

ON THE ENGLISH  
AND CZECH SITUATIONAL ADVERBS  
IN FUNCTIONAL SENTENCE PERSPECTIVE

The present paper is a modest contribution to the research into the functional sentence perspective in English viewed in its relation to the English system of word order. As it compares English with Czech, it also offers some observations on the functional sentence perspective in Czech viewed in its relation to the Czech word-order system. As to the method of investigation, it adopts the theory of functional sentence perspective (= FSP) as it has been presented by V. MATHESIUS (1) and elaborated by J. FIRBAS. (2)

By functional sentence perspective we understand with J. FIRBAS 'the arrangement of sentence elements as it is viewed in the light of the actual situation, i. e. in fact in the light of the context, both verbal and situational. Viewed in this way, those sentence elements which convey something that is known, or may be inferred, from the verbal or from the situational context (or simply something that evidently constitutes the starting point of the communication) are to be regarded as the communicative basis, as the THEME of the sentence. On the other hand, those sentence elements which convey the new piece of information are to be regarded as the communicative nucleus, as the RHEME of the sentence. Needless to say, the thematic elements are less important in the given situation, being communicatively less dynamic... than the rhematic elements. The latter, conveying the new piece of information, undoubtedly develop the communication very substantially. Those sentence elements which belong neither to the theme nor to the rheme form a kind of transition.' (J. FIRBAS, *Communicative Function*, p. 39). (3)

According to V. MATHESIUS' definition, an adverbial element (adverb) (4) of situation is one 'expressing the temporal, positional or causal background of the action' (V. MATHESIUS, *Srovn. studie*, p. 188). It consequently includes the adverbial elements (adverbs) of time, place and cause.

It may be taken for established that word order is the main means of FSP in Czech. In a non-emotive Czech sentence, the theme is situated at the beginning, the rheme at the end. Compare the following four versions:

- a) V Ženevě pokračuje jednání konference tří mocností.  
['In Geneva it-continues discussion of-conference of-three of-powers.'] (5)
- b) Pokračuje jednání konference tří mocností v Ženevě.  
['It-continues discussion of-conference of-three of-powers in Geneva.']
- c) Jednání konference tří mocností v Ženevě pokračuje.  
['Discussion of-conference of-three of-powers in Geneva it-continues.']
- d) Jednání konference tří mocností pokračuje v Ženevě.  
['Discussion of-conference of-three of-powers it-continues in Geneva.']

In each of the four versions, the rheme follows the other sentence element or ele-

ments; it stands at the end of the sentence. In contrast with Czech, the English order of words is to a considerable extent fixed. In consequence it cannot always meet the demands of FSP operating as a word-order principle; in other words, it cannot always change according to the changes in the actual situation. This induced V. MATHESIUS to draw the conclusion that English is much less susceptible to FSP than Czech (cf. p. 113). (6)

In his studies J. FIRBAS has convincingly shown that word order is not the only means of FSP that the written language has at its disposal. Where English cannot make full use of word order for the purposes of FSP, it can have recourse to other means. Some of these means are even without counterparts in Czech. Let us give at least one example: Firbas has shown that the non-generic indefinite article and its zero plural variant are means that signalize the novelty of the information and — if the co-operation of the FSP means within the sentence permits it — mark out the nouns they qualify as rhematic (cf. p. 113). According to J. FIRBAS, it is the semantic structure of the sentence that through these means co-operates in constituting the FSP of the sentence. The non-generic indefinite article and its plural zero variant are words that 'on account of their specific semantic character show quite a particular relation to the context and may — in co-operation with other means — either weaken or strengthen the positions in the sentence.' (J. FIRBAS, *Communicative Function*, p. 43). In this way they can act counter to the basic distribution of communicative dynamism (= CD). (By the basic distribution of communicative dynamism we understand with J. FIRBAS the natural, basic arrangement of sentence elements, gradually and consistently proceeding from theme proper, i. e. from the element(s) carrying the least amount of CD within the sentence (clause), on to rheme proper, i. e. to the element(s) carrying the highest degree of CD within the sentence (clause). Thus in the sentence *An old man entered the waiting-room*, the initial position, basically thematic, has been dynamically strengthened by the group *an old man* on account of the presence of the non-generic indefinite article. In co-operation with the semantic content of the verb *enter* (expressing 'emergence on the scene') and the definite article, under the circumstances signaling the familiarity of the *waiting-room*, the non-generic indefinite article marks out the element *an old man* as the most important in the sentence — as its rheme proper (cf. p. 113).

Besides the semantic structure of the sentence it is the context itself that functions as a means of FSP: if occurring in basically transitional or rhematic positions (in regard to the basic distribution of CD), the thematic elements, as a rule conveying notions that are known or may be gathered from the context, may communicatively weaken such positions, 'dedynamize' them. On the other hand, rhematic or transitional elements, if occurring in basically thematic positions, communicatively strengthen them, rendering them 'more dynamic'. (See J. FIRBAS, *Communicative Function*, p. 43.)

In our notes, we propose to concentrate upon the mutual relation between the sentence position of the situational adverb and the degree of CD carried by it as it can be seen in English novelistic prose and in its Czech translation. Especially such cases will be analyzed in which in regard to the basic distribution of CD the position of the situational adverb is at variance with the degree of CD carried by it. Under this heading come situational adverbs carrying low degrees of CD, but occurring finally, i. e. in basically rhematic positions, as well as situational adverbs carrying high degrees of CD, but occurring initially, i. e. in positions basically thematic. In all such cases we shall assume (on the ground of the theory put forth above) that some means of FSP, other than word order, have acted counter to the

basic distribution of CD. Our endeavour will be to find out what these means are. If we manage to do so, we may perhaps claim to have offered some proofs of the validity of the propounded theory. We shall confine ourselves to the written language only.

We have subjected to analysis about 730 English sentences containing 842 instances of the situational adverbs and compared them with their Czech counterparts, taken from two different Czech translations. The English material has been drawn from the first part of Galsworthy's *Forsyte Saga* (John Galsworthy, *The Forsyte Saga*, Vol. I, *The Man of Property*, The Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow 1958, pp. 41—146), the Czech material from its latest Czech translation by Zdeněk Urbánek (Bohatec, Státní nakladatelství krásné literatury, hudby a umění, Praha 1957, pp. 17—117) and from its older Czech translation by Božena Kubertová-Zátková (Bohatec, Aventinum, Praha 1926, pp. 19—120). (7)

Only declarative sentences have been examined or such exclamatory sentences as from the formal point of view do not differ from the declarative ones. We have excluded from our observation all non- emotive sentences containing some adverb of indefinite time (such as *never, often, ever, always* etc.). We have done so as in such sentences the position of the adverb between the subject and the notional part of the finite verb is practically fixed. From the point of view of FSP, second instance sentences have been excluded from our observation. (8)

Let us now begin examining our material. In a considerable number of sentences there is disagreement between the degree of CD carried by the situational adverb and the sentence position occupied by it. It has been observed with 134 adverbs of place (their total amount being 483), with 109 adverbs of time (their total number being 308), and with 11 adverbs of cause (from the total number of 50).

