

Firbas, Jan

From comparative word-order studies : (thoughts on V. Mathesius' conception of the word-order system in English compared with that in Czech)

Brno studies in English. 1964, vol. 4, iss. 1, pp. 111-128

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/118010>

Access Date: 16. 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.

FROM COMPARATIVE WORD-ORDER STUDIES

(Thoughts on V. Mathesius' Conception of the Word-Order System in English
Compared with that in Czech)

The study of word-order was a life-long interest of Professor Vilém MATHESIUS (1882—1945), the founder of the Prague Linguistic School. At the beginning of his academic career, he took it up in a series of articles (*Studie*), pursuing it later in a number of further papers (see *Soupis*), the last of which appeared three years before his death. It presented a summary of his researches into the word order of English as compared with that of Czech.

It is this last paper of Prof. M., entitled *Ze srovnávacích studií slovosledných* (*From Comparative Word-Order Studies*), that will be the starting point of the present discussion. (1) Endeavouring to continue in Prof. M.'s word-order studies, we propose to examine the solutions and suggestions offered by it. We should like to do so in the light of our own researches as well as of those of others, and in this way to survey the field that has been covered by these researches since the publication of the paper almost a quarter of a century ago. We do not, however, intend to submit an exhaustive treatment of all the problems touched upon by Prof. M. It is the general conception of his paper, not the details, that we shall be concerned with here. (2)

Nor can we discuss the place Prof. M.'s word-order studies occupy in the development of linguistic research. (3) Let us only briefly remark that Prof. M.'s views on word order had been considerably influenced by Henri WEL's book *Ordre*. This monograph, published as far back as in 1844, suggested to Prof. M. the idea of functional sentence perspective [= FSP].

Chapter One

ENGLISH WORD-ORDER AND THE GRAMMATICAL PRINCIPLE

In Prof. M.'s view, word-order phenomena constitute a system. In order to account for the general character of such a system as well as for particular word orders, it is necessary to know the character of each word-order principle in particular and the hierarchy of all the word-order principles in general. This hierarchy is determined by the mutual relations of the principles, i.e. by the extent to, and the manner in, which they operate (*Srovn. studie*, p. 181).

A fuller understanding of the word-order system of a language is achieved if the method of analytical comparison (4) is resorted to, i.e. if the word-order system of a language is compared with that of another language, preferably one of different structure. As we hope to show in the course of the present discussion, this conception of Prof. M. proves to be a sound and highly suggestive working theory.

When comparing the Czech and English word-order systems, Prof. M. deals with

the following word-order principles: the principle of grammatical function, the principle of coherence of members, the principle of FSP and the principle of sentence rhythm.

How do these principles operate in English, and how do they operate in Czech? In what respects do the two languages differ from each other? What answers has Prof. M. to offer to these questions? And what is our attitude towards his solutions?

Let us first concentrate on the difference between English and Czech in regard to the relation between the principle of grammatical function, with which the principle of coherence of members stands in close relation, and the principle of FSP.

By way of explanation let us add that the principle of grammatical function manifests itself in that the sentence position of an element is determined by the syntactic function of that element (*Srovn. studie*, p. 182). In accordance with this principle the English sentence puts the element that is to function as subject before the element that is to function as predicative verb, which in its turn is made to precede the element that is to function as object. As to the principle of coherence of members, it manifests itself not only in a negative way, not permitting to insert other qualifications between two sentence elements to which it is applicable, but also in a positive way, making the change in position of one of the two elements entail a change in position of the other element so that the two may remain in close proximity (*Srovn. studie*, p. 183). For the purposes of this paper it is possible to merge these two closely related principles, i.e. that of grammatical function and that of coherence of elements, into one — the grammatical principle. Anyway, this is the procedure adopted by Prof. M.'s *Obsahový rozbor*, p. 180.

The principle of FSP (we shall explain later why we prefer this term to possible other ones) causes the sentence to open with thematic and close with rhematic elements. Very roughly speaking, thematic elements are such as convey facts known from the verbal or situational context, whereas rhematic elements are such as convey new, unknown facts. Strictly speaking, thematic elements are such as convey facts that constitute the communicative basis of the sentence, such as contribute least towards the development of the discourse and consequently convey the lowest degree(s) of communicative dynamism [= CD] within the given sentence. Rhematic elements, on the other hand, are such as contribute most towards the development of the discourse and consequently convey the highest degree(s) of CD within the given sentence. In regard to the varying intensity of CD we find that the thematic and the rhematic elements, i.e. the theme and the rheme, are usually linked up by means of transitional elements (i.e. the transition). The word order that observes, or is at least in accordance with, the principle of FSP naturally places these elements between the theme and the rheme (e.g. *The situation* [theme] *has become* [transition] *quite dangerous* [rheme]). (5)

Whereas in Czech — as Prof. M. has convincingly shown — it is the principle of FSP, in English it is the grammatical principle, that plays the decisive role in determining the order of words. This explains why a non-emotive English sentence is less ready to observe the theme-rheme sequence than its Czech counterpart.

FSP, however, is a formative factor of considerable weight (*Srovn. studie*, p. 187) and English has found means with which to make amends — at least to a certain extent — for the mentioned lack of readiness to observe the theme-rheme sequence. Under the heading of such means Prof. M. lists the order preparatory *there* — predicative verb — subject (e.g. *Once upon a time there was a woman* [*Srovn. studie*, p. 186]) or the order that places the subject after an adverbial element with full meaning (e.g. *In Bamborough castle once lived a king* [*ibid.*]). These constructions make it

possible to shift the rhematic, non-thematic subject towards the end of the sentence.

Another such means listed by Prof. M. is the order thematic subject — predicative verb. In comparison with other languages English increases the number of thematic subjects. To this end, on a much larger scale than other languages, it employs personal predicative constructions (*Srovn. studie*, p. 187) (cf. Cz. *Je mi zima* with Engl. *I am cold*) and various passive voice constructions (*Srovn. studie*, p. 187) (*The matter must be inquired into*).

All these means, however, are not enough to put all the non-emotive English sentences into the theme-rheme order. This induces Prof. M. to adopt the following view: "In regard to English, however, this is of no account, for — as a comparison of a Czech original with a good translation would show — English differs from Czech in being *so little susceptible* to the requirements of FSP as *frequently disregard them altogether*" ([*ibid.*] — underlined by us). Prof. M. even goes the length of speaking about the 'comparative *heedlessness* of English of FSP' ([*ibid.*] — underlined by us).

It is not without interest that as late as in *Srovn. studie* Prof. M. expressly speaks about the insusceptibility ('heedlessness') of English to (of) FSP. In his earlier papers he speaks only about clashes between the grammatical and the FSP principle, and shows how these clashes are prevented with the help of means, a short list of which has been presented above and which work in accordance with both principles.

Regarding language as a means of thought and communication, we find the question of susceptibility to FSP highly important. For if it is really so that FSP efficiently signalizes various degrees of CD, its role in language is indeed significant: not only within the sentence, but within the entire utterance, it may be expected to single out elements that convey the very gist of communication (separating them from those that do not do so). In our opinion the solution of the question of susceptibility to FSP will throw new light on the position of FSP within the entire system of language as within the sub-system of word order. We think it will also throw new light on the relation between two important word-order principles, the grammatical principle and that of FSP, i.e. on the very relation we are concerned with in this section of our paper. Let us therefore turn our attention to the question of susceptibility to FSP.

