

Firbas, Jan

## Professor Josef Vachek septuagenarian

*Brno studies in English*. 1979, vol. 13, iss. 1, pp. 9-21

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/118083>

Access Date: 20. 02. 2024

Version: 20220831

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

## PROFESSOR JOSEF VACHEK SEPTUAGENARIAN

*Jan Fírbas*

### I

Ten years ago, the eighth issue of Brno Studies in English appeared as an homage volume honouring the sixtieth birthday of Professor Josef Vachek, Ph.D. (Caroline University, Prague), Sc.Dr. (Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences, Prague). It contained an appreciation of Vachek's work in the fields of English and general linguistics (Fírbas 1969a, cf. also 1969b, 1976)<sup>1</sup> and a bibliography of his writings (Hladký 1969).<sup>2</sup> The present appreciation and the accompanying bibliography (Hladký 1979) form their sequels covering Vachek's writings published within the ten years extending from 1969 to 1978. We consider it most proper for an appreciation and a bibliography to appear in a volume of Brno Studies in English, for it was at Professor Vachek's instigation that the BSE series was started twenty years ago, and moreover Professor Vachek is gratefully remembered by the Brno Anglicists as the virtual founder of the linguistic section of the Brno Department of English and American Studies (cf. Fírbas 1969.9).

Being a sequel to an earlier appreciation, the present one will avoid an unnecessary repetition of facts already stated and concentrate on the period between Professor Vachek's sixtieth and his seventieth birthday.

In a continuation of Vachek's *curriculum vitae*, especially the following points deserve particular mention. Accepting an invitation extended to him by the Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden, he filled the post of an ordinary professor of English at this illustrious seat of learning during the academic year 1968—9. Till 1971 he was one of the Senior Research Workers at the Institute of Czech

---

<sup>1</sup> Three other appreciations appeared: by the Bohemist František Daneš (1969), by the Bohemist Jan Chloupek (1969), and by the Bohemist Miroslav Komárek and the Anglicist Jaroslav Macháček (1969).

<sup>2</sup> A volume offering an extensive selection from Vachek's writings on English and general linguistics recently appeared as a co-publication of Academia, Prague, and Mouton, The Hague (see Vachek 1976b). With the exception of three items, all the selected writings originated before 1969.

Language of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences in Prague, an institute enjoying the reputation of a distinguished centre of linguistic research. In the academic years 1971–2, 1972–3, 1973–4, he acted as ordinary professor of English language first both at the Interpreters' Institute of the University of 17th November and at Comenius University in Bratislava, and later – after the former being joined to the latter – at Comenius University only. The English section of the Interpreters' Institute owed a great deal to Vachek, who in actual fact launched and organized its work. Needless to say, even the English Department of Comenius University benefited greatly from having Vachek on its staff. He retired in 1974, but his retirement has proved to be a very active one; since 1974 he has been serving as external professor in the Department of English of Šafařík University at Prešov, Slovakia. The Prešov Department is the youngest English Department in Czechoslovakia and Vachek once again takes the credit for founding a linguistic section of a university department of English. One cannot but conclude Vachek's *curriculum vitae* by underlining that during his career as university teacher (truly started only in 1945, the Czech universities being closed during the Nazi occupation) the promotion of English studies has been his constant concern. He has remained faithful to a tradition established by Vilém Mathesius and fortified by Bohumil Trnka, Ivan Poldauf and himself.

## II

Let us now turn to Vachek's scholarly achievements. They extend over a number of spheres, which Vachek approaches not only as an Anglicist, but also as a Bohemist and contrastive and general linguist. The present appreciation will attempt to cover all the spheres of Vachek's linguistic research. And it is perhaps the sphere of phonology that should be considered first.

Phonology has taken up a very important place in Vachek's researches. Ever since the early nineteen-thirties, when his first articles (Vachek 1932a, b) and his first monograph (Vachek 1933) appeared, he has been steeped in matters phonological. Before entering the seventh decade of his life, he had written a great number of phonological articles (cf. Hladký 1969), a book on the phonological system of present-day Czech (Vachek 1968a) and another on the peripheral phonemes of Modern English (Vachek 1964a), a third monograph concerned with problems of English analyticity (Vachek 1961) devoting three chapters out of seven to phonological issues. All these writings cover a vast and diversified, yet highly coherent complex of problems. They bear on synchrony and diachrony, standard and sub-standard language (Czech and English, but occasionally other languages as well), the relationship between the phonological and other levels of language, that between spoken and written language, and that between language and the community employing it.

