

Firbas, Jan

**Thoughts on the communicative function of the verb in English,
German and Czech**

Brno studies in English. 1959, vol. 1, iss. 1, pp. 39-68

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/117987>

Access Date: 28. 11. 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.

JAN FIRBAS

THOUGHTS ON THE COMMUNICATIVE FUNCTION OF THE VERB IN ENGLISH, GERMAN AND CZECH

I.

The present paper forms part of a study (1) dealing with some aspects of the shift from verbal to nominal expression within the structure of the English language. In order to promote a better understanding of the differences and similarities the English verb displays in comparison with verbs of other languages, it concentrates on a problem (or rather on one aspect of a problem) which does not concern merely the English verb, but the verbs in Czech and German as well, and very likely the Indo-Germanic verb in general. As the problem seems to be most perplexing with the German verb, German has been chosen as the starting-point of the comparison.

The problem pertains to the sphere of word-order, or rather to that of functional sentence perspective (to be further denoted as FSP). It has been prompted by the differences in position as revealed by the verbs in English, German and Czech, and involves the vexed question whether it is possible to square these differences with the theory of FSP. Before indicating how we intend to set about the propounded question, let us start with a word of explanation and with a short survey of views which we consider relevant to the problem.

By FSP (1a) [sometimes also referred to as actual sentence analysis (2), actual sentence division (3), or contextual organisation (4) of the sentence] we understand the arrangement of sentence elements as it is viewed in the light of the actual situation, i. e. in fact in the light of the context, both verbal and situational. Viewed in this way, those sentence elements which convey something that is known, or may be inferred, from the verbal or from the situational context (or simply something that evidently constitutes the starting-point of the communication) are to be regarded as the communicative basis, as the theme of the sentence. On the other hand, those sentence elements which convey the new piece of information are to be regarded as the communicative nucleus, as the rheme of the sentence. Needless to say, the thematic elements are less important in the given situation, being communicatively less dynamic, i. e. carrying a smaller amount of communicative dynamism (to be further denoted as CD), than the rhematic elements. The latter, conveying the new piece of information, undoubtedly develop the communication very substantially. Those sentence elements which belong neither to the theme nor to the rheme form a kind of transition.

A number of highly suggestive articles on FSP have been written by V. Mathesius (5), who has not only appreciated the impact exercised by FSP on word-order, but also determined the places occupied by FSP in the hierarchies of principles governing the word-order in Czech and in English, thus throwing valuable light on the structures of the two languages. As to Czech word-order (6), FSP operates as the chief principle, predominantly determining both the non-emotive and the emotive (emphatic) word-orders. On the other hand, the grammatical principle

and the principle of coherence of certain sentence elements (both being responsible for patterning the words according to their grammatical function in the sentence) and the rhythmical principle appear in Czech as secondary factors. As to English word-order (7), it is the grammatical principle and the principle of coherence of certain sentence elements that rank first, whereas the principle of FSP, the principle of emphasis, and the rhythmical principle come second. The fact of functional sentence perspective being given more play in the Czech than in the English order of words explains why the gradual arrangement of words "from the known to the unknown" is observed on a larger scale in Czech than in English.

This has induced Mathesius to adopt the opinion that English is much less susceptible to FSP than Czech. He believed this view to be corroborated by the fixed position of the English object and adverbial phrase after the verb (8), and by the fixed position of the English verb in general (9). The English verb cannot move so freely about in the sentence as its Czech counterpart can, and may therefore impair, or perhaps even spoil, the gradual arrangement of words according to the principle "from the known to the unknown" and get into serious disagreement with FSP.

As to the hierarchy of word-order principles in German, K. G. Krushel'nitskaya has convincingly shown (10) that it is the principle of FSP (11) that plays the leading part in arranging both the non-emotive and the emotive order of words. It cannot, however, assert itself to the same high degree as in Russian (or, let us add, in Czech); the limited number of fixed positions in which the German verb may occur prevent it from attaining that degree (cf. p. 18). From these conclusions it follows that the German verb, too, may often impair, or perhaps even "spoil", the ordinary gradual arrangement of words (in non-emotive sentences, that is) according to the principle "from the known to the unknown" and be in disagreement with FSP.