It is worth noticing that the comparatively high frequency of the said disagreement has first of all been caused by thematic adverbs. Thus, for instance, from 134 cases of disagreement observed with adverbs of place no less than 121 adverbs display a small amount of CD. How shall we account for this phenomenon?

As V. MATHESIUS has shown, the leading factor within the English system of word order is the grammatical principle, closely co-operating with the principle of coherence of members. (See V. MATHESIUS, *Srovn. studie*, p. 183 and p. 112 of the present volume.) This principle usually shifts the adverb of the examined type after the subject, predicate and object, i. e. to the end of the sentence (comparatively rarely the situational adverb stands at the beginning of the sentence and only in special cases it can appear between the subject and the predicative verb, or between the predicative verb and the object). As the basic distribution of CD places at the end of the sentence the most dynamic, i. e. the rhematic elements, all non-rhematic adverbs occurring at the end of the sentence are cases of disagreement between the degree of CD carried by the adverb and the sentence position occupied by it.

Let us turn to our first example.

1. The heat danced over the corn. — 102,29 (9)

Nad obilím tančil žár. U 74,31

['Over corn danced heat.']

If we denote the theme with<sup>10</sup> (or if a differentiation of degrees of CD within theme is necessary, with<sup>11, 12, 13, ...</sup>), the transition with<sup>20</sup> (or with<sup>21, 22, 23, ...</sup>) and the rheme with<sup>30</sup> (or with<sup>31, 32, 33, ...</sup>), (10) the FSP of the two versions of No. 1 will be indicated in the following way:

1. The heat<sup>30</sup> danced<sup>20</sup> over the corn<sup>10</sup>.

Nad obilím<sup>10</sup> tančil<sup>20</sup> žár<sup>30</sup>.

['Over the corn<sup>10</sup> danced<sup>20</sup> heat<sup>30</sup>.']

The corn has already been spoken about and that is why the notion conveyed by the adverb of place, *over the corn*, recedes into the background. The small amount of CD conveyed by the adverb of place is signaled by the context itself, which functions here as a means of FSP. Adverbs of time and those of cause may behave in the same way.

Sometimes the adverb (or at least part of it) is formed by a word/group of words that stands for (refers to) another word/group of words, occurring at least once in the previous context. Take No. 2, for instance.

2. You<sup>11</sup>'ll have<sup>20</sup> a lot of rain<sup>30</sup> there<sup>12</sup>. — 52,35

Tam<sup>10</sup> si užiješ<sup>20</sup> deště<sup>30</sup>. — U 28,09

['There<sup>10</sup> (refl. pron.) you-will-enjoy<sup>20</sup> rain<sup>30</sup>.']

The adverb of place *there/tam* stands for the group of words in *Wales/do Walesu*, occurring in the preceding sentence. (11) It is evident that the adverb *there/tam*, which by itself conveys no definite idea, could not have been used here had it not been for the preceding context. That is why in the English version the adverb of place *there* may be put at the very end of the sentence without necessarily carrying a higher amount of CD. The adverb *here (zde)* has a similar character, as can be seen from No. 3:

3. It<sup>11</sup>'ll be<sup>20</sup> lonely<sup>30</sup> here<sup>12</sup>... — 75,17

Bude<sup>20</sup> tady<sup>10</sup> smutno<sup>30</sup>... — U 48,36

['It-will-be<sup>20</sup> here<sup>10</sup> sadly<sup>30</sup>.']

Like in No. 2, the adverb *here (zde)* is of little semantic value, being only a substitute for another word known from the previous context. Thus it becomes a semantic-contextual means of FSP and can act counter to the basic distribution of CD. Also personal and reflective pronouns, as well as the demonstrative pronouns *this (Czech tento)* and *that (onen)*, can be classed with semantic-contextual means. (12) In illustration of such words, we have adduced Nos. 4–7.

4. A misgiving<sup>30</sup> arose<sup>20</sup> within him<sup>10</sup>! — 78,19

Zrodily se<sup>20</sup> v něm<sup>10</sup> obavy<sup>30</sup>! — U 52,10

['They-arose (refl. pron.)<sup>20</sup> in him<sup>10</sup> misgivings<sup>30</sup>!']

5. [His uplifted face, with the awed and wistful look]

which<sup>11</sup> faces<sup>12</sup> take<sup>20</sup> on themselves<sup>13</sup> in church<sup>30</sup>... — 98,14

[Jeho zdvižená tvář s bázlivým a hloubavým výrazem,]

jejž<sup>11</sup> na sebe<sup>12</sup> berou<sup>20</sup> tváře<sup>13</sup> v kostelích<sup>30</sup>... — U 70,31

['...which<sup>11</sup> on themselves<sup>12</sup> take<sup>20</sup> faces<sup>13</sup> in churches<sup>30</sup>.']

6. ...Swithin<sup>11</sup> was<sup>20</sup> so long<sup>30</sup> over this course<sup>12</sup>... — 85,13

... a Swithin<sup>11</sup> nad tímto chodem<sup>12</sup> tak dlouho<sup>32</sup> prodléval<sup>31</sup>....

... U 58,08

['— and Swithin<sup>11</sup> over this course<sup>12</sup> so long<sup>32</sup> lingered<sup>31</sup>.']

7. He<sup>11</sup> had worked<sup>30</sup> at that business<sup>12</sup>! — 64,20

Co se<sup>11</sup> v tom podniku<sup>12</sup> napracoval<sup>30</sup>! — U 39,19

['How (refl. pron.)<sup>11</sup> in that business<sup>12</sup> he-worked<sup>30</sup>!']

The function of semantic-contextual means can also be performed by the adverbs of time and those of cause. As to the adverbs of time, this would apply to such expressions as *now (Cz. teď, nyní)*, *at present (nyní)*, *today (dnes)*, *nowadays (dnes, za nymějších časů)*. And once again the demonstrative pronouns *this* and *that* have to be mentioned in this connection as they enter into the expanded adverbs of time/cause. Nos. 8 and 9 will illustrate.