The principles on which Vachek's pre-1969 phonological researches are based can be very briefly summarized as follows.<sup>3</sup>

Vachek is opposed to the exclusion from the definition of the phoneme of any reference to its distinctive functioning in language, as well as to the denial

<sup>3</sup>) For a more detailed discussion of these researches, and references, see Firbas 1969a, 1976.

of the importance of the phonic aspect of the sounds for phonological interpretation. He has shown that frequently it is not the distinctive features but rather the phonemes that are the bearers of systemic tensions which recurrently result in important reconstructions of the phonological system. He demonstrates that the peripheral phonemes, i. e. such as are, to use Martinet's term, not 'fully integrated' into the phonological pattern or exhibit a very low functional load, bear out the fact of language being not a closed, fully balanced system. Subjecting particularly English and Czech peripheral phonemes to detailed analyses, Vachek has thrown new light on a number of vexed problems both of English and of Czech phonology. He succeeds in presenting the phonological system as part of a complex system comprising a number of subsystems or levels, each of which has its own particular structure and consequently its own specific structural problems. He demonstrates that a change effected in one subsystem often has repercussions in other subsystems. In this way he avoids a rigorous separation of the subsystems without mixing them.

The pre-1969 phonological studies by Vachek the character of which has just been outlined provided a well-founded and well-tested theoretical basis for his further phonological inquiries carried out during the period covered by the present appreciation. They also afforded a coign of vantage enabling him to assess the place of phonology in linguistic research (cf. Vachek 1975e). Above all, they empowered him to continue his studies in contrastive phonology. A case in point is his comparison of the phonological systems of five modern standard languages — English, Russian, French, Czech and Slovak — in regard to the presence or absence of a transition zone between the vocalic and the consonantal subsystems. The results of Vachek's extensive comparison (see Vachek 1932b, 1968a.47—58, 1968c, 1968d, 1969b, 1970b, 1971—2, 1974b, 1975d) are worth recapitulating.

In respect of the described transition zone ModRuss. and ModE.<sup>4</sup> represent two diametrically opposed types of phonological structure. In ModRuss. the vocalic and the consonantal sphere (subsystem) are very distinctly delimited: no consonantal phonemes can function as syllabic nuclei, whereas all vocalic phonemes cannot perform any other but the syllabic function. ModE., on the other hand, shows a transition zone between the two subsystems.

In Southern British English at least three phonemes — /i/ (the non-syllabic variant of which is [j]), /l/, /n/ — perform both the syllabic and the non-syllabic function. In General American, the 'inverted' short mixed vowel phoneme /ə<sup>v</sup>/<sup>5</sup> (the non-syllabic variant of which is the sonant [r]) constitutes another phoneme associated with both functions.

As to ModF., ModCz. and ModSl., Vachek finds that ModF. stands close to ModR., whereas ModCz. and ModSl. stand close to ModE.

In ModF. no consonantal phoneme can function as a syllabic nucleus; only two vocalic phonemes (/u/, /y/) can perform the non-syllabic function, but do so merely through their allophones ([w], [ɥ]). In ModCz., on the other hand, three phonemes (/r/, /l/, /u/) normally function both in the vocalic and

<sup>4</sup>) Strictly speaking, the abbreviations should respectively be expanded into ModStRuss., ModStE., etc., for Vachek confines himself to the standard forms of the languages examined.

<sup>5</sup>) Not to be confused with the non-inverted short mixed vowel, acoustically roughly identical with the Southern British [ə] (cf. Vachek 1969b.10).

the non-vocalic sphere, the phonemes /i/ and /j/ showing an unmistakable tendency to merge into one phoneme and in this way tending to widen the zone between the two spheres even further. In ModSl., the transition zone is still more distinctly marked. This is mainly due to the virtual merger of the phonemes /i/ and /j/ and to the presence in the phonological system of the long phonemes /r:/, /l:/, which exclusively function as syllabic nuclei.

Vachek's comparison of various phonological systems in regard to the presence or absence of a transition zone within them substantially contributes to a characterology of each of the languages examined. The comparison is an outcome of revealing inquiries into the interrelations obtaining between the studied phonemes. Apart from the results of the comparison themselves, these inquiries have led to a number of other noteworthy conclusions. They prove, for instance, that a purely acoustic classification can hardly do justice to the position occupied by a phoneme within a phonological system (Vachek 1968c.198—9); acoustic criteria should be complemented by other criteria such as those of syllabicity/non-syllabicity of a phoneme, the degree of its integration into the phonological system, the volume of the load of oppositions it can enter into (Vachek 1968c.199). In fact, none of the criteria can be utilized in isolation to the exclusion of the others. (In respect to the functional load of a phoneme, this claim has been substantiated by equally convincing arguments in Vachek 1969a.) Needless to say, the function of the phoneme cannot be fully appreciated unless the role it plays in signalling semantic distinction is taken into account (cf. Vachek 1975e.18).

At this point an objection could be raised that what has been termed the implicit style of pronunciation (or *allegro* style) (cf. Vachek 1977a.433) lacks a clear-cut segmentation into discrete implementations of phonemes. But Vachek is certainly right in maintaining that this only reveals the significance of the explicit, *lento* style for the phonic implementation of phonological phenomena. In *lento* style, the flow of speech is much more distinct than in its elliptical *allegro* counterpart (see Vachek 1977a.434). It is in the former that, for instance, the affricate /tš/ can be duly distinguished from /t/ + /š/. In this way, word pairs like ModCz. *počít* ('begin') — *podšít* (prefix *pod-* 'under', *šít* 'sew': 'to sew sth on from beneath'), which are distinguished in *lento* style ([potšit:] — [pot-šit:]), have one and the same implementation ([potši:t]) in *allegro* style (Vachek 1977a.434, cf. also 1970f).