According to Prof. M., in a non-emotive context lack of susceptibility to FSP would certainly be revealed by sentences of the *A boy came into the room* type. Sentences of this type are at evident variance not only with the tendency to render the subject thematic, but also with the very tendency to arrange the sentence elements in the theme — transition — rheme order: the rhematic subject assumes front position, which is in accordance with the grammatical principle, but at variance with the principle of FSP. A detailed analysis of this type and similar ones has been offered in our *Nezákladové podmínky*. For the purposes of the present discussion it will suffice to state that the mentioned type is by no means insusceptible to FSP, and briefly to account for this statement. It may surely be supposed that the type *A boy came into the room* will most frequently occur in a context from which only the notion of *the room* is known. In this the subject, *a boy*, functions as rheme. For if the elements *a boy* and *came* convey new information, it is the former that carries a higher degree of CD. The explanation of this is as follows. From the point of view of communication greater importance is attached to the person who comes, who 'appears on the scene', than to the act of coming, appearing on the scene, itself. It is evident that in constituting FSP an essential role may be played by the semantic content of the sentence element and by the semantic relations into which it may enter. Thus in the discussed sentence type the non-generic indefinite article and the definite article mark out

the accompanying elements (*boy, room*) respectively as new and known, the verb to come belonging to verbs expressing 'existence' or 'appearance on the scene'. Just in passing let us add that we by no means maintain that in contrast with the non-generic indefinite article the definite article always marks out the accompanying element as known. It does so only under conditions treated of in detail in our above-mentioned paper. (6)

It follows that the definite and the indefinite article may function as important means of FSP. This applies not only to English, but also to other languages. A number of studies, published at about the same time as ours or shortly afterwards, bear out this statement. Let us refer at least to the studies by K. G. KRUSHELNITSKAYA and O. I. MOSKALSKAYA, concerning German, and to those by S. IVANCHEV and P. NOVÁK (*Zdvojování*), concerning Bulgarian and Albanian respectively. As to the verbs expressing 'existence' or 'appearance on the scene', we have to mention A. G. HATCHER's studies, *Syntax and Theme*, concerning English and Spanish. Nor can we leave unnoticed J. DUBSKÝ's *L'inversion*, treating of the Spanish verb, or K. DOVER's comments on the Greek verb in *Greek Word Order*.

Let us now turn our attention to the predicative verb, the object and the adverbial element. In *Srovn. studie* Prof. M. says, 'This comparative heedlessness of English of FSP manifests itself very clearly in positions allotted by the English sentence to the object and the adverbial element' (p. 188). The susceptibility of the verb and its object to FSP has been dealt with in our *Communicative Function*. (7) For the purposes of this paper a brief word of explanation why we disagree with Prof. M. on this point must again suffice. As has been shown by A. SECHERAYE (*Essai*, pp. 80—81), FR. KOPEČNÝ (*Základy*, pp. 29—34) and I. POLDAUF (*Srovnávání*, p. 70), the object is an essential amplification of the verb. This semantic relation manifests itself on the level of FSP in the following way: provided both the verb and its object convey new information, the object carries a higher degree of CD than the verb regardless of the positions they occupy within the sentence. Take these sentences, for instance: *He bought a new book yesterday, Er kaufte gestern ein neues Buch, Er hat gestern ein neues Buch gekauft, Koupil včera novou knihu*. If both the verb and the object in these sentences convey new information, then regardless of the positions occupied by them the object *book* [*Buch*] *knihu* will carry a higher degree of CD than its verb; under the circumstances it even becomes rheme proper.

If either the object or the verb, or both, convey things already known, the problem of susceptibility to FSP does not in fact arise, for elements conveying things already known pass into the theme (become thematic) — regardless of the positions they occupy within the sentence. Having become thematic, the sentence elements no longer co-operate in constituting FSP through their semantic content or the semantic relations into which they may enter.

Under the described conditions, as the examples show, the discussed semantic relations function on the level of FSP in various modern languages. In our opinion, it would not be difficult to prove that they function in the same way even in the course of the historical development of these languages and of course also in their dialects (again viewed both synchronistically and diachronistically).

The quoted examples allow of touching upon another problem—that of the susceptibility of the adverbial element to FSP. In these examples it is not only the verb and the object, but also the adverbial element that changes its position. It is a purely temporal adverb. Provided that such an adverbial element, together with the predicative verb and the object, conveys new information, the semantic content and its semantic relations to the verb-object group are such that regardless of position

the adverbial element carries a lower degree of CD than the verb and the object. This interpretation is based on the results offered by E. DVOŘÁKOVÁ in the study closing the present volume of *BSE*. (8) Applying E. Dvořáková's observations to the examples under discussion, we can account for the offered interpretation as follows. The adverb *yesterday/gestern/včera* conveys a mere temporal setting of the event expressed by the verb *bought/kaufte/hat gekauft/koupil* and the object *a book/Buch/knihu*. From the point of view of communication the temporal setting is naturally less important than the event. Hence the adverb becomes the carrier of the lowest degree of CD. Hence the adverb carries a lower degree of CD than the verb and the object, i. e. the elements expressing the event.

The semantic structure of the sentence, however, is not always such that the adverb can be interpreted as expressing a mere temporal setting. Take the sentence *Chaucer lived in the fourteenth century*, for instance. The verb expresses existence, the adverbial element the time of existence. If the subject *Chaucer* is thematic and the rest of the sentence non-thematic, then from the point of view of communication the statement of the time of existence is more important than that of the existence itself. The adverbial element even becomes the rheme of the sentence.

A somewhat different interpretation is required by the adverbial element of cause. The sentence *Thanks to his doctor's prescription he found himself extremely well* may serve as illustration. Provided that only *he* and *himself* convey known facts, the semantic content of the causal adverbial element, together with the free semantic relation the element displays in regard to the verb, operates on the FSP level in such a way as to leave it to the sentence position to determine what degree of CD is to be carried by the adverbial element. Consequently, under the circumstances the adverbial element of cause carries a comparatively low degree of CD. Together with *he*, it makes up the theme and serves as basis of communication within the discussed sentence. If, however, it comes to stand at the end of the sentence (*He found himself extremely well thanks to his doctor's prescription*) it will function — in its entirety — as rheme proper. Needless to say, the mentioned proviso remains valid: only *he* and *himself*, or perhaps also *his*, convey known facts. Even these conclusions are based on E. Dvořáková's observations. (9)

Although we have dealt with the subject, predicative verb, object and adverbial element, we have not exhausted (nor could we have done so), let alone solved all the problems concerning the operation of the semantic structure of the sentence on the level of FSP. Nevertheless, on the ground of the present discussion and on the ground of what we have arrived at in our studies, (10) we hope to be in a position to offer a brief theoretical generalization of our researches into FSP. We believe that in a nutshell this generalization presents a theory which opens up new vistas to further research.