8. She<sup>11</sup> had<sup>20</sup> just that one idea<sup>31</sup> now<sup>12</sup> — Bosinney and his affairs<sup>32</sup>. — 121,05

Měla<sup>20</sup> ted<sup>10</sup> jedinou starost<sup>31</sup> — Bosinneyho a jeho záležitosti<sup>32</sup> — ... — U 93,08  
[‘She-had<sup>20</sup> now<sup>10</sup> one worry<sup>31</sup> — Bosinney and his affairs<sup>32</sup>’]

9. ..., who<sup>11</sup> (i. e. June — E. D.) frequently<sup>21</sup> visited<sup>22</sup> his house in Lowndes Square<sup>30</sup> at this period<sup>12</sup>. — 131,06

..., jež<sup>11</sup> (tj. June — E. D.) v té době<sup>12</sup> často<sup>21</sup> navštěvovala<sup>22</sup> jeho dům na Lowndes Square<sup>30</sup>. — U 102,31

[‘..., who<sup>11</sup> at this period<sup>12</sup> frequently<sup>21</sup> visited<sup>22</sup> his house in Lowndes Square<sup>30</sup>.’]

Analyzing No. 9, we find that though the adverb *at this period* stands at the very end of the sentence it remains thematic. This is due to the familiarity of the notion conveyed by it, the familiarity being signalized by the semantic-contextual means *this*.

As to the adverbs of cause, the most characteristic semantic-contextual means is the adverb *therefore* (Czech *proto, tudíž*). It occurs in No. 10.

10. ..., there<sup>11</sup> was<sup>20</sup> therefore<sup>12</sup> nothing to do<sup>30</sup>. — 127,26

..., a neměl<sup>20</sup> tedy<sup>10</sup> co dělat<sup>30</sup>. — U 99, 06

[‘..., and he-had-not<sup>20</sup> therefore<sup>10</sup> something to-do<sup>30</sup>.’]

In our material, however, occur numerous adverbs of place and those of time that in spite of expressing notions not known or uninferable from the previous context, and in spite of occupying positions allotted by the basic distribution of CD to highly dynamic elements, actually convey only small amounts of CD. Nos. 11 and 12 contain such adverbs.

11. I<sup>11</sup> never<sup>31</sup> use<sup>20</sup> the lift<sup>32</sup> at the Club<sup>12</sup>. — 52, 20

V klubu<sup>10</sup> nikdy<sup>31</sup> nejezdím<sup>32</sup> výtahem<sup>33</sup>. — U 27,32

[‘At club<sup>10</sup> never<sup>31</sup> I-do-not-go<sup>32</sup> by-lift<sup>33</sup>.’]

12. In spite of himself<sup>12</sup> something<sup>20</sup> swelled<sup>30</sup> in his breast<sup>11</sup>. — 102,32

Proti jeho vůli<sup>13</sup> se<sup>12</sup> mu<sup>11</sup> v prsou<sup>14</sup> něco<sup>20</sup> vzdouvalo<sup>30</sup>. — U 74,34

[‘Against his will<sup>13</sup> (refl. pron.)<sup>12</sup> to-him<sup>11</sup> in breast<sup>14</sup> something<sup>20</sup> swelled<sup>30</sup>.’]

We suppose that the indication of the place (the local setting of the action), conveyed by the adverb, is communicatively less important than the action (what is actually happening). The notion conveyed by the adverb recedes, as it were, into the background. Thus, owing to its semantic content, the adverb carries a low amount of CD, though occurring in a basically rhematic position and conveying a notion not known (uninferable) from the context. Nos. 13 and 14 allow of a similar interpretation.

13. This dinner in honour of June’s engagement<sup>11</sup> had seemed<sup>20</sup> a bore<sup>30</sup> at first<sup>12</sup>...

— 79,13

‘Tato večeře na počest Junina zasnoubení<sup>11</sup> připadala<sup>20</sup> mu<sup>12</sup> zprvu<sup>13</sup> nudná<sup>30</sup>...

— U 52,36

[‘This dinner in honour of-June’s of-engagement<sup>11</sup> seemed<sup>20</sup> to-him<sup>12</sup> at first<sup>13</sup> boring<sup>30</sup>.’]

14. If you<sup>11</sup>’ve<sup>20</sup> nothing<sup>32</sup> better<sup>33</sup> to do<sup>31</sup> on Sunday<sup>12</sup>, ... — 98,25

Nemáte-li<sup>20</sup> v neděli<sup>10</sup> nic<sup>32</sup> lepšího<sup>33</sup> na práci<sup>31</sup> ... — U 71, 04

[‘If-you-have-not<sup>20</sup> on Sunday<sup>10</sup> nothing<sup>32</sup> better<sup>33</sup> for work<sup>31</sup>.’]

The adverbs *at first* and *on Sunday* express the temporal background of the action; like the adverbs of Nos. 11 and 12, they occur at the end of the sentence, and yet carry low amounts of CD. It is evident that acting counter to the basic distribution of CD, the semantic content of the adverb of time functions as means of FSP. Regardless of position the semantic content (i. e. the local or temporal setting) lowers the amount of CD carried by the adverb. It depends, of course, upon the co-operation of all the means of FSP operating within the given sentence to what extent the degree of CD carried by the adverb will eventually be lowered.

In our material we have ascertained five sentence types in which the co-operation of means has not led to a lowering of CD carried by the adverbs of place/time. These five types will now be discussed here. If not otherwise stated, our observations hold good both for the adverbs of place and for those of time.

I. In this type of sentence all the elements (or at least all the positive elements) except the adverb express notions known or at least inferable from the context. As the only unknown element in the sentence the adverb becomes rheme proper. Such a co-operation of means is illustrated by No. 15.

15. She<sup>11</sup> had met<sup>20</sup> this Bosinney<sup>12</sup> at the house of Baynes<sup>31</sup> — Baynes and Bildeboy<sup>32</sup> ..., the architects<sup>33</sup>. — 61, 36

Setkala se<sup>20</sup> s tím Bosinney<sup>10</sup> u Baynes<sup>31</sup> — Baynes a Bildeboy<sup>32</sup>, architekti<sup>33</sup>. — U 37,06

[She-met (refl. pron.)<sup>20</sup> with this Bosinney<sup>10</sup> at Baynes<sup>31</sup> — Baynes and Bildeboy<sup>32</sup>, architects.<sup>33</sup>]

The personal pronoun *she* refers to *June*, whose engagement is spoken about in the preceding sentence (61,35). In consequence also the notion *this Bosinney* is to be regarded as known, as it is given by the situational context (*June* was engaged to *Bosinney*, not to anybody else). The same applies to the notion conveyed by the verb *to meet* (considering the fact that the first meeting is indisputably a logical prerequisite of the engagement). Thus the adverb of place has become rheme proper.

