

PROFESSOR JOSEF VACHEK SEXAGENARIAN

A TRIBUTE TO HIS WORK IN THE FIELD OF ENGLISH STUDIES

JAN FIRBAS

University of Brno

I. There are several reasons why, on his sixtieth birthday (March 1st, 1969), *Brno Studies in English* should present a homage volume to Professor Josef Vachek, Ph.D. (Caroline University, Prague), Sc. Dr. (Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences, Prague), from 1945 to 1947 Reader and from 1947 to 1962 Professor of English Language in the Department of English and American Studies of the University of Brno.

Professor Vachek is the virtual founder of the linguistic section of the Department. Though by no means neglecting the linguistic side of English studies, the first professor and founder of the Department, František Chudoba, was not a linguist, but a literary historian. In the field of linguistic studies the pre-war Brno Department of English could therefore hardly compete either with the English Department of Prague, headed by Professor Vilém Mathesius, President of the Prague Linguistic Circle, or with some other philological departments, e.g., the Brno Department of Slavonic Studies on the staff of which there were two other prominent members of the Circle, Professors Bohuslav Havránek and Roman Jakobson. It was Professor Vachek who after the end of World War II organized the linguistic studies in the Brno Department of English on a truly modern basis and through whose work the linguistic section of the Department has become known even outside Czechoslovakia. In co-operation with Professor Karel Štěpaník, F. Chudoba's pupil and successor and director of the literary studies in the Department, Professor Vachek then rebuilt the Department, which together with all the other institutes of the University was closed during the six years of Nazi occupation (1939—45).

For almost two decades, Professor Vachek was director of the linguistic studies in the Department. One of the ablest pedagogues in the University, he will be gratefully remembered by his students for his lectures, in which he managed to present the most complex problems in a surprisingly lucid way, as well as for his set of mimeographed university textbooks, covering practically all the prescribed course of the theoretical study of English and offering an excellent introduction to the current state of research.¹ Out of concern for the future of English studies in Czechoslovakia, he never failed to encourage those of his students who showed serious interest in research. His former students fill posts of university teachers of English in Prague, Brno, Olomouc, Bratislava and Prešov.

Last but not least, it was on his initiative that *Brno Studies in English* started to appear with the aim of bringing, at irregular intervals, the results of the research carried on in the Brno Department of English.

A word must be added on the character of the homage volume. Professor Vachek's

work is not limited to English studies only. To a considerable extent, it also pertains to the fields of general linguistics and Slavonic studies. In keeping with the previous issues of *Brno Studies in English*, however, the homage volume contains only contributions that in a broad sense of the term come under the heading of English studies. This explains why it does not bring contributions from a great number of Professor Vachek's colleagues and friends, prominent linguists working outside the sphere of English studies. It also explains why the present paper opening the homage volume concentrates on Vachek's work in the field of English studies and only occasionally deals with his work in the field of Czech studies and in that of general linguistics. His contributions to the latter two fields would deserve special treatment.

It should further be borne in mind that the homage volume has been prepared without Professor Vachek's knowledge and advice. This makes all the responsibility rest solely with the editors.

Speaking of the character of the homage volume, the editors cannot fail to pay special tribute to two contributors who have not lived to see the publication of the volume: Professor Gustav Kirchner and Dr. Svatopluk Štech. Their respect and love for the scholar to be honoured was so great that in spite of failing health they spared no pains in working at and eventually finishing their contributions. Noble examples of unselfish devotion and extraordinary achievement!²

II. Professor Vachek came to Brno from Prague, where he was born on March 1st, 1909, and where he graduated from the Caroline University, taking both his final State Examination (in Czech and English philology) and his Ph.D. degree (in the same fields) in 1932.

The circumstances in which he attended the grammar school and studied at the University were not always easy, for his family was not one of means. When a boy of nine, he lost his father, a clerk by profession, his mother having to bear the brunt of the strenuous post-war years all by herself.³ Among his university teachers, especially four had a marked share in moulding his personality as well as his conception of language and language study: Professors Vilém Mathesius, Bohumil Trnka, Oldřich Hujer, and Miloš Weingart. To those names, two others should be added: those of Bohuslav Havránek and Roman Jakobson, who were then Professors in the University of Brno, but took part in the meetings and other activities of the Prague Linguistic Circle.