### III

As we shall have the opportunity to come back to phonological problems in the course of the present appreciation, we may now turn our attention to another field of Vachek's special interest. It is constituted by questions posed by written language. Vachek is a veritable pioneer in this sphere of research. As early as 1939, he held that written language must be viewed as a system in its own right (Vachek 1939). In the meantime, the interest in questions of written language has intensified (cf. Vachek 1973e.27—39) and he has kept on contributing to the discussion (cf., e.g., Vachek 1945—9, 1948, 1959; for a full list, see Hladký 1969, 1979). His conception of written language may

be summed up as follows. (The summary is based on Vachek's writings published after 1969: Vachek 1971, 1973c, 1973d, 1973e.)

Written language has a specific status: through its documentary capacity it satisfies communicative needs of higher order called forth, for instance, by literature, research, state administration. Functionally speaking, it stands in complementary relation to spoken language.<sup>6</sup> Owing to its autonomous character, it refers directly to extra-linguistic phenomena. It would be wrong to suppose that written messages acquire meaning only via speech, for the specific functions of written language prevent it from becoming identical with, and merely playing the role of, a phonetic transcription (the function of which is solely to represent sounds by written, 'phonetic' symbols). In fact, the specificity of these functions makes it impossible for the correspondence between spoken and written language to remain within the confines of the phoneme-grapheme level. It brings a number of facts into play that overstep these confines and operate also or only on higher levels, i. e. those of the morpheme and the word. Among these factors are the tendency to preserve the graphic shape of a morpheme, the logographic principle, stylistic differentiation, differentiation between native and foreign words, differentiation between common and learned words, emotional colouring. The extent to which these factors manifest themselves may vary from language to language, and so may in consequence the type of correspondence between the spoken and the written norm. But some correspondence is vitally essential, and therefore indispensable.

Vachek's functionalist concept of the correspondence between the two norms facilitates the evaluation of various spelling reforms. He rejects a strict enforcement of correspondence on the lowest level, for such a solution disregards the complexities resulting from the specific functions performed by written language, reducing it to mere phonemic or phonetic transcription. As to the spelling reforms so far proposed, he finds that it is Axel Wijk's project (1959) which pays greatest heed of the results of the research into written language.

#### IV

The bibliographies of Vachek's writings (Hladký 1969, 1979) prove that his writings are not restricted to phonology and written language. Let us focus our attention on at least some of his ideas and findings presented in four papers, concerning morphology (1972a), the functional stratification of language (its functional dialects) (1975c), sociolinguistics (1972c) and contrastive linguistics (1974b). The morphological topic, seen from the contrastive point of view, will be taken up first.

Comparing the English possessive case with the Czech possessive adjective of the *otcův, matčín* type, Vachek found in the pre-1969 years (Vachek 1954,

---

<sup>6</sup> The function of the spoken norm is, 'in principle, to react to a given stimulus (which, as a rule, is an urgent one) in a dynamic way, i.e. in a ready and immediate manner expressing not only the purely communicative but also the emotional aspect of the reacting language user'. On the other hand, the function of the written norm is 'to react to a given stimulus (which, as a rule, is not an urgent one) in a static way, i. e. in a preservable and easily surveyable manner, concentrating particularly on the purely communicative aspect of the approach of the reacting language user'. (Vachek 1959.12.)

1961.24—31) that whereas the English possessive case, a substantival phenomenon, tends to acquire adjectival character, the Czech possessive adjective, an adjectival phenomenon, has come to function almost as a variant of the genitive singular within the substantival paradigm. Pursuing this problem afresh, Vachek (1972a) adduces further evidence in support of his observation that Czech aims at gradually ousting the possessive adjective of the discussed type from its grammatical system.

The problem pertaining to the sphere of the functional stratification of language concerns what Havránek (1932) has termed functional dialects. Havránek distinguishes four functional dialects: conversational, workaday, scientific and poetic, his classificatory criteria being the milieu in which the dialects are employed (cf. Vachek 1975c.103). Vachek finds that there are other important criteria that would cover the functional dialects in a way both more appropriate and more exhaustive. He suggests three main criteria — the language user's approach to the content presented by the message, the language user's approach to the recipient of the message, the choice of the medium employed in transmitting the message (103) — and demonstrates how they may be applied in establishing and classifying various functional dialects. Among the dialects so established, there is only one that can claim the unmarked status. It is termed 'simple communicative style' (having a narrative or a descriptive variety) and is implemented by narratives or descriptions 'presented in a relatively clear and simple manner which, however, does not aim at exactness and exhaustiveness in tracing all the essential items of the treated subject and the mutual relations of these items' (104). This dialect can replace other, specialized functional dialects, while the reverse substitution is inadmissible (105).