The starting point of the theory is the assumption that it is in accordance both with the character of human thought and with the linear character (11) of the sentence to arrange the sentence elements in a consistent theme-transition-rheme sequence, i.e. according to the degree of CD, starting with the lowest and gradually passing on to (ending with) the highest. Such a sequence represents what we have termed the basic distribution of CD. In forming their sentences, however, languages may deviate from this basic distribution of CD. They may do so on account of grammatical structure, for emotive reasons, for the sake of the rhythm, etc. Such deviations are signalized in special ways, thus in fact only bearing out the basic distribution of CD. One way of signalizing deviations is provided by the context, another by the semantic structure of the sentence. The operation of the context consists chiefly in 'thematizing'

sentence elements (i.e. in rendering them thematic); any element already mentioned in the preceding context normally conveys the lowest amount of CD within a sentence irrespective of the position occupied in it. As to the semantic structure, it operates within that section of the sentence which has remained unaffected by the context. (Let us recall the cases in which the semantic content of a sentence element, or the semantic relation into which this content can enter, functions on the level of FSP only if it conveys new information.) It follows that the extent to which semantic structure may operate on the level of FSP depends on that to which the sentence has remained unaffected by (independent of) the context. (In other words, the extent to which semantic structure may operate on the level of FSP is determined by the degree of the contextual dependence of the sentence.)

A little proviso should be added to what has just been put forth. It concerns the operation of the semantic structure on the level of FSP. There is a special group of words predisposed by their semantic content to function in the theme. This group is formed especially by personal, possessive, demonstrative and reflexive pronouns and the definite article. In cases when they function as thematic, these elements undoubtedly signalize contextual dependence; on the other hand, they serve as media through which the semantic structure may operate on the level of FSP, i.e. co-operate in moulding FSP.

We hope to have succeeded in showing that FSP is the outcome of a tension between the basic distribution of CD on the one hand and the context and the semantic structure on the other. A full understanding of all the relations ensuing from this tension presupposes constant regard to the grammatical structure of the sentence. We cannot discuss here the degrees nor the ways and means of contextual dependence (or of contextual applicability for that matter) displayed by the sentence. We have attempted to do so elsewhere. (12) In this connection let us only point out that an inquiry into these phenomena facilitates to determine (i) the spheres of operation of various means of FSP and (ii) the limits within which various sentence types can function on the level of FSP.

From what has so far been put forth the following conclusion can be drawn. Word order is not the only means of FSP. If a non-emotive sentence does not observe the theme-transition-rheme sequence, it cannot *a priori* be regarded as insusceptible to FSP. (13) Word order, of course, is an important means of FSP. This is quite in accordance with the linear character of the sentence, and consequently also with the basic distribution of CD. The extent, however, to which word order can manifest itself as a means of FSP depends first of all on the grammatical structure of the given language. This explains why in Czech, but not in English, FSP can assume the function of the leading word-order principle. Both in English and in Czech, however, word-order formations in the end do comply with the requirements of FSP: the relations between the word-order and the other (non-word-order) means of FSP must be such as to induce the sentence to convey that FSP which the speaker/writer — consciously or subconsciously — wishes to express at the given moment of communication. It has to be emphasized that this wording pays heed to one very important fact — that not even in Czech do all non-emotive sentences consistently and strictly observe the theme-transition-rheme sequence.

We further believe that the present chapter has also borne out the legitimacy of the requirement advocated by FR. DANĚŠ (*Vedl. věty*, esp. p. 20, *Intonace*, p. 56, *Stanba*, pp. 231—246), M. DOKULIL (*Stanba*, pp. 231—246), L. DOLEŽEL (*Styl*, pp. 12—13) and K. HAUSENBLAS (*Závistost*, e.g. pp. 9—10) and subscribed to by us — the methodological requirement of distinguishing between the semantic level (the

semantic structure), the grammatical level (the grammatical structure) and the level of FSP.

Before passing on to the second part of our paper, we should like to account for our preference for the designation 'functional sentence perspective'. It has been suggested to us by the term used by Prof. M. in the title and text of his paper *Zur Satzperspektive*, and employed chiefly for two reasons: first, because it can easily be rendered into other languages, second, because it seems to appropriately indicate the active, 'dynamic' functioning of the semantic and grammatical sentence structures in the very act of communication, i.e. at the moment when in order to fulfil the function of expressing some definite extra-linguistic reality reflected by thought, the semantic and grammatical structures of the sentence appear in an adequate, proper kind of perspective. We think that with the help of the expressions 'functional' and 'perspective' the designation 'functional sentence perspective' fittingly responds to the efforts of contemporary linguistics to inquire into the function of language in regard to thought and extra-linguistic reality.

Chapter Two

ENGLISH WORD ORDER AND THE EMOTIVE AND RHYTHMICAL PRINCIPLES

We shall now turn our attention to the word-order principle of emphasis. (For the moment we shall keep this designation of Prof. M., although for reasons to be stated later we would rather replace it by 'the word-order principle of emotion'/'the emotive word-order principle'.) As can be gathered from Prof. M.'s judicious observations, in Czech this principle appears as a counterpart, or rather as an organic complement, of the principle of FSP. In *Základní funkce*, p. 175, he has the following to say about these two principles: 'Our wording, of course, covers these two factors: in stating that the word order of the Czech sentence is in principle determined by its FSP, viz. according to one set of principles in unagitated speech, and according to another in emphatic speech.' In Czech, according to him, unagitated, unemphatic, non-emotive sentences show the theme-rheme order, whereas the reverse, i.e. the rheme-theme, order is shown by the agitated, emphatic, emotive sentences. The former order is referred to by Prof. M. as objective, the latter as subjective. (*I ze čtení pětku dostal* — 'Even from reading five he-got'.) (14) The observation that in Czech the principle of emphasis appears as a counterpart, or rather as an organic complement, of the principle of FSP, in fact constituting one principle with it, is a lucid exposition of the basic feature of the Czech word-order system.

What is the position assigned by Prof. M. to the principle of emphasis in the English system of word order? In other words, what — in regard to this system — does Prof. M. think of the character of the principle of emphasis and of its relations to the grammatical principle and to that of FSP? And what will be our attitude towards his solutions? Before attempting to answer these questions, let us first briefly deal with the word order of questions and wish-clauses. For both in *Základní funkce* and in *Srown. studie* it is these two types that Prof. M. brings into close relation with the principle of emphasis.

In the latter paper Prof. M. makes the following statement about the two sentence types (p. 302): 'They are sentences of evidently emotional character and the normal word order within them is therefore subjective. In general questions and in wish-clauses an important part of the rheme is the verb, which in consequence usually precedes the subject and frequently occurs even at the beginning of the sentence.' Prof. M.'s arguments may be briefly summarized as follows: The expected subjective

order with the verb standing at the beginning of the sentence or at least before the subject is displayed by archaic wish-clauses of the *Long live the king!* type (*Srovn. studie*, p. 302), further by general questions opening with the verb *to be* or *to have* (either principal or auxiliary), and finally by general questions opening with a modal verb; cf. *Is that your coat?*, *Had the man no friends?*, *Have you seen that?*, *Could he hear you?* (all quoted from *Srovn. studie*, p. 302). Prof. M., however, finds that archaic wish-clauses of the *Long live the king!* type and general questions opening with a non-auxiliary *to be* and *to have* show a clash between the requirements of the FSP principle and those of the grammatical principle: for though in accordance with the FSP principle, the front position of the verb or in any case its occurrence before the subject is at evident variance with the grammatical principle, which requires the verb to follow its subject. According to Prof. M., a way of avoiding such a clash is found with those general questions and wish-clauses that open with an auxiliary verb. For in these types the notional, non-auxiliary verb stands after the subject. This leads Prof. M. to the following conclusion: 'English has resorted to this possibility so that within general questions and wish-clauses it may meet both the requirements of FSP and those of the grammatical principle: in questions it uses the periphrastic conjugation of *to do* and in wish-clauses the modal verb *may*. For instance: ... *Did you get there in time? May the king live long!*...' (*Srovn. studie*, p. 302). As to special questions, Prof. M. states that unless using the interrogative pronoun as subject, they have adopted — though owing to somewhat different circumstances — the same construction as general questions (*ibid.*).