In the third term of his university studies (began in 1927) Vachek became Professor Mathesius's amanuensis, filling a post held before him by Professor Trnka and other Czech Anglicists. His duties consisted chiefly in reading books and articles to Professor Mathesius, whose eyesight was failing, and in writing Professor Mathesius's lectures and papers from dictation. In the fifth term of his university studies, Vachek became secretary to the Prague Linguistic Circle, whose President Mathesius was, and shortly afterwards, in February 1931, even a virtual member of the Circle. (The main condition of membership was the delivery of a lecture at a session of the Circle.)

Having recognized his pupil's extraordinary talent for linguistic research, Mathesius soon began to encourage Vachek to begin preparing his habilitation work. But war intervened and Vachek's habilitation took place in Brno only in September 1945, five months after Professor Mathesius's death. By that time Vachek's name had already become well known even outside Czechoslovakia (both on account of his publications and on account of his papers and interventions presented at some pre-war linguistic congresses).⁴ A year later, Vachek was appointed Professor of English language in the University of Brno.

In the years after his graduation and before his call to Brno, Vachek was on the staff of the Československá obchodní akademie, a Prague commercial college of outstanding reputation, where at one time the well-known Czech poet and translator of Shakespeare J. V. Sládek and Dr E. Beneš, subsequently President of the Czechoslovak Republic, used to teach. From 1932—5, though remaining a member of the staff of the College, Vachek taught Czech at the Prague English Grammar School (anglické gymnásium, an English grammar school for Czech boys and girls). A year before the end of the war he was involuntarily drafted to manual work during the total mobilization of labour ('totaleinsatz') ordered by the Nazis.

After 17 years of directorship of linguistic studies in the Brno Department of English, Vachek followed Academician B. Havránek's call to join the Institute of Czech Language of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences in Prague, and has ever since been one of the most prominent representatives of the Institute, one of the leading centres of linguistic research in Czechoslovakia. Needless to say, Vachek's departure from Brno to Prague means a serious loss to the Brno Department of English. Ever since the end of the war, however, Vachek has remained an external member of the teaching staff of the Department of English in the Caroline University of Prague.

III. As is well known, it was the phonological level of language that in the pre-war years mostly attracted the Prague group's attention. Even Vachek's pre-war interests were chiefly focused on phonology. A wide range of interests is revealed chiefly by his post-war work, although phonology continues to occupy a most prominent place in it. It will therefore be appropriate to concentrate first on his work in the field of phonology. It concerns general phonological theory, the phonological system of Modern English, the history of the English phonological system, the phonological system of Modern Czech as well as its history, and last but not least the linguistic characterology of the English and Czech phonological systems (cf. end of note¹). It is naturally Vachek's contribution to English phonological studies that will mainly be dealt with here, although due regard will necessarily have to be paid at least to some of his most important contributions to general phonological theory. Here belongs, for instance, his contribution to the inquiry into the concept of the phoneme, a problem that has received much attention from the members of the Prague group.⁵

Endeavouring to improve on the definition offered by the 'Projet',⁶ Vachek defines the phoneme as 'a part of the member of the complex phonological opposition, a part which may be dissociated into simultaneous, but not into successive phonological units.'⁷ It should be added that by simple phonological opposition Vachek understands a 'minimum phonic opposition capable of serving, in the given language, for the differentiation of intellectual meanings', whereas by a complex one he understands 'a nonminimum phonic opposition' of analogous capacity. A phonological unit is defined by him as 'a member of a simple phonological opposition.'⁸ Like other definitions of the phoneme offered by the members of the Prague group, Vachek's definition pays due regard to semantic criteria and to phonic facts implementing the phonemes. In consequence, he is opposed to D. Jones's intentional exclusion from the definition of the phoneme of any reference to its distinctive functioning in language.⁹ On the other hand he is equally opposed to the Bloomfieldian denial of the importance of the phonic aspects of the sounds for phonemic interpretation.¹⁰ Vachek's term 'phonological unit' (adopted from N. S. Trubetzkoy) in fact covers what is nowadays usually called 'distinctive feature'. Vachek, however, does not concur with the Harvard group in the amount of emphasis laid on the importance of distinctive features.