II. The adverb follows a verb that (in a wide sense of the word) states the existence of somebody or something while the existence of the person or thing is known or can be gathered from the context. The adverb develops the discourse by conveying a new piece of information — by communicating where, or when the given person or thing exists (or existed etc.). Let us give here at least one instance of this type of sentence:

16. ... and Rachel and Cicely<sup>10</sup> were<sup>20</sup> on a visit<sup>31</sup> in the country<sup>32</sup>. — 112,33

... a Rachel s Cicely<sup>10</sup> byly<sup>20</sup> na návštěvě<sup>31</sup> na venkově<sup>32</sup>. — U 85,07

[... and Rachel with Cicely<sup>10</sup> were<sup>20</sup> on visit<sup>31</sup> in country<sup>32</sup>.]

The existing persons are known from the context; the verb *to be* expresses mere existence, so that its semantic content is very poor; that is why it allows the adverb *on a visit in the country*, conveying the new piece of information, to obtain the highest amount of CD in the sentence, to become rheme proper. (Of course, if the person or thing in existence is not known, nor inferable from the context, the adverb cannot attain the highest amount of CD, though it is itself unknown and uninferable from the context.) This can be seen from No. 17.

17. In this house of his<sup>12</sup> there<sup>11</sup> was<sup>20</sup> writing<sup>30</sup> on every wall<sup>13</sup>. — 106, 30

Na všech stěnách tohoto jeho domu<sup>10</sup> bylo možno číst<sup>20</sup> předpověď zhouby<sup>30</sup>. ... U 78, 35

[‘On all walls of-this his of-house<sup>10</sup> was possible to-read<sup>20</sup> omen of-destruction<sup>30</sup>.’]

Existence is not expressed by the verb *to be* only, though, of course, this verb expresses it most evidently. Other verbs convey it as well, such as *to live* (in Czech *bydlet*), *to sit* (*sedět*), *to stand* (*stát*), *to stay* (*zůstat*), *to find oneself* (*nalézat se*) *to appear* (*objevit se*), and the verbs of perception such as *to feel* (*cítit*), *to see* (*vidět*), or such verbs (in the passive) as *to be spread*, *to be encased*, *to be laid down*, *to be seated* and others. All of these verbs express the ‘existence’ or ‘emergence on the scene’ of a person or a thing. (13) In No. 18 the verb *to live* has been used, in 19 the passive verb *to be laid down*.

18. [He had heard, of course — ... —] that Jo<sup>10</sup> lived<sup>20</sup> in St. John’s Wood<sup>30</sup>, ... — 71.11

[Samozřejmě se dověděl — ... —.] že Jo<sup>10</sup> bydlí<sup>20</sup> v St. John's Wood<sup>30</sup>, ... — U 45,17

[‘... that Jo<sup>10</sup> lives<sup>20</sup> in St. John's Wood<sup>30</sup>.’]

19. ...; that law<sup>10</sup> was laid down<sup>20</sup> in all the novels, sermons, and plays<sup>30</sup>. — 71, 05  
...; tento zákon<sup>10</sup> byl stanoven<sup>20</sup> ve všech románech, kázáních a dramatech<sup>30</sup>,  
... — KZ 49,01

[‘...; that law<sup>10</sup> was laid-down<sup>20</sup> in all novels, sermons and plays<sup>30</sup>, ...’]

III. The adverb of place follows a verb that needs an amplification answering one of the following questions: *where to?*, *where from?*, *which way?* or *from where to where?* In most cases the verb expresses active motion of a person or thing (*to go, to run, to come*, etc.), but verbs expressing passive motion of a person or thing may be classed here as well (*to place something, to put something, to take someone, to drive someone*, etc.). If such a verb is followed by an adverb of place conveying a notion unknown from the context and the object which moves or is moved is known or inferable from the context, the adverb usually attains the highest amount of CD in the sentence, for under the circumstances the communication of the direction of the motion is certainly more important than the communication of the motion itself. Let us examine, e. g., the following two instances:

20. The cab<sup>10</sup> rattled<sup>21</sup> gaily<sup>22</sup> along the streets<sup>30</sup>, ... — 68,15

Kočár<sup>10</sup> vesele<sup>21</sup> rachotil<sup>22</sup> ulicemi<sup>30</sup>... — U 42,34

[‘Cab<sup>10</sup> gaily<sup>21</sup> rattled<sup>22</sup> through-streets<sup>30</sup>.’]

21. June<sup>11</sup> took<sup>21</sup> her lover<sup>12</sup> up<sup>22</sup> to the woman with the beautiful figure<sup>30</sup>. — 48,14

June<sup>11</sup> odvedla<sup>20</sup> snoubence<sup>12</sup> k ženě krásné postavy<sup>30</sup>. — U 24,03

[‘June<sup>11</sup> took<sup>20</sup> fiancé<sup>12</sup> to woman of-beautiful of-figure<sup>30</sup>.’]

In these two instances the adverbs *along the streets* and *to the woman of beautiful figure* have become rhemes because of expressing *which way* and *to where* the motion proceeds.

For the sake of comparison, let us quote two sentences (Nos. 22 and 23) instancing other types of co-operation of FSP means.

22. A fly<sup>30</sup> settled<sup>20</sup> on his hair<sup>10</sup> ... — 60,32

Na vlasy<sup>12</sup> mu<sup>11</sup> usedla<sup>20</sup> moucha<sup>30</sup>... — U 36,03

[‘On hair<sup>12</sup> to-him<sup>11</sup> settled<sup>20</sup> fly<sup>30</sup> ...’]

23. [‘Abandon hope, all ye] who<sup>11</sup> enter<sup>30</sup> here<sup>12</sup>.’ — 86,12

[‘Vzdej se naděje,] kdo<sup>11</sup> sem<sup>12</sup> vstupuješ<sup>30</sup>.’ — U 59,06

[‘... who<sup>11</sup> here<sup>12</sup> you-enter<sup>30</sup>.’]

In 22 the moving object (*a fly*) appears ‘on the scene’ for the first time and attracts greater attention than the place of appearance conveyed by the adverb (*on his hair*), though even the place is a new notion not mentioned in the previous context. Thus the expression *a fly* becomes rheme proper and the adverb of place *on his hair* conveys a comparatively small amount of CD.

23 contains an adverb answering one of the given questions but conveying a known, familiar notion; that is why it is given only a low degree of CD.