Though K. Boost (12) does not realize that the fixed positions of the German verb must needs come into conflict with the aforesaid arrangement of words, the existence of this conflict is betrayed by his very argument. Boost views the German sentence as a field of tension called into being by the fact that the speaker is in possession of a certain item of knowledge (communication) to be imparted (13), whereas the listener is not (p. 85). The tension will be relieved after the communication has been conveyed (p. 30). The linguistic means employed in creating and removing the tension are twofold (14). The tension is sustained (a) in that the words are being arranged according to the principle "from the known to the unknown" [i. e. according to the degree of the communicative value (15), the bearer of the highest communicative value, the rheme proper, coming last], or (b) in that at least one element standing in close relation to the finite part of the verbal form is separated from it and shifted on to the end of the sentence (as, e. g., the past participle in *Er hat sich ein schönes Buch gekauft*). These two sets of means (p. 57), however, do not function in isolation, but are mutually interrelated and co-operate with each other (16). — The conflict becomes especially evident if we admit that the positions in the sentence are capable of marking out the various degrees of communicative value (cf. *Ich schenke dem Kind den Apfel, Ich schenke den Apfel dem Kind*, in which the change in position entails a change in the respective communicative values); for here the question arises about the degree of co-operation displayed by the two sets of means. One can hardly speak of co-operation if finding, for instance, the German verbal form quite frequently at the end of the sentence without being marked out by its position as bearer of the highest communicative value.

From what has been said so far it might perhaps be gathered that in non-emotive sentences the Czech verb is always placed in complete agreement with the gradual

arrangement "from the known to the unknown". This would be an erroneous conclusion. As it has been pointed out, for instance by F. Kopečný (17), and subscribed to by F. Daneš (18), Present-Day Czech shows a tendency to place the verb in a medial position. As we shall see further on (cf. p. 54), the ModCz verb not infrequently appears in this position, although carrying a definitely higher amount of CD than the element which follows. In older Czech literature, on the other hand, it is quite usual to place the verb at the end (19), regardless of whether it carries the highest amount of CD or not, a practice surely reminiscent of that followed by German. And last but not least, the same holds good for the OE verb in subordinate clauses.

We hope to have advanced ample proof that the question posed at the beginning of this chapter (i. e. whether it is possible to square the varying positions of the verb in non-emotive sentences with the FSP theory) is important enough to be tackled. Its solution seems all the more desirable as we believe FSP to be one of the most essential constituents of language. For how could language function as an efficient instrument of thought and communication if it were not in a position to secure — at least to some degree — a reliable appreciation of the distribution of communicative dynamism, in other words, to aid its users to discriminate between thematic, transitional, and rhematic elements? Consequently, if the verb of some language (perhaps throughout the entire existence of that language or during a certain period of its development) should really prove insusceptible to FSP, the degree of insusceptibility to FSP displayed by the language would seem intolerably high.

The propounded problem is therefore worth attacking. As we do not intend to dispose of it in its entirety, we propose to approach it at least from a point at which the disagreement of the verb with FSP may be most conspicuous — the final position of the verb. This, of course, does not exclude other positions from our observation.

As to the clue point'ing to the solution, it seems that it will have to be sought for in the fact that word-order is not the only means of FSP. As has been demonstrated by G. K. Krushel'nitskaya (20) on German material and by our papers on English material, FSP can avail itself of semantic means (see more about it further below on p. 43) that are capable of working counter to the power exercised by sentence positions. [In this direction point also the observations by H. Paul, M. Schubiger, B. A. Il'jish, F. Daneš, K. Boost and others (21).] This is why it seems advisable to approach the problem from the semantic side. A highly valuable suggestion from which we intend to start is the classic observation (22) on the transitive character of the verb voiced by A. Sechehaye in his *Essai sur la Structure Logique de la Phrase* (Paris 1926). Sechehaye extends the use of the term "transitive" to any verb whose semantic content is in need of an amplification (23), an amplification without which the meaning of the verb would be incomplete. As Sechehaye's observation is the starting point of our argument, we quote its relevant part in full (pp. 80—81).