In his researches into the history of phonological systems (to be discussed presently), he has shown that it is often not the distinctive features, but rather the phonemes as wholes that are the bearers of systemic tensions which frequently result in important reconstructions of the phonological system.¹¹

Another important pre-war contribution of Vachek's to phonological theory is his monograph devoted to the problem of phonemic interpretation of diphthongs,¹² in which among other things he pays special attention to the ModE *i-* and *u-*diphthongs. On the phonic level, he describes them as glide vowels, accounting for their gliding character by the unstable qualities of their initial and final points. He draws the conclusion that the ModE *i-* and *u-*diphthongs cannot be phonically characterized by specific positions of their components, but by specific zonal extents of the diphthongal sounds regarded as wholes.¹³ On the phonemic level, Vachek consequently interprets the ModE *i-* and *u-*diphthongs as monophonematic. In his post-war work, he shows that this interpretation is borne out by the very history of these diphthongs, which have been developing as compact, monophonematic wholes, not as biphonematic groups. Further changes to which the diphthongs are subject in present-day Cockney only substantiate this monophonematic interpretation.¹⁴

In the late forties and the early fifties, the Prague phonologists found themselves in a defensive position. They were induced carefully to weigh the methods used and the results achieved.¹⁵ It was not, for instance, always duly appreciated that the Prague phonological theory was by no means ahistoric. The critics did not seem to realize that valuable contributions to historical phonology had been offered by B. Havránek, R. Jakobson, B. Trnka and also J. Vachek,¹⁶ though Vachek's main contribution to historical phonology was still to come. It was his monograph *On Peripheral Phonemes of Modern English*,¹⁷ an outcome of work extending for over ten years and based on a number of papers published in various periodicals.

In the mentioned monograph, Vachek concentrates his attention on phonemes that are either not 'fully integrated'¹⁸ in the phonemic pattern or exhibit a very low functional load. He rightly finds that the existence of such phonemes bears out the fact that language is not a closed, fully balanced system, and concurs with C. F. Hockett in regarding this lack of 'systemic balance' as a language universal. He even goes further than Hockett in that he sets out to inquire into the causes of this lack of balance and into the problem of how this lack can be reconciled with the systemic character of language. In doing so, he further develops some of the earlier findings of the Prague group and vindicates the claim that the problems of the periphery of language have been given more profound consideration by this group than by any other centre of linguistic thought.¹⁹ His detailed analysis of peripheral phonemes throws new light on a number of vexed problems of the historical development of English.

The monograph inquires into the history and the phonematic status of the ModE [h], *wh*, [ŋ], [r], [i], [j], [ə], [oi] sounds. Perhaps one of the most remarkable achievements of the research presented by the monograph is the new light thrown on the development of ME *schē* from EME *zhō*, *zhē* [ço:, çe:] < OE *hēō*. The development is explained as the result of an interplay of all language levels, especially the phonic and the grammatical. The share of the former consisted in the voicing of slightly burdened voiceless sonant phonemes, that of the latter in the disintegration of the OE series of personal pronouns of the third person with an identical phonetic beginning —*hē*, *hēō*, *hit*, *hīē*/*hī*—by *it* and *pei* and the loss of the demonstrative pronouns *sē*, *sēō*.²⁰

Vachek's contributions to the study of the present-day Czech phonological system and its historical background lie outside the scope of the present paper. Two things, however, cannot be left unmentioned here.

First, when examining the English phonological system—both from the diachronic and the synchronic point of view—, Vachek frequently compares it with that of Czech. Such comparisons are to be regarded as contributions towards the linguistic characterologies of the two systems. Vachek's most important observations are the following: while Mod. Czech diphthongs are only biphonematic, in Mod. English there is also an important group of monophonematic diphthongs; while the Czech vowels are characterized by a correlation of quantity, a characteristic of the English vowels is a correlation of close *vs* open contact; as to the hierarchy of correlation within the consonantal sphere, the correlation of voice in Czech equals in importance that of tense or lax in English. (For more comment on Vachek's inquiries into the mentioned correlations, see also p. 14).

Second, let us at least mention that a culmination of Vachek's work so far published in the field of Czech phonology is his phonological description of present-day Standard Czech, *Dynamika fonologického systému současné spisovné češtiny* (Prague, 1968), published on the occasion of the Sixth International Congress of Slavists in Prague 1968.

In the course of the present discussion, there will still be opportunity to come back to Vachek's phonological studies, which of course would deserve more attention than they can possibly be given here.^{20a} It has, however, to be borne in mind that Vachek's interests have not been confined to phonology. Let us therefore turn our attention to his work outside the phonological sphere.