The sociolinguistic problem (Vachek 1972c) involves the question of the immanentist approach to problems of linguistic diachrony. Vachek has remained in opposition to such an approach to language phenomena (cf. Firbas 1969.15, 1976.12). He is emphatic about the important part played by sociolinguistic factors in language development, substantiating his views by discussing instances from the histories of British and American English. The discussion offers a solution to a question of vital importance: that of the hierarchical relation of the internal and external factors of language development. Though co-operating, the former are hierarchically superior to the latter; for if exposed to external influence, language yields to it only provided the external force is not at variance with the requirements of the language system.

It remains to pass a note on the problem pertaining to contrastive linguistics (Vachek 1974b). Vachek's teaching in Slovak universities has revived his interest in the Slovak language (cf. Vachek 1932b). Commenting on the structures of Slovak and Czech, he finds that in many cases Slovak and its closest Slavonic relation, Czech, show the same tendencies, but do not respond to them in the same way. The tie between the popular dialects and the standard form of language being closer, and factors motivated by tradition less firmly established, in Slovak than in Czech, the former permits the tendencies to assert themselves to a far greater extent, and exploits them in solving problems of structure in a far more consistent manner, than the latter.

We have now reached a point in our appreciation at which we can return to phonological problems, inserting a section devoted to Vachek's approach to generativist phonology. We have to do so, because Vachek has kept up his attentive interest in its development, continuing to endorse Mathesius' dictum that language is a fortress that can and must be assailed from all sides and with every kind of weapon (cf. Vachek 1970h.69).

Vachek has not changed his views expressed in the 1964 volume of *Zeitschrift für Phonetik, Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung* and the 1968 volume of *Lingua*, where he presented his evaluation of N. Chomsky's approach to language, concentrating chiefly on phonological problems. Let us recall Vachek's position taken up in his contributions to the two mentioned volumes (Vachek 1964c, 1968b).

Vachek feels inclined to believe that Chomsky's generativist and transformationalist conception is in fact an ingenious attempt at a theory of what de Saussure denoted as 'parole'. The functionalist and structuralist approach of the Prague group, on the other hand, is found by Vachek to be in essence a theory of 'langue', conceived of as a dynamic, non-static phenomenon. Chomsky's conception of grammar is that of a number of selective processes by which the means placed at the disposal of the speaker are selected and mobilized for communicative purposes. His approach may consequently be denoted as processual. In Vachek's view the Prague approach, on the other hand, concentrates on the system of means, 'langue', from which the selection is made, i. e. in other words, on a system of entities with and upon which the processes operate. It follows that it is the entitative aspect that the Prague approach is chiefly concerned with. Vachek believes that this evaluation indicates the possibility of a synthesis of the two approaches, which in fact attack the problem from complementary angles.

Discussing Chomsky and Halle's monograph *The sound pattern of English* (1968), Vachek regards it as a landmark in the history of English and generative phonology (Vachek 1970e.24; 1970g.111). Once again weighing the pros and cons, he finds that Chomsky and Halle's book contains points that seem to begin to bridge the (still wide) gap between the generativist approach and that of the Praguians. He welcomes the authors' emphasis on the empirical nature of discovering the grammar of language, their observation on the existence of a margin of irregularity and their adoption of the principle of markedness.

As to the differences between the two approaches, Vachek points out the following. Chomsky and Halle do not draw a clear dividing line between diachrony and synchrony; they do not appreciate stylistic differentiations within the vocabulary; upon the whole they present only a description of language changes, not looking for their motivation.

It should be added that all the methodological requirements mentioned in the two preceding paragraphs are strictly observed in Vachek's works on synchronic and diachronic phonology. It is somewhat odd that neither his nor Bohumil Trnka's contributions to English synchronic and diachronic phonology have been taken account of in Chomsky and Halle's book.



Vachek's erudition, his active engagement in inquiries into a wide range of diversified problems and recognized prestige eminently qualify him (i) to survey the present state of research in the field, (ii) to acquaint the linguists in and outside his country with the present and past achievements, as well as the general history of, the Prague School, and last but not least (iii) to write textbooks for university students.

## (i)

At the invitation of Thomas A. Sebeok, editor-in-chief of *Current Trends in Linguistics*, Vachek contributed to the 9th volume of the 'Trends' a competent survey of the research into Middle and Modern English, carried out by scholars in Western and Central Europe in the course of approximately the five decades preceding the nineteen-seventies. The survey (Vachek 1972b) covers English studies in Great Britain, Scandinavia, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, the German-speaking countries and Czechoslovakia.

