Firbas, Jan

A study on the functional perspective of the English and the Slavonic interrogative sentence

Brno studies in English. 1976, vol. 12, iss. 1, pp. 9-56

A STUDY IN THE FUNCTIONAL PERSPECTIVE OF THE ENGLISH AND THE SLAVONIC INTERROGATIVE SENTENCE

Jan Firbas

The present study takes up the problem of the interrogative sentence. It does so from the point of view of functional sentence perspective (= FSP). It also intends to be a modest contribution to contrastive linguistics, for it compares the English interrogative sentence with its counterparts in Czech and other Slavonic languages, and occasionally even in German. In this way it offers a contribution to the linguistic characterologies of the English and the Slavonic questions.

The study consists of two chapters. Chapter One chiefly concerns the English and the Czech interrogative sentence. It was written in 1970.[1] Chapter Two has been occasioned by H. Křížková's important study in the functional sentence perspective of the Slavonic interrogative sentence, entitled Kontextové členění a typy tázacích vět v současných slovanských jazycích (Contextual Organization [Functional Sentence Perspective] and Types of Interrogative Sentence in Contemporary Slavonic Languages) and published in Slavia (vol. 41, 1972, pp. 241—262). As it deals with the problem of the interrogative sentence from the point of view of FSP and arrives at conclusions that to a certain extent seem to be at variance with my interpretation offered

[1] It was prepared for the Seminar on the Construction of Complex Grammars, held by the Thomas J. Watson Research Center, Yorktown Heights, New York 10598, at Cambridge, Mass., 1—5 June 1970. Under the title On the Function of the Question in the Act of Communication, it was mimeographed by the Center and distributed among the participants. A highly abridged version, but containing an amplification concerning the Czech interrogative sentence, was presented as a brief report, entitled A note on the Intonation of Questions from the Point of View of the Theory of Functional Sentence Perspective, at the Intonological Symposium held in Prague, 6—8 October 1970. (The report was published in *Acta Universitatis Carolinae* 1972, *Philologica* 1, *Phonetica Pragensia* III. 91—4). A Russian version of the original paper appeared under the title Funkciji voprosa v processe kommunikaciji in *Voprosy jazykoznanija* (1972 : 2, 55—65), and a German version under the title Die Funktion der Frage im Kommunikationsprozeß in *Postilla Bohemica* 1 : 2. 45—58, Bremen 1972. The original English version appears here in print for the first time. Except the corrections of a few references and the above mentioned amplification, the printed version does not differ from the mimeographed one. Together with a section on the Slavonic interrogative sentence, it forms the present study. This new section was written during my resident

in Chapter One, I have attempted to offer an evaluation of Křížková's approach. Her copious material, assembled from all Slavonic languages, has made it possible to examine the problem in a wider setting. I have arrived at the conclusion that the situation in Slavonic languages only corroborates the interpretation offered in Chapter One. It is the same interplay of means of FSP that is at work in all the examined languages.

With two exceptions (cf. here note[1]), I have intentionally left the 1970 wording of Chapter One unchanged. Further research, reported on in Chapter Two has naturally elaborated some of the points raised in Chapter One. Attention is directed to these elaborations by references added to the 1970 wording in square brackets.

CHAPTER ONE

In the present paper I propose to offer some notes on the problem of the interrogative sentence. I will present them from the point of view of the theory of functional sentence perspective (= FSP).

In the light of the theory of FSP, the suggested problem has been dealt with by a number of Czechoslovak scholars (first by V. Mathesius [1941.173; 1942.302; 1947.336—7], then by F. Daneš [1949; 1957.80—1], later by other scholars including myself [Firbas 1957.90—2; Grepl 1965; 1967.41; Mistrík 1966.97—8], and fairly recently by H. Křížková [1968]; mention must be made also of F. Trávníček [1951: Vol. 2]). From a very similar—one can say functionalist and structuralist—angle, the problem has been dealt with also by M. A. K. Halliday (1967: Part 5). I will first deal with the Czechoslovak scholars' views and then pass on to Halliday's approach. In doing so I will of course also endeavour to offer my own modest contribution towards the solution of the examined problem. For purposes of presentation I will somewhat simplify matters at first. I hope to be able to make amends for it later on.

Before proceeding further, I feel I have to explain what I mean by FSP. Let me give at least the following very brief explanation. Following F. Daneš (1964), I distinguish between semantic sentence structure and grammatical

---

fellowship at N.I.A.S. (Netherlands Institute for Advanced Studies) at Wassenaar, taken up with the consent of the Ministry of Education of the Czech Socialist Republic in 1973—4. My grateful thanks are due to both institutions. — In January 1974, through the good offices of N.I.A.S., the present study appeared in a pre-print form, entitled Two chapters on the function of the question in the act of communication (A comparative study in the English and Slavonic questions). It was received for publication in BSE in February 1974. This explains why it makes no mention of such relevant studies as E. Hajičová's Struktura doplňovací otázky a odpovědi z hlediska aktuálního členění [Wh-questions and answers with regard to topic and focus], *Slovo a slovesnost* 36. 300—7 (Prague 1976), M. Rankova's Върху словореда на въпросителното изречение в английски и български език, [On word-order in interrogative sentences in English and Bulgarian], *Annuaire de l'Université de Sofia* 69: 1. 101—36 (Sofia 1976), V. E. Ševjakova, Актуальное членение вопросительного предложения [Functional perspective of the interrogative sentence], *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 1974: 5. 107—16, (Moscow 1974), K. Wikberg's *Yes-no questions and answers in Shakespeare's* plays (Abo 1975).

sentence structure. For simplicity, however, let me, for a moment, speak of a semantic-grammatical sentence structure. This structure may appear (may function) in different kinds of context. Different kinds of context make it function in different kinds of perspective; they make it serve different communicative purposes. This is most evidently borne out by the fact that the intonation centre, i.e. the functionally most important prosodic feature within the sentence,[2] can accordingly be assigned to different sentence elements, e.g., *The* ˈ*girl* ˈ*came into the* ˈ*room*, *The* ˈ*girl* ˌ*came into the* ˌ*room*, or with heavy contrastive stress *The* ˝*girl came into the room*, *The girl came* ˝*into the room*, etc. The theory of FSP sets out to establish the laws determining the functioning of different semantic-grammatical structures in different contexts.

Apart from the term FSP, there are two other terms that must be explained: theme and rheme. Again, for the time being, very roughly and very briefly, in Mathesius' conception, the theme of a sentence is constituted by elements that express something known, given or something that can be gathered from the previous context; the rheme, on the other hand, is constituted by elements that express something new, something unknown from the preceding context. (Mathesius defines the theme as 'that which is known or at least obvious in the given situation, and from which the speaker proceeds' in his discourse [Mathesius 1939.171; cf. Firbas 1964.268]. The rheme of utterance "jádro výpovědi" is defined by Mathesius as 'that which the speaker states about, or in regard to, the theme of utterance' [Mathesius 1939.171; cf. Firbas 1964. 268].) Thus, if the sentence structure *The girl came into the room* is to present the girl as the newcomer, as newly appearing on the scene, the element *the girl* will be rhematic, the rest of the sentence thematic. If, on the other hand, it is the scene of appearance that is presented as new, the girl will be thematic, and the rest of the sentence rhematic. As will be seen later, an analysis of the functional perspective of a sentence can be carried out with greater accuracy, with greater delicacy, to use a term, introduced by M. A. K. Halliday.

I have now proceeded far enough to be able to start discussing the problem of how to interpret the functional perspective of interrogative sentences. As is well known, there are, basically, two types of interrogative sentence: the so-called yes/no (or verbal) question, designated by Halliday (1967) as the polar interrogative, and the so-called special (or pronominal) question, designated by Halliday as the non-polar (WH-) interrogative. *Are you reading this book?* would be an instance of the former, *What are you reading at the moment?* an instance of the latter.

In two Czech papers on word order (1941, 1942), Mathesius expressed the following view. The rheme of a pronominal question (a non-polar interrogative) is its initial interrogative word, i.e. in English the WH-element (*What are you reading at the moment?*). This is so because the interrogative word stands for the unknown element, which is going to be disclosed as the rheme of the reply. As for the element placed after the interrogative word, they constitute the theme of the question.

As to the yes/no questions (the polar interrogatives), Mathesius proceeds in a similar way. He finds that the most frequent Czech type opens with the finite verb, which bears the main stress and is rhematic. It expresses the rheme,

[2] A term introduced by F. Daneš (1957.27, 153) and used by H. Křížková.

because it points towards the unknown element to be disclosed in the reply—a *yes* or a *no* (*Pojedeš dnes večer s Petrem do Prahy? Fährst du heute abend mit Peter nach Prag?*). The rest of the question is interpreted as containing notions known to the enquirer and consequently interpreted as thematic. Mathesius points out, however, that the main stress may not occur on the verb, but on some other element. This element would not appear in front, but in end position.

In a Czech paper on the intonation of the question in Czech (1949), Daneš disagrees with Mathesius. He maintains that in a pronominal (non-polar) question the interrogative word is not always necessarily rhematic. The rheme may be carried by another element than the interrogative word. The following two sets of sentences, each set consisting of a question and a reply, will illustrate. I have slightly adapted Daneš's examples and translated them into English.

A: Chceme jet do Prahy.
[*We-want to-go to Prague.]
A: Zítra jedeme do Prahy.
[*Tomorrow we-are-going to Prague.]

B: Kdy tam pojedete?
[*When there are-you-going?]
B: Kdy pojedete do Brna?
[*When are-you-going to Brno?]

According to Daneš, in the first set *kdy* (when) actually does function as rheme, all the other elements conveying known information. In the second set, however, *kdy* (when) is overshadowed by *do Brna* (to Brno), which is contrasted with *do Prahy* (to Prague).

It may equally be gathered from Daneš's observations that the verb of the yes/no questions can by no means be regarded as a consistent bearer of the rheme. Different intonations indicate different shades of the enquirer's interest. (*ˈHave you ˈseen my 'hat? ˈHave you 'seen my hat? ˈHave 'you seen my ·hat? 'Have you ·seen my ·hat?*) The verb expresses the rheme only when functioning as bearer of the intonation centre.

In an earlier paper of mine (Firbas 1957.90—2), I came to the conclusion that to some extent Mathesius's and Daneš's views could be reconciled. My argument, slightly modified and improved upon, may be summed up as follows. It is important to realize that a question reflects quite a different relation between speaker and listener than a declarative sentence does. In the case of the declarative sentence the speaker is in possession of some knowledge and is imparting it to the listener. In the case of an interrogative sentence, the speaker's primary concern is to obtain some knowledge from the listener; he appeals to him to take over the role of the speaker, to become speaker himself and to reveal the knowledge. The very means employed in this effort is, of course, the question.

In a pronominal (non-polar) question, the function of indicating the desire for knowledge on the part of the speaker is first and foremost performed by the interrogative word (the WH-element); in a verbal (polar) question, this function is first and foremost performed by the finite verb. The other elements convey notions well known to the speaker (enquirer). When asking, for instance, *ˈWhat did you dis‚cuss with ‚Peter ‚yesterday?*, the speaker knows that the listener was discussing something with Peter the day before. This explains why Mathesius regards the elements occurring in the question besides the indicators of the desire for knowledge as thematic.

The mentioned notions may, and in our example certainly are, also known to the listener. (He certainly knows of the discussion he had with Peter.)

The mentioned notions may, and in our example certainly are, parts of common knowledge shared by him and the speaker. Nevertheless, it must be borne in mind that usually not all these notions are of equal importance to the speaker, and that he must make this clear to the listener. He must make it clear to him from which particular angle he desires him to approach the question. This angle is new to the listener and must be communicated to him as such. An important means of indicating the angle of approach, the perspective in which the question is to function, is of course intonation: *|What did you dis\cuss with |Peter |yesterday?*, *|What did you dis|cuss with \Peter |yesterday?*, *|What did you dis|cuss with |Peter \yesterday?... 'What did you dis·cuss with ·Peter ·yesterday?*

The matter, however, has to be viewed in yet another aspect. The speaker may share some item or items of knowledge with the listener. He must, however, inform the listener of what knowledge he is thinking of. He cannot expect the listener to be a thought-reader. Normally, the enquirer cannot ask merely *'What?* He could do this when a mere repetition of the reply was desired, a repetition of a reply that has already been offered. (In such a case he could, of course, also use the form *'What did you dis·cuss with ·Peter ·yesterday?*)

It follows that elements that may be looked upon as known in regard to the common knowledge shared by the speaker and listener cannot be equated with information regarded as known at the moment of utterance. They may not appear as known in regard to the narrow, ad hoc context as it is set at the moment of utterance, or in other words, in regard to the narrow scene created by the act of communication, or in still other words, in regard to the very communicative purpose of the question (cf. Firbas 1966.246).

As I have explained elsewhere, elements that do not appear as known in regard to the communicative purpose of the sentence are to be regarded as context independent (e.g. Firbas 1966.246). The following observation may further illustrate. In the sentence *John has gone to the window*, the 'window' may be well known from the preceding context. But if the purpose of the communication is to express the direction of the movement, a specification of the place reached or to be reached, the 'window' necessarily appears to be context independent. In Halliday's very appropriate terms, context independent elements could be described as conveying information that is not derivable, not recoverable from the preceding context (Halliday 1967: Part 4.3).

Viewed in the light of what has been said so far, the question performs two functions: (i) it indicates the desire for knowledge on the part of the enquirer and appeals to the informant to satisfy this desire; (ii) it imparts knowledge to the perspective informant in that it informs him of what the enquirer is interested in (what he is thinking of at the moment) and of the particular angle from which he wishes the intimated lack of knowledge to be satisfied.

My attempt to reconcile Mathesius's and Daneš's views may be summed up as follows. Mathesius seems to be overemphasizing the first function; it is Daneš's merit to have led towards a better understanding of the second. Nevertheless, it is certainly not possible to agree with Mathesius's interpretation of known and unknown elements within the question. It has further become evident that an interpretation of the FSP of the question in terms of two degrees of communicative importance is not fully adequate either.

It may be assumed that as in declarative sentences, even in interrogatives

the sentence elements differ in the extent to which they contribute to the further development of the communication. Referring to my previous researches into FSP, I maintain that in its most natural use, the semantic-grammatical structure *He has found a hat*—*to give a simple example*—*can be interpreted as follows.* The element *he*, the only one that can be looked upon as context dependent, i.e. as conveying known information in regard to the narrow scene, contributes least to the further development of communication. *A hat* contributes most to this development. The element *has* and *found* rank between *he* and *a hat*, *found* contributing more to the further development of communication than *has*. The elements carry different degrees of CD. The one carrying the lowest degree of CD constitutes the theme, the one carrying the highest degree of CD, the rheme of the sentence. The elements ranking between theme and rheme can be looked upon as constituting a kind of transition. Irrespective of different word order, a German version of the type under examination would display the same relations in regard to the distribution of CD: *Ich habe einen Hut gefunden.* It may certainly be assumed that even in the interrogative forms *Has he found a hat?*, *Hat er einen Hut gefunden?*, *What has he found?*, *Was hat er gefunden?* different degrees of CD could be established. In unmarked use, *he/er* could certainly be interpreted as thematic. The question I should like to discuss now is that of the status displayed in FSP by the finite verb and the WH-element. Before taking up this question, however, I will insert a note on Halliday's treatment of interrogative sentences (as presented, for instance, in 1967: Part Two).

In the first place, an important terminological observation must be made in this connection. Halliday explicitly states that the functions of 'given' and 'new' are not the same as those of 'theme' and 'rheme' (1967.205). In my approach, on the other hand, 'given' and 'new' come under the heading of 'degrees of CD'. As has just been explained, the element(s) carrying the lowest degrees within a sentence constitutes (constitute) its theme. Halliday views the function of the theme as that of clause-initial position (ibid.). Basically, the theme is what comes first in the clause (1967.212). Halliday regards the theme as the point of departure of the clause as a message (ibid.). Thematization structures the clause in two parts: the theme is assigned initial position in the clause, and all that follows is the rheme (ibid.). In my approach, thematization would mean rendering an element thematic, making it carry the lowest degree of CD, irrespective of the position within the sentence. (In unmarked use, the structure *I saw him* would have two thematic elements: *I* and *him*).

To some extent, the phenomenon designated as 'theme' by Halliday corresponds to that referred to by E. Beneš (1959) as 'basis' (in a Czech article dealing with sentence openings in German). By this term Beneš understands the phenomenon that 'as the opening element of the sentence links up the utterance with the context and the situation, selecting from several possible connections one that becomes the starting point, from which the entire further utterance unfolds and in regard to which it is orientated' (translated from E. Beneš's Czech paper dealing with the beginning of the German sentence from the point of view of FSP; cf. Beneš 1959.216). The term 'theme' would be applied by him to the phenomenon defined here as the element(s) carrying the lowest degree of CD.

A while ago, I used the somewhat cautious statement 'to some extent'.

This is because I am aware that Beneš, on the one hand, speaks of the basis as an element linking up the sentence with what precedes, whereas Halliday, on the other hand, emphasizes that thematization structures the clause in a way that is independent of what has gone before (ibid.). I believe, however, that a more detailed inquiry would show that each of the two notions is justified in its way.