IV. After the war, phonological research in fact no longer stood in the centre of interest of Czech and Slovak linguists.²¹ Especially syntactic problems came to have more attraction for the younger generation. Vachek found this a natural and desirable development. As has already been pointed out, like other members of the Prague group, he has never confined his functionalist and structuralist conception of language to the phonic level alone.²² This is borne out by his habilitation work *Obecný zápor v angličtině a v češtině* [General Negation in English and Czech].²³ In this monograph he shows, among other things, that in regard to positiveness or negativeness the English verb is neutral, becoming positive or negative only after its incorporation in a context. This dependence on the sentence context of the meaning and the grammatical function of the English verb made it possible for the rationalistic tendencies in the seventeenth century to bring about the discarding of double negation in English.²⁴

Other problems of grammatical structure are taken up in some of the chapters of *Some Less Familiar Aspects of the Analytical Trend of English*,²⁵ a monograph throwing fresh light on a number of problems connected with the analytical character of English. Thus, for instance, one chapter of this monograph deals with the so-called complex condensation phenomena in English, which are an outcome of the well-known English tendency to use nominal elements, especially participles, gerunds and infinitives, in the place of subordinate clauses. Comparing English sentences with their Czech counterparts, Vachek finds that the former tend to be more condensed, and in regard to the relations between at least some of their members, more complex, than the latter. These differences are in close connection with the greatly reduced dynamism of the English finite verb forms on the one hand, and the comparatively high amount of dynamism present in the Czech finite verb forms

on the other. Ultimately, all the mentioned differences are to be traced to the analytic and the synthetic character of English and Czech respectively.

In another chapter of the same monograph, Vachek shows that what is usually called the 'possessive case' is to be regarded as a form that has considerably loosened the ties originally linking it up with the substantival paradigm and is gradually acquiring an adjectival character.²⁶ An opposite tendency is displayed by the Czech dialectal absolute possessive ending in *-ovo/-ino* (*tatínkovo* [Father's], *mamiňčino* [Mother's]), which though originally an adjectival form, has come to function almost as a variant of the genitive singular within the nominal paradigm. The comparison reveals that whereas English, an analytical language, weakens the position of the nominal paradigm within the system, Czech, a synthetic language, strengthens it.

One of the most important contributions of *Some Less Familiar Aspects of the Analytical Trend of English* is the emphasis on 'the necessity of regarding the analytical trend of English not as a merely 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 on the phonic plane' (62). The validity of this observation is borne out by some of the important phonological changes that took place in the history of English and which, to a considerable extent, were prompted by the changing situation on the morphological level of English, i.e. by the process restructuring the prevalently synthetic grammatical pattern into one prevalently analytical. Thus the revaluation of the vocalic correlation of quantity into that of contact seems to have been due to the necessity of a phonetic underlining of grammatical limits separating the stem from the suffixes or endings (e.g., *drink-est*, *drink-əp/-əs*, *giv-ing*, *giv-en*).²⁷ The revaluation of the consonantal correlation of voice into that of tension has prevented the neutralization of consonantal opposition at word ends and in consequence an increase of homonyms. In treating of the mentioned revaluations and other problems, Vachek convincingly presents language as a complex system comprising a number of sub-systems or levels, each of which has its own particular structure and consequently its own specific structural problems.²⁸ It often happens that a change effected in one sub-system has repercussions in the other sub-systems. In this way Vachek avoids a separation (compartmentalization) of the sub-systems (levels) without mixing them.

The methodological approach of *Some Less Familiar Aspects of the Analytical Trend of English* is also adopted in Vachek's paper 'Notes on Gender in Modern English'.²⁹ The paper answers in the affirmative the question whether there is a category of gender in ModE. A proof of the existence of this category is the very contrastive use in which gender differences are being utilized for signalling emotional approach.

A good deal of Vachek's attention has been devoted to problems of written language. In his view, the functionalist and structuralist approach of the Prague School can throw new valuable light even on such problems. His own investigations corroborate the legitimacy of this view.

Vachek's interest in the problems of written language dates back to the pre-war years. (Cf. his paper 'Zum Problem der geschriebenen Sprache').³⁰ The main conclusion he has so far arrived at have been summarized in 'Two Chapters on Written English'.³¹

The functional justification of a spoken and a written norm of language follows from the following two definitions. The function of the spoken norm of language is, in principle, to react to a given stimulus (which, as a rule, is an urgent one) in a dynamic way, i.e., in a ready and immediate manner expressing not only the purely

communicative but also the emotional aspect of the approach of the reacting language user'. On the other hand, the function of the written norm is 'to react to a given stimulus (which, as a rule, is not an urgent one) in a static way, i.e. in a preservable and easily surveyable manner, concentrating particularly on the purely communicative aspect of the approach of the reacting language user'.³²

The written norm certainly constitutes a system derived from that of the spoken norm, but both functionally and structurally the former is by no means inferior or subordinated to the latter. In a remarkable way, the two norms are mutually complementary, which implies the requirement of a certain amount of correspondence between the two. The written norms of English, Czech and Russian are all based on correspondences between spoken and written language implemented on the lowest, i.e. phoneme-grapheme, level. In all the three norms, however, these correspondences are interfered with by correspondences implemented on higher levels (i.e. on the morphemic and the word level). In the course of historical development, the extent of these interferences may vary. While Czech has been displaying an ever-growing tendency to strengthen the correspondences on the lowest level, English has reached a stage at which comparatively extensive room is given to correspondences on the morphemic, and, particularly, on the word level (cf. *walked—begged—ended, write—wright—right—rite*).