As we see it, Prof. M.'s observations elicit the following comments. The word order of the archaic type *Long live the king!* can certainly be interpreted as 'subjective'. The sequence followed is undoubtedly a rheme-theme one, starting with the element carrying the highest degree of CD and ending with one carrying the lowest. Such a sequence, however, is hardly ever found with general questions or with wish-clauses of the non-archaic type, i.e. with wish-clauses opening with a modal verb. Let us compare the non-archaic type of wish-clause, *May the king live long!*, with the archaic one quoted above. The former differs from the latter in that it places the element carrying the highest degree of CD at the end, not at the beginning! General questions behave in a similar way, their initial verbal form very rarely assuming rhematic character. In our opinion, this can be accounted for as follows.

As a rule, a general question does not merely appeal to the listener for confirmation or denial of a certain piece of information, but also communicates this piece of information to him, i.e. intimates to him what he is expected to confirm or to deny. According to the context, the degrees of CD within a general question may naturally vary, and so may in consequence the FSP of the general question. (This has already been pointed out by FR. DANEŠ in *Otázka*.) This view is borne out by the intonation of the special questions. The most frequent type, at the same time displaying the lowest degree of contextual dependence, is the one intoned *'Have you 'seen my /hat?*, with the most dynamic element at the end. Other types of perspective are indicated by the following intonations: *'Have you ,seen my hat?*, *'Have you seen ,my hat?*, *'Have ,you seen my hat?*, *Have 'you seen my /hat?* In general questions the initial verbal form does not usually become rheme proper, merely because its semantic content is very slight. This form does not actually convey any proper lexical meaning at all, and if it does so after all (in cases when *to be* and *to have* function as notional verbs), the lexical meaning expressed by it is of comparatively small communicative value. No wonder that the initial verbal form becomes rheme proper on very rare occasions, in fact only when mere appeal is conveyed inviting the listener to express his con-

firmation or denial. Such mere appeal is expressed by the type of general question, the intonation of which keeps on rising from beginning to end (*Have you seen my hat?*).

One thing, of course, has to be admitted, without entailing the necessity to alter the conclusions just presented. The subject, which in non-archaic wish-clauses and general questions stands after the initial verb, is frequently thematic. Carrying a higher degree of CD than the following subject, the initial verb is then set off. Such cases may certainly be interpreted as deviations from the consistently objective sequence (i.e. from the consistent theme proper-rheme proper sequence), in other words as deviations producing at least a slight subjective colouring of word order. But on account of the already mentioned small semantic value of the initial verb, this colouring is not effective enough to warrant the conclusion drawn by Prof. M., viz. that the so-called subjective word order is an indispensable characteristic feature common to general questions and non-archaic wish-clauses in English. On the contrary — as the preceding paragraphs have shown — the word order as displayed by English general questions and by English non-archaic wish-clauses is not basically subjective, but objective.

If our interpretation is correct, the discussed order of words cannot be regarded as a solution avoiding a clash between the requirements of the FSP principle and those of the grammatical principle. In fact, the question arises whether — from the point of view of Modern English structure — there exists such a clash at all.

For one may ask whether the principle of emphasis occupies the same position within the word-order system of English as within that of Czech. In Czech it is the deviation from unmarked, objective order that creates emphatic word order. This is due to FSP performing the role of the leading principle within the Czech system of word order. FSP, however, does not perform this role in English, whose system of word order is dominated by the grammatical principle. This raises the question whether the so-called emphatic word order in English should not be accounted for as a deviation from the unmarked, grammatical order.

If we answer this question in the positive, the explanation it offers admits of applying one common denominator both to the archaic wish-clauses of the *Long live the king!* type, opening with the element carrying the highest degree of CD, and to general questions, opening on the contrary with a dynamically very weak element. Although these sentence types are structured differently on the level of FSP, they deviate in one and the same way from unmarked word order — through the marked pre-subject position of the element performing the function of the finite verb.

The objection might be raised that a common denominator is equally applied to archaic and non-archaic sentence types. The described denominator, however, is applicable to all the sentences — no matter whether they are archaic or not — adduced by Prof. M. in *Srovn. studie* in illustration of how the principle of emphasis operates in English (pp. 303—304). All these illustrative sentences have one striking feature in common: in various ways they all deviate from ordinary grammatical word order. They are, however, far from uniform in deviating from the so-called objective word order.

It is perhaps unnecessary to quote all the examples adduced by Prof. M. But in order to prove that not all of them deviate from the so-called objective word order, let us concentrate at least on the following four of them: *This lesson time will teach to all alike, These great men we trust that we know how to prize, Hers is the meekness that belongs to the hopeless, Therefore have we linked ourselves to the only Party that promises us the boon we seek.* The elements *This lesson...* and *These great men...*,

respectively opening the first and the second sentence, are thematic. As to the elements following these openings, in each of the two sentences they show a gradual increase in CD, ending up with rheme proper. It is therefore not in a rheme-theme sequence but in a theme-rheme one, i.e. not in a subjective but in an objective order, that each of the two sentences appears. Objective is the order even in the sentence opening with *Hers...* and in that opening with *Therefore...* Prof. M. himself refers to the adverbial *therefore* as emphatically connective. As is not difficult to understand, connective elements are usually thematic.

In English, then, a subjective sequence is not a necessary condition of emotive word order. As may have been gathered from the preceding lines, the following facts are of special concern in this connection. The emphasis of a front-positioned word is not necessarily due to a high degree of CD carried by such a word; it may merely be due to a deviation from the usual (unmarked) word order. The rhematic elements may in such cases occupy quite 'objective' positions at the end of the sentence. As even then they remain bearers of strongest emphasis, it is possible to say that neither strongest emphasis nor rhematic character is indispensable for marking out word order as emotive. (15)

In discussing the English system of word order, or word order in general, our findings lead us not to invariably identify subjective with emotive word order, and objective with non-emotive word order. In regard to the English system of word order, or of word order in general, they also induce us to replace the term 'the word-order principle of emphasis' by that of 'the emotive word-order principle'. This new designation refers to the agent that produces emotive word order, thus conveying the speaker's/writer's agitated attitude towards the communicated information. This attitude may partly, or sometimes even entirely, consist in the speaker's/writer's appeal to the hearer/reader. The total amount of conveyed agitation varies; it depends on the way in, and the extent to, which the concerned language means (co-)operate in bringing about the emotive effect (16).

Let us now summarize what we have so far arrived at in Chapter Two and attempt to answer the questions with which we opened it. As far as Czech is concerned, Prof. M. is certainly right in interpreting the word-order principle of emphasis (in our terms, the emotive word-order principle) as a counterpart, or rather organic complement, of the word-order principle of FSP. In other words, as to Czech, the emotive word-order principle can and is to be interpreted first and foremost in regard to (on the background of) the word-order principle of FSP. On the other hand, the character of the English word-order system is such as to restrict the operation of FSP as a word-order principle even within emotive spheres. An exact statement of the share FSP has in the interplay of means producing emotive word order has not been attempted in this paper, but the following seems to be certain: in contrast with its Czech counterpart, the English emotive word-order principle is to be interpreted first and foremost in regard to (on the background of) the grammatical principle. An important consequence of these differences between English and Czech (17) is that the extent to which the emotive word-order principle can operate is not the same in the two languages. And it is not hard to understand why the emotive word-order principle is given much wider play in Czech than in English. This is so because in Czech the dominating word-order principle (the FSP principle) tends to loosen the word order, whereas the opposite is true of the dominating word-order principle (the grammatical principle) in English.