With greater caution, perhaps, it could be said that the theme as defined by me is a term falling under Halliday's information system. The problem arising here is that of the relation of the information systems to grammatical structure. Halliday emphasizes that the information systems assign to the discourse a structure which is independent of sentence structure (1967.211). Not wanting to misinterpret Halliday's approach, I will refrain from any further comment at the moment. Let me just say that in my view, FSP constitutes a system to be interpreted in its own terms; it is, however, to be regarded as superimposed upon the semantic and the grammatical structure of the sentence. The three levels do not operate independently in the act of communication.

Coming back to interrogatives, we find that in Halliday's interpretation the unmarked, most frequent theme of the non-polar interrogative is the WH-element; the unmarked, most frequent theme of the polar interrogative the finite verbal element. According to Halliday, the theme of the message is that there is something the speaker does not know and that he wants to know; the rest of the message is explanatory comment about his demand. What at the moment is of particular interest to me is that this observation fully substantiates the conclusion (see above and Firbas 1957.90—2) concerning the two functions performed by an interrogative sentence. Stressing the explanatory function, Halliday's observation bears out my interpretation of the elements occurring in the question besides the chief indicators of the desire for knowledge (i.e. the WH-element and/or the finite verb element as the case may be); in regard to the narrow scene such elements cannot normally be interpreted as conveying merely known information. This brings us back to the question of the status to be assigned to the finite verb and the WH-element on the level of FSP.

The semantic content of the finite verb is not homogeneous, but heterogeneous [see here also pp. 42 and 50]. This is also reflected on the level of FSP. In unmarked use, the contributions of the components of the finite verb towards the further development of communication are not the same: in unmarked use the notional component carries a higher degree of CD than the temporal and modal exponents (= TMEs).

I should explain that following B. Trnka (1932.58; 1964.330) I understand by the TMEs all the formal expedients used by the finite verb to convey its temporal and modal indications. Under the indicated heading would come, for instance, the variation of the stem vowels in *sing*, *sang*, *sung*, the verbal suffix *-ed*, the auxiliaries. I should add that I accept Halliday's useful distinction between mood and modality. According to Halliday, mood is the selection by the speaker of a particular communicative role in the speech situation: as informer, narrator, enquirer, suppliant; modality is a form of the speaker's comment on or assessment of what he is saying. In the definition of the TMEs adduced above, the adjective 'modal' covers both aspects. According to con-

text, it refers either to the one or to the other or to both. It will be seen that for the purposes of this paper this approach is acceptable.

On another occasion (Firbas 1965), I discussed the function of the TMEs in FSP in some detail. I came to the conclusion that in their unmarked use they mediate between the thematic and the non-thematic section of the sentences. They carry the lowest degrees of CD within the non-thematic section and constitute what may be called transition proper. In unmarked use the information they convey, i.e. the temporal and modal indications, always appears as new, i.e. contextually independent. Partly using Halliday's terms, one could say that normally the speaker selects his communicative role and decides on the form of his comment or assessment anew in every new act of predication. The same applies to his establishing the temporal relation between the language event (the sentence) and the reported extralingual event; in other words the same applies to his choice of tense. It is evident that normally the information conveyed by the TMEs cannot be regarded as recoverable, derivable from the preceding context, i.e. as contextually dependent. By supplying the temporal and modal indications, the TMEs start building up the very information on account of which the sentence is uttered; they start building up this information upon the foundation provided by the thematic elements. They are transitional par excellence.

In their marked use, on the other hand, the TMEs constitute either rheme proper or become part of a more or less extensive theme proper. This happens when the sentence appears in sharp, ad hoc contrast on account of one of its elements. The element singled out for such sharp, ad hoc, second instance contrast (Firbas 1968.15—8) becomes bearer of rheme proper, the other elements constituting a more or less extensive theme proper. Let us compare *I "HAVE found a hat* with *"I have found a hat.* In the former, *have* functions as bearer of rheme proper, in the latter it is part of an extensive theme proper.

The TMEs functioning in declarative sentences show an extraordinarily high degree of coincidence (congruence), perhaps the highest in the system of language, between the semantic, the grammatical and the FSP level. This high degree of coincidence (congruence) is also borne out by the prosodic features of the finite verb, as I have attempted to show at some length in a paper (1968) meant to be also a modest contribution to an inquiry into the correspondence of prosodic to grammatical features initiated by R. Quirk and his collaborators (Quirk 1964).

For lack of time I cannot discuss in detail the problems of correspondence between the gamut of CD and the gamut of prosodic weight. But the following very sketchy notes are at least to indicate the basis on which the attempt has been made to evaluate the prosodic weight of the TMEs in declarative and interrogative sentences. (For a more detailed discussion, see Firbas 1968.) First, a word on the gamut of CD and the gamut of prosodic weight.

The gamut of CD is constituted by theme proper, i.e. the element carrying the very lowest degree of CD, rest of theme, transition proper, rest of transition, rheme excluding rheme proper, rheme proper, i.e. the element carrying the very highest degree of CD. The gamut of prosodic weight is constituted basically by A. C. Gimson's four degrees of accentuation (Gimson 1962.244). Roughly speaking, they may be designated with the labels: unstressed, partially stressed, stressed, bearing a nucleus. I also follow A. C. Gimson in applying the

term 'nucleus' to the prosodic features of a fully stressed syllable which stands out from among its neighbours (stressed, partially stressed and unstressed) in that it displays (at least through initiating it) a change of pitch direction. It displays (at least through initiating it) a fall, a rise, or a combination of the two. The correspondence between the two gamuts is to be sought for within distributional fields. They are provided by grammatical structures arising through explicit or (as has been shown by A. Svoboda [1968]) implicit predication. A distributional field of the former type would be a sentence, one of the latter type an attributive construction (headword + attribute). I should add that of two prosodic features phonically equal in terms of the four degrees of accentuation and occurring within the same distributional field, I consider the one occurring later to be functionally weightier (i.e. signalling a higher degree of CD). This implies that, if two or more nuclei occur within a distributional field, the one occurring last will be functionally weightiest. An example will illustrate.

They ˈ*said on the* ˈˈ*radio last* ˈ*night that a* ˈ*thaw was expected.* The complex sentence structure provides a basic distributional field; within it a distributional subfield occurs created by the objective subclause. The subclause functions as rheme within the basic distributional field, which is duly signalled by the functionally weightiest feature. The subclause has an FSP structure of its own. *They* functions as theme proper; thematic is also the element *last night*; the elements ˈ*said on the* ˈˈ*radio* are transitional.

Though undoubtedly valid to a high degree, the offered generalization concerning the functional weight of phonically equivalent features cannot stand without modification. Perhaps the most important of the necessary modifications is the following: if within one and the same distributional field a low rise occurs after a fall, it will be functionally less important than the preceding fall. (*I'll* ˈ*show them* ˌ*to you if you* ˌ*like*).

It is by no means claimed that language displays a perfect correspondence betveen the two gamuts. In fact it must be asked in this connection whether it is at all desirable that there should be a perfect correspondence between the two gamuts. On the one hand, it seems that such a perfect correspondence would but impede language in fully coping with all its tasks. On the other hand, to make language capable of coping with all its tasks, a comparatively high degree of correspondence appears to be essential. Anyway, as has been pointed out by Quirk (1965) and subscribed to by Halliday (1969), in language not all criteria exactly match.

It is worth noticing, however, that the inquiry (Firbas 1968) referred to earlier has shown that within the transition-rheme section of a declarative sentence the correspondence between the two gamuts is well-nigh perfect. But within the theme-transition section deviations from perfect correspondence evidently can occur as long as the distribution of CD is signalled clearly enough by the interplay of means of FSP, in which the non-prosodic means in no way play a negligible role. A case in point is the well-known deviation which may be described as the prosodic intensification of the theme. It may take place for various reasons. In ˈˈ*Mine is from the* ˈ*library*, for instance, the theme (ˈˈ*Mine*) appears in evident, though not heavy, contrast with some element mentioned in, and easily understood from, the previous context. It is important to note that ˈˈ*Mine* would lose its thematic status were it not followed by an

element bearing a functionally weightier prosodic feature. Prosodic intensification, realized through deviation from perfect correspondence between the two gamuts, thus remains within certain limits set by the requirements of FSP [see also here pp. 37 and 51].

Proceeding along the sketchily indicated lines I believe to have shown (Firbas 1968) that even an inquiry into the prosodic features of the finite verb bears out the conclusion that in unmarked use the TMEs perform the function of transition proper, whereas in marked use they become either rheme proper or part of a more or less extensive theme proper.

Let us now turn our attention to the function of the TMEs in questions. It may be safely assumed that in questions the TMEs display a greater communicative value than in declarative sentences. This is due to the type of mood they come to express in questions. Whereas the kind of mood expressed by them in declarative sentences is unmarked, the mood expressed by them in interrogative sentences is marked. Especially in polar questions they unmistakably express the enquirer's desire for knowledge as well as his appeal to the listener to satisfy this desire. This is duly reflected in the form of the polar interrogatives. First, they show the additional use of the *do*-auxiliary; second, upon the whole, they show a higher frequency of auxiliaries occurring in strong, occasionally even stressed form; third, they display inversion. Occasional absence of inversion, and as the case may be, also of the auxiliary *do*, must be compensated for at least by the presence of interrogative intonation. Indicating that a *yes* or a *no* reply is expected, and not one of the type signalled and required by a WH-element, the TMEs of a polar question in fact participate in informing the speaker as to how he is to set about the reply. Thus, at least to a certain extent, the TMEs of a polar question participate in the explanatory function of the question. Neither the explanatory nor the indicatory function is recoverable from the preceding context.

The described function of the TMEs is less conspicuous in the non-polar question, in which the main indicator of the interrogative mood is the WH-element. Whereas the TMEs merely co-signal the want of knowledge on the part of the enquirer, through its sematic content the WH-element takes an active part in specifying it. Like the TMEs in polar questions, the WH-element is not entirely excluded from participating in the explanatory role of the question. The comparison of the roles as performed in non-polar questions by the WH-element and the TMEs leads to the conclusion that under normal circumstances the WH-element exceeds in CD the TMEs. The prosodic features are in harmony with this observation. In normal circumstances, the WH-element appears to be prosodically heavier than the TMEs. Usually, the former is stressed, whereas the latter are unstressed.

We have come to the conclusion that the TMEs in polar questions and the WH-element in non-polar questions do not merely function as indicators of the desire for knowledge, but also participate in the explanatory function. All this makes them contribute more to the further development of the communication than the TMEs of the declarative sentences. As the declarative TMEs have been interpreted as non-thematic, transitional, the interrogative TMEs and the WH-element must in consequence be interpreted as non-thematic as well. This raises the question whether the interrogative TMEs and the WH-element are to be regarded as transitional or rhematic. They can

hardly be interpreted as rhematic in regard to the first function, i.e. that of indicating the desire for knowledge on the part of the speaker. For this is a modal function and in unmarked use has to be looked upon as a concomitant phenomenon. In regard to the explanatory function, the WH-element and the TMEs merely participate in indicating the angle from which the question is to be approached; in unmarked use they do not ultimately specify this angle, the perspective, in which the question is to function. In unmarked use, they certainly do not become rheme proper. The fact that they are mere substitutes for real knowledge and elements of stereotyped character undoubtedly substantiates this conclusion. It seems to be best to interpret them as transitional, admitting that the WH-element may come near or perhaps even occur in the periphery of the rheme [see here pp. 35, 41, 48, 51]. This conclusion appears to be borne out by the prosodic features of the TMEs and the WH-element examined in relation to the other elements occurring within the interrogative sentence.

Although at the moment I am not in a position to offer results of a statistical inquiry, I believe that the following observation may be safely made. The cases in which the WH-element or the TMEs appear as bearers of the intonation centre are comparatively very rare. They are highly marked. They occur when a repetition of the reply is required (*"What has he ·found?, "Have you ·found your ·hat?*). In such cases the only semantic item that can be regarded as contextually independent and on account of which the WH-element or the TMEs express rheme proper and in consequence become bearers of the intonation centre is the indication of the desire for knowledge. The explanatory function has in actual fact become redundant. Let me add that the cases under discussion show an unusually high degree of context dependence, which has its share in signalling the request for repetition. In unmarked use neither the WH-element nor the TMEs appear among the bearers of the functionally weightiest prosodic features within the question. This bears out the diagnosis offered a while ago and excluding them from the rhematic section. Deviations from perfect correspondence between the gamut of CD and the gamut of prosodic weight occur within the non-rhematic section, especially in its thematic subdivision. As in the case of the declarative TMEs, however, we may assume that these deviations are sufficiently compensated for by the operation of non-prosodic means of FSP. Once again, the prosodic means are not entirely excluded from co-operation. The WH-element or the TMEs lose their transitional status, the moment they themselves become bearers of the intonation centre [see here also pp. 51—2] (*"What have you ·found? "Have you ·found your ·hat?*). They equally lose their transitional status the moment they occur within a section that has been deprived of all prosodic weight because some other element within the question has been singled out for sharp, ad hoc contrast, e.g., *What have "you found?*, repeating a question that has already been asked and singling out one element from the explanatory comment that may have been misunderstood.

Let me now sum up the offered diagnosis. In their unmarked use, the WH-element and the TMEs have been interpreted as transitional. Further research will have to specify how near the WH-element comes to the rhematic sphere. The interrogative TMEs still participate in constituting transition proper, but on account of the semantic item of interrogative mood carry a higher degree

of CD than the declarative TMEs. They cover, as it were, a wider section within the gamut of CD. The prosodic features quite evidently tend to be in harmony with the established degrees of CD. [See here also pp. 51—2].

Before closing this chapter, I have to add a note on the prosodic form of the rheme in interrogative sentences. This note is necessitated by the way H. Křížková (1968) accounts for the occurrence of the intonation centre in unmarked, non-emotive Czech questions. In such Czech questions, the intonation centre would appear on the last word. Křížková accounts for this phenomenon by a rhythmical tendency characteristic of Czech unmarked sentences, a tendency that can be observed both with unmarked declarative and unmarked interrogative sentences. Only, whereas in unmarked declarative sentences the last word bears the intonation centre on account of its rhematic status, in unmarked questions the last word bears it merely owing to the operation of the mentioned rhythmical tendency. According to Křížková, in unmarked questions, this tendency works quite automatically.

Let me first examine the interrogative structure *Pracuje tatínek doma?* (*He-works Father at-home?, Does Father work at home?). The most natural way to intone it is to place the intonation centre on *doma*, i.e. the last word of the question. Other word orders keeping the intonation centre on the last word would be possible: *Pracuje doma tatínek?*, *Tatínek pracuje doma?*, *Tatínek doma pracuje?*, *Doma pracuje tatínek?*, *Doma tatínek pracuje?*. I will not go into the problem whether these variants are marked or unmarked, and if marked, to what degree they are so. What is of particular importance here is the following. True enough, in certain situations some of the variants may be interchangeable. I maintain, however, that it is equally true that each of them is capable of expressing a particular shade of perspective more or less not conveyable by any of the other variants; in other words that each of them is capable of serving a more or less specific communicative purpose.

With due alterations, the same applies to a set of variants bearing the intonation centre on the last but one word, as well as to a set of variants bearing the intonation centre on the first word. The first of these two sets is constitued by the variants: *Pracuje tatínek doma?*, *Pracuje doma tatínek?*, *Tatínek pracuje doma?*, *Tatínek doma pracuje?*, *Doma pracuje tatínek?*, *Doma tatínek pracuje?* The second of the two sets is constituted by the variants: *Pracuje tatínek doma?*, *Pracuje doma tatínek?*, *Tatínek pracuje doma?*, *Tatínek doma pracuje?*, *Doma pracuje tatínek?*, *Doma tatínek pracuje?*.

I believe that all the mentioned variants are acceptable to a native speaker of Czech. I am well aware, however that other types of semantic and grammatical structure may not always yield such a high number of acceptable variants as the type adduced here (Seiler 1962.121—31). Further, in some cases, the communicative purposes that the variants are capable of serving may differ only very slightly. Moreover, neither English nor German, for instance, displays such an array of variants, which is due to the fact that neither English nor German word order is as 'free' as Czech word order. (In German, and partly also in English, it is the high degree of word order contiguity of the subject and the verb that matters here.) But as in Czech, both in English and in German, the change in position of the intonation centre goes hand in hand with a change (shift) in the angle from which the question is to be answered.

No matter how slight this change (shift) may appear, it is at least potentially there. And it is not sentence rhythm, but the very indication of the angle from which the question is to be approached, that plays the decisive role in placing the intonation centre. In other words, the rhythmical patterns are not primarily due to the operation of some automatic principle. They are ultimately controlled by the requirements of FSP. I hold that the congruence between rheme proper and intonation centre is a feature common to both types of question, polar and non-polar, a feature both types of question share with declarative sentences, commands, and with the borderline types (Bolinger 1957: Part 1.1.) between the declarative sentences or commands on the one hand and the questions of the other. This brings me to the end of my notes. They have left a number of problems untouched. (More could be said, for instance, on the word order of interrogative sentences. Interesting problems are posed by the so-called tag-questions. I am convinced that a diachronic inquiry could be most revealing as well.) My notes, however, have fulfilled their purpose if they have succeeded in pointing out at least some aspects of the role played by FSP in regard to the function of the interrogative sentence in the very act of communication.