Vachek has also shown keen interest in problems of the standard language and linguistic culture, a field worked in by Czechoslovak linguists since the pre-war years.³³ It is therefore understandable why particular attention has been paid by him to A. C. Ross's article 'Linguistic Class-Indicators in Present-Day English'.³⁴ Vachek's interpretation of the phenomena discussed by Ross have been put forth in the article 'On Social Differences of English Speech Habits'³⁵ and can be briefly summed up in Vachek's own words as follows: '... the differences in language referred to as class-indicators, though certainly of social provenience, are not always entirely social in character. At least some of the class-indicators, that is to say, are being reevaluated into indicators of style: what is referred to as "U-features" proves to be, at least, in many instances, well fitted to signalize the higher style, used in top-level intercourse, while the so-called "non-U-features"³⁶ are able to function as signalizers of lower stylistic levels, characteristic of everyday conversation, informal and familiar talk, etc.'

It is hoped that the preceding discussion has sufficiently illustrated Vachek's insistence on not examining linguistic levels in isolation. In fact he maintains that the entire language system should not be examined in isolation from the extralinguistic reality. He is against 'a self-contained immanentist conception', unjustifiably ignoring the fact of the social functioning of language.³⁷ In his investigations into the internal and external factors in the development of language, he comes to the conclusion (anticipated by B. Havránek) that the system of language may succumb to foreign influence provided the latter is not incompatible with the requirements of the former.

V. At this point it seems appropriate to insert a note on Vachek's attitude to recent developments in linguistics. Though or rather just because an adherent of the Prague School, he wholeheartedly subscribes to V. Mathesius's dictum that language is a fortress that can and must be assailed from different sides. It is in this spirit that Vachek presents his recent evaluation³⁸ of N. Chomsky's approach to language, naturally concentrating chiefly on phonological problems. As in other places, even in the mentioned evaluation Vachek takes great pains in weighing the

pros and cons before drawing his conclusions. Endeavouring to appreciate even diametrically opposed views, he masters the art of disagreeing with a scholar without belittling his achievements.

Vachek shows in which respect he cannot agree with Chomsky, as well as in what he finds Chomsky's main contribution to the development of modern linguistics. He protests against Chomsky's view that the Prague approach is to be described as taxonomic in the sense that the facts of the phonic level are only enumerated and classified, no notice being taken of the relations existing between them and other linguistic facts. Vachek's view of language as a system certainly entitles him to raise this protest. He further shows that Chomsky is not right in blaming the members of the Prague group for subscribing to such inconsistent principles as those of linearity, invariance, biuniqueness, and complementary distribution.

The exceptional cases to which the mentioned principles cannot be applied are not a proof of the inadequacy of the principles, but are due to the fact that language does not constitute a perfectly balanced, fully closed, self-contained, static system. The special circumstances in which the principles do not apply indicate places in the system of language which are to be regarded as fuzzy points, 'indicators of the fact that, at the given time, the system has some structural problems to solve, in other words, that far from being a static structure, it is a structure in motion' (419).

In illustration, let us summarize quite briefly Vachek's argument concerning a fuzzy point revealed by the phonological structures of most types of American English.

It is well known that one and the same vocalic element (a single vowel or diphthong) is markedly longer before a voiced consonant than before its voiceless counterpart (cf. *ride* and *write*). As Vachek points out, 'Chomsky's new contribution is that this quantitative differentiation of the vowel can be observed even in those instances in which, to all appearances, the opposition of voice in the following consonant has become neutralized by merging the original [t] and [d] into [D]' (420). This would apply to the word-pair *rider* — *writer* as it is pronounced in most types of American English. In Chomsky's conception, 'the phonological structures of the two words continue to be (rayt#r) — (rayd#r) but . . . the opposition of the phonemes [t] and [d] is implemented not by the opposition of the consonant sounds but by that of the diphthongal articulations preceding these consonants, i.e. [ay]: [a:y] (420). According to Chomsky, this discloses a gross violation of the linearity principle, i.e. 'the principle that a sequence of the phonemes A and B is phonetically implemented by the corresponding sequence of phones [a] and [b]' (416).