IV. This type may be characterized as follows. In addition to its basic semantic content, i. e. that of the temporal setting, the adverb of time is characterized by a certain semantic adumbration (colouring) of degree, evaluation or manner proper, the adumbration of degree being present also in the precise determination of time. An adverb of time is coloured by an adumbration of degree mostly when denoting the length of an action, i. e. the degree of duration of an action, or that of its frequency. Such a case occurs when the adverb answers one of the following questions: *how*

long?, how often?, since when?, till when?, or how many times? Such an adverbial phrase is to be found in No. 24.

24. I<sup>11</sup> drink<sup>20</sup> it<sup>12</sup> every night of my life<sup>30</sup>. — 79,12  
Piji<sup>20</sup> je<sup>10</sup> noc co noc<sup>30</sup>. — KZ 43,31  
[‘I-drink<sup>20</sup> it<sup>10</sup> night after night<sup>30</sup>.’]

The adumbration of manner proper can be seen e. g. in the adverbial phrase at a moment's notice in No. 25.

25. He<sup>10</sup> was ready to rise<sup>20</sup> at a moment's notice<sup>30</sup>. — 79,12  
Byl připraven<sup>20</sup> okamžitě<sup>31</sup> vstát<sup>32</sup>. — U 52,35  
[‘He-was ready<sup>20</sup> instantly<sup>31</sup> to-rise<sup>32</sup>.’]

The semantic adumbration of evaluation is caused by the evaluating words of the *so* or *too* type. See No. 26.

26. ..., of which<sup>11</sup> he<sup>12</sup> had<sup>21</sup> so long<sup>31</sup> been<sup>22</sup> chairman<sup>32</sup>, ... — 76.19  
..., v nichž<sup>10</sup> je<sup>20</sup> už tolik let<sup>31</sup> předsedou správní rady<sup>32</sup>... — U 49,34  
[‘... in which<sup>10</sup> is<sup>20</sup> already so-many years<sup>31</sup> chairman of-administrative of-board<sup>32</sup>.’]

In our material the adumbration of evaluation always accompanies the adumbration of degree.

If the modification of the semantic content of the adverb (caused by the adumbration of degree or that of manner proper, or sometimes by both that of degree and that of evaluation or by that of precise determination of time) is supported also by the word order, the adverb most often becomes rhematic.

V. A high degree of CD can be observed with an adverb that is extended by many attributes or even by a clause, occurs in the context for the first time and is situated at the end of the sentence. We can find such an extended adverb of place in No. 27.

27. This guard of men<sup>11</sup>, all attached to the dead by the bond of kinship<sup>12</sup>, was<sup>30</sup> an impressive and singular sight<sup>32</sup> in the great city of London<sup>31</sup> with its overwhelming diversity of life<sup>33</sup>, its innumerable vocations, pleasures, duties<sup>34</sup>, its terrible hardness<sup>35</sup>, its terrible call to individualism<sup>36</sup>. — 145,10

Tato stráž mužů<sup>11</sup>, spoutaných příbuzenstvím s mrtvou<sup>12</sup>, byla<sup>20</sup> působivou a jedinečnou podívanou<sup>31</sup> ve velikém městě Londýně<sup>32</sup> s jeho drtivou rozmanitostí života<sup>33</sup>, s jeho nespočetnými povoláními, radovánkami, povinnostmi<sup>34</sup>, s jeho strašnou krutostí<sup>35</sup>, s jeho strašným voláním po svébytnosti<sup>36</sup>. — U 116, 08

[‘This guard of-men<sup>11</sup>, bound by-kinship with the-dead<sup>12</sup>, was<sup>20</sup> impressive and singular sight<sup>31</sup> in great city London<sup>32</sup> with its overwhelming diversity of-life<sup>33</sup>, with its innumerable vocations, pleasures duties<sup>34</sup>, with its terrible hardness<sup>35</sup>, with its terrible call for individualism<sup>36</sup>.’]

The adverb of place *in the great city of London* would — in accordance with its basic semantic content — recede into the background, carrying a smaller amount of CD than the phrase *an impressive and singular sight*, if the head-word *London* were not extended by a number of attributes, conveying new notions. But the extension is of such a degree as to raise the CD of the entire adverb.

We have briefly discussed five types of sentences in which the co-operation of FSP means has not led to the lowering of the amount of CD carried by the adverbs of place/time. Let us now turn our attention to the adverb of cause.

Studying the adverb of cause from the point of view of FSP, we find that the basic semantic content (14) of the adverb of cause is not of a purely ‘situational’ character which — under favourable circumstances — would make the adverb



act counter to the basic distribution of CD. In contrast with the adverbs of place/time the adverb of cause seems to convey more than a mere situational setting through its basic semantic content. As in Czech, in English as well, the amount of CD carried by the adverb of cause depends on the position within the sentence, provided, of course, the adverb conveys a new piece of information. Thus at the beginning of the sentence, the adverb of cause as a rule becomes thematic, whereas at the end of the sentence it becomes rhematic. Let us compare Nos. 28 and 29.

28. ... for, thanks to that prescription of Blight's<sup>13</sup> he<sup>11</sup> found<sup>20</sup> himself<sup>12</sup> extremely well<sup>30</sup>, ... — 79,02

..., neboť se<sup>11</sup> zásluhou Blightova receptu<sup>12</sup> cítil<sup>20</sup> neobyčejně dobře<sup>30</sup>... — U 52,29

[... for (refl. pron.)<sup>11</sup> thanks-to Blight's prescription<sup>12</sup> he-felt<sup>20</sup> extremely well<sup>30</sup>...']

29. Her shoulders<sup>10</sup> were shaking<sup>20</sup> with sobs<sup>30</sup>. — 125,11

Ramena<sup>13</sup> se<sup>12</sup> jí<sup>11</sup> otřásala<sup>20</sup> vzlykotem<sup>30</sup>. — U 97,07

['Shoulders<sup>13</sup> (refl. pron.)<sup>12</sup> to-her<sup>11</sup> were-shaking<sup>20</sup> with-sobs<sup>30</sup>.']

In 28 the adverb of cause *thanks to that prescription of Blight's* is thematic, in accordance with its initial position, whereas in 29 the adverb of cause *with sobs* becomes rhematic — also in accordance with its final position.

Thus, from the point of view of FSP, the semantic character of the adverb of cause appears to be quite different from the semantic character of the adverbs of place/time.