CHAPTER TWO

As has been stated in the introductory section of this study, Chapter Two is occasioned by H. Křížková's important researches into the functional sentence perspective of the Slavonic interrogative sentence (Křížková 1972). An evaluation of Křížková's approach offers an excellent opportunity to test the validity of the conclusions arrived at in Chapter One. I will first deal with the special question and then with the polar (yes/no) question.

I

Let me first outline Křížková's treatment of the Slavonic special (pronominal) question. It is a counterpart of the English pronominal question and could therefore be referred to as the 'Slavonic WH-question'. As in a chapter concentrating on the Slavonic situation, the designation 'IW-question' more readily suggests the phenomenon under discussion, it will be adopted from now on. (IW stands for 'interrogative word' in the narrow sense of the term; it covers the interrogative pronoun and the interrogative adverb; it does not cover other interrogative words, such as the interrogative particles. For the purposes of the present study, the two abbreviations, WH and IW, can be regarded as interchangeable.)

According to Křížková, the basic type of the Slavonic IW-question has the following characteristics: the IW appears in front position, expresses rheme proper, and bears the intonation centre (= IC).[2] But not all Slavonic languages employ the basic type to the same extent. They show a number of deviating types. The deviations from the basic type consist in a different placement of the IW and/or in a different placement of the IC (the IW occurring in mid-position or even in end-position, the IC occurring on another element than

the IW). It follows, and Křížková says so explicitly (253), that in contrast with declarative sentences, questions are not consistent in making one element simultaneously function as rheme proper and IC-bearer.

There is one point, however, in which all Slavonic languages are in perfect agreement: the echo question. For this type all Slavonic languages use an IW occurring in front-position and bearing the IC (252—3); see exx. 1—2, quoted after Křížková (ib.).

1. O *któ*rej[3] wróciłeś — Polish.
   *At which [i.e. which hour] you-returned?[4]
   What time did you return?
2. *Kdo* ti to dal? — Czech.
   *Who to-you it he-gave?
   Who gave it to you?

Following Křížková's account, let us compare Slovene, Russian, Polish and Czech as to their deviating IW-question types. We shall first examine the types with the IW in front-position and those with the IW in mid-position, and only then turn our attention to those with the IW in end-position.

Slovene shows the least amount of deviation from the basic pattern.[5] The IW invariably appears in front-position. For the sake of special emphasis, however, the IC may occur on another sentence element. Exx. 3 and 4, quoted after Křížková (251), will illustrate.

3. *Kdaj* pa prideš v šolo? — Slovene.
   *When well you-will-come to school?
   Well, when will you come to school?
4. Tebi je že dobro, kdo bo pa *me*ne potolažil? — Slovene.
   *To-you is well, who will however me comfort?
   Well, you are all right, but who will comfort me?

Russian shows the same deviation as Slovene. In addition, however, it can put the IW in mid-position. The medial IW usually carries the IC. For the sake of special emphasis, however, the IC can be removed from the medial IW

---

[3] The syllable bearing the IC is indicated by a different kind of type: in italics in contrast with ordinary type, and vice versa.

In the body of the text, I refrain from indicating the ICs in the English equivalents of the Slavonic examples. I do so in order not to anticipate the interpretation of the FSP of these examples. For easy reference, however, I am indicating the English ICs in the list below.

1. *What* time did you return?
2. *Who* gave it to you?
3. Well, when will you come to *school*?
4. Well, you are all right, but who will comfort *me*?
5. Where do you *go* in the evening? or Where do you go in the *even*ing? (cf. here pp. 29—33).
6. Where do you go in the *even*ing?
7. And you, where do you *go* in the evening? or And you, where do you go in the *even*ing (cf. here pp. 29—33).
8. And where do *you* go in the evening?
9. What will you *do* in the evening? or What will you do in the *even*ing? (cf. here pp. 29—33).
10. What will you do in the *even*ing?
11. Where is a lynx to be *seen*? or Where is a *lynx* to be seen or A lynx, where can you *see* one? (cf. here p. 28).
12. And what will you *do* in the evening? or And what will you do in the *even*ing or And in the evening, what will you *do*? (cf. here pp. 29—33).

and put on the non-IW element opening the question. Křížková gives the following two pairs of examples (252).

5. Куда ты собираешься вечером? — Russian.
   *Where you you-go in-the-evening?
   Where do you go in the evening?
6. Куда ты собираешься *вечером*? — Russian.
   [The same as under 5.]
7. Ты куда собираешься вечером? — Russian.
   *You where you-go in-the-evening?
   [The same as under 5.]
8. А *ты* куда собираешься вечером? — Russian.
   *And... [The same as under 5.]

Polish, too, shows the same deviation as Slovene. Like Russian, it can place the IW in mid-position. Unlike Russian, it invariably makes the medial IW carry the IC. Křížková gives the following two pairs of examples (252).

9. *Co* będziesz robił wieczorem? — Polish.
   *What you-will-be doing in-the-evening?
   What will you do in the evening?
10. Co będziesz robił wieczorem? — Polish.
    [The same as under 9.]
11. Rysia *gdzie* można spotkać? — Polish.
    *Lynx where possible to-meet?
    Where can one see a lynx?
    (A lynx, where can you see one?)
12. A wieczorem *co* będziesz robił? — Polish.
    *And in-the-evening what you-will-be doing?
    And what will you do in the evening?
    (And in the evening, what will you do?)

The greatest amount of deviation is shown by Czech. The IW usually occurs in front-position. Unless specially emphasized (in echo questions), it does not bear the IC, which as a rule occurs on another sentence element —

---

13. What will you *do* in the evening?
14. What will you do in the *even*ing?
15. Who *said* this to you?
16. What will you *do* in the evening? or What will you do in the *even*ing? or In the evening, what will you *do*? (cf. here pp. 29—33).
17. And one gets there — *how*?
18. And you will fetch it — *when*?
19. Where did the can *stand* then?
20. Where did the can *stand* then? (Where did the *can* stand then? would correspond to: Kde přitom stála ta *ple*chovka?, Kde přitom ta *ple*chovka stála?, Kde ta *ple*chovka přitom stála?; cf. here p. 28).
21. How did you *get* into this mess?
22. How did you *get* into this mess? (How did you get into this *mess*? would correspond to: Jak ses dostal do toho *mal*éru?, Jak ses do toho *mal*éru dostal?; cf. here p. 28).
23. When do you go on *hol*iday this year?
24. How can I best get to the *rail*way station, please? (corresponding also to: Prosím vás, kudy se dostanu nejlépe *na* nádraží?; How *best* can I get to the railway station, please? would correspond to: Prosím vás, kudy se dostanu na nádraží *nej*lépe?; cf. here p. 29),
25. Where *were* you last night?
26. Where were you last *night*?
27. Where is *Jo*žo?

one in end-position or a medial verb. Occasionally the IW occurs in mid-position and, as in Polish, carries the IC. Křížková gives the following two pairs of examples (252).

13. Co budeš *dělat* večer? — Czech.
    *What you-will-be to-do in-the-evening?
    What will you do in the evening?
14. Co budeš dělat *večer*? — Czech.
    [The same as under 13.]
15. To ti *kdo* říkal? — Czech.
    *It to-you who he-said?
    Who said this to you?
16. Večer *co* budeš dělat? — Czech.
    *In-the-evening what you-will-be to-do?
    [The same as under 13.]

The possible position of the IW (front, mid, end) and the possible occurrences of the IC (on the IW or on another element) can be represented in tabular form as shown on p. 25. Let us recall that it is special emphasis that in Křížková's view causes the IC to be placed on another element than the IW.

---

28. When did you re*turn*?
29. When did you last go to the *pic*tures?
30. What is for *lunch* today?
31. Where *were* you at that time?
32. And how much should be given to *him*?
33. When will *you* go to the pictures?
34. And why don't you cook in *that*?
35. And what did happen to this *safe*?
36. Well, and how does the first line (of defence) run *now*?
37. Do you have *friends*? or Do you *have* friends? (see here p. 43).
38. Will you drink one *cof*fee? or Will you *drink* one coffee? (see here p. 43).
39. Do you know Miss Majstorović? or Do you *know* Miss Majstorović? (see here p. 43).
40. Do you mean it *se*riously? (For semantic reasons, probably the only possibility within first instance.)
41. Does Father let you go to *Mos*cow? or Does Father *let* you go to Moscow?
42. Is she *cer*tain that she saw him?
43. Is it an exhibition and *sale*?
44. Did Iwona *fear* anything?
45. Are you *wai*ting for anybody, madam?
46. Does Father *know* it?
47. Will you *help* me with this roller?
48. Will the money suffice till the *first*?
49. Have you ever seen a discreet *jour*nalist?
50. Have you ever dreamt that you are *fly*ing?
51. May I stretch out here on the *couch* for a while?
52. Have you got a *gram*ophone? or Have you *got* a gramophone or *HAVE* you got a gramophone? (Cf. here p. 44).
53. Will there be a des*sert*? or Will there *be* a dessert? or *WILL* there be a dessert? (Cf. here p. 44).
54. Will there be a des*sert*?
55. Did you serve in the *ar*my? or Did you *serve* in the army or *DID* you serve in the army? (Cf. here p. 44).
56. Did you serve in the *ar*my?
57. Did they go *far*?
58. Does the offensive develop *suc*cessfully there?
59. Have you a room *va*cant?

	Basic Type	Other Types			
IW	front	front	mid	mid	end
IC	front	non-front	mid	front	end

Basic Type	Other Types			
IW in front-position		IW in mid-position		IW in end-position
IC on IW	IC not on IW	IC on IW	IC not on IW[1]	IC on IW
Slovene	Slovene[2]	—	—	—
Russian	Russian[3]	Russian	Russian[2]	—
Polish	Polish[3]	Polish	—	Polish
Czech[4]	Czech	Czech[5]	—	Czech

[1] Occurring on the element in front-position.
[2] Only for special emphasis.
[3] For special emphasis, but also in other cases.
[4] IC practically excluded from occurring on IW; placed on it only in cases of special emphasis (in echo questions).
[5] Only in colloquial speech.

It will have been noted that Křížková distinguishes between IW-questions with a specially emphasized element and IW-questions without such an element. She finds that not all Slavonic languages keep these two question types strictly apart. This means that it is not possible to say that all the deviations from the basic question type are due to special emphasis. A tendency is at work that blurs the questions with a specially emphasized element and those without. The intensity of this tendency is not the same in all Slavonic languages. In regard to the initial-IW questions and the medial-IW questions, Czech, Polish, Russian and Slovene offer the following picture.

Czech blurs the two types within the sphere of the initial IW-questions and within that of the medial IW-questions. It does so in practically excluding the initial IW from bearing the IC on the one hand, and in invariably linking the medial IW with the IC on the other.

As to the medial IW-question, Polish behaves in the same way as Czech. To a certain extent, it also displays a tendency to blur the two types within the sphere of the initial-IW questions.

Like Polish, Russian would be capable of keeping the two types separate

60. And do you know how to *skate*?
61. You have already *known* my husband for a long time, haven't you?
62. Can Sasha be *asked*?
63. Do you speak *Eng*lish?
64. Did you not try to *count*?
65. Did you watch tele*vi*sion today?

[4] For the benefit of those who may not be well acquainted with the language of the example, a literal translation is added. It is always marked with an asterisk.
[5] Křížková points out that Upper Sorbian and Serbo-Croatian behave in the same way as Slovene (248).

within the initial-IW question sphere, but is not consistent in doing so and tends to blur the two types.

Slovene appears to be consistent in keeping the two types apart.

By way of concluding the brief survey of deviations from the basic Slavonic IW-question type, a word must be added on the final-IW questions. In accordance with its low degree of deviation from the basic pattern, Slovene does not put the IW in end-position at all. Both in Russian and in Polish, the IW occurs in end-position only occasionally (247, 248). The phenomenon is far more frequent in Czech (248). It is, however, confined to colloquial speech (cf. exx. 17 and 18 quoted after Křížková).

17. A jede se tam *kudy*? — Czech.
    *And it-goes *refl. pron.* there what - way?
    And one gets there - how?
18. A přijdeš si pro to *kdy*? — Czech.
    *And you-will-come *refl. pron.* for it when?
    And you will fetch it - when?

As the IC practically always occurs on the final IW, the final-IW question need not be considered in connection with the blurring tendency. It has a special kind of status of one's own. I shall come back to this point later (see here p. 33).

Let us now pay closer attention to the phenomenon of special emphasis and the tendency to blur the question types that display it and those without it. I shall first deal with the initial-IW questions, and then the medial-IW questions.

Discussing initial-IW questions, Křížková points out that special emphasis is called forth by the preceding context, especially when a sentence element is to be put in contrast. Such an element comes to bear the IC (cf. exx. 4, 6, 8, 10). No special emphasis occurs if the entire non-IW section of the question conveys new information (i.e., in my terms, if it is context independent). In such a case, the IC is not removed from the IW (cf. exx. 3, 9).

On the other hand, as Křížková points out, the blurring tendency will place the IC on an element within the non-IW section of the question even if no special emphasis is required by the context. She makes a number of observations as to the placement of the IC, ascribing special importance to the position of the verb (254). The IC occurs on the verb, medially or finally, or on some other element, usually one standing in end-position. If the non-IW section is entirely context independent, the blurring tendency will put the IC on the element in end-position. Křížková sums up her observations by giving the following rule for Czech (255), in which the blurring tendency is most prominent. If the IC does not occur on the IW, which — in Křížková's wiew — is the rheme proper of the question, it falls on some other word within that part of the question which in regard to the preceding context conveys new information: the IC falls either on a specially emphasized word or on some element of the predicate requiring no special emphasis. If the predicate is expanded, it is as a rule the last component that carries the IC. If the predicate is not expanded, the IC falls on the verb. In another place, Křížková briefly characterizes the situation in which the IC occurs on an element of the non-IW section: the IC occurs either on the verb or on the element in end-position (250). Thus in ex. 13, the IC occurs on the medial verb, in 14 on the

final adverbial element. In the examples adduced below, the IC occurs on the verb in exx. 19, 20, 21, 22, 25; on the final element (verb or non-verb) in exx. 20, 22, 23, 26. The non-IW sections of exx. 23 and 24 are entirely context independent. All the examples are quoted after Křížková (254-5).

19. Kde přitom *stála* ta plechovka? — Czech.
*Where then it-stood that can?
Where did the can stand then?
20. Kde přitom ta plechovka *stála*? — Czech.
[The English versions are the same as under 19.]
21. Jak ses *dos*tal do toho maléru? — Czech.
*How *refl. pron.* you-got into this mess?
How did you get into this mess?
22. Jak ses do toho maléru *do*stal? — Czech.
[The English versions are the same as under 25.]
23. Kdy jedete letos *na* dovolenou? — Czech.
*When you-go this-year on holiday?
When do you go on holiday this year?
24. Prosím vás, kudy se dostanu nejlépe *na* nádraží? — Czech.
*I-beg you, where *refl. pron.* I-get best to railway-station?
How can I best get to the railway station, please?
25. Kdes *byl* včera večer? — Czech.
*Where-you was yesterday evening?
Where were you last evening?
26. Kdes byl včera *večer*? — Czech.
[The same as under 25.]
Where were you last night?

It is now possible to add some comment on Křížková's observations. I will once again deal with the initial-IW questions first and then turn to the medial-IW questions. I will insert a note on the final-IW questions. Eventually, I will attempt to draw some conclusions from the offered comments.

I consider it to be of utmost importance that there is a feature that is shared by all the initial-IW questions the IC of which occurs on another element than the IW. The feature is shared by the initial-IW questions displaying special emphasis and by those without it. It consists in the IC never occurring on a context dependent element: the IC can occur only within the context independent part of the question. This can be gathered from, and is borne out by, Křížková's observations. The common feature can, however, be characterized in a more precise way. It consists in the IC occurring on the element that carries the highest degree of CD within the non-IW section: the IC signals the carrier of the highest degree of CD within that section.

Viewed in this light, the IC performs an important function. It signals the perspective of the non-IW section, focusing the informant's attention on one particular element. True enough, in some cases it may appear almost irrelevant whether the IC is placed on one element or another, the difference in meaning seeming to be very slight (cf. here p. 20); nevertheless, even then a change in the position of the IC is capable of conveying different shades of meaning brought about by the change in perspective (cf. ib.). The following discussion of examples previously adduced is to illustrate the points made about the feature shared by all the initial-IW questions the IC of which occurs on a non-IW.