Vachek draws attention to the highly exceptional character of the case. The neutralization is limited to one single phonological situation (before [D]), while in all others the quantitative difference of [ay] and [a:y] is functionally irrelevant. It appears clear that the case under discussion is a manifestation of the beginning of a phonological change the development of which has been halted by the impact of the morphological system (424). In preserving the difference in quantity, the word-bases of *writer* and *rider* (or of *writing* and *riding*, for that matter) keep on indicating, in the phonic sphere, their close semantic and grammatical relationship with the forms *write* and *ride*.

Together with other members of the Prague group, e.g., R. Jakobson and B. Trnka, J. Vachek has shown that the regularities of language differ in character from those examined by natural sciences. He concludes therefore that the methods of mathematical modelling are not applicable to the two types of regularities to the same extent.

This is not taken into account by Chomsky, who does not conceive of language as a system whose very essence is dynamic, non-static, and whose continuous motion is always reflected in some structural irregularities ('fuzzy points').³⁹

Nevertheless, like other members of the Prague group, J. Vachek is not opposed to the methods of algebraic linguistics and mathematical models. He even points out the possibility and usefulness of an attempt at a synthesis of Chomsky's conception and that of the Prague group. He finds that the possibility of such a synthesis is afforded by the fact that the two conceptions approach the problem of language from complementary angles.

He feels inclined to believe that Chomsky's generativist and transformationalist conception is in fact an ingenuous attempt at a theory of what Saussure has denoted as 'parole'. The functionalist and structuralist approach of the Prague School, on the other hand, is found by Vachek to be in essence a theory of *langue*, *langue* being naturally conceived of as a dynamic, not as a static phenomenon. Chomsky's conception of 'grammar' is that of a number of selective processes by which the means placed at the disposal of the speaker are selected and mobilized for communicative purposes. His approach may consequently be characterized as processual. In Vachek's view the Prague approach, on the other hand, concentrates on the system of means, *langue*, from which the selection is made, i.e., in other words, on a system of entities with and upon which the processes operate. It follows that is it the entitative aspect that the Prague approach is chiefly concerned with. Vachek believes that this evaluation indicates the possibility of a synthesis of the approaches.

VI. Before closing the survey of Vachek's work in the field of English studies, we cannot fail to mention (i) the service he has rendered Anglicists through editorial work, and (ii) his awareness of the necessity of turning the results of linguistic research to practical purposes. He has prepared, for instance, a posthumous edition of V. Mathesius's university lectures on a functional analysis of present-day English and provided it with extensive editorial comment.⁴⁰ Well-known is his comprehensive textbook of English *Anglický svěže a spolehlivě* [A Bright and Safe Road to English],⁴¹ one of the most popular textbooks of English ever published in Czechoslovakia. In addition to this, he is co-author of textbooks of English for Czech and Slovak grammar schools, and has taken interest in questions of practical language teaching. All this is quite in keeping with the efforts of the members of the Prague group, who in their overwhelming majority have been far from pursuing linguistics for linguistics' sake.

By way of closing our survey, the following should perhaps still be added. Since his student days, Vachek has remained a devoted pupil of Mathesius, but carried on the work of his teacher in an original, non-epigonic way. There are not too many masters who can claim such a pupil—one who, keeping abreast of the times, continues and develops the work in a manner truly worthy of and equalling his great master's achievements. Vachek further develops the progressive ideas of the pre-war Prague Linguistic Circle without indiscriminately subscribing to all theses held by the Circle in the pre-war years and without having his eyes closed to the exploits of other groups. In the post-war years he became one of the leading figures of the Prague School, the teaching of which he has recently made accessible to a wide scholarly public in a triad of books (*Dictionnaire de linguistique de l'École de Prague*,⁴² *A Prague School Reader in Linguistics*,⁴³ *The Linguistic School of Prague*.⁴⁴) These and others of his works in the field of general linguistics provide a welcome frame for his English and Czech studies. Let us add that from the very outset all his work has been permeat-

ed by a keen sense of the hierarchy of linguistic values. But it is by placing the ethical values above all others in the general structure of life⁴⁵ that he has come to be respected by his pupils, colleagues and friends not only as an eminent teacher and scholar of world-wide reputation, but as a man of character and heart.