## (ii)

In the sixties, Vachek brought out the well-known triad of books — *Dictionnaire de linguistique de l'École de Prague* (1960),<sup>7</sup> *A Prague School Reader in Linguistics* (1964d), *The Linguistic School of Prague* (1966) — in which he made the teaching of the Prague School accessible to a wide scholarly public. The same aim is promoted by his editorship of the English version of Mathesius' Czech university lectures on the linguistic characterology of present-day English (Mathesius 1975), and that of two smaller volumes of several important, but hardly accessible writings by some prominent members of the older generation of the Praguists (Vachek ed. 1970h, 1972e). Each of the three volumes contains Vachek's additional notes and comments and a preface or postscript offering background information essential to a full appreciation of the edited text or texts. Equally informative is Vachek's account of the Prague approach that opens a collection of papers by Czechoslovak linguists published by the Oxford University Press in the early seventies (Vachek 1972d). The account centres on characteristic traits of the Prague approach: the vindication of the synchronistic approach, the prevailing systemic character of language, and above all the function performed by language in a speech community.

In a number of articles, Vachek presents himself as a historian of the Prague School. In his paper read at the Bucharest linguistic congress in 1967, but published only three years later (Vachek 1970c), he draws attention to less known facts of the history of Prague linguistic thought. He points out that as early as 1911 Mathesius (see Mathesius 1911) stressed the necessity of studying facts of language also from the synchronistic point of view. (De Saussure's *Cours de linguistique générale* appeared in 1922.) And it was in fact the Czech group among the Praguists, especially Vilém Mathesius, Bohuslav Havránek and Bohumil Trnka, that in preparing the ground for new ideas laid special emphasis on the functionalist approach to language phenomena.

<sup>7</sup>) A Russian translation of the *Dictionnaire*, edited and prefaced by A. A. Reformatskij, appeared four years later (Vachek 1964b).

In another paper, concerning contrastive linguistics, Vachek (1975a) most pertinently accentuates that Mathesius' pioneering contributions to contrastive studies (esp. Mathesius 1928) appeared long before other scholars fully realized the importance of this approach to language, a fact that is not always appreciated by scholars outside Czechoslovakia.

One of Vachek's papers commemorates the Hungarian scholar Gyula Laziczius; appraising his contribution to the Prague phonological studies, Vachek stresses the importance of Laziczius' inspiring observation that emotively functioning phonic facts are just as conventional as the phonic facts serving 'pure', i. e. non-emotional communication (Vachek 1976a.482). With due alterations, this observation, evidently arrived at by Laziczius independently of other scholars, is naturally applicable even to higher language levels (ib).

A not insignificant detail of the history of Prague linguistic thought is constituted by the development of the problem concerning the dichotomy of correlations versus disjunction (Vachek 1970a). (Roughly speaking, phonological correlation is a system of phonological oppositions characterized by one common correlative property; a disjunct relation is such as cannot be classified as correlative. Cf. Vachek 1970a.160.)

The mentioned dichotomy was introduced by R. Jakobson, N. S. Trubetzkoy and S. Karcevskij in the theses submitted to the First International Congress of Linguists held at The Hague in 1928. Because of its too simplistic character, it soon came to be criticized by the ordinary members of the Prague Circle. In his monograph on the phonological interpretation of English diphthongs (Vachek 1933.118), Vachek himself explicitly criticizes it („... dagegen will ich ausdrücklich bemerken, dass man nicht alle Disjunktionen für gleichwertig halten darf“). Even Trubetzkoy and Jakobson later abandoned the idea of strict dichotomy of correlative and disjunct oppositions, but a letter received from Trubetzkoy in May 1933 leads Vachek to suppose that by that time Trubetzkoy and Jakobson had not yet changed their original attitude. As Vachek sees it, the idea of radical dichotomy persisted in the Prague group until 1936, the year of the publication of Trubetzkoy's 'Essai d'une théorie des oppositions phonologiques', in which the concept of the dichotomy of correlative and disjunct oppositions of phonemes was abandoned.

Speaking of the history of Prague linguistic thought, we must not fail to mention Vachek's masterly drawn portrait of Vilém Mathesius, which was presented at a commemorative session held by the Caroline University of Prague in 1970, twenty-five years after the great scholar's death. It is most proper that his tribute has been preserved in printed form (Vachek 1970d), for it not only bears testimony to Mathesius' scholarship the brilliancy of which hardly anybody will doubt, but also to his heroic unequal fight against protracted and exhausting illness which did not prevent him from inspiring others with ideas, confidence and courage, a circumstance that would have remained unknown to those who did not have the privilege of knowing him personally.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>8</sup>) Only after the present paper had gone to the press, I had an opportunity of acquainting myself with Vachek's address (Vachek 1977c) delivered in the University of Vienna in 1974 on the occasion of the unveiling of a plaque in memory of Nikolaj Sergejevič Trubetzkoy. The address depicts Trubetzkoy's personality and offers a number of important observations on his active relationship to the Prague Linguistic Circle.