Let us first turn our attention to the structure adduced by exx. 19 and 20,

and in assessing its contextual applicability let us first go by no other signals than those offered by the structure itself, postulating no definite context or prosodic features. The most natural interpretation that presents itself under such circumstances is to regard both *přitom* and *ta plechovka* as context dependent. The finite verb *stála* would then carry the highest degree of CD within the non-IW section. This interpretation tallies with the occurrence of the IC on *stála*. Under the circumstances, *stála* would carry the highest degree of CD within the non-IW section and bear the IC irrespective of sentence position. In addition to the two positions of *stála* instanced by exx. 19 and 20, there is even a third possibility: *Kde stála přitom ta plechovka?*

It would of course also be possible to think of *ta plechovka* as context independent. This would apply if the enquirer wished to point out that it was the tin the position (the place of existence) of which he was asking about. In this case, *ta plechovka* would be a non-thematic subject expressing a phenomenon existing on the scene, *stála* serving as a verb of existence. From the point of view of communication, the newly mentioned phenomenon existing on the scene would appear to be more important than its mere existence (cf., e.g. Firbas 1957a.31—5; 1966.241). This would hold good irrespective of sentence position: *Kde přitom stála ta* plechovka?, *Kde přitom ta* plechovka *stála? Kde ta* plechovka *přitom stála?* The occurence of IC on *ta plechovka* would be in harmony with this interpretation, for under the circumstances *ta plechovka* would carry the highest degree of CD within the non-IW section. (For the English equivalent, cf. note[3], ex. 20.)

Other contextual situations could be imagined. Any word of the question (including the IW) could come to express ordinary or heavy, sharp (second instance) contrast[6] and bear the IC.

Analogical interpretations apply to the structure instanced by exx. 21 and 22. On account of the demonstrative pronoun, the element *do toho maléru* could be regarded as context dependent. On the other hand, the structure may well occur at the beginning of a conversation. Both the enquirer and the prospective informant know of the 'mess', but the informant does not know that it is going to be mentioned. Under the circumstances, the adverbial element of direction, *do toho maléru*, will be context independent and carry a higher degree of CD than the finite verb, expressing motion. From the point of view of communication, the 'narrow scene', cf. here p. 13, the newly mentioned direction (goal) of the motion is more important than the motion itself (cf. Firbas 1959.49). The adverbial *do toho maléru* will bear the IC. This will apply irrespective of sentence position: *Jak ses dostal* do *toho maléru?*, *Jak ses* do *toho maléru dostal?* (for the English equivalent, cf. note[3], ex. 22).

Incidentally, the structures instanced by exx. 23 and 24 also contain adverbials of direction and verbs of motion. Provided the adverbial of direction is context independent, it will carry a higher degree of CD than the verb. This rule applies even if the word order within the structure changes. In the case of 23 the adverbial of direction will always bear the IC: *Kdy jedete letos* na *dovolenou?*, *Kdy jedete* na *dovolenou letos?* This is because as long as it remains context independent, it will not be exceeded in CD by *letos*, which

[6] For an explanation of this phenomenon, see here p. 16. For a more detailed discussion of second instance, see Firbas 1968.15—18.

will continue to express a mere temporal setting. In the case of 24, the adverbial element of direction, *na nádraží*, will bear the IC as long as it is not followed by a context independent *nejlépe*. As an adverbial of manner, a context independent *nejlépe* has its degree of CD influenced by sentence position: *Prosím vás, kudy se nejlépe dostanu* na *nádraží? Prosím vás, kudy se dostanu nejlépe* na *nádraží?*, *Prosím vás, kudy se dostanu na nádraží* nejlépe? (for English equivalents see note[3], ex. 24). (The most natural interpretation of *na nádraží* occurring before a context independent *nejlépe* seems to be to regard it as context dependent. — *Prosím vás, kudy se nejlépe na nádraží dostanu?* would probably not be accepted by every speaker of Czech.)[7]

It is evident that the multifunctionality in FSP of a structure may be gradually reduced to unequivocalness if in analyzing the interplay of means of FSP, devices (signals) operating outside the structure, i.e., context and the prosodic features, are taken into consideration. Occurring on an element within the non-IW section, an IC can be regarded as an ultimate means capable of signalling with unequivocalness that the element is the carrier of the highest degree of CD within that section. Let us approach exx. 25 and 26 from this point of view and go by the signals offered by intonation.

As IC bearer (in ex. 25), the adverbial *včera večer* is unequivocally marked as a temporal specification; the finite verb *byl* can be either context dependent or independent. Not bearing the IC (in ex. 26), the adverbial *včera večer* serves only as a temporal setting; it may be either context dependent or independent; the finite verb *byl*, the IC bearer, is marked as the carrier of the highest degree of CD within the non-IW section. These interpretations hold good even if the word order were reversed: *Kdes včera večer* byl?, *Kdes včera* večer *byl?*. If *včera večer* functions as a temporal specification, the form *byl* tends to serve as a mere verb of existence. If *včera večer* becomes a temporal setting, *byl* tends to acquire greater communicative value, somewhat approaching the sphere of the verbs of action. If this interpretation is correct, it would be another example of semantic structure and FSP influencing each other. Let me only add a note. If neither contextual nor prosodic clues were given, the most natural interpretation of the structure *Kdes byl včera večer?* would seem to be to regard *byl* as a verb of existence and *včera večer* as a temporal specification.

According to whether it bears the IC or not, the adverbial *večer* is a temporal specification or a temporal setting also in exx. 14 and 13. This would hold good even if the order of the elements were reversed: *Co budeš* večer *dělat?*, *Co budeš večer* dělat?

The above explanation is valid not only for the Czech examples. In exx. 6 and 10, the Russian and Polish IC bearers, *вечером* and *wieczorem*, are to be interpreted as temporal specifications and carriers of the highest degree of CD within the non-IW section. Russ. *вечером* in 8, on the other hand, is a mere temporal setting, *мы* being singled out by the IC as the carrier of the highest degree of CD within the non-IW section.

The above comments were to illustrate the feature shared by all the initial-

---

[7] The effect sentence position can have on the communicative importante (in my terms, degree of CD) of an adverbial of manner has been noted by a number of scholars (cf. D. L. Bolinger 1952.1120; O. S. Akhmanova 1963.134).

IW questions the IC of which occurs on a non-IW: the IC singling out the carrier of the highest degree of CD within the non-IW section. It is important to realize that the signalling of the carrier of the highest degree of CD within the non-IW section is the result of an interplay of means of FSP. An inquiry into this interplay reveals that the finite verb, both semantically and grammatically, and the sentence positions are not the only phenomena in play. Their share in determinig the FSP of the question can be established if attention is paid to the relations existing between them and the other participants in the interplay of FSP means. As will become evident later, the established common feature of the initial-IW questions the IC of which occurs on a non-IW constitutes a very important point in the analysis of the so-called blurring tendency.

Before turning to the medial-IW questions, let me add a further note on the degrees of CD carried by *dělat* and *večer* in the structures *Co budeš večer dělat?*, *Co budeš dělat večer?* In determining the degrees of CD of the two elements, I have so far been ultimately guided by prosodic clues. For a moment let me exclude these clues from observation. In their absence, it is the contextual clues that will serve for ultimate guidance.

The prosodic clues absent, the situation is clear if one of the two elements is context dependent and the other context independent: the former will carry the lower, the latter the higher degree of CD. This applies irrespective of sentence position.

The situation becomes less clear if both elements are context independent. At the present state of knowledge, only a cautious conjecture can be offered. If *dělat* performs the function of a genuine verb of action, it will carry a higher degree of CD than *večer*, the latter serving as a temporal setting and receding into the background. The adduced proviso is necessitated by the fact that the semantic content of *dělat* is highly abstract, referring to no action in particular; semantically speaking, this may occasionally induce a context independent *dělat* to function as a kind of pro-verb, and a context independent *večer* even to supersede it in CD. Genuine verbs of action (such as *studovat* [to study], *vařit* [to cook], *spravovat* [to mend]) do not seem to permit of such an interpretation. As long as they are context independent, they will carry a higher degree of CD than the adverbial *večer*, making it function as a temporal setting. Within the non-IW section of the initial-IW question, this seems to hold good irrespective of sentence position and to apply even to corresponding combinations in other languages than Czech. In each case, the respective hierarchy and interplay of word order principles will determine which orders are marked and which are unmarked.

Definite answers must await further research; but the present conjecture appears to be borne out by what I trust is the most natural interpretation of the structures *Co budete večer dělat? | Na čem budete večer pracovat? | Co budete večer studovat? | Co budete večer vařit?* and *Co budete dělat večer? | Na čem budete pracovat večer? | Co budete studovat večer?*, if neither any prosodic nor any contextual clues are given. In giving the most natural interpretation of these structures, one of course immediately postulates a certain kind of context dependence or independence and intones the structures accordingly. The most natural interpretation of the adduced structures seems to be to regard *večer* as a temporal setting if it occurs in penultimate position, but a-

a temporal specification if it occurs finally. It is important that this interpretation is in harmony with the leading Czech word order principle, that of FSP. In accordance with it, end position is taken up by the carrier of the highest degree of CD. Czech also seems to indicate that the adverbial expressing the notion of 'evening' can carry a higher degree of CD than a genuine verb of action, only provided the latter is context dependent (cf. also *|What are you |going to 'work on to|night / |What are you |going to 'read to|night / |What are you 'cooking to|night* and *|What are you |going to |work on to'night / |What are you |going to |read to 'night / |What are you |cooking to 'night*).

If the above conjecture is correct, it also throws some light on the example of the Russian/Polish initial-IW question whose IW is an IC-bearer and whose non-IW section contains the combination verb of action + the temporal adverb *вечером/wieczorem* (cf. exx. 5 and 9). Provided the verb is context independent and functions as a genuine verb of action, the adverb *вечером/ wieczorem* will not exceed it in CD and function as a temporal setting. This seems to be the most natural interpretation of exx. 5 and 9. In exx. 6 and 10, on the other hand, the IC occurring on *вечером / wieczorem* unequivocally signals it as a temporal specification. As will be seen later, the unequivocalness achieved by the IC occurring on a non-IW constitutes an important point in the discussion of the so-called blurring tendency.

Let us now turn to the medial-IW questions. Křížková points out that the initial element(s), opening the question and occurring before the medial IW, may or may not be connected with special emphasis (251). In Russian, the presence of special emphasis on the initial element or its absence from it is signalled by the presence or absence of the IC. In Křížková's opinion, this holds good neither for Czech nor Polish, where the initial element may express special emphasis without simultaneously bearing the IC; consequently, Czech and Polish blur the two types of medial-IW question. I should like to add the following comment on these observations.

In regard to the development of the communication, the initial position is not always taken up by the most important element of the non-IW section of the question, i.e. the element carrying the highest degree of CD within that section. This is, for instance, quite obvious if the initial position is taken up by a context dependent pronoun uncontrasted with any previous elements, and if among the elements occurring after the medial IW there is at least one that is context independent and which in consequence carries a higher degree of CD than the initial pronoun; under the circumstances, the initial element is evidently thematic (cf. ex. 15).

There is, however, one interesting point that should not pass unobserved. The medial IW divides the non-IW section of the question into two parts: it separates the initial element from the rest of the section and in this way sets it apart. The effect produced is an intensified theme, acquiring the meaning of "as far as... is concerned".[8] The function of an intensified theme can naturally be performed even by a non-pronominal element, provided it carries the lowest degree of CD within the non-IW section of the question.[9]

[8] Intensification raises the CD of the element functioning as theme, without making it exceed the other sentence elements in CD (cf. Firbas 1968.22).

[9] It should be emphasized that the wording 'lowest degree of CD' does not exclude context independent elements (cf., e.g., Firbas 1970.744).

On the other hand, the initial element can, to use Křížková's term, express "special emphasis". This will occur provided the initial element is context independent and carries the highest degree of CD within the non-IW section of the question. In order to illustrate the points raised in this and the previous paragraph, let me recall the comments on the adverbial *večer* occurring in the structures instanced by exx. 13 and 14 (cf. here p. 29) and add an analysis of ex. 16.

In the structures instanced by exx. 13 and 14 and in the possible variants of these structures, *večer* functions as a temporal specification or a temporal setting, according to whether it does or does not bear the IC. The situation becomes less clear when we examine the function of *večer* in 16. The prosodic clues we are given (the IC occurring on the medial IW) do not suffice to determine the carrier of the highest degree of CD within the non-IW section of the question. Under the circumstances (further prosodic clues and preceding context being unknown), the structure instanced by 16 is multifunctional. Concentrating on the relation between *budeš dělat* and *večer*, I can think of at least four possible interpretations.

Status in regard to context (context dependent/independent)		Function in FSP	
večer	*budeš dělat*[c]	*večer*	*budeš dělat*[c]
dependent	independent	temporal setting and intensified theme	*dělat* — highest degree of CD[a]
independent	dependent	temporal specification and highest degree of CD[a,b]	thematic
independent	independent	temporal setting and intensified theme	*dělat* — highest degree of CD[a]
		OR	
		temporal specification and highest degree of CD[a,b]	thematic

[a]Highest degree of CD: short for "carrier of the highest degree of CD within the non-IW section of the question".

[b]Temporal specification and highest degree of CD: in Křížková's terms, a function causing special emphasis.

[c]Strictly speaking, the TMEs of the finite verb form, *budeš dělat*, remain context independent and retain the status of transition proper throughout (cf. Firbas 1965, 1968).

The above analysis suggests the conclusion that the contextual applicability of the element opening a medial-IW question can be twofold. Further analysis of the numerous examples offered by Křížková would only corroborate this conclusion. Generally speaking, the opening element can function either as an intesified theme or as carrier of the highest degree of CD within the non-IW section of the question (conveying, in Křížková's terms, special emphasis). It is a pity that Křížková's examples are not given in context. Contexts are especially needed for the analysis of Czech and Polish examples where the

medial IW is almost invariably linked up with the IC. In such cases, the task of signalling the carrier of the highest degree of CD within the non-IW section may fall to the non-prosodic means of FSP. In this respect, the operation of context, rendering elements context dependent or context independent, becomes of utmost importance. Further examination would have to establish which structures tend to have their initial elements function as intensified themes, which as carriers of the highest degree of CD within the non-IW section, and which perhaps show an almost exclusive predilection for one function only.

It may also be asked to what extent the prosodic features of the non-IW section co-operate in signalling the function of the initial element. In my pronunciation, I could employ either of the following two intonations of the structure *Večer* co *budeš dělat? / A tatínek* kdy *chce odejet?* [*And Father when he-wants to leave?, And when does Father want to leave?], not removing the IC from the IW: (i) keeping both the initial element *Večer / A tatínek* and the elements occurring after the IW, *budeš dělat / chce odejet*, on a low level; (ii) keeping only the elements after the IW low and providing the initial element with a secondary IC. The former arrangement of the prosodic features would indicate the interpretation "As to the evening, what will you *do* then?" / "As to Father, when does he want to *leave?*", whereas the latter, the interpretation "What do you want to do in the *eve*ning?" / "When does *Father* want to leave?" The secondary IC is a functionally more important prosodic feature than low level and in consequence signals the initial element as carrier of the highest degree of CD within the non-IW section.

As the IC is invariably linked up with the IW, the two possible functions of the initial element may indeed become indistinguishable. Only as long as other means of FSP, non-prosodic and perhaps even prosodic other than the IC, are capable of signalling the function of the initial element, indistinguishableness has been eliminated. I shall discuss the consequences of the blurring phenomenon in greater detail later.

As in the initial-IW questions, even in the medial-IW questions, the IC occurring on a non-IW will unequivocally determine it as the carrier of the highest degree of CD within the non-IW section. In other words, the common feature that has been established in regard to the initial-IW questions the IC of which occurs on a non-IW can equally be established even in regard to the medial-IW question of the corresponding type. As will become evident later, this constitutes a very important point in the discussion of the so-called blurring tendency. Another important point, revealed by the above analysis and relevant to the discussion of the blurring tendency, is the fact that the invariable linking of the IW with the IC invites multifunctionality (ambiguity).

A word must be added on the final-IW question, a rare phenomenon in Slavonic languages, occurring mostly in Czech, but even there confined to colloquial speech (cf. here p. 26). In view of the rare occurrence of the IC on the IW in Czech, the regularity with which the IC falls on the final IW must be regarded as a special feature of the final-IW questions. Another special feature of this question type is the particular kind of appeal with which the required piece of information is elicited from the listener. He is, as it were, just to add the word(s) conveying the required information to a structure that has been prepared for him by the questioner: *A přijdeš si pro to...* (And you will fetch it...). The question has the unmarked (non-emotive)

word order of a declarative sentence, an order observing the FSP principle, i.e. the one observing the tendency towards the basic distribution of CD. In this respect, the final-IW questions come very near the declarative sentences. Thus the final IW in the true sense of the word fills the slot in which the carrier of the highest degree of CD, disclosing the required piece of information, would occur in a declarative sentence. It is for this reason, that I am referring to the final IW-questions as '*slot* questions'.