Having disposed of the three types of situational adverbs referred to by V. MATHEUSIUS as situational, we should like to add a few notes on FSP and word order in Czech as compared with the corresponding phenomenon in English. Even in Czech — though not so frequently as in English — there are cases in which the amount of CD carried by the adverb is not in agreement with the sentence position, i. e., with the basic distribution of CD. Thus in Czech we can comparatively often find a thematic adverb of place/time in a position that according to the basic distribution of CD is basically non-thematic. Owing to its basic semantic content, the adverb conveys a small amount of CD and operates as a means of FSP even in Czech. It has to be pointed out, however, that it is not usual for such adverbs to occur in end-position. (Cf. No. 30.)

30. Each of these ladies<sup>11</sup> held<sup>20</sup> fans<sup>30</sup> in their hands<sup>12</sup>, ... — 43,37

Každá z těchto dam<sup>11</sup> držela<sup>20</sup> v ruce<sup>12</sup> vějíř<sup>30</sup>... — KZ 22,01

['Each of these ladies<sup>11</sup> held<sup>20</sup> in hand<sup>12</sup> fan<sup>30</sup>...']

In this respect, there is a marked difference between Czech and English. While in English the final position of an adverb with a small amount of CD is quite common, in Czech it is very unusual. Needless to say, the Czech demand of a communicatively strong end in a non- emotive sentence is in strict accordance with the fact that the role of the leading word-order principle in Czech is performed by FSP (not by the grammatical structure as in English). If a translator fails to observe these facts, he runs the risk of an unusual, strange or — from the point of view of FSP — even inadequate translation. Nos. 31 and 32 exemplify such unusual Czech translations. (The English version of 31 has already been given in No. 11. Notice, however, the difference between the Czech translation quoted in 11 and that given here.)

31. I<sup>11</sup> never<sup>31</sup> use<sup>20</sup> the lift<sup>32</sup> at the club<sup>12</sup>. — 52,20

Nikdy<sup>31</sup> nejezdím<sup>32</sup> liftem<sup>33</sup> do klubu<sup>10</sup>. — KZ 30,20

['Never<sup>31</sup> I-do-not-go<sup>32</sup> by-lift<sup>33</sup> to club<sup>10</sup>.']

32. The tears<sup>30</sup> sprang up<sup>30</sup> in June's eyes<sup>10</sup>. — 133,07

Slzy<sup>30</sup> vstoupily<sup>21</sup> Juně<sup>10</sup> do očí<sup>22</sup>;... — KZ 107,30

['Tears<sup>30</sup> entered<sup>21</sup> to-June<sup>10</sup> into eyes<sup>22</sup>;...'] (15)

Sometimes inadequate word order can give the Czech translation another kind of FSP than that displayed by the English original. Let us compare the two Czech translations of No. 33.

33. ... who<sup>11</sup> was talking<sup>20</sup> to Bosinney<sup>30</sup> by the door<sup>12</sup>. — 55,06

..., jež<sup>11</sup> u dveří<sup>12</sup> hovořila<sup>20</sup> s Bosinney<sup>30</sup>. — U 30,09

[‘..., who<sup>11</sup> at door<sup>12</sup> talked<sup>20</sup> with Bosinney<sup>30</sup>.’]

..., která<sup>11</sup> hovořila<sup>20</sup> s Bosinney<sup>12</sup> u dveří<sup>30</sup>. — KZ 33,05

[‘..., who<sup>11</sup> talked<sup>20</sup> with Bosinney<sup>12</sup> at door<sup>30</sup>.’]

In the English version it is undoubtedly the object to *Bosinney* that serves as rheme proper. This is well rendered by the author of the more recent Czech translation who puts the Czech counterpart of the English object in end position. The other Czech translation, on the other hand, keeps the word order of the original and induces the reader to regard the adverb of place *u dveří* (*at the door*) as rheme proper. (16)

We are closing our notes in which we have attempted to throw some light on one of the numerous problems raised by FSP. In our opinion a solution of those problems is a most urgent task of modern linguistic research. (17) Further inquiries into FSP will certainly contribute towards a better knowledge of the function of language as a means of thought and communication.