»Il y a, comme l'ont fait remarquer ceux qui se sont occupés de la terminologie scolaire, une quantité de verbes qui ne sont pas suivis d'un complément direct et qui n'en sont pas moins étroitement unis à leur «objet»; exemples: *se servir de*, *aspirer à*, *nuire à*, etc. Ces verbes, autant que ceux qui précèdent [i. e. such as require a direct object — J. F.], ont besoin de leur complément comme d'une détermination qui vient achever une idée insuffisante en elle-même. Dans un cas comme dans l'autre, l'idée représentée par ces mots s'offre à l'imagination avec un caractère d'incomplétude: c'est un principal qui est fait pour un complément et qui ne paraît pas avoir accompli sa fonction s'il n'y aboutit pas. Or, si nous définissons la transitivité par l'incomplétude de l'idée principale, nous voyons aussitôt une perspective beaucoup plus vaste s'ouvrir devant nous. Les verbes transitifs ne seront plus nécessairement des verbes d'action appelant un objet, dans le sens spécial du terme:

appartenir à, qui demande un complément désignant le possesseur, *aller* à, qui appelle une indication de lieu, seront transitifs également. Parmi les verbes il faudra compter aussi tous ceux qui sont faits pour être suivis d'un infinitif avec ou sans particule comme *devoir, vouloir, cesser de, se mettre à* et beaucoup d'autres. »

We have now proceeded far enough to start our inquiry into concrete language materials. Fearing, however, our previous papers on FSP (5, 16) may not be accessible to the reader, we feel we ought to give a summary of the main principles of the theory presented there. In doing so we will confine ourselves to those issues whose knowledge is presupposed by the argument pursued in the following chapters of this study.

We hold that between the comparatively least important element, the theme proper, and the comparatively most important element, the rheme proper, one can observe a gamut of degrees of varying importance, of varying communicative value, of varying CD. It is, of course, not always easy to draw an exact dividing line between the transition and the theme on the one hand, and the transition and the rheme on the other. In such cases it is necessary to attempt at least a correct estimate of the relative importance of the elements composing the analysed structure.

Let us apply the described method of analysis to the following illustrative example. The small figures placed above the line after a word or group of words represent the gamut of CD as displayed by the elements within theme (¹¹, ¹², ¹³...), transition (²¹, ²³, ²¹...) and rheme (³¹, ³², ³³...) (The numbers ¹⁰, ²⁰, ³⁰, are used if no further differentiation within theme, transition, and rheme, respectively, seems necessary.)

1. Every evening¹³ he¹¹ used to²⁰ come and see³¹ her¹², and stop to³² supper³³ at the farmhouse¹⁴.
— The Three Sillies, English Fairy Tales, coll. by J. Jacobs (24, 25).

As to the elements before the comma, *he* is undoubtedly the theme proper; *her* and *every evening* are also thematic, but communicatively more dynamic (26) than *he*, *every evening* being in its turn more dynamic than *her*; the words *used to* are transitional, *come* and *see* rhematic. After the comma, the expression *at the farmhouse* is perhaps the most dynamic thematic element, whereas the words *stop to supper* are rhematic, *supper* probably being the most dynamic element, and consequently the rheme proper, of the entire sentence.

Strictly speaking, any element that names (27), or refers to, some phenomenon of the extralinguistic reality (by which we understand all the things — in the widest sense of the word — about which communication is being made) carries a certain amount of CD. Consequently, even a morpheme has to be considered a carrier of CD, and if necessary (if, for instance, a consistently detailed analysis is attempted for comparative purposes) marked out as such. The Cz. *nežidala* of 2 (28) is an illustration of such procedure.

2. She¹¹ did²⁰ not³³ want³¹ him¹².
Ne³²žáda³¹2³a¹¹ si¹¹ ho¹².

By referring to theme proper, Cz. *-a* in *nežidala*, to a certain degree, corresponds to E. *she*. As transitional time-indicator, the Cz. morpheme *-l* operates in a way similar to that of the E. *did*. Etc. (29).

The degrees of CD carried by the elements of a written/printed (30) sentence are marked out by the following means of FSP: (i) word-order, (ii) the context itself (both verbal and situational), (iii) the semantic-contextual means.