I trust to have shown that the IC occuring on a non-IW in an initial-IW or a medial-IW question performs an important function: it signals the carrier of the highest degree of CD within the non-IW section. It may be asked whether it is possible to identify the carrier of the highest degree of CD within such a non-IW section as does not bear the IC. Leaving aside the echo question (in which the entire non-IW section is context dependent and therefore homogeneous in regard to CD) and the slot question, I find that to a considerable extent even within such a non-IW section it is possible to identify a carrier of the highest degree of CD. This is largely due to the operation of non-prosodic means of FSP. The limitation 'to considerable extent' will appear to be justified in the discussion of the blurring tendency. The following examples are adduced in illustration of the operation of the non-prosodic means of FSP within an IC-less non-IW section. They are quoted after Křížková (249—50).

27. *Kde* je Jožo? — Slovak.
    Where is Jožo?
28. *Ke*dy si sa vrátil? — Slovak.
    *When you *refl. pron.* returned?
    When did you return?
29. *Ke*dy si bol naposledy v kine? — Slovak.
    *When you were last in cinema?
    When did you last go to the pictures?
30. *Co* dziś na obiad? — Polish.
    *What today for lunch?
    What is for lunch today?
31. *Gdzie* pan byl w tym czasie? — Polish
    *Where Mister was in that time?
    Where were you at that time?

The most natural interpretation of the non-IW sections of exx. 27—31 is pretty straightforward. The adverbials *naposledy* of 29, *dziś* of 30, and *w tym czasie* of 31 are temporal settings (the last of them can be regarded as context dependent). The finite verbs *je* of 27, *bol* of 29 express the notion of existence. The finite verb *byl* of 31, on the other hand, comes to the foreground on account of the described character of *w tym czasie* functioning as a setting (cf. the interpretation of *včera večer* here on p. 29). The carriers of the highest degree of CD within the non-IW section are in consequence *Jožo* (ex. 27), *vrátil* (28), *v kine* (29), *na obiad* (30), *byl* (31).

Two facts have emerged from the preceding discussion. In the Slavonic IW-question, the IC occurs either on the IW or on the carrier of the highest degree of CD within the non-IW section of the question. Before taking up the problem of the so-called blurring tendency, one crucial

problem must be settled. It is that of the relation between the IW and the carrier of the highest degree of CD within the non-IW section of the question. When does one or the other become bearer of the IC? As the non-IW section has been the object of our attention for some time, let me now turn to the IW and continue the examination of its status in FSP started in Chapter One (cf. here p. 19).

Analysing the Slavonic interrogative sentence, Křížková interprets the IW as rheme proper, irrespective of whether it bears the IC or not. Viewed in this light, the Slavonic interrogative sentence shows an absence of perfect congruence between the function of IC bearer and that of rheme proper. It can further be inferred from Křížková's interpretations that Slavonic languages differ as to the degree of this congruence. The greater the intensity of the so-called blurring tendency, the lower the degree of congruence between the two functions. Slavonic languages could be arranged in a scale reflecting the descending amount of congruence. Slovene, for instance, would be at the top of the scale, Russian and Polish in the middle, Czech at the bottom.

In my interpretation, offered in Chapter One and based on an analysis of English and Czech interrogative sentences, I have come to the following conclusion. The IW can be interpreted as rheme proper only if ultimately expressing the perspective, or in other words, the angle from which the listener is to approach the question, or still in other words, the focus[10] of the question. This happens when the interrogative structure functions as an echo question; its entire non-IW section being context dependent. (As was explained earlier [see here p. 34], the slot question, in which the IW functions simultaneously as rheme proper and IC bearer, presents a case sui generis in that it borders very closely on the declarative sentence sphere.) If not expressing the focus, the IW does not become IC bearer; the IC will occur on the element that expresses the focus, i.e., in my interpretation, the rheme proper of the question. In this case, it is, of course, the carrier of the highest degree of CD within the non-IW section that plays the role of focus, i.e. rheme proper. Viewed in this light, the congruence between the function of rheme proper and that of IC bearer is practically perfect in English and Czech. Deviations from this pattern (e.g., the Czech medial-IW questions, relegated to colloquial speech) are comparatively very rare. Let me recall that according to Křížková's view, invariably interpreting the IW as rheme proper, English and Czech would, on the contrary, display a very low degree of congruence between the function of rheme proper and that of IC bearer (cf. the preceding paragraph). It is evident that a further inquiry into the status of the IW in FSP has become imperative. Which is the correct interpretation?

It is worth recalling that cases in which the IW appears as context dependent are extremely rare. Normally, the IW is context independent both from the speaker's (enquirer's) point of view as well as from that of the listener (prospective informant). Seen solely from the speaker's viewpoint, the IW is the only element within the question indicating unknown information. Seen from this angle, the IW can be looked upon as the 'speaker's rheme'. The listener, perhaps subconsciously, appreciates this fact. But as long as the non-IW

[10] The term 'focus of the question' has been suggested to me by Quirk et al. (1973).

section contains at least one context independent element, he will not identify the speaker's rheme with the focus. (An entirely context dependent non-IW section is a characteristic of the echo, i.e. second instance, question; cf. here p. 19.) In any case, the function of the 'speaker's rheme' is a constant characteristic of the context independent IW. This constant characteristic plays an important role in the interplay of means of FSP.

As under the indicated circumstances the listener does not expect the IW to be the focus, the following solution suggests itself. If without the aid of the IC, the means of FSP that operate within the non-IW section signal the focus sufficiently adequately, may not the IC be free to perform another function, e.g., that of signalling the 'speaker's rheme'? The stipulated proviso fulfilled, this indeed appears to be the case.

Křížková's examples and comments show that a language can regularly place the IC on the IW as long as the non-IW section is entirely context independent. Within such a section other FSP means than the IC are as a rule capable of signalling the focus with satisfactory adequacy. On the other hand, non-IW sections that are partly context dependent and partly context independent may claim the aid of the IC to ensure a satisfactorily adequate signalling of the focus. As can be gathered from Křížková's examples, they do so especially if the role of the focus is performed by such elements as are normally context dependent (personal pronouns, see exx. 32, 33) or such as tend to be rather context dependent than independent (phrases containing a demonstrative pronoun, see ex. 35), or such as even if context independent will carry a low degree of CD (temporal, spatial, and possibly other settings, see ex. 36). It seems to be perfectly natural that elements that are normally carriers of low degrees of CD should be put in relief if they come to be rhematic: it ensures a satisfactorily adequate signalling of the focus; at the same time, it efficiently lowers the degrees of CD of those elements that are normally carriers of high degrees of CD. Viewed in this light, Křížková's term 'special emphasis' receives some justification. It follows that the IC can occur on the IW, the 'speaker's rheme', but it can only do so provided it is not called upon by the non-IW section to ensure a satisfactorily adequate signalling of the focus. (The following examples, 32—6, are quoted after Křížková [250].)

32. А сколько надобно дать *ему*? — Russian.
*And how-much necessary to-give to-him?
And how much should be given to him?

33. Kiedy *ty* pójdziesz do kina? — Polish.
*When you you-will-go to cinema?
When will you go to the pictures?

34. A prečo nevaríš v *ňom*? — Slovak.
*And why you-do-not-cook in it?
And why don't you cook in that?

35. A co sie stalo z tym *skar*bem? — Polish.
*And what *refl. pron.* it-happened with this safe.
And what did happen to this safe?

36. Ну, а где передный край проходит *теперь*? — Russian.
*Well, and where front line it passes now?
Well, and how does the first line (of defence) run now?

The table below sums up the conditions on which the IC can occur on the IW.

IW	non-IW section	IC
'speaker's rheme' and focus	context dependent	must occur on the IW
'speaker's rheme'	context independent	not claimed by the non-IW section; can occur on the IW
'speaker's rheme'	partly context dependent, partly context independent	can occur on the IW unless claimed by the non-IW section for the purpose of a satisfactorily adequate signalling of the focus

The must's and can's in the above table make it clear that the criterion of placing the IC is the requirement of a satisfactorily adequate signalling of the focus. In terms used in Chapter One, the explanatory function is hierarchically above the indicatory function (cf. here pp. 13, 15): the congruence between IC and focus is hierarchically above that between IC and 'speaker's rheme'. This makes a strong case for regarding the element expressing the focus as the rheme proper of the question.

Viewed in the above light, the deviations from the basic Slavonic type of IW-question are occasioned by, and aim at, a satisfactorily adequate signalling of the focus. As the deviations tend to become the rule, a higher degree of congruence between IC and focus is established. Czech has practically reached the end of the scale, showing almost perfect congruence between IC and focus. The very fact that this kind of congruence is displayed by two of the examined languages (Czech and English, German in fact coming under the same heading), whereas the other kind, (almost) perfect congruence between IC and 'speaker's rheme', is displayed by none of them, also testifies to the established hierarchy of the explanatory and the indicatory functions. The speaker's communicative purpose is naturally not impaired by perfect congruence between IC and focus; it would be impaired by perfect congruence between IC and 'speaker's rheme'. Viewed in this light, the 'blurring' tendency, aiming at establishing congruence between IC and focus, is in fact not a blurring tendency, but a *clarifying* one.

The observation might be made that the congruence between IC and 'speaker's rheme' represents a gross deviation from the correspondence between the gamut of CD and the gamut of prosodic weight. The deviation is indeed considerable: the IC, regarded as the most important prosodic feature, occurs on an element not functioning as rheme proper. Now this is certainly true. On the other hand, this deviation can be compensated for by the interplay of means of FSP. An important role in this interplay is performed by the described constant characteristic of the IW. The very fact that the deviation is kept within limits not to impair a satisfacorily adequate signalling of the focus suggests the solution of the problem. In view that it is kept under control, the deviation is to be interpreted as an intensification of the 'speaker's rheme'.

The fact that the so-called blurring tendency is explainable if seen in relation to the requirement for a satisfactorily adequate signalling of the focus has shown how important it is to take the listener into account. It is after all the

listener that the communication is addressed to. Another concept that cannot be interpreted without taking the listener into account is that of context dependence. The analysis of the question has shown, that in view of the communicative purpose (the narrow scene, cf. here p. 13), what is known to the speaker need not be known to the listener. If context dependence is interpreted in terms of knowledge derivable from the preceding *ad hoc* context, then the knowledge of the speaker is not equal to that of the listener.

A word of caution must be added in this connection. The mere fact of displaying or not displaying perfect congruence between IC and focus by no means renders one language superior to another. What matters is the observance of the requirement for a satisfactorily adequate signalling of the focus.

II.

Křížková's interpretation of the polar question is parallel to that of the IW-question. The rheme proper of the polar question is constituted by the inquiry about the mood of the predicate, in other words, by the speaker's desire to establish whether the mood is positive or negative (256). This invariably holds good irrespective of the position of the IC (256.02).

Rheme proper is not the only factor determining the position of the IC (making it occur on the core of the predicate, i.e. on the verb or on a nominal predicative [261]). Preceding verbal context is also in play. Křížková holds it to be responsible for what she terms contextual organization in the narrow sense of the word ('kontextové členění v užším slova smyslu' [ib.]).

Basically, there are two types of polar question in Slavonic languages. One type is entirely, or at least in its entire predicate part, context independent (rhematic, in Křížková's terms). Irrespective of sentence position its IC occurs on the core of the predicate, i.e. on the verb or on a nominal predicative. In Křížková's view, this type shows a congruence between IC bearer and what Křížková considers to be rheme proper (implemented by the verb or a nominal predicative). Křížková offers a host of examples (258—259). The following five, exx. 37—41, are quoted after her.

37. Вие *и*мате ли приятели? — Bulgarian.
    *You you-have *inter. particle* friends?
    Do you have friends?
38. Едно кафе ще *пи*ете ли? — Bulgarian.
    *One coffee will you-drink *inter. particle*?
    Will you drink one coffee?
39. Vi *po*znajete gospodicu Majstorović? — Serbo-Croatian.
    *You you-know Miss Majstorović?
    Do you know Miss Majstovorić?
40. *Mi*slite li to ozbiljno? — Serbo-Croatian.
    *You-mean *inter. part.* it seriously?
    Do you mean it seriously?
41. Отец от*пу*стит тебя в Москву? — Russian.
    *Father he-lets you to Moscow?
    Does Father let you go Moscow?

The other type of polar question contains only one context independent (in Křížková's terms, rhematic) element. This element bears the IC. There is

no congruence between IC bearer and what in Křížková's view is to be considered rheme proper. The IC signals special emphasis. Exx. 42—43, quoted after Křížková (257), will illustrate.

42. Da li je *si*gurna da ga je videla? — Serbo-Croatian.
**Two elements constituting the interrogative particle* is she-certain that him she-saw?
Is she certain that she saw him?
43. Da li je to *pro*dajna izložba? — Serbo-Croatian.
**Two elements constituting the interrogative particle* is it selling exhibition?
Is it an exhibition and sale?

The majority of Slavonic languages keep the two types of polar question — the one with special emphasis and the one without it — strictly apart (258). It is especially the South Slavonic languages that observe the distinction (ib.). In some Slavonic languages, however, a tendency towards a more or less automatic placing of the IC on the final element blurs the two types (ib.). It is especially Polish, Czech and Slovak that blur them to a very high degree (cf. 258 and 259).

The following first four questions, two Polish (exx. 44, 45) and two Slovak (exx. 46, 47), are adduced by Křížková (258, 259) in illustration of the non-emphatic type, the next group of four questions, two Polish (exx. 48, 49) and two Czech (exx. 50, 51), are meant to illustrate the 'blurring' tendency.

44. Czy Iwona ob*awiała* sie czegoś? — Polish.
**Inter. part.* Iwona [*proper name*] she-feared *refl. pron.* anything?
Did Iwona fear anything?
45. Pani *cze*ka na kogoś? — Polish.
*Lady she-waits for anybody?
Are you waiting for anybody, madam?
46. Otec to *vie*? — Slovak.
*Father it he-knows?
Does Father know it?
47. *Po*môžeš mi s tým válcom? — Slovak.
*You-will-help me with this roller?
Will you help me with this roller?
48. Czy starczy pieniędzy do pierw*szego*? — Polish.
**Inter. part.* it-will-suffice of-money to first?
Will the money suffice till the first?
49. Czy widział pan kiedyś dyskretnego dzienni*karza*? — Polish.
**Inter. part.* he-saw gentleman ever discreet journalist?
Have you ever seen a discreet journalist?
50. Zdálo se vám někdy, že *lí*táte? — Czech.
*It-dreamt *refl. pron.* to-you ever that you-fly?
Have you ever dreamt that you are flying?
51. Můžu se tady na chvilku natáhnout *na* gauč? — Czech.
I-may *refl. pron.* here for while stretch on couch?
May I stretch out here on the couch for a while?

Let me now offer some comments on Křížková's interpretation of the polar questions.

Strictly speaking, the speaker's desire for knowledge and his appeal to the listener to satisfy it is indicated by the interrogative particle and/or the TMEs of the finite verb (cf. here p. 18). I shall summarily refer to these means of the polar question as its interrogative modal elements, or for short MEl(s). On the analogy of the discussion of the IW-question, I will divide the polar

question into the MEl(s) and the non-MEl section. This distinction will prove useful in the inquiry into the FSP of the polar question.

Both from the speaker's (enquirer's) and the listener's (prospective informant's) point of view, it is most natural to interpret the MEls as pointing to, and in fact conveying, new information. The MEls will constantly do so provided they are context independent. Seen solely from the speaker's viewpoint, the MEls are the only elements within the polar question indicating unknown information. Seen from this angle, the MEls can be looked upon as the 'speaker's rheme'. As long as they are context independent, the function of the 'speaker's rheme' will be their constant characteristic. Let me emphasize in this connection that it is indeed very rare for the MEls to be context dependent. This could happen within second instance (e.g., when a polar question is repeated in order to single out an element of the non-MEl section for sharp contrast; *Are you flying to* PRAGUE *with your family?*)

In contrast with the IW, the MEls do not always appear in separate word forms. The prepositive interrogative particle appears in such a form (cf. exx. 42, 43, 44, 48, 49); it can even bear the IC.[11] This does not, however, apply to the enclitic particle (cf. ex. 40). As to the modal exponent of the Slavonic verb, it is not only identical with the temporal exponent in form, but appears in separate word form far less frequently than its English counterpart. (Opening the polar question and occurring before the 'subject — notional verb — etc.' sequence, the English auxiliary verb in fact performs a function similar to that of the prepositive interrogative particle.) It follows that far more frequently than its English counterpart, the modal exponent of the Slavonic verb appears as a bound morpheme, welded together with the notional component into a one-word finite verb form. It should be emphasized that the finite verb form, English or Slavonic, taken as a whole, functions in both sections of the polar question. This fact appears to be of considerable importance for a better understanding of the FSP of the polar question.

Let me now briefly turn to the non-MEl section of the polar question. From the speaker's point of view, it conveys known information. It constitutes the 'speaker's theme'. But recalling the argumets adduced earlier, we know that this is not the listener's interpretation; nor is this interpretation in harmony with the communicative purpose of the question. From the listener's point of view, the non-MEl section is either entirely new (i.e. conveying only new information) or only partly new; in other words, it is either entirely context independent, or partly context independent and partly context dependent.