Impressive is the series of Vachek's university courses brought out in mimeographed textbook form during the decade under consideration. With one exception — a course in the history of English presented in Czech (Vachek 1978b)<sup>9</sup> — the versions of the courses are English and written after 1969. They comprise an abridged English version of the textbook on the history of English (1978a), originally prepared for the students of Leiden University; an introduction to the diachronistic study of English presented from the point of view of present-day English (1977b); a general introduction to the study of English (1973a); an introduction to the study of ModE phonology (1973b); chapters from ModE lexicology and stylistics (1974a); chapters from ModE syntax (1974c); a linguistic characterology of ModE (1975b). Some of the English versions are updated adaptations of Czech texts brought out before 1969, others are new, post-1969 publications. All the textbooks by Vachek excel in lucidity and reliable information, the motto 'Qui bene distinguit, bene docet' aptly characterizing their autor.

## VII

The present appreciation has been concerned with the writings of Professor Josef Vachek published during the last ten years. Their very number arouses admiration. Yet they form merely a fragment of Vachek's scholarly output. What is even more remarkable, however, is the coherence of the publications under consideration, and the way they cohere with those preceding them. The entire work of Vachek constitutes a singularly homogeneous whole, programmatically developing the progressive heritage of the past, preserving what is worthy of preservation and preparing the way for new developments. His appreciative but duly critical attitude to the achievements of the past has induced him occasionally to assume the role of a historian of Czech linguistic thought. But he has been making history himself, substantially contributing to the development of linguistics. The significance of his scholarship has extended far beyond the borders of his native country.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Chomsky, N.—Halle, M. (1968). *The sound pattern of English* (New York).
- Daneš, F. (1969). 'K šedesátinám Josefa Vachka' [In honour of Josef Vachek's sixtieth birthday], *Naše řeč* 52.59—61 (Prague).
- Firbas, J. (1969a). 'Professor Josef Vachek sexagenarian (A tribute to his work in the field of English studies)', *Brno Studies in English* 8.9—20 (Brno).
- Firbas, J. (1969b). 'K šedesátinám prof. Josefa Vachka' [In honour of Professor Vachek's sixtieth birthday], *Časopis pro moderní filologii* 51.129—34 (Prague).
- Firbas, J. (1976). 'Josef Vachek's work in general and English linguistics', in Vachek 1976b. 7—14.
- Havránek, B. (1932). 'Úkoly spisovného jazyka a jeho kultura' [The functions of standard language and language culture], in Havránek, B.—Weingart, M. (eds.), *Spisovná čeština a jazyková kultura*, 32—84 (Prague); reprinted in Havránek 1963.30—59.

<sup>9</sup> The bibliographical references in the present paper give only the latest editions of the textbooks. All earlier editions are duly listed in Hladký's bibliographies (Hladký 1969, 1979).