- (1) Cf. J. FIRBAS' study in the present volume of BSE. It discusses V. MATHESIUS' conception of FSP and word order as presented in his paper *Srovň. studie*. Other important studies by MATHESIUS concerning these problems have been included in *Čeština*, a posthumously published collection of his articles. See also the references to MATHESIUS' writings in J. FIRBAS' papers, in J. VACHEK's comments on MATHESIUS' *Obsahový rozbor*, and in P. NOVÁK's *Prostředky*.
- (2) Cf. J. FIRBAS' study in the present volume of BSE. For a list of his contributions to the theory of FSP, see Bibliography.
- (3) Cf. also the entries 'division actuelle de la phrase', 'perspective fonctionnelle de la phrase', 'rhème de la phrase' in J. VACHEK's *Dictionnaire*.
- (4) The term 'adverb' is used here in its wider application, covering not only simple adverbs, but also adverbial phrases. Cf. H. W. FOWLER, *Usage*.
- (5) For the benefit of the reader who has not a ready command of Czech we add literal translations of the Czech examples.
- (6) Unless further indications are given, references are to pages of the present volume of BSE.
- (7) The present paper is based on a diploma thesis, supervised by Dr. J. FIRBAS and presented at the English Department of the Brno Philosophical Faculty in 1960. A parallel inquiry, examining cases drawn from English dramatic prose, has been carried out by another diploma thesis offered by L. LUNER. The conclusions arrived at by LUNER are in agreement with the results of our investigation.
- (8) 'Roughly speaking, these sentences contain one HEAVILY CONTRASTED word, and except for their phonic (prosodic) and possibly also typographical form, they imitate the structure of those sentences with which they are being contrasted (no matter whether these sentences have really been uttered or merely exist in the writer's/speaker's and reader's/listener's minds).' (J. FIRBAS, *Communicative Function*, p. 43.) V Ženevě pokračuje jednání tři mocností ['In Geneva it-continues discussion of-three of-powers'.]
- (9) The figures give the page and line on which the quoted example begins. Quotations from KUBERTOVÁ-ZÁTKOVÁ's translation are indicated by the abbreviation KZ, those from URBÁNEK's translation by U.
- (10) Cf. J. FIRBAS, *Communicative Value*, p. 97.
- (11) So you are going to Wales to-morrow to visit your young man's aunts? — 52, 33.  
Tak zítra tedy jedeš do Walesu navštívit tety toho svého mladíka? — U 28, 08.  
['So tomorrow then you-are-going to Wales to-visit aunts of-that of-your of-young-man?']
- (12) As has already been pointed out, the pronouns *this* and *that* obviously only form part of the adverb, never making up adverbs by themselves.
- (13) The operation of the 'verbs of existence or emergence on the scene' on the level of FSP has been discussed by J. FIRBAS, e. g., in *Nezákladové podmínky*, pp. 31–40, *Communicative Function*, p. 48 and 50, *Word Order in OE & ModE*, p. 85. Cf. A. G. HATCHER, *Theme*, and J. FIRBAS, *Sentence*, p. 138.
- (14) The term 'basic semantic content' refers only to the semantic feature characteristic of all the adverbs belonging to one of the three discussed groups (time, place, cause); it does not cover any of the possible semantic adumbrations.
- (15) Z. URBÁNEK offers the following translation:  
Do Juniných očí<sup>10</sup> vhrkly<sup>20</sup> slzy<sup>30</sup>. — U 104, 26  
['Into June's eyes<sup>10</sup> sprang<sup>20</sup> tears<sup>30</sup>.']  
URBÁNEK's rendering of the sentence type under discussion as a rule sounds more natural than B. KUBERTOVÁ-ZÁTKOVÁ's. Observing Czech usage, he places the rheme at the end of the sentence (clause).
- (16) More examples could be adduced from B. KUBERTOVÁ-ZÁTKOVÁ's otherwise careful translation. Let us give here at least her version of No. 1.  
Žár<sup>10</sup> se chvěl<sup>20</sup> nad obilím<sup>30</sup>. — KZ 79, 04  
['Heat<sup>10</sup> (refl. pron.) quivered<sup>20</sup> over corn<sup>30</sup>.']
- (17) V. V. VINOGRADOV has stressed the importance of these problems in *Grammatika*, ii. 1, p. 91.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- J. DUBSKÝ, see J. VACHEK, *Dictionaire*
- J. FIRBAS, *Communicative Function = Thoughts on the Communicative Function of the Verb in English, German and Czech*, Brno Studies in English 1, 1959, pp. 39—68
- J. FIRBAS, *Communicative Value = On the Communicative Value of the Modern English Verb*, Brno Studies in English 3, 1961, pp. 79—104
- J. FIRBAS, *Deutscher Beitrag = Bemerkungen über einen deutschen Beitrag zum Problem der Satzperspektive*, Philologica Pragensia 1, 1958, pp. 49—54
- J. FIRBAS, *Nezákladové podmínky = K otázce nezákladových podmětů v současné angličtině [On the Problem of Non-Thematic Subjects in Contemporary English]*, Časopis pro moderní filologii 39, 1957, pp. 22—42 and 165—173.
- J. FIRBAS, *Poznámky k problematice anglického slovního pořádku z hlediska aktuálního členění větného [Notes on the Problem of English Word Order from the Point of View of Functional Sentence Perspective]*, SPFFBU A4, 1956, pp. 93—107
- J. FIRBAS, *Sentence = Notes on the Function of the Sentence in the Act of Communication (Marginalia on Two Important Studies in Syntax by Anna Granville Hatcher)*, SPFFBU A10, 1962, pp. 133—148
- J. FIRBAS, *Srovn. studie = Ze srovnávacích studií slovosledných [From Comparative Word-Order Studies]*, Slovo a slovesnost 23, 1962, pp. 174. (The English version of this paper appears in the present volume of BSE, pp. 111—128)
- J. FIRBAS, *Word Order in OE & ModE = Some Thoughts on the Function of Word Order in Old English and Modern English*, SPFFBU A5, 1957, pp. 72—98
- H. W. FOWLER, *Usage = A Dictionary of Modern English Usage* (London 1944)
- Grammatika = Grammatika ruského jazyka [Grammar of the Russian Language]*, i—ii, Akademiya nauk SSSR (Moscow 1954)
- A. G. HATCHER, *Theme = Theme and Underlying Question, Two Studies in Spanish Word Order*, Supplement to Word 12, 1956
- V. MATHESIUS, *Čeština = Čeština a obecný jazykozpyt [The Czech Language and General Linguistics]* (Prague 1947)
- V. MATHESIUS, *Obsahový rozbor = Obsahový rozbor současné angličtiny na základě obecně lingvistickém [A Functional Analysis of Present-Day English on a General Linguistic Basis]*, edited and commented upon by J. VACHEK (Prague 1961)
- V. MATHESIUS, *Srovn. studie = Ze srovnávacích studií slovosledných [From Comparative Word-Order Studies]*, Časopis pro moderní filologii 28, 1942, pp. 181—190 and 302—307
- P. NOVÁK, *Prostředky = O prostředcích aktuálního členění [On the Means of Functional Sentence Perspective]*, Acta Universitatis Carolinae 1959, Philologica 1, pp. 9—15
- SPFFBU = Sborník prací filosofické fakulty brněnské university (Brno)
- J. VACHEK, *Dictionnaire de linguistique de l'École de Prague Avec collaboration de J. DUBSKÝ* (Utrecht—Anvers 1960)
- J. VACHEK, see V. MATHESIUS, *Obsahový rozbor*

## Poznámky k postavení příslovečného určení situačního v angličtině a češtině z hlediska funkční perspektivy větné

Na základě teorie o funkční perspektivě větné, jak ji vyslovil V. MATHEUS a dále podnětně propracoval J. FIBBAS, zkoumá autorka rozdíly mezi větným postavením anglického a českého příslovečného určení situačního, tj. příslovečného určení, které vyjadřuje časové, místní nebo přítčinné pozadí děje.

Vzhledem k tomu, že gramatický princip není v češtině hlavním slovosledným činitelem, souhlasí větné postavení českého příslovečného určení situačního daleko častěji se základním rozložením výpovědní dynamičnosti než větné postavení příslovečného určení v angličtině: v české větě jeví základové příslovečné určení (dále jen PU) nepochybnou tendenci obsadit základové, tj. počáteční místo ve větě, přechodové PU se nejčastěji objevuje uprostřed věty, tj. na místě přechodovém, jádrové PU pak na konci věty, tj. na místě, jež náleží složkám jádrovým. Tyto tendence jsou ve shodě se známou skutečností, že funkční perspektiva větná (= FPV) je v češtině hlavním slovosledným činitelem. Slovosled jako prostředek FPV je v češtině daleko řídkěji než v angličtině překonán jiným prostředkem FPV. To také vysvětluje, proč stupeň výpovědní dynamičnosti českého PU situačního je velmi často určen jen jeho větným postavením.