It remains to touch upon the word-order principle of sentence rhythm. Even here a great number of problems are involved. But in view of the general conception,

with which we are chiefly concerned in this paper, it will suffice to point out one important fact: practically neither in English nor in Czech does the word-order principle of sentence rhythm interfere with FSP. This is once again due to FSP being implemented also by other means than by those of word order. This explanation can easily be squared with Prof. M.'s statement that in English it is in fact not the word-order principle of FSP, but that of sentence-rhythm that co-determines the mutual position of subject and predicative verb with greater efficacy (*Srovn. studie*, p. 305).

How so that the word-order principle of sentence rhythm does not actually interfere with FSP and in consequence does not render the sentence insusceptible to FSP? This can be explained mainly by the fact that among the elements coming within the operational sphere are such as through change in sentence position do not alter the mutual relation of degrees of CD within the sentence. Let us adduce one illustrative example from Czech and one from English.

Different rhythmical structures are shown by these three Czech variants: *Ani se na to nemohu podívat* ['Not-even (reflex. pronoun) at it I-cannot look'], *Ani podívat se na to nemohu* ['Not-even look (reflex. pronoun) at it I-cannot'], *Ani se na to podívat nemohu* ['Not-even (reflex. pronoun) at it look I-cannot']. Leaving aside the operation of the emotive word-order principle, which is given full play in the second variant and some in the third, we find that neither the positional change of the reflexive *se* nor the positional changes of *nemohu* and *podívat* alter the mutual relation of the degrees of CD, which remains the same in all the three variants. (They all display the same degree of contextual dependence.) The reflexive pronoun *se*, virtually devoid of any semantic content, remains thematic, whilst the infinitive *podívat* remains an essential semantic amplification of the modal verb *nemohu*. (Provided both the amplifying element and the element to be amplified convey new information, the former calls for a higher degree of CD than the latter. Cf. p. 114.) It follows that the word-order principle of sentence rhythm can operate in the indicated way because it is permitted to do so not only by the grammatical, but also by the semantic structure of the sentence. Under the circumstances, the latter assumes the function of a means of FSP, counteracting the basic distribution of CD.

And now for the English example. As has been pointed out by Prof. M., a special stylistic effect is achieved in English if both the beginning and the end of the sentence are made rhythmically heavy. Thus instead of the sentence *He no sooner began to speak than every one was silent* with a rhythmically weak beginning, it is possible to use the variant *No sooner did he begin to speak than every one was silent* with a beginning made rhythmically heavy (*Srovn. studie*, p. 305). Leaving aside the operation of the emotive word-order principle, which manifests itself through deviation from unmarked word order, we find that the relation of degrees of CD is virtually the same within the two variants. Because of its semantic content, the element *he* is thematic in both variants. As to the element *did*, newly introduced into the second variant, it indicates only the past time of the action and carries only a slightly higher degree of CD than the dynamically weak element *he*.

Both in the Czech and the English variants, the rhythmical principle operated within limits set up by the grammatical and the semantic structures and by FSP. This indicates the positions occupied by the rhythmical principle within the Czech and the English system of word order. In both languages, the word-order principle of sentence rhythm observes the requirements of the three mentioned levels, and in this way interferes with none of the other three word-order principles discussed here: the FSP principle, the grammatical principle and the emotive principle.

We are nearing the close of our discussion of English word-order principles as

compared with their Czech counterparts. It would certainly be possible to discuss other word-order principles than those examined here. In *Základní funkce* (p. 180) Prof. M. mentions other word-order principles, such as the factor of syntactic clearness, that of easy enunciation and that of the general arrangement of sounds. All these principles and possibly even some others, however, would not — as Prof. M. is undoubtedly right in maintaining — alter the pattern which, in accordance with the structure of the language in question, is set by the word-order principles discussed in Prof. M.'s *Srovn. studie* and taken up by the present paper.

By way of conclusion let us briefly summarize our discussion as follows. Basing it on Prof. M.'s conception of word order, we have attempted to prove that FSP occupies a far more important position within the system of language than Prof. M. was led to suppose. In our opinion this conclusion throws new light not only on the relation between the grammatical word-order principle and the word-order principle of FSP, but also on that between the emotive word-order principle and on the word-order principle of sentence rhythm. We think that it throws new light on the entire structure of the sentence, as well as on the function of the sentence in the very act of communication. We believe it even to open new vistas to the diachronistic study of word order. All the additions to, or perhaps corrections of, Prof. M.'s conception, however, only bear out its usefulness and soundness. To our knowledge, Prof. M. was the first to offer a systematic interpretation of the English system of word order in regard to its main principles. He is right when closing his paper 'Ze srovnávacích studií slovosledných' ('From Comparative Word-Order Studies') with these words, 'There is a vast literature dealing with it [i. e. with the word order in English — J. F.], but such a consistent approach covering all its main principles as I have attempted in this paper is, to my knowledge, in view of method and performance the first of its kind' (p. 307).