If not interfered with by other means, WORD-ORDER creates what we call the basic distribution of CD. This means that in distributing CD the sentence positions as they follow each other from beginning to end, tend to run through the basic gamut, starting with theme proper and finishing with rheme proper. The sentence then stands in consistent theme — rheme perspective. Cf. *Father*¹⁰ *has*²¹ *gone*²² *with John*³¹, *Father*¹⁰ *has*²¹ *gone*²² *with John*³¹ *for a walk*³³, *John*¹⁰ *has been*²¹ *taken*²² *out*²³ *for a walk*³¹ *by Father*³², the given notations holding good, of course, only in case we take the sentences at their face value, without putting them into special contexts. (Though starting from a somewhat different point of view, D. L. Bolinger's remarkable theory of linear sentences modification (31) seems to point in the same direction.)

In this connection it is worth notice that in some cases even a thematic element may contribute considerably to the development of discourse. Thus in a sentence of the type *A girl*¹⁰ *broke*²⁰ *a vase*³⁰, the thematic subject carries a comparatively high degree of CD (the non-generic indefinite article marking out a new idea). Yet as the other elements are more dynamic still, the subject is felt to be thematic owing to the pressure exerted by the basic distribution of CD. This means

that the fact of the theme carrying the least amount of CD does not preclude the possibility of its carrying a new piece of information.

In its operation, basic distribution of CD is not limited to the sphere of a single clause. There are spheres of higher order, such as that of a complex sentence, or that of a paragraph, etc., within which the basic distribution of CD functions as well. On the other hand, there are spheres of lower order than that of a clause. For instance, the semi-clausal structure in *Coming home tired, he refused to take his supper* would represent such a lower sphere (*Coming²¹ home²² tired²⁰*). Viewed in its relation to the remaining part of the sentence, the semi-clausal structure would have to be interpreted as a transitional or perhaps as a considerably dynamic thematic element.

Strictly speaking, the examined sentence does not stand in consistent theme-rheme perspective. This is due to the operation of the CONTEXT, which itself is another important means of FSP. The operation of the context (both verbal and situational) is especially obvious when it acts counter to the basic distribution of CD. Thus when thematic elements, i. e. such as express notions that are known or may be gathered from the context, occur in basically transitional or basically rhematic positions, they communicatively weaken them, or so to speak, "dedynamize", "thematize" them. On the contrary, transitional and rhematic elements, i. e. such as express notions that are unknown or cannot be gathered from the context, communicatively strengthen basically thematic positions if they occur in them; they, so to speak "dynamize" them, rendering them transitional or "rhematizing" them respectively.

Under the heading of SEMANTIC-CONTEXTUAL means of FSP (for short SC means) come words that on account of their specific semantic character show quite a particular relation to the context and may — in co-operation with other means — either weaken or strengthen the positions in the sentence in a more or less invariable way, as e. g. the personal pronouns *I, you, he*, which tend to appear as thematic. Another important SC means are, e. g., the indefinite article and its zero plural variant. These two articles perform the function of SC means, as they signalize the novelty of ideas conveyed by the nouns they qualify. They may therefore play an important part in that co-operation of means which may render non-thematic even such a subject as occurs at the very beginning, or very near the beginning, of the sentence. A comparatively high degree of co operation of means is needed if a subject of the described kind is to appear as the rheme proper of the sentence (32), as e. g. in *A haze²⁰ hovered over²⁰ the prospect.*¹⁰ (The words *the prospect* express a notion known from the previous context, "dedynamizing" the position in which they occur. As to the verb *hover*, it functions as a "dedynamizing" SC means. It is one of those verbs which imply the notion of "emergence [or simply 'existence'] on the scene" and which under the circumstances (33) somewhat recede into the background, allowing the reader's attention to concentrate on the very object that "exists, or is emerging, on the scene".)

Another SC means is the definite article. Provided the conditions created by other means are favourable, the definite article may communicatively weaken (under very favourable conditions even "thematize") the position which it occupies together with its substantive. This may be so especially when the definite article conveys the highest degree of definiteness, i. e. when it unmistakably refers to an idea well-known from the verbal or situational context (cf. the function of the definite article in the example quoted above). It is obvious that, on account of its semantic character, the definite article taken by itself cannot communicatively strengthen the noun it qualifies. This, however, can be achieved by other means, which accounts for the existence of non-thematic subjects containing the definite article [as e. g. (34) *The word fisherman²⁰ came into²¹ his head²²*].