Naproti tomu v angličtině, jejímž nejdůležitějším slovosledným činitelem je princip gramatický, vyskytují se PU situační, zejména PU místa a času, daleko častěji na místech, která nejsou ve shodě se základním rozložením výpovědní dynamičnosti. To však neznamená, že je angličtina k FPV méně citlivá. Má totiž k dispozici ještě jiné prostředky FPV, jimiž může vyjádřit skutečný stupeň výpovědní dynamičnosti PU. Patří k nim: 1. sám kontext, 2. sémanticko-kontextové prostředky, tj. slova, zastupující výrazy známé už z kontextu nebo na ně alespoň odkazující, 3. základní sémantická náplň PU situačního. Základní sémantická náplň PU se však projevuje jako prostředek FPV jen u PU místa a času, nikoli u PU příčiny. (Tato skutečnost spolu s tendencí PU příčiny obsadit větné místo, které by bylo ve shodě se základním rozložením výpovědní dynamičnosti, odhaluje důležitý rozdíl, jenž z hlediska FPV existuje mezi PU místa a času na jedné straně a PU příčiny na straně druhé.)

Působení základní sémantické náplně PU místa/času jako prostředku FPV osvětlí následující příklad: jestliže ve větě *I came across an important monograph yesterday* přinásejí všechny složky kromě zájmena *I* nové sdělení, jeví se PU času *yesterday* jako méně důležité (a tudíž i méně výpovědně dynamické) než vyjádření vlastního děje *came across an important monograph*. Ve shodě se svou sémantickou náplní, pouhou situačností, vyjadřuje totiž PU jen časovou kulisu děje, vyjádřeného přechodovým slovesem a jádrovým předmětem, a stává se tak složkou základovou, ačkoliv se vyskytuje na místě příslušejícím jádru. Stupeň výpovědní dynamičnosti PU situačního závisí ovšem vždy na souhře všech prostředků FPV v dané větě. Nelze proto předpokládat, že PU místa/času bude vždy základové. Ve svém materiálu zjistila autorka pět typů vět, v nichž souhra prostředků FPV činí z PU místa/času složku nezakladovou.

I. PU situační je ve větě jedinou neznámou složkou (ostatní větné složky jsou známy nebo mohou být odvozeny z předešlého kontextu).

II. Situační PU místa/času spolu se slovesem vyjadřujícím existenci přináší nové sdělení, kdežto existující osoba nebo věc je z kontextu známá nebo odvoditelná (existenční slovesa jako *to be* – *byti*, *to live* – *žít*, *to stand* – *státi*, *to appear* – *objeviti se* aj. vyjadřují „existenci“ nějaké osoby nebo věci, případně jejich „objevení se na scéně“).

III. Situační PU místa, které není z kontextu známé ani odvoditelné, odpovídá na jednu z otázek: *kam?*, *odkud?*, *kudy?*, *odkud* – *kam?*, přičemž pohybující se objekt je už z kontextu znám.

IV. PU času, neznámé z kontextu a vyskytující se na nezakladovém místě ve větě, je charakterováno významovým odstínem míry/způsobu nebo vyjadřuje nějaký přesný časový údaj.

V. PU místa/času je rozvíto mnoha výrazy, přinášejícími nová sdělení, a vyskytuje se zároveň na konci věty.

Podobně jako ostatní prostředky FPV ani základní sémantická náplň PU místa/času nepůsobí ve větě nezávisle na ostatních prostředcích; uplatňuje se jen ve spolupráci s nimi. Jen dokonalá znalost této spolupráce, této souhry prostředků FPV, umožní porozumět tomu, jak jazyk rozlišuje základové, přechodové a jádrové složky. Autorčiny poznámky chtějí být skromným příspěvkem k poznání této souhry.

Заметки к положению ситуативного обстоятельства в английском и чешском языках  
с точки зрения функциональной перспективы предложения

Исходя из теории функциональной перспективы предложения — ФПП — (= смыслового, или актуального членения предложения), намеченной В. Матезиусом и разработанной Я. Фирбасом, автор исследует различия между английским и чешским языками, касающиеся положения в предложении ситуативного обстоятельства, т. е. обстоятельства места, времени и причины.

В силу того, что в иерархии влияющих на порядок слов факторов в чеш. яз. господствующую роль играет ФПП, а в англ. яз. — грамматический принцип, положение ситуативного обстоятельства в чеш. яз. гораздо чаще находится в соответствии с основным распределением динамичности высказывания (т. е. в направлении от низшей тематичности — от данного — к высшей рематичности — к новому), чем в англ. яз. В этом факте, однако, не следует усматривать доказательство того, будто бы англ. яз. менее чутко реагирует на ФПП, чем чеш. яз. Нужно иметь в виду, что приходящаяся на долю ситуативного обстоятельства степень коммуникативной динамичности может обслуживаться также другими средствами, чем порядком слов, а именно: а) самым контекстом, б) словами, замещающими известные из контекста выражения или, по крайней мере, указывающими на них, в) основным семантическим содержанием ситуативного обстоятельства. Следует, впрочем, подчеркнуть, что основное семантическое содержание является действенным средством ФПП лишь у обстоятельства места и времени, а не у обстоятельства причины.

Воздействие основного семантического содержания — одной только ситуативности — у обстоятельства места и времени можно проиллюстрировать на следующем примере. Если в предложении *I came across an important monograph yesterday* все компоненты, за исключением местоименного подлежащего *I* передают новое сообщение, то определение времени (временная „кулиса“ события), выраженное обстоятельством *yesterday* оказывается менее важным (и, следовательно, менее динамичным в данном высказывании), чем собственное событие, выраженное предикативным глаголом *came across* и дополнением *an important monograph*. Обстоятельство здесь становится компонентом темы (основы, данного), несмотря на то, что оно занимает положение в конце предложения, где по основному распределению динамичности высказывания обычно находится собственно ядро (рема, новое).

Ситуативные обстоятельства места и времени, конечно, не всегда носят характер компонентов темы (данного). Степень их динамичности в высказывании всегда зависит от взаимоотношений средств ФПП, действующих в данном предложении. В своем материале автор установил пять типов предложений, в которых взаимоотношения средств ФПП превращают обстоятельство места или времени в не относящийся к теме компонент. Все эти пять типов автором в его статье описываются, объясняются и подкрепляются примерами.

Предлагаемые заметки автора не могли охватить всех типов взаимоотношений средств ФПП, в которых основное семантическое содержание обстоятельства времени или места может проявлять себя. Они хотя бы лишь скромным вкладом в дело познания того, каким образом язык, орудие мышления и общения, различает между компонентами темы (данного), ремы (нового) и переходными компонентами.

Перевел Роман Мразек