- (1) In referring to this paper we shall use only its abbreviated title (*Srovn. studie*) without giving the author's name.
- (2) A number of problems have been given detailed treatment in some of our papers to which we shall refer in the course of the present discussion.
- (3) Prof. M.'s highly suggestive treatment of word order (as well as of FSP) has been favourably received by Czech and Slovak scholars. Recently it has also been greatly appreciated by some Soviet scholars: cf. e. g. V. V. VINOGRADOV, *Grammatika*, 1, p. 80; B. A. ILYISH, *Razvitiye*, pp. 195 and 197—198; K. G. KRUSHELTNISKAYA, *Ocherki*, p. 188; I. P. RASPOPOV, *Aktualnoye chleneniye*, pp. 14—17. The study of FSP has also been taken up by a group of workers led by O. Š. AKHMANOVA and E. M. MEDNIKOVA at the English Department of Moscow State University (see their *English Studies*, p. 74). The papers of two other Slavonic scholars working outside Czechoslovakia are worth mentioning in this connection: S. IVANCHEV'S *Nablyudeniya* and F. MICHALK'S *Wliw*.
- (4) For the method of analytical comparison cf. J. VACHEK'S *Dictionnaire* (p. 22, s. v. *comparaison analytique et point de vue fonctionnel*) quoting from V. MATHESIUS' *Systematic Analysis*, p. 95: 'If we are to apply analytical comparison with profit, the only way of approach to different languages as strictly comparable systems is the functional point of view, since general needs of expression and communication, common to all mankind, are the only common denominators to which means of expression and communication, varying from language to language can reasonably be brought.'
- (5) At the present state of research it is sometimes difficult to draw a definite line between the thematic and the transitional elements on the one hand, and between the transitional and the rhematic elements on the other. For a correct interpretation of FSP, however, it is, in the first place, essential to give a reliable statement of the relations as displayed by the degrees of CD within the clause (sentence). (Cf. our *Word Order in OE & ModE*, pp. 72—73). — A highly suggestive interpretation of the relations of the sentence elements to the context has been advanced by K. J. DOVER, *Greek Word Order*. The author draws a double distinction between dispensable and indispensable elements, and predictable and unpredictable ones. He treats 'a Greek utterance as composed of . . . nuclei (symbol N) and concomitants (symbol C)', calling 'an element N if it is indispensable to the sense of the utterance and cannot be predicted from the preceding elements, and C in so far it is deficient in either of these qualities' (*Greek Word Order*, p. 40; cf. P. TROST, *Word Order*, p. 154). Focusing our attention on Prof. M.'s conception of word order, we regret not to be able at the moment to offer a discussion of K. J. DOVER'S valuable theory. We hope to do so on another occasion.
- (6) As to the problem of how the articles function on FSP level, it has been suggested to us by B. A. ILYISH, *Angliyskiy yazyk*, §§ 363—364.
- (7) Quite recently the question of the susceptibility of the German verb to FSP has been taken up by E. BENEŠ in *Verbstellung*. The author also draws the conclusion that the German verb is susceptible to FSP.
- (8) The volume brings the English version of the author's paper published in SPFFBU A9, 1961, pp. 74—98. Cf. our *Ještě k postavení*, an afterthought on this study.
- (9) It is certainly significant what an important part is played on the level of FSP by the semantic sphere of 'existence, or appearance, on the scene'. (This sphere covers not only the actual existence or appearance, but also the place and time of existence or appearance, as well as the existing person, thing, action, etc.) We think that it would not be difficult to prove that these semantic relations are to be found not only in English, German and Czech, but also in other Indo-European languages; we believe this statement to hold good both for the diachronistic and for the synchronistic study of languages, both for their standard and their dialectal forms. As to English and Spanish, see also our *Sentence*.
- (10) Besides the studies already referred to, see also *Poznámky, More Thoughts, Communicative Value, Deutscher Beitrag*.
- (11) The significance of the linear character of the sentence in regard to FSP has been suggested to us by D. L. BOLINGER'S *Linear Modification*.
- (12) See *Communicative Function*, Chapter Three, and *Sentence*, p. 141. — The preceding pages have perhaps shown the usefulness of the attempt to establish the degrees of CD within a sentence. K. J. DOVER would not think such an attempt feasible. He confines himself to pointing out, 'in a given example, which elements have some degree of C status' and prefers 'to leave all other questions of importance alone' (*Greek Word Order*, p. 53).
- (13) Cf. P. NOVÁK, *Prostředky*, p. 10.

- (14) For the benefit of the reader who may not have a ready command of Czech, here and elsewhere a literal translation of the Czech example is added.
- (15) Let us add that even in such cases the rhematic elements co-operate in bringing about the emotive colouring of the sentence. They do not, however, convey emotiveness because of the change in their sentence position, but because of the emotive character of the entire sentence. This seems to be an interesting parallel to a phenomenon pointed out by J. VACHEK. According to him, it is the context within the sentence that eventually renders the finite verbal form in English subjective or objective, transitive or intransitive, perfective or imperfective, positive or negative. (See J. VACHEK's editorial comments on Prof. M.'s *Obsahový rozbor*, pp. 219—220.)
- (16) In our previous papers (e. g. in *Communicative Function*, p. 39 and *Word Order in OE & ModE*, p. 73) we only used the term 'emphatic word order' when acquainting the reader with Prof. M.'s conception of word order. K. J. DOVER (*Greek Word Order*, p. 32) is right when emphasizing the necessity of distinguishing emphasis called forth by the speaker's emotion and emphasis essential to the clarity of the argument.
- (17) From the diachronic point of view, we have dealt with the position of the emotive principle within the English word-order system in *Word Order in OE & ModE*. — Important contributions to the study of emotive word order in English are A. GRAD's *Affectivity* and the chapters on word order in B. M. CHARLESTON's *Studies* (pp. 137—158) and H. SPITZBARDT's *Lebendiges Englisch* (pp. 215—225). A. Grad and Charleston evaluate the emotive word-order principle in about the same way as Prof. M.; H. Spitzbardt appreciates the role played by structural deviations in producing emotive word order. He subscribes to M. BROŽOVÁ's correct view (put forth in her unpublished dissertation, *Influence*) that 'the normal English word-order is subject, verb, object — but, in order to give a forceful impression, we can place a word or phrase in an unaccustomed position'. (Quoted after H. SPITZBARDT's *Lebendiges Englisch*, p. 221.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- O. S. AKHMANOVA—E. M. MEDNIKOVA, *English Studies = English Studies at the Moscow State University*, Zeitschrift für Anglistik und Amerikanistik 9, 1961, pp. 65—75
- E. BENES, *Verstellung = Die Verstellung im Deutschen, von der Mitteilungsperspektive her betrachtet* [The Sentence Position of the Verb in German from the Point of View of Functional Sentence Perspective], *Philologica Pragensia* 5, 1962, pp. 6—19
- D. L. BOLINGER, *Linear Modification*, PMLA, 1952, pp. 1117—1144
- M. BROŽOVÁ, *Influence = The Influence of Emphasis on English Syntax*. An unpublished dissertation (Prague 1948). Quoted after H. SPITZBARDT, *Lebendiges Englisch*, pp. 221 and 280.
- B. M. CHARLESTON, *Studies on the Emotional and Affective Means of Expression in Modern English* (Bern 1960)
- FR. DANEŠ, *Intonace = Intonace a větu ve spisovné češtině* [Sentence Intonation in Present-Day Czech] (Prague 1957)
- FR. DANEŠ, *Otázka = Intonace otázky* [The Intonation of the Question], *Naše řeč* 33, 1949, pp. 62—68
- FR. DANEŠ, *Vedl. věty = Vedlejší věty účinkově přírovnávočí se spojkou než aby* [Consecutively Coloured Comparative Sub-Clauses with the Conjunction NEŽ ABY], *Naše řeč* 38, 1955, pp. 12—22.
- FR. DANEŠ—M. DOKULIL, *K tzv. významové a mluvnické stavbě věty* [On the So-Called Semantic and Grammatical Structures of the Sentence], published in: *O vědeckém poznání soudobých jazyků* [On the Research into Contemporary Languages], (Prague 1958), pp. 231—246
- M. DOKULIL, see FR. DANEŠ
- L. DOLEŽEL, *Styl = O stylu moderní české prózy* [On the Style of Modern Czech Prose], (Prague 1960)
- K. J. DOVER, *Greek Word Order* (Cambridge 1960)
- J. DUBSKÝ, *L'inversion = L'inversion en espagnol*, SPFFBU A8, 1960, pp. 111—122
- E. DVOŘÁKOVÁ, *Adverbs = On the English and Czech Situational Adverbs in Functional Sentence Perspective*, see pp. 129—142 of the present volume
- J. FIRBAS, *Communicative Function = Thoughts on the Communicative Function of the Verb in English, German and Czech*, *Brno Studies in English* 1, 1950, pp. 39—68
- J. FIRBAS, *Communicative Value = On the Communicative Value of the Modern English Finite Verb*, *Brno Studies in English* 3, 1961, pp. 79—104
- J. FIRBAS, *Deutscher Beitrag = Bemerkungen über einen deutschen Beitrag zum Problem der Satzperspektive*, *Philologica Pragensia* 1, 1958, pp. 49—54