SC means do not operate in what we have called after D. L. Bolinger (35) second-instance sentences. Roughly speaking, these sentences contain one heavily contrasted word, and except for their phonic (prosodic) and possibly also their typographical form, they imitate the structure of those sentences with which they are being contrasted (no matter whether these sentences have really been uttered or merely exist in the writer's/speaker's and reader's/listener's minds). Viewed from the angle of FSP, the heavily contrasted word constitutes the rheme proper, all the other elements forming an extensive theme proper. Any word may function as rheme in these sentences, even such as otherwise serves as a thematic SC means. For instance, any word in 1 might become the heavily contrasted word, if the sentence passes into the second instance.

The distinction made by D. L. Bolinger between first and second instance sentences is of great methodological value to the theory of FSP, for it facilitates a more accurate classification of means of FSP. In our opinion, further research might establish a hierarchy of transitional types between and within the first and second instances, which would undoubtedly yield another significant contribution to the classification of means. In Chapter Three of the present study we shall try to offer some new thoughts on this problem.

It may have been gathered from what has so far been put forth that there is a certain tension between the sentence positions as carriers of the basic distribution of CD and the other means

of FSP. If properly handled, however, this tension may result in a truly manifold, but effective co-operation of all the means concerned.

We may now turn to the examination of concrete language materials. Needless to say, the positions of the verb which are not in accordance with the arrangement "from the known to the unknown", or to use a term of our own, with the basic distribution of CD, will certainly serve as a touchstone of the FSP theory outlined above (36).

II.

The materials to be examined have been drawn from the following English, German and Czech texts: John Galsworthy, *The Forsyte Saga*, Heinemann, London 1922 (abbr. FS); John Galsworthy, *Die Forsyte Saga* (transl. by Luise Wolf and Leon Schalit), Paul List Verlag, Leipzig 1957 [abbr. FS (37)]; John Galsworthy, *Bohatec* (transl. by B. Kubertová-Zátková), Melantrich, Praha 1935 (abbr. FS₁); John Galsworthy, *Bohatec* (transl. by Z. Urbánek), SNKLHU, Praha 1957 (abbr. FS₂); Karel Čapek, *Anglické listy*, Borový, Praha 1947 (abbr. LE); Karel Čapek, *Letters from England* (transl. by P. Selver), Geoffrey Bles, London 1945 (abbr. LE (37)); Karel Čapek, *Seltsames England* (transl. by Vincy Schwarz), Bruno Cassirer, Berlin (probably) 1936 [abbr. LE (37)]; Anna Seghers, *Das siebte Kreuz*, Aufbau-Verlag, Berlin 1951 (abbr. SK).

Seeking a solution of the problems suggested in Chapter One, we subjected to analysis about 400 German instances (about 200 taken from FS 13–27 and about 200 from LE 9–30) with verbal forms actually occurring finally or with verbal forms whose non-final occurrence was an evident deviation from the prevalent usage; in addition to these instances, their English (FS 3–19, LE 9–36) and Czech (FS₁ 11–24, FS₂ 17–31, LE 9–27) opposite numbers were analyzed. As the instances taken from the German versions of FS and LE were not original German texts, but translations, we analyzed also about 200 instances from SK 7–18.

It should be explained that by a German verbal form occurring finally we understand not only the entire finite verbal form (made up of the auxiliary/auxiliaries and the past participle/infinitive) as found at the end of a German subordinate clause, but also that part of the finite verbal form which, separated from its basic auxiliary, occurs at the end of a German principal clause, and also the non-finite verbal form as found at the end of a German semi-clausal construction (i. e. a participial or an infinitive phrase). It should be further added that the instances were taken from declarative sentences only. The criterion according to which we have grouped the instances for analysis is the degree of CD carried by the final (i. e. finally placed) verbal form. The final German verbal form of the first group to be discussed (instances 3–20) is non-thematic, but never carrying the highest amount of CD, i. e. never functioning as rheme proper. The instances with which we are opening our inquiry are 3, 4 and 5 below.