Křížková holds that when forming the question the speaker presupposes either no knowledge or some knowledge on the part of the listener (256—7). She regards the context dependent part as thematic, the context independent part as rhematic (258—9). If the entire question is context independent, it will in consequence be entirely rhematic. In my terms, such an interpretation would point to two degrees or merely one degree of CD displayed by the non-MEl section of the question; both the context dependent and the context independent part of the non-MEl section would then be homogeneous in regard to CD.

[11] In Bulgarian and Macedonian, for instance: Bulg. *Дали ще ни изиграе някоя?* (**Interrogative and future particles* to-us she-will-dance she-somebody. Will anybody dance to us?). (Cf. Křížková 1968.257.)

As I see it, a context independent part of the non-MEl section that consists of more than one element will as a rule not be homogeneous in regard to CD. The elements constituting it display various degrees of CD. They are heterogeneous in regard to CD, one of them carrying the highest degree. It is this element that constitutes the focus of the question. An MEl can come to function as focus only if the entire non-MEl section is context dependent. This once again brings up the problem of congruence between IC and focus.

An analysis of Křížková's examples yields an interpretation parallel to that of the IW-question offered in the first part of the present chapter. This time I will summarize the interpretation first and substantiate it by comments on Křížková's examples afterwards.

Any element within the non-MEl section, including the notional component of the verb, can come to express the focus.[12] As has already been pointed out, an MEl can express the focus only when the entire non-MEl section is context dependent. This happens when an MEl is singled out for sharp, heavy (second instance) contrast.

It is only an MEl that can express the 'speaker's rheme'. This is an important aspect of the described constant characteristic of the MEls. The listener will not expect any other element to perform this function. On the other hand, he will not expect the MEl(s) to convey the focus unless very special circumstances arise (cf. the preceding paragraph).

Even in the Slavonic polar question, the IC can perform one of two functions: it signals the focus or the 'speaker's rheme'. It is practically permitted to signal the latter only as long as the former is signalled with satisfactory adequacy through the interplay of other FSP means. An important role in this interplay is performed by the described constant characteristic of the MEls. A failure to achieve satisfactory adequacy in signalling the focus leads to multifunctionality and prevents an unequivocal signalling of the focus. Congruence between IC and focus is given priority over congruence between IC and speaker's rheme. This makes a strong case for regarding the focus as the rheme proper of the polar question.

As in the sphere of IW-questions, even in that of the polar question the so-called blurring tendency is at work. The feature shared by Křížková's

[12] The term 'focus of the question' has been suggested to me by Quirk et al. (1973). In the examples adduced by them (52—3), the elements interpreted as conveying the focus correspond to what is signalled as focus by the interplay of means of FSP. Restan (1972) uses the term 'искомое' (the item looked for); it in fact denotes the context independent part of the non-MEl section. How one structure can appear in various perspectives, changing the focus accordingly, is aptly illustrated by Bauer et al. (1960.24). For the purposes of the present study, I have not found it necessary to pay particular attention to various subtypes of the pronominal and the polar question. In one way or other, all the subtypes serve the two basic functions of the question, i.e. the indicatory (speaker oriented) and the explanatory (listener oriented) function. Thus even the subtype that involves only one interlocutor (the one uttering the question) and the subtype involving a passive addressee (one who is not expected actively to respond) serve the two basic functions. The former subtype is represented by the so-called deliberative questions (cf. Bauer—Grepl 1970.22—3), i.e. such as are put by the speaker to himself. True enough, the roles of the speaker and listener (addressee) are performed by one person, but they are performed none the less and correspond to the two basic functions of the question. The latter subtype is represented by rhetorical questions. In that case, the addressee is in fact a 'mute', an actor with no spoken part, but the question calculates on his existence. (For various subtypes of question, see, e.g., Bauer-Grepl 1970, Restan 1972).

cases of special emphasis and those displaying the 'blurring' tendency is the occurrence of the IC on the carrier of the highest degree of CD within the non-MEl section, i.e. on the focus of the question. This once again shows that the 'blurring' tendency aims at establishing congruence between the IC and the focus. Removing multifunctionality, it ensures an unequivocal signalling of the focus. Viewed in this light, the so-called blurring tendency is in fact a clarifying one.

Before starting the comments on Křížková's examples I must insert a word on the function of the IC borne by a finite verb form. It has become clear that in polar questions the IC can occur on this form for more than one reason. Let me illustrate this by surveying the functions the IC can perform when occurring on a one-word finite verb form.

Any semantic item conveyed by the finite verb can be singled out for sharp, heavy (second instance) contrast. It may be the semantic content of the notional component or any of the semantic items conveyed by the TMEs.[13] Thus the finite verb *pracuje* in PRA*CUJE*[14] *tatínek doma?* (*He-works Father at-home?, Does Father work at home?) may appear in second instance contrast, for example on account of the notional component (*Does Father* WORK *at home?*), or on account of the temporal item (DOES *Father work at home?, does* occurring in contrast, e.g., to *did, will,* etc), or for the sake of clarifying the modality (DOES *Father work at home?, does* appearing in contrast, e.g., to *would, might,* etc.), or for the sake of clarifying the yes-no polarity (DOES *Father work at home*?, *does* appearing in contrast to *does not*). (Cf. Firbas, 1968.16.) The item appearing in contrast constitutes the focus, the rest of the semantic context of the question being context dependent. The IC occurs on the finite verb just on account of one particular semantic item. All cases display a congruence between IC and focus.

Outside the sphere of sharp, heavy (second instance) contrast, i.e. within first instance, the IC will occur on the finite verb form either to signal the notional component as focus, or merely in order to signal the 'speaker's rheme', expressed by the MEl. The first case displays congruence between IC bearer and focus, the second, congruence between IC and 'speaker's rheme'.

It is worth noticing that the 'blurring' tendency, operating within first instance, discourages the placing of the IC on the finite verb if merely the 'speaker's rheme' is to be signalled. Placing the IC on the verb only if its notional component conveys the focus, the 'blurring' tendency operates in harmony with its aim to establish congruence between IC bearer and focus.

I can now begin my comments on Křížková's examples. Let me first examine exx. 37—41. I will concentrate my attention on the carrier of the highest degree of CD within the non-MEl section: the conveyer of the focus.

Křížková does not give the contexts of her examples, but it is most natural to assume that the pronouns (*Bue, vi, to, меба* in 37, 38, 40, 41, respectively)

---

[13] The stress, however, does not change its position. It is evidently only in metalinguistic contexts and within second instance that a shift of stress can occur within a finite verb form. For instance, *Půj*DE *se na to podívat*? [He-will-go *refl. pr.* at it look?], with a heavy contrastive stress on *-de* (meaning *Will* HE *go to a look at it*?), might be heard in the class-room when put in contrast, e.g., with *Půjdeš se na to podívat* [You-will-go *refl. pr.* at it look?].

[14] The notional component and the TMEs of the finite verb form *pracuje* are *prac-* and *-uje.*

are context dependent and therefore not to be regarded as carriers of the highest degree of CD within the respective non-MEl sections. It is equally natural to assume that in 41, *отец*, together with *тебя*, constitutes the thematic section (made up of the carriers of the lowest degrees of CD). In consequence, it remains to decide whether it is the notional component of the verb (the TMEs belonging to the MEl section) on the one hand, or the object (*приятели* in 37, *едно кафе* in 38, *gospodicu Majstorović* in 39), the adverbial of manner (*ozbiljno* in 40) and the adverbial of direction (*в Москву* in 41) on the other, that carries the highest degree of CD within the non-MEl section. Provided the mentioned modifiers of the verb are context independent, they will carry a higher degree of CD than the verb and function as the carriers of the highest degree of CD within the non-MEl section and convey the focus.

It is certainly possible to think of contexts in which the mentioned modifiers would be context dependent. Other things being equal, it would be the notional component of the verb that would convey the focus.

In either case, i.e. no matter whether the focus is conveyed by the verbal modifier or by the notional component of the verb, the IC occurs on the verb. Its function, however, is not to signal the focus, but the 'speaker's rheme', expressed by the MEl. The examined examples display no IC-focus congruence, but merely IC-'speaker's rheme' congruence. Outside context, the known non-prosodic and prosodic features of the examined question structures do not signal the focus unequivocally.

The type represented by exx. 42 and 43, on the other hand, permits only of one interpretation. *Sigurna* and *prodajna* are the only context independent elements in the non-MEl sections of 42 and 43, respectively. Each carries the highest degree of CD within the non-MEl section and consequently conveys the focus. Exx. 42 and 43 show perfect congruence between IC and focus. Even outside context, the IC signals the focus unequivocally.

Before turning my attention to the exx. 44—57, I find it very instructive to examine the following Russian examples adduced by Křížková (256).

52. У вас *есть* патефон? — Russian.
*With you is gramophone?
Have you got a gramophone?

53. Закуска *будет*? — Russian.
*Dessert it-will-be?
Will there be a dessert?

54. За*куска* будет? — Russian.
[The same as under 53.]

55. Ви *служили* в армии? — Russian.
*You served in army?
Did you serve in the army?

56. Вы служили в *армии*? — Russian.
[The same as under 55.]

57. Дале*ко* ушли? — Russian.
*Far they-went?
Did they go far?

58. У*дачно* там наступление идет? — Russian.
*Successfully there offensive goes?
Does the offensive develop successfully there?

Like the question structures adduced under 37—41, those given under 52, 53 and 55 (with the ICs respectively occuring on *есть*, *будет*, and *служили*

can certainly function in more than one perspective. It would certainly be possible and quite natural to regard *патефон, закуска, в армии* as context independent and in consequence as carriers of the highest degree of CD within the non-MEl section and conveyers of the focus (*патефон* and *закуска* expressing objects existing or appearing on the scene, *в армии* expressing a local specification). If occurring in these perspectives, the discussed structures show no IC-focus congruence. The IC, occurring on the finite verb form, signals the 'speaker's rheme' and occasions IC-'speaker's rheme' congruence.

Congruence between IC and focus will occur within the examined structures (retaining the IC on the finite verb) if the verb comes to convey the focus. Context has to determine which particular item of the complex semantic content of the verb it is on account of which the IC occurs on the verb. It can do so, for instance, on account of the semantic item of existence, which constitutes the basis of the notional component of the verb. In that case the focus belongs to the non-MEl section of the question. Within second instance, however, the IC can occur on the finite verb form even on account of any semantic item expressed by the TMEs (cf. Firbas 1968.16). If it is the inquiry about the positive or negative mood itself that is singled out for sharp, heavy contrast and consequently comes to function as focus, the IC will occur on the finite verb form on account of the MEl (cf. here p. 42).

Exx. 54, 56, 57 and 58 allow of only one interpretation. Bearing the IC, the verbal modifiers *закуска, в армии, далеко, удачно* cannot be regarded as context dependent. (The IC never occurs on a context independent element.) Consequently, they carry a higher degree of CD than the notional component of the verb; they become carriers of the highest degree of CD within the non-MEl section and conveyers of the focus. Exx. 54, 56, 57 and 58 show perfect congruence between IC and focus.

The analysis of the Russian examples, which could be multiplied, has highlighted one important aspect of the Russian 'blurring' tendency. Russian can put the IC even on such non-verbal elements as are not the only context independent items within the non-MEl section (cf. here p. 41). This means that Russian can put the IC even on such elements as (in Křížková's terms) are not liable to special emphasis, but nevertheless (according to my interpretation) convey the focus. The 'blurring' tendency raises the frequency of IC-focus congruence.

Let me now turn to exx. 44—51, illustrating the Polish, Slovak and Czech use of polar questions. All the examples show perfect IC-focus congruence. This applies both to the examples in which the IC bearer is the verb (44—7) and to those in which the IC is borne by a non-verbal element (48—51). (The verb form *lítáte* of 50 has been interpreted as belonging to the object clause *že lítáte* and the IC falling on the verb as belonging to the entire clause).[15]

The non-verbal elements bearing the IC express a temporal specification (48), a spatial specification (51), an object (49, 50). Elements of this kind, if context independent (as they actually are in the discussed examples), carry a higher degree of CD than the verb under the circumstances; they in fact carry the highest degree of CD within the non-MEl part and convey the focus. They show perfect IC-focus congruence.

[15] The subordinate clause is interpreted here as one communicative unit (cf. Svoboda 1968.72).

As to the verbal modifiers of the examples in which the verb is an IC bearer, they are incidentally all objects. Two of them (46, 47) are context dependent. Other two (44, 45) are context independent, but being indefinite pronouns, they do not exceed the verb in CD. The verbal IC bearers are all carriers of the highest degree of CD within the non-MEl section and focus conveyers: they show perfect congruence between IC and focus.

Examples could be multiplied. They would show that a truly overwhelming majority of Polish, Slovak and Czech polar questions show an interplay of FSP means the outcome of which is perfect IC-focus congruence. The Polish, Czech and Slovak polar questions indeed show an extremely high degree of satisfactory adequacy in focus signalization.

An analysis of the Polish, the Slovak or the Czech polar question that is carried out on the lines indicated above, i.e. an analysis that does not consider the context independent section of the polar question to be invariably homogeneous in regard to CD and pays due attention to the interplay of means within it, also leads to the following conclusion. In principle, there is no automatic placing of the IC on the verb or on the final element.

If in Polish, Slovak or Czech, the IC occurs on a final element (which may be a verb), it is so because in all three languages the leading word order principle is that of FSP. This principle applies both to declarative and to interrogative clauses, and manifests itself in arranging the elements in accordance with the basic distribution of CD. The carrier of the highest degree of CD is placed last. Deviations from this arrangement, which may result in placing the IC on a non-final carrier of the highest degree of CD (which may be a verb), render the order more or less marked (more or less emotive). In regard to the IC occurring on the verb, the situation may be summed up as follows. If in a Polish, Czech or Slovak polar question, the IC occurs on the verb, then in an overwhelming majority of cases it is so because the verb conveys the focus (either within the non-MEl or in the MEl section; cf. here p. 42). It is not because, through its MEl, the verb expresses the 'speaker's rheme'.

I believe that the above observations can also throw some light on a Russian way of IC realization pointed out by Křížková (259—60). In Russian the syllable bearing the IC receives high pitch and is followed by a fall. The fall sometimes begins only before the stressed syllable of the next word, the syllables occurring after the IC and before the beginning of the fall retaining high pitch. The fall may be deferred even further and occur only before the last stressed syllable of the question, the high pitch being sustained even over a number of words.

The examples given below are quoted from Křížková's study. Following her practice, I use different type to bring out the deferring phenomenon. The first italicized syllable is the one on which the IC occurs, the subsequent first syllable in ordinary print the one before which the fall takes place.

59. У вас *есть* *сво*бодные номера? — Russian.
*With you is vacant rooms?
Have you a room vacant?

60. А ты *умеешь* *ка*таться? — Russian.
*And you you-know to-skate?
And do you know how to skate?

61. Вы давно знакомы с моим мужем? — Russian.
*You for-a-long-time acquainted with my husband?
You have already known my husband for a long time, haven't you?

62. Сашу можно попросить? — Russian.
*Sasha (*accus.*) possible to-ask?
Can Sasha be asked?

63. Вы говорите по-английски? — Russian.
*You you-speak in-English?
Do you speak English?

64. Не пробовали ли вы считать? — Russian.
*Not you-tried *inter. part.* you to-count?
Did you not try to count?

65. Ты смотрела вчера телевизор? — Russian.
*You you-watched yesterday television-set?
Did you watch television yesterday?

It is of particular interest to realize to what kind of word the fall is deferred. In Křížková's examples, it is most natural to interpret this word as the carrier of the highest degree of CD within the non-MEl section and hence as the focus of the question. Let me give at least a rough analysis of the adduced examples (59—65).

It is certainly most natural to assume that the elements *у вас* (59), *ты* (60), *Вы* (61), *вы* (63), *вы* (64), *ты* (65), *с моим мужем* (61), *Сашу* (62) can be regarded as context dependent and hence as carriers of the lowest degrees of CD. It is equally natural to assume that the other elements are context independent. If this is so, then a subject expressing a phenomenon existing on the scene (*свободные номера* of 59) will carry a higher degree of CD than a verb merely expressing existence (*есть*) (cf. Firbas 1966, p. 243). An object (*кататься* of 60, *считать* of 64, *телевизор* of 65) expressing an absolutely essential amplification of the meaning of the finite verb (*умеешь* of 60, *пробовали* of 64, *смотрела* of 65) will carry a higher degree of CD than the finite verb (cf., e. g. Firbas 1959. 46). On similar lines *попросить* (62) can be looked upon as an absolutely essential semantic amplification of *можно*. The adverbial element of manner *по-английски* (63), adding an essential specification of the action expressed by the finite verb (*говорите*), equally shows a higher degree of CD than the latter. *Вчера* (65) is understandably given no prosodic prominence as it merely expresses a temporal setting. Even *давно* (61) appears to be a mere temporal setting, attention being focused rather on the notion of acquaintance than on that of its duration. If my interpretation of the functional aspect of the deferring phenomenon is correct, it will be in harmony with the prosodic features displayed. Ex. 65 would then be a case of prosodic features removing multifunctionality (under the circumstances preventing *давно* from being interpreted as a temporal specification). The analysis that has just been offered bears out the interpretation that the words to which the fall in pitch has been deferred are carriers of the highest degrees of CD within the non-MEl sections and hence the foci of the questions.