NOTES

1. *Zvukový rozbor současné angličtiny*³ [An Analysis of the Phonic Structure of Contemporary English] (Prague, 1959); *Historický vývoj angličtiny*⁵ [The Historical Development of English] (Prague, 1966); *Historický pohled na dnešní angličtinu* [Modern English Viewed in the Light of Historical Development] (Prague, 1962); *Lingvistická charakteristika současné angličtiny*² [A Linguistic Characterology of Contemporary English] (Prague, 1962); *Some Geographical Varieties of Present-Day English* (Prague, 1961). — As to the concept of 'linguistic characterology', it may be explained in J. Vachek's words as follows: 'By comparing the means with which different languages satisfy essentially the same kinds of communicative needs and wants, the analyst can arrive at what is typical of this or that language. The sum of such typical features, duly arranged in their hierarchy is dealt with by the descriptive approach called by Mathesius the linguistic characterology'. J. Vachek, *The Linguistic School of Prague* 6 (Bloomington — London, 1966).
2. Professor Gustav Kirchner died in Jena on December 6th, 1966. (See *Zeitschrift für Anglistik und Amerikanistik* 15. 181—2 [Berlin, 1968]). Dr. Svatopluk Stech died in Göteborg on January 7th, 1968. (See *Universitas* 68. 75—76 [Brno, 1968].)
3. Mrs A. Vachek, Professor Vachek's mother, aged over eighty, lives in Prague. It would be an act of ingratitude not to mention her in an evaluation of Professor Vachek's work.
4. For Vachek's contributions and interventions presented at linguistic congresses, see J. Hladký's 'Bibliography of Professor Josef Vachek's' works at the end of the present volume (205—15).
5. Cf. the entries concerning the phoneme in J. Vachek's *Dictionnaire de linguistique de l'École de Prague* 59—61 (Utrecht — Anvers, 1960).
6. 'Projet de terminologie phonologique standardisée', *Travaux du Cercle linguistique de Prague* 4.311 (Prague, 1931).
7. See J. Vachek, 'Phonemes and Phonological Units', *Travaux du Cercle linguistique de Prague* 6.239 (Prague, 1936). Reprinted in *Prague School Reader in Linguistics* (ed. by J. Vachek) 143—149 (Bloomington, 1964).
8. See the paper quoted in note⁷. See also J. Vachek, *The Linguistic School of Prague* 45 (Bloomington—London, 1966).
9. J. Vachek, 'Professor Daniel Jones and the Phoneme', *Charisteria Guilelmo Mathesio ...* 25—33 (Prague, 1932).
10. Cf. J. Vachek, 'Yaleská škola a strukturalistická fonologie' [The Yale School and Structuralist Phonology], *Slovo a slovesnost* 11.36—44 (Prague, 1949). See, e.g., also J. Vachek, 'The English Great Vowel Shift Again', *Prague Studies in English* 11.5 (Prague, 1965).
11. Cf. J. Vachek, *The Linguistic School of Prague* 59.
12. J. Vachek, 'Über die phonologische Interpretation der Diphtonge mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Englischen', *Prague Studies in English* 4.87—170 (Prague, 1933).
13. See J. Vachek, 'Some Thoughts on the Phonology of Cockney English', *Philologica Pragensia* 5.164 (Prague, 1962). Cf. also J. Vachek, 'The Phonematic Status of Modern English Long Vowels and Diphtongs', *Philologica Pragensia* 6. 59—71 (Prague, 1963).
14. Cf. J. Vachek, 'Some Thoughts...' 164.
15. Cf. J. Vachek, 'Prague Phonological Studies Today', *Travaux linguistiques de Prague* 1.08 (Prague, 1964).
16. E.g., B. Havránek, 'Ein phonologischer Beitrag zur Entwicklung der slavischen Palatalreihen', *Travaux du Cercle linguistique de Prague* 8.327—34 (Prague, 1939); R. Jakobson, 'Prinzipien der historischen Phonologie', *Travaux du Cercle linguistique de Prague* 4.247—67 (Prague, 1931), reprinted in *Selected Writings* 1.202—20 (The Hague, 1962); B. Trnka, 'The Phonemic Development of Spirants in English', *English Studies* 19.26—31 (Amsterdam, 1937); J. Vachek, 'Professor Karl Luick and Problems of Historical Phonology', *Časopis pro moderní filologii* 19.273—92 (Prague, 1933).