3. Er¹⁰ war²¹ *fast zur Mythe*³⁰ geworden²² — ... — FS 21.36 (38,39)

He¹⁰ had²¹ become²² *almost a myth*³² — ... — FS 12.31

Stal se z²⁰ něho¹⁰ *takřka mythus*³⁰ — ... — FS₂ 25.23

4. [Die Poesie des englischen Heims ist damit bezahlt,] daß die englische Straße¹⁰ *poesielos*³⁰ ist²⁰. — LE 21.4

[The poetry of the English home exists at the expense of the English street] which¹⁰ is²⁰ *devoid of poetry*³⁰. — LE 24.1

[Poesie anglického domova je zaplácena tím,] že anglická ulice¹⁰ je²⁰ *bez poesie*³⁰. — LE 18.16

5. [Inzwischen habe ich unter anderm enträtselt,] daß der wilde Schrei „o-ě-ó“ auf der Straße¹⁰ *Kartoffeln*³⁰ bedeutet²⁰; ... — LE 27.23

[In the meanwhile I have found out, among other things,] that the wild cry "o-ei-o" in the street¹⁰ means²⁰ *potatoes*³⁰; ... — LE 31.20

[Zatím jsem mimo jinérozluštil,] že divý křik „o-ej-ó“ na ulici¹⁰ znamená²⁰ *brambory*³⁰. — LE 23.29

3, 4 and 5 have the following features in common. The verbal forms *war geworden*, *had become*, *stal se* etc., are not the only non-thematic elements in their sentences. Each verbal form enters into its sentence together with another non-thematic element. It is not difficult to see that in contra t with this non-thematic element (its non-thematic partner), the verbal form conveys little meaning. The meaning of the verb is indeed so poor that it sorely needs amplification, and it is the said non-thematic partner that satisfies the need and convey the amplification. Speaking in terms of FSP, in 3, 4 and 5 the non-thematic partners of the verbs carry higher amounts of CD (functioning in fact as rhemes proper) than the respective verbs. It is further worth notice that the differences in position as respectively revealed by the transitional *geworden* etc., and the rhematic *fast zur Mythe* etc. on the one hand, and by the transitional *had become*, *stal se* etc. and by the rhematic *almost a myth*, *takřka mythus* etc. on the other, do not entail different interpretations of the respective amounts of CD.

What has been said about the copulative verbs (40) in 3, 4 and 5 may be virtually repeated about the non-copulative verbal forms in 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10.

6. Das englische Heim¹⁰ muß²¹ sein eigenes Gärtchen³⁰ haben²², ... — LE 20.24

The English home¹⁰ must²¹ have²² its own garden³⁰, ... — LE 23.14

Anglický domov¹⁰ musí²¹ mít²² svou vlastní zahrádku³⁰, ... — LE 18.11

7. [Was er gewandt, ..., so hielten sie es für geboten,] ihm¹⁰ auch²⁰ hübsche Geschenke³⁰ zu machen²¹, ... — FS 18.36

[If he were sleek..., it was more necessary] to give²⁰ him¹⁰ nice things³⁰, ... — FS 9.14

[Jestliž by byl pěkňš vystrojen..., bylo by tím nezbytnějši] dát²⁰ mu¹⁰ hezké věci³⁰; ... — FS, 22.22

8. ..., so habe²¹ ich¹⁰ ein Bildchen³⁰ gezeichnet²², ... — LE 10.17

... I¹⁰ will²¹ draw²² a little pictur³⁰... — LE 11.3

..., tedy nakreslil²² jsem²¹ vám¹² obrázek³¹, ... — LE 10.14 (41)

9. Ich¹⁰ hab's²¹ mit Harrogate³⁰ versucht²². — FS 24.1

I¹⁰ ve²¹ tried²² Harrogate³⁰. — FS 15.9

Vyzkoušel²² jsem²¹ Harrogate³⁰. — FS, 27.23

10. [Eine große Dame von schöner Gestalt]— ein Familienmitglied¹² hat²¹ sie¹¹ einmal²² mit einer heitrischen Göttin³¹ verglichen²³—[beobachtete die beiden mit einem schattenhaften Lächeln.] — FS 20.1

[A tall woman, with a beautiful figure,] which¹⁰ some member of the family²¹ had²² once²³ compared²¹ to a heathen goddess³⁰, [stood looking at these two with a shadowy smile.] — FS 10.19