- Havránek, B. (1963). *Studie o spisovném jazyce* [Studies in standard language] (Prague).
- Hladký, J. (1969). 'Bibliography of Professor Josef Vachek's works', *Brno Studies in English* 8.205–15 (Brno).
- Hladký, J. (1979). 'Bibliography of Professor Josef Vachek's works (1968–1978)', *Brno Studies in English* 13.23–8.
- Chloupek, J. (1969). 'Jubiläum profesora Josefa Vachka' [In honour of Professor Josef Vachek], *Sborník prací filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity A* 17.163–4 (Brno).
- Komárek, M.—Macháček, J. (1969). 'K šedesátinám prof. dr. Josefa Vachka' [In honour of Professor—Josef Vachek's sixtieth birthday], *Slovo a slovesnost* 30.105–11 (Prague).
- Mathesius, V. (1911). 'O potenciálnosti jevů jazykových' [On the potentiality of the phenomena of language], *Věstník Král. společnosti nauk, třída filos.-histor.-jazykozpytná*. 1–24 (Prague). English translation (prepared by J. Vachek) published in Vachek 1964d.1–32.
- Mathesius, V. (1928). 'On linguistic characterology with illustrations from Modern English', *Actes du Premier Congrès International des Linguistes à La Haye (1928)*, 56–63 (The Hague), reprinted in Vachek 1964d.59–67.
- Mathesius, V. (1975). *A functional analysis of Present-Day English on a general linguistic basis*, transl. by L. Dušková, edited and provided with notes and a postscript by J. Vachek (Prague).
- Trubetzkoy, N. S. (1936). Essai d'une théorie des oppositions phonologiques, *Journal de Psychologie* 33.5–18. [Cited after Vachek 1970.160.]
- Vachek, J. (1932a). 'Professor Daniel Jones and the Phoneme', *Charisteria Guilelmo Mathesio quinquagenario ... oblata* 25–33 (Prague).
- Vachek, J. (1932b). 'Fonologický poměr hlásek i a j v češtině a slovenštině' [The phonological relation of the sounds i a j in Czech and Slovak], *Slavia* 11.265–73 (Prague).
- Vachek, J. (1933). 'Über die phonologische Interpretation der Diphtonge mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Englischen', *Prague Studies in English* 4.87–170 (Prague).
- Vachek, J. (1939). 'Zum Problem der geschriebenen Sprache', *Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Prague* 8.94–104 (Prague); reprinted in Vachek 1964d.441–52, and in Vachek 1976b. 112–20.
- Vachek, J. (1945–9). 'Some remarks on writing and phonetic transcription', *Acta Linguistica* 5.86–93 (Copenhagen).
- Vachek, J. (1948). 'Written language and printed language', *Recueil Linguistique de Bratislava* 1.67–85 (Bratislava).
- Vachek, J. (1954). 'K problematice českých posesivních adjektiv' [On the problems of Czech possessive adjectives], *Studie a práce lingvistické I*. 178–89 (Prague).
- Vachek, J. (1959). 'Two chapters on written English', *Brno Studies in English* 1.7–38 (Prague); reprinted in Vachek 1976b. 408–41.
- Vachek, J. (1960). (In collaboration with J. Dubský.) *Dictionnaire de linguistique de l'École de Prague* (Utrecht—Anvers).
- Vachek, J. (1961). 'Some less familiar aspects of the analytical trend of English', *Brno Studies in English* 3.9–78 (Prague); reprinted in Vachek 1976b.310–85.
- Vachek, J. (1964a). 'On peripheral phonemes of Modern English', *Brno Studies in English* 4.7–109 (Prague); reprinted in Vachek 1976b.176–287.
- Vachek, J. (1964b). (In collaboration with J. Dubský.) *Lingvističeskij slovar Pražskoj školy*, translated by I. A. Melčuk and V. Z. Sannikov, edited and prefaced by A. A. Reformatskij (Moscow).
- Vachek, J. (1964c). 'On some basic principles of "classical" phonology', *Zeitschrift für Phonetik, Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung* 17.409–31 (Berlin).
- Vachek, J., ed. (1964d). *Prague School reader in linguistics* (Bloomington, Ind.).
- Vachek, J. (1966). *The Linguistic School of Prague* (Bloomington, Ind.).
- Vachek, J. (1968a). *Dynamika fonologického systému současné spisovné češtiny* [The dynamism of the phonological system of Present-Day Standard Czech] (Prague).
- Vachek, J. (1968b). 'A note on future prospects of diachronic language research', *Lingua* 21.483–93 (Amsterdam).
- Vachek, J. (1968c). 'Some remarks on "glides" in phonological analysis', *Travaux linguistiques de Prague* 3.189–201 (Prague).
- Vachek, J. (1968d). 'Remarks on the internal structuration of the French phonological system', *Word* 24.491–7.
- Vachek, J. (1969a). 'On the explanatory power of the functional load of phonemes', *Slavica Pragensia* 11.63–71 (Prague); reprinted in Vachek 1976b.36–43.