Křížková notes (259) that the deferring of the fall towards the end of the question may recall Czech usage. But she finds such an analogy to be only a seeming one. In her opinion, it is the last rise within the question, not the ensueing fall, that signals the IC bearer.

Now it may well be that even in polar questions showing the deferring phenomenon, the last rise would have to be interpreted as the IC. It would

then serve to signal the 'speaker's rheme'.[16] The deferring phenomenon, however, serves to signal the focus of the question. In this respect, there is an analogy between Russian and Czech, the deferring phenomenon proving to be just another symptom (indication) of the tendency aiming at satisfactory adequacy in signalling the focus. If this explanation, paying due regard to function, is correct, it views the deferring phenomenon in a wider setting, demonstrating that it is not merely a matter of prosodic form.

Let me now briefly turn to German questions. Křížková quotes examples from O. von Essen's *Grundzüge der hochdeutschen Satzintonation* to prove that like Czech, German frequently puts the IC on the final element or on the verb. She finds that this applies both to IW and to polar questions. Let me adduce the examples and add some comment.

66. Hast du den Boten ge*sehen*?
67. Ist der Wein in diesem Jahr gut ge*raten*?
68. Waren Sie nicht in Kopen*hagen*?
69. Wo *fehlt* es?
70. Wer *sagt* es?
71. Wem gehört dieser *Schirm*?

It is worth noticing that in addition to, or to be more exact, before giving the intonation instanced here by 66, von Essen intones the same question structure in a different way, placing the IC on *den Boten* (*Hast du den Boten gesehen?*). As has been shown elsewhere (Firbas 1959.45—6; 1969) an object will carry a higher degree of CD than the verb if context independent. This holds good irrespective of sentence position. This explains why the most natural intonation of *Hast du einen Boten gesehen* would be the one placing the IC on *einen Boten*. (As has been shown elsewhere, [Firbas 1957.29—41; 1966.241—5] the most natural FSP function of the non-generic indefinite article is the signalization of context independence. The definite article, though required by context dependent elements, is not exclusively confined to the context dependent section of the sentence.)[17] All this goes to show that as long as it is context independent, the object of the question structure *Hast du den/einen Boten gesehen* will carry a higher degree of CD than the verb and under the circumstances function as the focus of the question.

In none of the examined versions has the IC been put on the verb or on the element in end position automatically. Neither has it automatically fallen on the finite verbs in 69 and 70 (*fehlt, sagst*). In each case, the IC occurs on the finite verb, because the latter undoubtedly carries the highest degree of CD within the non-IW section, the only other element within this section being a pronoun (*es*). The IC could occur on the finite verb of 71 (*gehört*) if *dieser Schirm* were context dependent. (It is not difficult to imagine a suitable context such as 'Was machen wir nun mit diesem *Schirm*? Wem ge*hört* dieser Schirm?', *dieser Schirm* being replaceable by *er*.) Bearing the IC, *dieser Schirm* is context independent. (A suitable context, for instance, would be: 'Was machen wir

[16] In Křížková's examples, the IC as a rule occurs on a verb. Those in which it does not are verbless questions. It is interesting to note that the IC then occurs on elements that in regard to semantic content come close the TMEs (cf. давно of 61 expressing time, можно of 62 expressing modality).

[17] According to circumstances, *den Boten* could either be replaced by a pronoun (*ihn*) or not.

nun mit allen diesen *Sa*chen? Wem gehört dieser *Schirm*?', *diesen* being not used anaphorically, but cataphorically). In 68 *in Kopenhagen* is a context independent spatial specification and cannot but function as the negation and question focus. As to the question structure instanced by 67, it is certainly most natural to interpret *der Wein* and *in diesem Jahre* as carriers of the lowest degrees of CD. (Of course, other perspectives, with the IC on *der Wein* or *in diesem Jahre*, could be thought of. They are actually given by von Essen. They would naturally put *der Wein* or *in diesem Jahre* in—not necessarily heavy—contrast.) Let me add that in my opinion the most natural use of the structure would put the IC on *gut*, for a context independent *gut* develops the communication further than *geraten*, specifying (evaluating) the outcome of the process.[18]

CHAPTER THREE

I believe to have reached a point at which I can offer some evaluative comment on the conclusions arrived at in Chapters One and Two and attempt some further elaborations. The basic conclusion arrived at in Chapter One is that in unmarked use, i.e. within first instance, neither the IW of the pronominal question nor the TMEs of the polar question function as rheme proper. This conclusion has been fully corroborated by Chapter Two.

In Chapter One, the question of the exact FSP status of the IW has been left open. The IW has been interpreted as transitional, admittedly coming near, or perhaps even occurring in, the periphery of the rheme (see here p. 19). As to the FSP status of the interrogative TMEs, it has been pointed out that they participate in constituting transition proper, but on account of the semantic item of interrogative mood carry a higher degree of CD than the declarative TMEs (see here p. 18). Let me now attempt an elaboration of these statements. But before doing so, I have to insert a note on terminology.

In some Slavonic types of polar question, the speaker's desire to establish whether the mood is positive or negative can also be signalled by an interrogative particle. This has necessitated the introduction of a designation covering both the interrogative particle of the polar question and the TMEs. For the purposes of this study, the designation 'interrogative modal elements of the polar question', or for short 'MEls', has been adopted (see here p. 39). It is restricted here to polar question phenomena.

Substituting for unknown information to be disclosed in the reply and expressing the 'speaker's rheme', the IW and the MEls operate in a kind of partnership with the element expressing the 'listener's rheme', i.e., the focus, the rheme proper, of the question. The 'speaker's rheme' is constantly related to the 'listener's rheme' (the focus of the question) in a way similar to that in

[18] At the moment, I can offer this explanation only as a conjecture, but I feel convinced that if a high enough number of educated native German speakers were asked to intone structure 67 out of context (to ensure that both *gut* and *geraten* are interpreted as context independent), an overwhelming majority of them would put the IC on *gut*. (Cf. also Firbas 1972, and Uhlířová 1974.)

which the negative particle is related to the focus of negation. The following Czech and English sentences will illustrate:

72. Tatínek večer doma *ne*pracuje.
    *Father evening at-home he-does-not-work.
    Father does not *work* at home in the evening.
73. Tatínek nepracuje doma *večer*.
    *Father he-does-not-work at-home evening.
    Father does not work at home in the *even*ing.
74. Večer doma nepracuje *ta*tínek.
    *Evening at-home he-does-not-work Father.
    *Fa*ther does not work at home in the evening.

Each sentence shows a different focus of negation, signalled by the IC; in each the negative particle enters into a different kind of partnership. Like the MEls of a 'first instance' polar question, or the IW of a 'first instance' pronominal question, the negative particle does not function as rheme proper, but merely accompanies it occurring in the periphery of the rheme.

Like the IW of the pronominal question and the MEls of the polar question, the negative particle can itself become focus, i.e. rheme proper, within second instance. Like them, it can be singled out for sharp, heavy contrast (cf. here, e.g., p. 42), all the other elements becoming context dependent. Hence it is the negative particle on account of which the forms *NEPRACUJE* (ex. 75) and *DOESN'T* (ex. 77) bear the IC. In 76 the negative particle occurs in formal isolation.

75. Tatínek večer doma NEPRACUJE.
76. Father does NOT work at home.
77. Father DOESN'T work at home.

Of special interest are negative questions. They are structures in which interrogativeness is combined with negativeness. Let us briefly examine the following examples. They all function within first instance.

78. Tatínek večer doma *ne*pracuje?
    Father does not *work* at home in the evening?
79. Tatínek nepracuje doma *večer*?
    Father does not work at home in the *even*ing?
80. Večer doma nepracuje *ta*tínek?
    *Fa*ther does not work at home in the evening?

It is worth noticing that in exx 78—80 the focus of negation is identical with the focus of interrogation. This means that in the sense explained above, the MEl and the negative particle share one and the same partner. Even this is in harmony with interpreting the focus of negation/interrogation as rheme proper. Within second instance, of course, either the negative particle or the MEl can appear in focus, i.e. function as rheme proper. But within second instance, the 'periphery in the rheme—rheme proper' partnership has become effaced.

It follows from the above interpretations that in comparison with the declarative TMEs, the interrogative TMEs carry a higher degree of CD: they additionally express interrogativeness. It is the TMEs of the polar question that show a particular rise in CD. This is because functionally speaking, they correspond to the IW of the pronominal question. All this is in harmony with the observations made in Chapter One. In Chapter Two, these observations

are only improved upon by consistently interpreting both the IW of the pronominal question and the TMEs of the polar question as operating in the periphery of the rheme.

Now the TMEs of the polar question operate in the periphery of the rheme solely through their semantic item of yes-no polarity. The other items constitute transition proper. This testifies to the semantic heterogeneity of the finite verb, semantic heterogeneity entailing heterogeneity in CD. (Not all the items constituting the semantic content of the finite verb equal in the extent to which they contribute to the further development of communication.) Moreover, it shows that the described heterogeneity is not necessarily due merely to the finite verb consisting of a notional and non-notional component, but possibly also to the semantic and the CD heterogeneity of the non-notional component. In this connection let me add a note on the function of the non-notional component on the level of FSP. I will do so by briefly commenting on how *-uje*, the non-notional component of *pracuje* (*he/she/it-works) functions in FSP. All the comments apply only to first instance.

Expressing tense and mood, *-uje* is a TME and functions as transition proper (cf. here p. 16 and Firbas 1965, 1968). It has to be borne in mind, however, that it also expresses person and number; in this respect it is an exponent of person and number, or in short, a PNE. The *-l* of the ending *-oval* of *pracoval* (*he-worked) even expresses gender (cf. *pracoval*—*he worked, *pracovala*—*she-worked, *pracovalo*—*it-worked) and consequently is an exponent of gender, or in short, a GE. Moreover, *-uje* and *-oval* express aspect, or—to use a term borrowed from Czech and appropriately introduced by Poldauf (1965. 1236)—'vid', and functions as a VE. Now as a VE,*-uje* participates in constituting transition proper. As a PNE, in a majority of cases, it participates in constituting the theme (*Petr/Ø pracuje na zahradě*, *Petr/Ø he-works in garden). Occasionally, it points to the rheme (*Na zahradě pracuje Petr*, *In garden he-works Peter). It does not enter it, however, because it merely points to it, operating in an anticipatory pro-form manner.

All these observations testify to the semantic as well as the CD heterogeneity of *-uje* and *-oval*. It may even be argued that the temporal and the modal elements can differ in CD. A case in point may be, for instance, the recurrence in a string of sentences making up a narrative, the recurrence rendering them context dependent and therefore thematic (cf. Lyons 1968.336). There are, however, functions that keep *-uje* and *-oval* within transition proper. In performing these functions, both the temporal and the modal elements are involved.

Let me recall that under the above heading come such functions as are absolutely *sui generis*, uniquely connected with the very moment of utterance (spoken or written) and therefore non-recoverable from the preceding verbal context (see here p. 13). They include the establishment of the relation between the language event (cf. here p. 16) and the corresponding extra-lingual event (the extra-lingual correlate). The indication of the speaker's role and his assessment of what he is saying is of particular importance here, both role and assessment being performed for every language event (clause) afresh and anew. Let me add that another feature, also uniquely connected with the moment of utterance, is the establishment of a link between theme and rheme (or to be more exact, between the thematic and the non-thematic section of

the language event); it ensues from the very communicative purpose motivating the language event and is equally underivable from the preceding verbal context (cf. Adamec 1966.22—3, Daneš 1970.7, Firbas 1973.136).

Heterogeneity in CD resulting from semantic heterogeneity renders the non-notional component of the finite verb capable of pointing to the theme on the one hand and the rheme on the other, its function of transition proper remaining thereby unblurred. Heterogeneity renders the non-notional component of the finite verb form an efficient connecting device, for pointing to the items to be connected is undoubtedly fully comparable with the very mediating function of a link.

In polar questions, through the semantic item of yes-no polarity, the non-notional component of the finite verb can even reach the periphery of the rheme. Viewed in this light, the wording employed in Chapter One and exluding the TMEs from the rhematic section (see here p. 19) may not seem to be fully adequate. As I see it, however, the periphery of the rheme is to be understood as a 'border-strip' between transition and rheme. It is in this sense that the wording of Chapter One should be understood and perhaps amended.

As has been explicitly stated, the above observations on the function of the non-notional component of the finite verb in FSP apply only to first instance. Within second instance, or anyway within genuine second instance (not to fail to take account of 'borderline cases' between first and second instance; cf. Firbas 1968.17), semantic heterogeneity naturally remains. CD heterogeneity however, is reduced to a minimum; as is well known, this is because within genuine second instance, the syntactic structure appears in sharp, heavy contrast only because of one item of its semantic content, this item constituting (frequently an extensive) theme proper; second instance contrast eliminates transition. (It might be argued that even within the non-contrasted section of the semantic content the degrees of CD remain discernible. As I see it, such an interpretation could be based on a reminiscence of unmarked, first instance use which a structure may evoke even when occurring within second instance). With regard to form, the IC occurs on the formal element that expresses the semantic item on account of which the entire syntactic structure appears in second instant contrast. The prosodic feature, the amount of prosodic weight to be borne by this formal element, is decided by the degree of CD carried by the contrasted semantic item. In the light of these statements, an IC occurring on an IW or a finite verb form merely to signal the 'speaker's rheme', not the focus (rheme proper), must appear as a gross deviation from a perfect correspondence between the gamut of prosodic weight and the gamut of CD. This has been duly appreciated in Chapter Two (cf. here pp. 37—8). At the same time, however, a highly important phenomenon has been demonstrated: the occurrence of the IC on a Slavonic IW or a Slavonic finite merely for the purpose of signalling the 'speaker's rheme' is kept well under control by the interplay of means of FSP. The IC can signal the 'speaker's rheme' provided the focus (rheme proper) is signalled with sufficient adequacy by other FSP means — non-prosodic and prosodic other than the IC. In short, the placing of the IC is ultimately controlled by the interplay of means of FSP. This ensures a still high enough degree of correspondence between the gamut of prosodic weight and the gamut of CD. On this point, the conclusions arrived at in Chapter One and those arrived at in Chapter Two are in perfect agreement.

Moreover, even if not valid for Slavonic languages in general, the claim raised by Chapter One that the IW or the TMEs lose their transitional status the moment they themselves become bearers of the IC (cf. here p. 19) is valid for English, a language in which IC-focus congruence is practically perfect.

I have now proceeded far enough to be in a position to answer the question posed at the beginning of Chapter Two. Have the conclusions concerning the English and Czech questions and arrived at in Chapter One been corroborated by the conclusions concerning the Slavonic question in general and arrived at in Chapter Two? I trust that they have. By way of conclusion, let me briefly recapitulate.

The principles that determine the interplay of means of FSP operating within the question are the same as those that determine the interplay of FSP means within the declarative sentence. They apply not only to English, Czech and German, but also to the Slavonic languages other than Czech. They will, however not be understood if the FSP of the question is interpreted only in terms of 'speaker's rheme' and 'speaker's theme'. The listener's point of view cannot be neglected. But the FSP of the question will not be properly understood if from this point of view the context independent part (apart from the 'speaker's rheme', which is also context independent from this viewpoint) is considered to be as homogeneous in regard to CD as the context dependent part. In order to secure a better understanding of the FSP of the question, a higher degree of delicacy (cf. here p. 11) is needed. This will enable the identification of the focus, i.e. the rheme proper of the question.

An important role within the interplay of FSP means is performed by the IW and the MEls. Their specific semantic content makes them serve as signals of the 'speaker's rheme' and may permit of a high degree of their prosodic intensification.[19] It is of great significance that this intensification is kept within limits by the interplay of means of FSP. The limits are determined by the requirement that the focus should be signalled with satisfactory adequacy. The fact that the prosodic intensification of the 'speaker's rheme' is kept to a minimum within English, Czech and German, and under adequate control in Slavonic languages other than Czech (though the extent of the intensification displayed by them varies) testifies to the focus being hierarchically superior to the 'speaker's rheme'. It bears out the view that the explanatory function of the question is hierarchically superior to its indicatory function (cf. here p. 37). Let me recall that the so-called special emphasis and the so-called blurring tendency discussed in connection with the Slavonic question efficiently participate in keeping the prosodic intensification under control. They reduce the possible multifunctionality in FSP of an interrogative sentence structure, unequivocally signalling the focus; in other words, they clarify the FSP of the structure. In interpreting the perspective in which an interrogative sentence structure functions in the act of communication both the speaker's and the listener's point of view must be taken into consideration and their hierarchy duly observed.

---

[19] With due alterations, what has been said about the prosodic intensification of the IW (cf. here p. 37) applies also to that of the MEls.

REFERENCES

Adamec, P. (1966). *Porjadok slov v sovremennom russkom jazyke* [Word order in present-day Russian] (Prague).

Akhmanova, O. S., Mikaeljan, G. B. (1963). *Sovremennyje sintaksičeskije těoriji.* [Present-day theories of syntax]. (Moscow). Rev. English version: *The theory of syntax in modern linguistics* (The Hague, 1969).