- J. FIRBAS, *Ještě k postavení = Ještě k postavení příslovečného určení v angličtině a češtině z hlediska aktuálního členění větného* [Another Note on the Position of the Situational Adverbs in English and Czech from the Point of View of Functional Sentence Perspective], SPFFBU A9, 1961, pp. 153–156
- J. FIRBAS, *More Thoughts = More Thoughts on the Communicative Function of the English Verb*, SPFFBU A7, 1959, pp. 74–98
- J. FIRBAS, *Nezákladové podměty = K otázce nezákladových podmětů v současné angličtině* [On the Problem of Non-Thematic Subjects in Contemporary English], Časopis pro moderní filologii 39, 1957, pp. 22–42 and 165–173
- J. FIRBAS, *Poznámky = Poznámky k problematice anglického slovního pořádku z hlediska aktuálního členění větného* [Notes on the Problem of English Word Order from the Point of View of Functional Sentence Perspective], SPFFBU A4, 1956, pp. 93–107
- J. FIRBAS, *Sentence = Notes on the Function of the Sentence in the Act of Communication (Marginalia on Two Important Studies in Syntax by Anna Granville Hatcher)*, SPFFBU A10, 1962, pp. 133–148
- J. FIRBAS, *Word Order in OE & ModE = Some Thoughts on the Function of Word Order in Old English and Modern English*, SPFFBU A5, 1957, pp. 72–100
- A. GRAD, *Affectivity = Affectivity and Inversion in Modern English*, Zbornik Filozofske fakultete II (Ljubljana 1955), pp. 335–373
- Grammatika = Grammatika ruského jazyka* [Grammar of the Russian Language], i – ii, Akademiya nauk SSSR (Moscow 1954)
- A. G. HATCHER, *Syntax = Syntax and the Sentence*, Word 12, 1956, pp. 234–250
- A. G. HATCHER, *Theine = Theme and Underlying Question, Two Studies in Spanish Word Order*, Supplement to Word 12, 1956
- K. HAUSENBLAS, *Závislost = Syntaktická závislost, způsoby a prostředky jejího vyjadřování* [Syntactic Dependence – Ways and Means of its Implementation], Bulletin Vysoké školy ruského jazyka a literatury 2; 1958, pp. 23–51
- B. A. ILYISH, *Anglijskij jazyk = Sovremennyy anglijskij jazyk* [Contemporary English] (Moscow 1948)
- B. A. ILYISH, *Razvitiye = Razvitiye sposobov vyraženiya smyslovogo predikata v anglijskom jazyke* [Ways of Expressing the Sense Predicate in English (Historical Outline)], Materialy vtoroy nauchnoy sessii po voprosam germanskogo jazykoznanija, (Moscow–Leningrad 1961), pp. 194–215
- S. IVANCHEV, *Nablyudeniya = Nablyudeniya vŕrku upotrebat na chlena v bulgarski ezik* [Notes on the Use of the Article in the Bulgarian Language], Bŕlgarski ezik 7, 1957, pp. 499–524
- FR. KOPEČŪV, *Základy = Základy české skladby* [Fundamentals of Czech Syntax], (Prague 1958)
- K. G. KRUSHELNITSKAYA, *Očerki = Očerki po sopostovitel'noj grammatike nemetskogo i ruskogo jazykov* [Studies in the Comparative Grammar of the German and Russian Languages] (Moscow 1961)
- V. MATHESIUS, *Obsahovŕj rozbor = Obsahovŕj rozbor současnŕe angličetiny na základŕe obecnŕe lingvistickŕm* [A Functional Analysis of Present-Day English on a General Linguistic Basis], edited by J. VACHEK (Prague 1961)
- V. MATHESIUS, *Srovn. studie = Ze srovnávacích studiŕ slovosledných* [From Comparative Word-Order Studies], Časopis pro moderní filologii 28, 1942, pp. 181–190 and 302–307
- V. MATHESIUS, *Studie = Studie k dějinám anglického slovosledu* [Studies in the History of English Word Order], Věstník České akademie 16, 1907, pp. 261–275; 17, 1908, pp. 195–214 and 299–311; 18, 1909, pp. 1–12; 19, 1910, pp. 125–130
- V. MATHESIUS, *Systematic Analysis = On Some Problems of the Systematic Analysis of Grammar*, TCLP 6, (Prague 1936), pp. 95–107
- V. MATHESIUS, *Základní funkce = Základní funkce pořádku slov v češtinŕe* [The Basic Function of Word Order in Czech], Slovo a slovesnost 7, 1941, pp. 169–180
- V. MATHESIUS, *Zur Satzperspektive = Zur Satzperspektive im modernen Englisch*, Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen, Band 155, Jahrgang 84, 1929, pp. 202–210
- E. M. MEDNIKOVA see O. S. AKHMANOVA
- F. MICHALK, *Wliw = Wliw němčiny na položenije finitneho slovjesa v serbskej sadže* [The Influence of German on the Position of the Finite Verb in the Sorabian Sentence], Otázky slovauskŕ syntaxe [Questions of Slavonic Syntax], Opera Universitatis Purkynianae Brunensis – Facultas Philosophica 85, pp. 190–198 (Brno 1962)
- O. I. MOSKALSKAYA, *Artikl = Artikl v nemetskom jazyke* [The Article in German], Inostrannyje jazyki v shkole 1956, 5, pp. 17–37
- P. NOVÁK, *Prostředky = O prostředcích aktuálního členění* [On the Means of Functional Sentence Perspective], Acta Universitatis Carolinae 1959, Philologica 1, pp. 9–15

- P. NOVÁK, *Zdvojení = K zdvojení předmětu v albánštině* [On the Doubling of the Object in Albanian], Sborník slavistických prací věnovaných IV. mezinárodnímu sjezdu slavistů v Moskvě, Universita Karlova, pp. 27–32 (Prague 1958)
- I. POLDÁUF, *Srovnávání = Srovnávání s mateřštinou při vědeckém studiu jazyků* [Comparison with the Mother Tongue as a Method of Research into Foreign Languages], Sborník Vysoké školy pedagogické v Olomouci, (Prague 1954), pp. 45–72
- I. P. RASPOPOV, *Aktualnoye chleneniye = Aktualnoye chleneniye predlozheniya* [Functional Sentence Perspective] (Ufa 1961)
- A. SECHEHAYE, *Essai = Essai sur la structure logique de la phrase* (Paris 1926)
- Soupis = Soupis prací Viléma Mathesiusa* [The Bibliography of Writings of Vilém Mathesius], published by the English Department of the Caroline University and the Prague Linguistic Circle (Prague 1947)
- SPFFBU = *Sborník prací filosofické fakulty brněnské university* (Brno)
- H. SPITZBARDT, *Lebendiges Englisch* (Halle a. d. S. 1962)
- TCLP = *Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Prague*
- P. TROST, *Word Order = Review of K. J. DOVER's Greek Word Order*, Listy filologické 86, 1963, p. 154
- J. VACHEK, *Dictionnaire = Dictionnaire de linguistique de l'École de Prague*. Avec collaboration de J. DUBSKÝ (Utrecht—Anvers 1960)
- J. VACHEK, see V. MATHESIUS, *Obsahový rozbor*
- H. WEIL, *Ordre = De l'ordre des mots dans les langues anciennes comparées aux langues modernes* (Paris 1844, 1879)

Ze srovnávacích studií slovosledných

(K Mathesiovu pojetí anglické slovosledné soustavy ve srovnání se slovoslednou soustavou českou)

Téměř na sklonku života vydává V. Mathesius článek, nazvaný *Ze srovnávacích studií slovosledných* (Časopis pro moderní filologii 28, 1942, str. 181—190 a 302—307). Tento článek shrnuje výsledky bádání V. Mathesia o anglickém slovním pořádku ve srovnání s pořádkem českým.