17. *Brno Studies in English* 4.7—109 (Prague, 1964).
18. A term adopted by J. Vachek from A. Martinet.
19. Cf. J. Vachek, 'On the Integration of the Peripheral Elements into the System of Language', *Travaux linguistiques de Prague* 3.22 (Prague, 1966). It is interesting to note that the entire volume of TLP just referred to is devoted to the problems of the centre and the periphery of the system of language. It has been edited by J. Vachek and subtitled 'Les problèmes du centre et de la périphérie du système de la langue.'
20. Cf. J. Šimko's account in G. Scheurweghs's *Analytical Bibliography of Writings on Modern English Morphology and Syntax 1877—1960* 2.209 (Louvain, 1965).
- 20a. In connection with Vachek's work in English phonology, it should be added that during his years in Brno, a group of students under his supervision analyzed a corpus of contexts of Present-Day Standard English amounting to 400 000 phonemes. The results of this analysis, however, have not been published.
21. Cf. J. Vachek, 'Prague Phonological Studies Today', *Travaux linguistiques de Prague* 1.7 (Prague, 1934).
22. Op. cit. 21.
23. *Prague Studies in English* 6.7—64 (Prague, 1947).
24. Cf. J. Šimko's account in op. cit. 207—8.
25. *Brno Studies in English* 3.9—78 (Prague, 1961).
26. Cf. J. Šimko's account in op. cit. 199.
27. See J. Vachek, op. cit. 53.
28. Cf. J. Vachek, 'Some Notes on the Development of Language Seen as a System of Systems', *Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Linguists, Oslo 1958* 418—9 (Oslo, 1958). See also 'Notes on the Development of Language Seen as a System of Systems (A Contribution to Comparative Phonematic Studies of English and Some Slavonic Languages)', *Sborník prací filosofické fakulty brněnské university* A6.94—106 (Brno, 1958).
29. *Sborník prací filosofické fakulty brněnské university* A 12.189—94 (Brno, 1964).
30. *Travaux du Cercle linguistique de Prague* 8.94—104.
31. *Brno Studies in English* 1.7—38 (Prague, 1959).
32. See J. Vachek, *The Linguistic School of Prague* 110. Cf. also his 'Two Chapters on Written English' 12.
33. Cf., e.g., *Spisovná čeština a jazyková kultura* [Standard Czech and Linguistic Culture] (Prague, 1932), a collection of papers by V. Mathesius, B. Havránek, R. Jakobson, J. Mukařovský, M. Weingart. Of these papers let us mention here at least B. Havránek's contribution, entitled 'Úkoly spisovného jazyka a jeho kultura' [The Tasks and Cultivation of the Standard Language] (in part translated by P. L. Garvin under the title 'The Functional Differentiation of the Standard Language' and published in his *Prague School Reader in Esthetics, Literary Structure, and Style* [Washington, D. C., 1964]).
34. *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 55. 20—56 (Helsinki, 1954). Reprinted in (Ed.) Nancy Mitford, *Noblesse Oblige, An Inquiry into the Identifiable Characteristics of the English Aristocracy* (London, 1956).
35. *Philologica Pragensia* 3.222—7 (Prague, 1960).
36. 'U-usage' stands for 'upper-class usage'. 'Non-U' in A. C. Ross's terminology stands for 'non-upper class'.
37. See his 'Prague Phonological Studies Today' 13. Cf. further his paper 'On the Interplay of External and Internal Factors in the Development of Language', *Lingua* 11.433—48 (Amsterdam, 1962).
38. J. Vachek, 'On Some Basic Principles of "Classical" Phonology', *Zeitschrift für Phonetik, Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung* 17.409—31 (Berlin, 1964).
39. Cf. also J. Vachek, 'The Non-Static Aspect of the Synchronically Studied Phonological System', *Phonologie der Gegenwart, Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch, Ergänzungsband VI* 79—85 (Vienna, 1967). Vachek's interpretation of peripheral phenomena has been subscribed to, e.g., by W. Haas (op. cit. 85).
40. V. Mathesius, *Obsahový rozbor současné angličtiny na základě obecně lingvistickém* (Prague, 1961). Mention should be made also of Vachek's editorship of volumes 1, 3 and 4 of *Brno Studies in English*. Outside the field of English studies, let us recall at least his editorship of volumes 1 and 2 of *Travaux linguistiques de Prague*. It is fair to say that it is chiefly thanks to Vachek that the tradition of the Prague *Travaux* has been revived.
41. (Prague, 1946).
42. In collaboration with J. Dubský; compiled at the request of the Terminological Committee of the International Permanent Committee of Linguists (Utrecht — Anvers, 1960).

43. (Bloomington, 1964).
44. Subtitled *An Introduction to its Theory and Practice* (Bloomington—London, 1966). The book is based on a series of lectures given at the 1964 Linguistic Institute, held at Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana, U.S.A.
45. An attitude, faithfully shared by his wife, Mrs Pavla Vachek, a pupil of A. Beer, B. Havránek and R. Jakobson, and member of the teaching staff of the German Department of the Prague School of Economics.