Bauer, J., Grepl, M. (1970). *Skladba spisovné češtiny.* [A syntax of Standard Czech] (Prague).

Bauer, J., Mrázek, R., Žaža, S. (1960). *Příruční mluvnice ruštiny pro Čechy* [A handbook of Russian grammar for Czechs] (Prague).

Beneš, E. (1959). Začátek německé věty z hlediska aktuálního členění větného. [The beginning of the German sentence from the point of view of functional sentence perspective], *Časopis pro moderní filologii* 41.205—17 (Prague).

Bolinger, D. L. (1952). Linear modification, *PMLA* 1952. 1117—1144; republished in *Forms of English.*

Bolinger, D. L. (1957). *Interrogative structures of American English,* Publications of the American Dialect Society 28 (Alabama).

Bolinger, D. L. (1965). *Forms of English. Accent, Morpheme, Order* (Tokyo).

Daneš, F. (1949). Intonace otázky [The intonation of the interrogative sentence], *Naše řeč* 33.63—8 (Prague).

Daneš, F. (1957). *Intonace a věta ve spisovné češtině* [Sentence and intonation in present-day Standard Czech] (Prague).

Daneš, F. (1964). A three-level approach to syntax, *Travaux linguistiques de Prague* 1.225—40 (Prague).

Daneš, F. (1970). *FSP and the organisation of the text* (a preliminary version), mimeographed for the conference on functional sentence perspective in Mariánské Lázně, held in 1970 by the Institue of Czech Language of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences (Prague); published in Daneš 1974. 106—28.

Daneš, F., editor (1974). Papers on Functional Sentence Perspective (Prague).

Essen, O. van (1964). *Grundzüge der deutschen Satzintonation* (Rattingen-Düsseldorf).

Firbas, J. (1957a) K otázce nezákladových podmětů v současné angličtině [On non-thematic subjects in contemporary English], *Časopis pro moderní filologii* 39.22—42, 165—173 (Prague).

Firbas, J. (1957b). Some thoughts on the function of word order in Old English and Modern English, *Sborník prací filosofické fakulty brněnské university* A 5.72—98 (Brno).

Firbas, J. (1959). Thoughts on the communicative function of the verb in English, German and Czech, *Brno Studies in English* 1.39—68 (Prague).

Firbas, J. (1964). On defining the theme in functional sentence analysis, *Travaux linguistiques de Prague* 1.267—280 (Prague).

Firbas, J. (1965). A note on transition proper in functional sentence analysis, *Philogogica Pragensia* 8.170—6 (Prague).

Firbas, J. (1966). Non-thematic subjects in contemporary English, *Travaux linguistiques de Prague* 2.239—54 (Prague).

Firbas, J. (1968). On the prosodic features of the Modern English finite verb as means of functional sentence perspective, *Brno Studies in English* 7.11—48 (Brno).

Firbas, J. (1969). On the prosodic features of the Modern English finite verb-object combination as means of functional sentence perspective, *Brno Studies in English* 8.49—59 (Brno).

Firbas, J. (1970). On the interplay of means of functional sentence perspective, *Actes du X^e congrès international des linguistes* ii. 741—5 (Bucharest).

Firbas, J. (1972a). Funkciji voprosa v processe kommunikaciji, *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 1972: 2.55-65 (Moscow).

Firbas, J. (1972b). Funktion der Frage im Kommunikationsprozeß, *Postilla Bohemica* 1:2.45—58 (Bremen).

Firbas, J. (1973). Zamečanije o roli těmporalnych i modalnych ukazatělej ličnoj formy glagola v aktualnom členěniji. [On the function of the temporal and modal exponents of the finite verb form in functional sentence perspective], *Otázky slovanské syntaxe III* [Problems of Slavonic syntax iii]. 135—40 (Brno).

Gimson, A. C. (1962). *An introduction to the pronunciation of English* (London).

Grepl, M. (1965). O větách tázacích [On interrogative sentences], *Naše řeč* 48.276—91 (Prague).

Grepl, M. (1967). *Emocionálně motivované aktualizace v syntaktické struktuře výpovědi* [Emotively motivated actualizations in the syntactic structure of the utterance], *Opera Universitatis Purkynianae Brunensis, Facultas Philosophica* 113 (Brno).
Halliday, M. A. K. (1967). Notes on transitivity and theme in English II, *Journal of Linguistics* 3.199—244 (London-New York).
Halliday, M. A. K. (1969). *Clause types and structural functions*, Department of General Linguistics, University College London (London). Reprinted in a shortened version, entitled Language structure and language function in J. Lyons (ed), *New horizons in linguistics* (Harmondsworth 1970).
Křížková, H. (1968). Tázací věta a některé problémy tzv. aktuálního (kontextového) členění [The interrogative sentence and some problems of so-called functional sentence perspective] *Naše řeč* 51.200—10 (Prague).
Křížková, H. (1972). Kontextové členění a typy tázacích vět v současných slovanských jazycích [Contextual organization (functional sentence perspective) and types of interrogative sentence in contemporary Slavonic languages], *Slavia* 41.241—62 (Prague).
Lyons, J. (1968). *Introduction to theoretical linguistics* (Cambridge).
Mathesius, V. (1939). O tak zvaném aktuálním členění větném [On so-called functional sentence perspective], *Slovo a slovesnost* 5. 171—4 (Prague)—Reprinted in Mathesius 1947.
Mathesius, V. (1941). Základní funkce pořádku slov v češtině [The basic function of word order in Czech], *Slovo a slovesnost* 7.169—80 (Prague)—Reprinted in Mathesius 1947.
Mathesius, V. (1942). Ze srovnávacích studií slovosledných [From comparative word order studies], *Časopis pro moderní filologii* 28.181—90, 302—7 (Prague).
Mathesius, V. (1947). *Čeština a obecný jazykozpyt* [The Czech language and general linguistics] (Prague).
Mistrík, J. (1966). *Slovosled a vetosled v slovenčine* [Word order and clause order in Slovak] (Bratislava).
Quirk, R. (1964) (in collaboration with J. Svartvik, A. P. Duckworth, J. P. L. Rusiecki, and A. J. T. Colin) Studies in the correspondence of prosodic to grammatical features in English, *Proceedings of the IXth International Congress of Linguists* (The Hague).
Quirk, R. (1965). Descriptive statement and serial relationship, *Language* 41.205—17 (Baltimore).
Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., Svartvik, J. (1973a). *A Grammar of Contemporary English* (London).
Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., (1973b). *A university grammar of English* (London).
Restan, P. (1972). *Sintaksis voprositelnogo predloženija, Obščij vopros* [Syntax of the interrogative sentence, Yes-no question] (Oslo-Bergen-Tromsö).
Seiler, H. (1962). On the syntactic role of word order and of prosodic features, *Word* 18.121—31 (Baltimore).
Svoboda, Aleš (1968). The hierarchy of communicative units and fields as illustrated by English attributive constructions, *Brno Studies in English* 7.49—101 (Brno).
Trávníček, F. (1951). *Mluvnice spisovně češtiny* I—II [Grammar of Standard Czech] (Prague).
Trnka, B. (1932). Some thoughts on structural morphology, *Charisteria Guilelmo Mathesio... oblata* 55—61 (Prague).
Trnka, B. (1964.) Some thoughts on structural morphology, *A Prague School reader* (ed. by J. Vachek) 329—34 (Bloomington). A republicatin of Trnka 1932.
Uhlířová, L. (1974). O vztahu sémantiky příslovečného z určení k aktuálnímu členění [Semantics of adverbials and their roles in functional sentence perspective], Slovo a slovesnost 35.99—106 (Prague).

RESUMÉ

Studie o funkční perspektivě anglické a slovanské tázací věty

Studie řeší problém aktuálního členění neboli funkční perspektivy (= fp.) otázky. V první části se zabývá otázkou anglickou a českou, v druhé se soustřeďuje na otázku slovanskou.

Autor dospívá k názoru, že otázka plní v aktu sdělení v podstatě dvojí funkci: a) tazatel otázkou signalizuje nevědomost a apeluje na posluchače, aby poskytl informaci, která by tuto nevědomost odstranila; b) tazatel v otázce sděluje posluchači, o čem chce být informován a z jakého aspektu — z jaké perspektivy — má být žádaná informace podána. Tak otázky *Kdy pojede tatínek s Petrem* **do** *Prahy? / When will Father go with Peter to* **Prague**?, *Kdy pojede tatínek do Prahy s* **Petrem**? / *When will Father go to Prague with* **Peter**?, *Kdy pojede s Petrem do Prahy* **tatínek**? / *When will* **Father** *go with Peter to Prague?*, *Pojede tatínek s Petrem* **do** *Prahy? / Will Father go with Peter to* **Prague**?, *Pojede tatínek do Prahy s* **Petrem**? / *Will Father go to Prague with* **Peter**?, *Pojede s Petrem do Prahy* **tatínek**? / *Will* **Father** *go to Prague with Peter?* jeví různá rozložení výpovědní dynamičnosti, a tak i různé funkční perspektivy.

Funkci uvedenou pod *a* plní prostředky signalizující otázku, např. tázací zájmena (*kdo*), tázací příslovce (*kdy*), modální exponent určitého slovesa vyjadřující dotaz na kladnou nebo zápornou modalitu predikátu (tento exponent může být realizován i v pomocném slovesném tvaru, srovn. *Pracuje?* s *Does he work?*, *Is he working?*, *Bude pracovat?*, *Will he work?*), slovní pořádek, otázková intonace. Funkci uvedenou pod *b* plní prostředky fp. Jejich souhra vytyčuje ohnisko otázky. (Tučné písmo v dokladech vyznačuje intonační centrum. Složky vytištěné kapitálkami jsou nositelkami ostrého kontrastu. Prostrkovaně je v dokladech vyznačeno ohnisko otázky. Avšak o tom, zda tučně vysázené složky fungují v otázkovém ohnisku, informuje jen doprovodný text. Pokud jde o tučně vytištěné složky v dokladech uvedených výše, fungují všechny v otázkovém ohnisku.)

Tázací zájmeno, tázací příslovce nebo modální exponent určitého slovesa vyjadřující dotaz na kladnou nebo zápornou modalitu predikátu (= me.) funguje jako otázkové ohnisko jen tehdy, jsou-li ostatní složky otázky kontextově zapojené, tj. vyjadřují-li informaci, kterou posluchač z předchozího slovního kontextu a z hlediska tzv. úzké scény již zná. (Tak tomu např. je, když otázka už vyjadřuje jen žádost o opakované sdělení: **KDY** *pojede tatínek s Petrem do Prahy?*, **WHEN** *will Father go with Peter to Prague?*, **PO***jede tatínek s Petrem do Prahy?*, **WILL** *Father go with Peter to Prague?* Z uvedeného vyplývá, že modální exponent určitého slovesa (= me) není ohniskem otázky, zůstává-li vlastní významová složka určitého slovesa kontextově nezapojena!) S tím souvisí i skutečnost, že tázací zájmeno nebo příslovce může stát samo o sobě, např. *Komu? Kde?*, jen tehdy, jsou-li ostatní složky otázky kontextově zapojené. Mutatis mutandis to platí i o pomocném slovesném tvaru (který však v angličtině musí stát alespoň se zájmenným podmětem), např. *Bude?*, *Will he?*, *Does he?* — Otázkové ohnisko je vlastním rématem otázky.

Jak vyplývá z toho, co zde bylo řečeno, tázací zájmeno, tázací slovo nebo určité sloveso, přesněji me., není vlastním rématem otázky, pokud nevyjadřuje otázkové ohnisko. I když nefungují jako vlastní réma, zůstávají ovšem kontextově nezapojená tázací slova (zájmena a příslovce) a me. „rématy" z hlediska mluvčího. Funkci vlastního rématu však neplní z hlediska posluchače, jemuž je ve shodě s komunikativním záměrem mluvčího otázka určena. Není-li otázkovým ohniskem, kontextově nezapojené tázací slovo nebo me. sice tlumočí neznámou informaci, činí tak však jen zástupně a stereotypně a má vzhledem k ohnisku jen doprovodný charakter. Na tázací slovo nebo me. je v takovém případě možno pohlížet nejvýše jako na složku působící na periferii rématu.

Komplexnost sémantické náplně určitého slovesného tvaru způsobuje, že se tento tvar může stát otázkovým ohniskem buď pro svou základní významovou složku — a to jak v ostrém kontrastu, tak i mimo něj — nebo — tentokrát však jenom při ostrém kontrastu — pro některý z významů vyjadřovaných jeho modálním a temporálním exponentem (modálními a temporálními exponenty). (Komplexnost sémantické náplně slovesa vynikne právě v ostrém kontrastu, v tzv. druhé instanci. Tak *pracuje* v **PRA***cuje tatínek?* se může vyskytnout např. v kontrastu s *odpočívá*, *prochází se;* s *pracoval*, *bude pracovat* [jde o časový význam], *pracoval by* [kondicionální význam], *nepracuje* [dotaz na zápornou nebo kladnou modalitu predikátu].)

Podaný výklad fp. otázky plně potvrzují prosodické (intonační) rysy angličtiny. Intonační centrum signalizuje v anglické otázce důsledně otázkové ohnisko. Angličtina tedy jeví důslednou kongruenci mezi otázkovým ohniskem (vlastním rématem otázky) a intonačním centrem. Podobně se v podstatě chová i čeština. Odchylky, např. důsledné kladení intonačního centra na středové tázací slovo (*Tatínek* **co** *včera četl?*), jsou vzácné. (Uvedená odchylka se vyskytuje jen v hovorovém jazyce.) Ostatní slovanské jazyky nejeví tak vysoký stupeň zmíněné kongruence jako čeština. Tato skutečnost vyvolává otázku, zdali podaný výklad fp. otázky je správný.

H. Křížková, autorka cenné konfrontační studie o slovanské otázce (Kontextové členění

a typy tázacích vět v současných slovanských jazycích, *Slavia* 41.241—62, Praha 1972) považuje za základní typ doplňovací slovanské otázky typ, v němž tázací slovo stojí na začátku a je nositelem intonačního centra. Za základní typ otázky zjišťovací považuje Křížková typ, v němž nositelem intonačního centra je sloveso. Odchylky od těchto základních typů jsou vyvolány buď potřebou zvláštního zdůraznění některé složky nebo tendencí automaticky přesouvat intonanční centrum na konec tázací věty. Tato tendence stírá podle Křížkové rozdíl mezi otázkami, v nichž je jedna složka speciálně zdůrazněna, a otázkami, v nichž o takové speciální zdůraznění nejde. V nejvyšší míře se tato „zastírající" tendenc projevuje v češtině. Křížková považuje tázací slovo v doplňovací otázce a sloveso v zjišťovací otázce za vlastní réma otázky, a to bez ohledu na větné postavení a na umístění intonačního centra.

Analýza bohatého materiálu nashromážděného H. Křížkovou v uvedené studii však potvrzuje dříve podaný výklad fp. otázky, podle něhož je vlastním rématem otázky otázkové ohnisko. Je totiž pozoruhodné, že intonační centra umístěná v slovanských otázkách na jiných složkách než na tázacím slově nebo určitém slovese jednoznačně signalizují otázkové ohnisko (*Куда ты собираешься* **вечером**? *А* **ты** *куда собираешься вечером*?). Na druhé straně je neméně pozoruhodné, že se intonační centrum může v doplňovací otázce objevit na tázacím slově a v zjišťovací otázce na určitém slovese tehdy, vyjadřuje-li tázací slovo nebo určité sloveso otázkové ohnisko nebo je-li otázkové ohnisko vyjadřované jinou složkou otázky signalizováno s dostatečnou zřetelností (jednoznačně) souhrou prostředků fp. i bez pomoci intonačního centra. (Tak za předpokladu, že v následujícím otázkovém útvaru je složka *v kine* kontextově nezapojená, vyjadřuje otázkové ohnisko, i když nositelkou intonačního centra je tázací příslovce: **Kedy** *si bol naposledy v kine*? Za daných okolností *naposledy* funguje jako časová kulisa, kdežto *v kine* jako místní specifikace.)

Kongruence mezi otázkovým ohniskem a intonačním centrem je i v slovanských jazycích nutná, je-li ohrožena jednoznačná signalizace otázkového ohniska. „Zastírací" tendence se z tohoto hlediska naopak jeví jako tendence zjasňující fp. otázky, jako tendence směřující k jednoznačné signalizaci otázkového ohniska. Objeví-li se intonační centrum na tázacím slově nebo na určitém slovese, i když tyto složky nevyjadřují ohnisko otázky, jde o prosodickou (intonační) intenzifikaci „rématu mluvčího". Jak vyplývá z toho, co bylo řečeno, k této intenzifikaci může dojít tehdy, je-li signalizace ohniska, tj. vlastního rématu otázky, dostatečně zajištěna souhrou prostředků fp. i bez pomoci intonačního centra.

Situace v slovanských jazycích potvrzuje výklad funkční perspektivy otázky, ke kterému se dospívá při analýze otázky anglické, že totiž vlastním rématem otázky je otázkové ohnisko.