Autor resumované studie na tento článek navazuje a používá jeho podnětů. Zároveň však ukazuje, jak se mu na základě vlastních a jiných prací jeví v něm zkoumaná problematika dnes, tj. dvacet let po jeho vyjití.

Ve svém článku Mathesius uplatnil dvě závažné metodologické zásady. Za prvé: aby bylo možno podat rozbor slovosledné soustavy, jakož i vysvětlit konkrétní slovosledné formace, je třeba znát povahu slovosledných činitelů i jejich vzájemný poměr z hlediska rozsahu a způsobu jejich uplatnění. Za druhé: k hlubšímu postižení slovosledné soustavy jazyka vydatně napomáhá, zkoumáme-li ji metodou analyticko-srovnávací, tj. srovnáváme-li ji se slovoslednou soustavou jiného jazyka, jehož struktura je pokud možno rozdílná.

Mathesius přesvědčivě ukázal, že v češtině je vedoucím, nejdůležitějším slovosledným činitelem princip aktuálního členění větného (neboli funkční perspektivy větné [= fpv.]), v angličtině však princip gramatický. Autor resumované studie má však za to, že angličtina není proto méně citlivá k fpv. než čeština, jak se domníval Mathesius. Autor dovodil podrobně už jinde, že slovní pořádek není jediným prostředkem fpv. Míra, v níž se jako takový prostředek projeví, závisí především na gramatické struktuře jazyka. Proto se může v češtině fpv. dokonce uplatnit jako vedoucí slovosledný činitel, v angličtině však nikoli. Přitom však jak v češtině, tak v angličtině slovosledné formace vposledu respektují fpv., tj. požadavek, aby vzájemné vztahy mezi slovoslednými a neslovoslednými prostředky fpv. byly takové, aby věta mohla tlumočit onu fpv., již mluvčí — ať již vědomě nebo podvědomě — chce v daném aktu sdělení vyjádřit.

Druhá část resumované studie se soustřeďuje na slovosledný princip důraznosti (v autorově terminologii slovosledný princip emotivní) a zkoumá jeho vztah k principu gramatickému a k principu fpv. Pro češtinu platí zjištění V. Mathesia, že se slovosledný princip emotivní jeví jako protipól, či spíše organický doplněk principu fpv. V češtině se emotivní pořádek projevuje jako odchylka od sledu základ—přechod—jádro. Pokud však jde o angličtinu, je charakter její slovosledné soustavy takový, že emotivní princip je třeba vykládat především na pozadí principu gramatického. Emotivní pořádek se v angličtině projevuje především jako odchylka od pořádku, vyžadovaného principem gramatickým. Je pochopitelné, že v češtině, v níž vedoucí slovosledný princip slovní pořádek uvolňuje, uplatní se slovosledný princip emotivní v daleko širší míře než v angličtině, v níž vedoucí princip slovosledný slovní pořádek naopak zpevňuje.

Ani slovosledný princip větného rytmu neznecitlivuje větu k fpv. To lze vyložit především tím, že se do okruhu jeho působnosti dostávají složky, které změnou svého větného místa nemění uvnitř věty vzájemný poměr stupňů výpovědní dynamičnosti. Jak v češtině, tak v angličtině rytmický princip se nedostává ani do rozporu se slovosledným principem gramatickým a emotivním.

Všechny doplňky, resp. snad korekce Mathesiových tezí však jenom potvrzují plodnost základních rysů jeho koncepce. V. Mathesiovi patří nesporně zásluha o to, že podal první pokus o soustavné zachycení anglické slovosledné soustavy v jejich hlavních principech s důsledným přihlídnutím k jejich hierarchii.

Из сравнительных изучений по порядку слов

(К Матезиусовой концепции

английской системы порядка слов по сравнению с чешской системой порядка слов)

Почти на склоне жизни издает В. Матезиус статью, названную „Из сравнительных изучений по порядку слов“ (Casopis pro moderní filologii 28, 1942, стр. 181—190 и 302 до 307). Эта статья резюмирует результаты исследования В. Матезиуса по английскому порядку слов в сопоставлении с порядком слов в чешском языке.

Автор резюмируемой работы исходит из этой статьи и пользуется его стимулами. Но он одновременно показывает, как он на основании собственных и других трудов понимает исследуемую проблематику сегодня, т. е. двадцать лет после ее издания.

В своей статье Матезиус применил два важных принципа. Во-первых: чтобы было возможно сделать анализ системы порядка слов, а также объяснить его конкретные формации, надо знать характер факторов порядка слов и их взаимное отношение с точки зрения объема и способа их применения. Во-вторых: более глубокому пониманию системы порядка слов очень способствует, если ее исследовать аналитическо-сравнительным методом, т. е. если ее сравнивать с системой порядка слов другого языка, структура которого является по возможности другой.

Матезиус убедительно показал, что в чешском языке руководящим, важнейшим фактором порядка слов является принцип актуального членения предложения (или же функциональной перспективы предложения [= ФПП]), в английском, однако, принцип грамматический. Но автор резюмируемой работы полагает, что английский язык не поэтому менее чувствителен к ФПП, чем чешский, как предполагал Матезиус. Автор показал подробно уже в других местах, что порядок слов не является единственным средством ФПП. Как сильно он проявляется как такое средство, зависит прежде всего от грамматической структуры языка. Поэтому ФПП может найти себе применение в чешском языке даже в качестве руководящего фактора порядка слов, но не в английском языке. Притом, однако, как в чешском, так в английском языках формации порядка слов наконец соблюдают ФПП, т. е. требование, чтобы взаимоотношения между порядком слов и другими средствами ФПП были такие, чтобы предложение могло выражать ту ФПП, которую говорящий — или сознательно или подсознательно — хочет выразить в данном акте сообщения.

Вторая часть резюмируемой работы сосредоточится на принципе подчеркивания (в терминологии автора эмоциональный принцип порядка слов) и изучает его отношение к принципу грамматическому и к принципу ФПП. Для чешского языка является действительным установление В. Матезиуса, что эмоциональный принцип порядка слов является противоположностью или скорее органическим добавлением принципа ФПП. В чешском языке эмоциональный порядок проявляется как отклонение от порядка основа — переход — ядро. Но что касается английского языка, характер его системы порядка слов такой, что эмоциональный принцип надо излагать прежде всего на фоне грамматического принципа. Эмоциональный порядок проявляется в английском языке прежде всего как отклонение от порядка, требуемого принципом грамматическим. Понятно, что в чешском языке, в котором руководящий принцип порядка слов освобождал, эмоциональный принцип порядка слов действительно гораздо больше, чем в английском языке, где руководящий принцип порядка слов наоборот укрепляет.

Ни принцип порядка слов фразового ритма не делает предложение не чувствительным к ФПП. Это можно объяснить прежде всего тем, что в области его действительности попадают элементы не меняющие изменением своего места в предложении взаимоотношение степеней динамичности высказывания внутри предложения. Как в чешском, так в английском языках ритмический принцип не попадает даже в противоречие с грамматическим и эмоциональным принципами порядка слов.

Все добавления, или же, может быть, исправления тезисов Матезиуса, однако лишь подтверждают плодотворность основных черт его концепции. В. Матезиус бесспорно имеет заслуги в том, что он первый сделал попытку систематически описать английскую систему порядка слов в ее главных принципах с последовательным учетом их иерархии.

Перевод: Ирки Ирачек