- Vachek, J. (1969b). 'Some phonological problems of Modern English sonant sounds', *Prague Studies in English* 13.7—14 (Prague).
- Vachek, J. (1970a). 'A note on Trubetzkoy and phonemic disjunctions' *Folia Linguistica* 2.160—5 (The Hague).
- Vachek, J. (1970b). 'Několko zamečanií o roli slogoobrazující funkce při fonologickém analýze' [Some notes on the role of syllabic function in phonological analysis], *Jazyk i člověk* 45—54 (Moscow).
- Vachek, J. (1970c). 'On some less known aspects of the early Prague Linguistic School', *Actes du Xème Congrès International des Linguistes (Bucarest 1967)* II.333—7 (Bucharest).
- Vachek, J. (1970d). 'Pětadvacet let od skonu Viléma Mathesia' [Twenty-five years since the death of Vilém Mathesius], *Časopis pro moderní filologii* 52.121—6 (Prague).
- Vachek, J. (1970e). 'Remarks on *The sound pattern of English*', *Folia Linguistica* 4.24—31 (The Hague); reprinted in Vachek 1976b.304—10.
- Vachek, J. (1970f). 'Some remarks on "juncture" in phonological analysis', *Proceedings of the Sixth International Congress of Phonetic Sciences (Prague 1967)* 963—5 (Prague).
- Vachek, J. (1970g). 'Z nových cest generativní fonologie' [Generative phonology looking for the new ways], *Slovo a slovesnost* 31.111—24.
- Vachek, J., ed. (1970h). *U základů pražské jazykovědné školy* [From works constituting the fons et origo of the Prague Linguistic School], edited, and provided with notes and a postscript, by J. Vachek (Prague).
- Vachek, J. (1971). [Review of] 'Richard L. Venetzký, *The structure of English orthography* (The Hague 1970)', *Language* 47.212—6 (Baltimore).
- Vachek, J. (1971—2). 'Ještě jednou k otázce slovenského [i] a [j]' [Once again on the question of Slovak [i] and [j]], *Zborník Filozofickej fakulty Univerzity Komenského* 23—4.139—45 (Bratislava).
- Vachek, J. (1972a). 'Ještě k osudu českých posesivních adjektiv' [More remarks on the fate of Czech possessive adjectives], *Slovo a slovesnost* 33.146—8 (Prague).
- Vachek, J. (1972b). 'Middle English and Modern English', *Current Trends in Linguistics* 9.1407—60 (The Hague).
- Vachek, J. (1972c). 'Some sociolinguistic factors in the development of English', *Studies in linguistics in honor of Raven I. McDavid, Jr.*, 333—41 (Alabama); reprinted in Vachek 1976b.400—7.
- Vachek, J. (1972d). 'The linguistic theory of the Prague School', in V. Fried (ed.), *The Prague School of Linguistics and language teaching*, 11—88 (London).
- Vachek, J., ed. (1972e). *Z klasického období pražské školy 1925—1945* [From the classical period of the Prague School], edited, prefaced and commented on by J. Vachek (Prague).
- Vachek, J. (1973a). *An introduction to the study of English*, mimeo (Prague).
- Vachek, J. (1973b). *Chapters from phonology of Modern English*, mimeo (Bratislava).
- Vachek, J. (1973c). 'The present state of research in written language', *Folia Linguistica* 6.47—61 (The Hague); reprinted in Vachek 1976b.134—46.
- Vachek, J. (1973d). [Reviews of] 'W. Haas, *Alphabets for English* (Manchester 1969); W. Haas, *Phono-graphic translation* (Manchester 1970)', *Language* 49.190—4 (Baltimore).
- Vachek, J. (1973e). *Written language (General problems and problems of English)* (The Hague).
- Vachek, J. (1974a). *Chapters from Modern English lexicology and stylistics*, mimeo (Prague).
- Vachek, J. (1974b). 'Glosa k srovnávací typologii slovenštiny a češtiny' [A note on the comparative typology of Slovak and Czech], *Jazykovědné štúdie* 12.30—35 (Bratislava).
- Vachek, J. (1974c). *Selected chapters from Modern English syntax*, mimeo (Prague).
- Vachek, J. (1975a). 'Kontrastívna a konfrontačná jazykoveda' [Contrastive linguistics], *Komenského trienále Bratislava 1974, Zborník vybraných referátov a diskusných príspevkov*, 29—38 (Bratislava).
- Vachek, J. (1975b). *Linguistic characterology of Modern English*, mimeo (Bratislava).
- Vachek, J. (1975c). 'Some remarks on functional dialects of standard language', *Studies presented to N. E. Enkvist*, 101—7 (Stockholm).
- Vachek, J. (1975d). 'The phonemic relation of Modern Slovak [i] and [j]', *Bereiche der Slavistik (Festschrift zu Ehren von Jossip Hamm)* 297—306 (Vienna).
- Vachek, J. (1975e). 'The place of phonology in linguistics', in Dressler, W.—Mareš, F. V. (eds.), *Phonologica 1972*, 15—23 (Munich—Salzburg).
- Vachek, J. (1976a). 'Gyula Laziczus and early Prague phonology', *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* 76.480-3.
- Vachek, J. (1976b). *Selected writings in English and general linguistics* (Prague).

- Vachek, J. (1977a). 'Segmentation of the flow of speech and written language', *Kwartalnik Neofilologiczny* 24.431–6 (Warsaw).
- Vachek, J. (1977b). *Standard English in historical perspective*<sup>2</sup>, mimeo (Košice).
- Vachek, J. (1977c). 'N. S. Trubetzkoy and the Prague Linguistic School', *Wiener Slavistische Beiträge* 23.103–9 (Vienna).
- Vachek, J. (1978a). *A brief survey of the historical development of English*<sup>4</sup>, mimeo (Prague).
- Vachek, J. (1978b). *Historický vývoj angličtiny*<sup>7</sup> [The historical development of English], updated edition prepared by Jan Firbas, mimeo (Prague).
- Wijk, A. (1959). *Regularized English* (Stockholm).

## K SEDMDESÁTINÁM PROFESORA JOSEFA VACHKA

Příspěvek je psán na počest sedmdesátých narozenin univ. prof. PhDr. Josefa Vachka, DrSc. Podává přehled jeho vědecké činnosti v letech 1969–1978, a tak navazuje na článek, který vyšel v osmém svazku řady Brno Studies in English (Brno 1969) a který informoval o vědecké činnosti prof. Vachka do r. 1968.

První část příspěvku obsahuje data životopisná, druhá je věnována Vachkovým pracím v oblasti fonologie, třetí pracím o psaném jazyce, čtvrtá studiím zabývajícím se problematikou morfologickou, stylistickou a sociolingvistickou, pátá se týká Vachkova postoje k novým směrům v lingvistice, zejména ke generativistické fonologii, šestá pojednává především o jeho studiích o pražské škole a o jeho souboru vysokoškolských učebních textů (skript).

Vachkovo rozsáhlé dílo tvoří homogenní celek. Svědčí o plodnosti a nosnosti Vachkova funkčně-strukturního pojetí jazyka jako otevřeného systému systémů, analyzovaného jak z hlediska diachronního, tak synchronního a se zřetelem k mimojazykové skutečnosti. Vachkovo dílo přesahuje daleko hranice anglistiky a zařazuje se mezi špičkovou lingvistickou produkci v měřítku světovém.

