривать с тщательным учетом специфики данной языковой системы.

V. Количественные и качественные противоположности новоанглийских гласных

Согласно почти общепринятому в настоящее время мнению, новоанглийские гласные отличаются друг от друга не в порядке количественной корреляции, а корреляции контакта (обозначающейся, иногда, в виде корреляции слогового предела). Напротив, в древнеанглийском языке существовала полностью развитая, чисто количественная корреляция гласных, основанная на противоположности двумерности и одномерности. Такая корреляция полностью проявляется также в поздний период древнеанглийского языка; в ранний среднеанглийский период, в результате различных фонетических изменений, значительно ограничивается функциональная роль древней корреляции, однако сама по себе она продолжает существовать как языковое данное. Морное восприятие количества гласных в то время засвидетельствовано еще параллельным развитием первых дифтонгических компонентов и самостоятельных кратких гласных, которые в качественном отношении совпадают с этими компонентами.

После того как принцип параллельного развития начинает нарушаться (первым серьезным доказательством подобного нарушения явилось ранне-среднеанглийское изменение $e_i > a_i$), то это означает начатки новой, аморной оценки дифтонгов и впоследствии даже долгих гласных. Тем не менее наряду с новой оценкой сосуществовало, вплоть до раннего новоанглийского периода, традиционное морное воспринимание долготы гласных; та и другая оценка на всем протяжении среднеанглийского периода находилась в борьбе за конечную победу. Решение в пользу аморного восприятия завершилось лишь в раннем новоанглийском языке, когда аморная оценка получила значительное подкрепление благодаря возникновению новых аморных дифтонгов, в результате изменения, известного под названием „Great Vowel Shift“, начало которого относится к концу среднеанглийского периода. Древняя, морная оценка долготы гласных к тому времени была уже значительно ослаблена в силу среднеанглийской утраты посттонических редуцированных гласных и в силу предшествовавшего сдвига слогового предела в случаях типа $dæ-zes - dai-as$ и т. п.

Противоположность контакта заменила противоположность количества с фонологической стороны в начале раннего новоанглийского периода. Фонетически, конечно, она существовала уже раньше, в виде сопутствующей черты количественной противоположности (та появилась когда-то в отрезке между половиной 13-го и половиной 14-го веков). Особый интерес для нас представляет тот факт, что возникновение новой оценки противоположностей гласных стоит в тесной взаимосвязи с продвигавшимся аналитизмом английского грамматического строя (эта новая оценка способствовала аналитизму тем, что более отчетливо подчеркивала грань, отделяющую основу слова от флексии).

VI. Противоположности по звонкости и напряженности у новоанглийских парных согласных

Иной интересный случай влияния, оказываемого со стороны аналитизма английского грамматического строя на структуру звукового плана, дает сопоставление английских и чешских парных фонем, называемых обычно звонкими или глухими (как-то $p - b$, $t - d$, $s - z$ и т. п.). Между тем как в чешском (с аналогиями в словацком, русском и др.) парные звонкие согласные в конце слов в силу нейтрализации сменились глухими, в английском языке противоположности подобного типа в таких положениях сохранялись, за счет переоценки противоположности по звонкости в противоположность по напряженности. Различное развитие здесь, в свою очередь, обусловливалось потребностями высших планов соответствующих языков. В главе обстоятельно объясняется, что перегрузка английского контекста предложения рядом грамматических функций не позволяла его дальнейшей нагрузке, которая произошла бы в результате возникновения новых омонимичных словесных пар. С другой стороны, относительно малая функциональная нагрузка чешских (словацких, русских и т. д.) контекстов, естественно вытекающая из синтетизма грамматического строя этих языков, создавала предпосылки для освоения ими еще дополнительных функций.

Высказанная здесь теория может пролить новый свет также на т. н. неассимилиро-

ванные древнечешские сочетания согласных, напр. в словах *sde*, *dchoř*. Не исключена возможность, что такие написания отражают переходное состояние, сложившееся к тому времени, когда чешский язык был поставлен перед возможностью переоценки противоположности согласных по звонкости в противоположность по напряженности. Т. н. окончательная ассимиляция (с результатом *zde*, *tchoř*) означала бы, согласно высказанному, окончательное закрепление в чешском языке противоположности по звонкости.

VII. Процесс утраты новоанглийского нейтрального согласного

При постепенной ликвидации новоанглийского нейтрального согласного весьма важную роль играло его падение в интервокалическом положении (глухое *h* подвергалось ассимиляции со своим вокалическим соседством, и в конце концов было поглощено им). Показательно, что чешское — и подобно также словацкое, украинское и верхнелужицкое — звонкое *h* в аналогичном положении не ассимилировалось, и тем менее поглощалось своим вокалическим соседством, хотя его звонкость особенно благоприятствовала бы такому изменению.

Причина различного развития в английском и славянских языках заключается, по-видимому, в том, что славянское *h* гораздо сильнее закреплено в последовательно синтетической морфологической славянской системе, чем *h* древнеанглийского периода, к которому и относятся изменения интервокалического *h*. Стремление сохранить чешское (и, вероятно, вообще славянское) *h* влекло за собой, очевидно, также его специфическую артикуляцию, обеспечивающую это *h* от механической ассимиляции со стороны вокалического соседства. В английском языке подобного стремления не было, так как синтетический строй грамматической системы уже в то время обнаруживал определенные тенденции к аналитизму (который позднее, в среднеанглийский период, полностью распространился). Оказывается, следовательно, что и здесь различие фонетического развития тесно связано с различиями грамматических структур сравниваемых языков.

Перевел Р. Мрагек