[Nedaleko nich stála vysoká žena krásné postavy,] již¹⁰ jeden z členů rodiny²¹ kdysi²² přirovna¹²³ k antické bohyni³⁰, [a pohlížela na snoubence s matným úsměvem.] — FS₁ 17.4

Like the copulative verbs in 3—5, the non-copulative verbal forms in 6—10 are not the only non-thematic elements in their sentences. Each of them enters into its sentence together with a non-thematic element and is surpassed by it in CD (cf. the rhemes in 6—10). It is further worth notice that the differences in position as respectively revealed by the transitional *muß... haben* (instance 6), *zu machen* (inst. 7) etc. and the rhematic *sein eigenes Gärtchen* (inst. 6), *hübsche Geschenke* (inst. 7) on the one hand, and by the transitional *must have* (inst. 6), *to give* (inst. 7), *musí mít* (inst. 6), *dát* (inst. 7) etc. and the rhematic *its own garden* (inst. 6), *nice things* (inst. 7), *svou vlastní zahrádku* (inst. 6), *hezké věci* (inst. 7) on the other, do not entail essential differences in the respective amounts of CD.

Grammatically speaking, the non-thematic elements of 6—10 that carry higher amounts of CD than their respective verbs are all objects, either simple or preposi-

tional (cf. the rhemes in 6—10). Semantically, these objects are undoubtedly essential amplifications of the respective verbal meanings. (Cf. Sechehaye's observation quoted earlier on p. 41.) From the point of view of FSP, they appear — regardless of position — more dynamic than the verbal elements. This explains why a change in word-order as shown by the following German sentences will not bring about any essential changes in FSP. Just compare "Das englische Heim¹⁰ hat⁰ sein eigenes Gärtchen³⁰" with the English and Czech equivalents quoted in 6, and similarly, "Sie¹¹ machten⁰ ihm¹² auch⁰ hübsche Geschenke³⁰" in 7, "Ich¹⁰ zeichnete²⁰ ein Bildchen³⁰" in 8, etc.

It is evident that as to their relation to non-thematic partners conveying an essential semantic amplification, the non-copulative verbs behave in virtually the same way as the copulative. Of course, the verbs in 3—5 (which are to be regarded as representatives of copulas in general) illustrate the character of this relation in a most conspicuous manner. They clearly constitute a point in the structure of language at which the CD of the verb is at its weakest, and its need of a semantic amplification at its greatest. They seem to set up one end of a gamut, one end at which we find verbs with the lowest possible amount of CD. The other end of the gamut would be made up by verbs performing the function of rheme proper.

As in regard to the discussed relation the copulative and non-copulative verbs do not show any fundamental difference, we do not think it necessary, at least for the purpose of this paper, to draw a dividing line between them. Or, to put it differently: no matter whether the range of semantic applicability of the verb is considerably large and the amount of CD conveyed by it (42) consequently small (cf. the copulas in 3—5 and the semantically weak verbs *haben*, *have*, *mit* in 6, and *machen*, *give*, *dat* in 7), or on the contrary the range of semantic applicability rather narrowed, specified and the amount of CD consequently raised (cf. e. g. such verbs as *zeichnen*, *draw*, *nakreslit* in 8), the relation between the non-thematic verb and its non-thematic partner conveying an essential semantic amplification will remain fundamentally the same. This leads up to the following conclusion, which contains the theses we would like to prove in Chapters Two and Three.

Entering into the sentence together with a non-thematic partner that carries an essential amplification of its meaning, a non-thematic verb will carry a lower amount of CD than its described partner.

To this the following important provisos are to be added. The above observation cannot apply to a verbal form that has come to function as rheme proper in what we have so far termed second instance sentences (see p. 43), or to a verbal form whose CD has been rhematized through the operation of such special SC means of FSP as e. g. negation (cf 2 on p. 42). Yet, second instance sentences and sentences containing words rhematized through special SC means of FSP belong to other instance levels, and will have to remain outside the scope of our analysis; some thoughts, however, will be offered later (p. 53) in regard to their character and position within the system of language (43). — It should be stressed that the fact that the said types have been excluded from our analysis does in no way distort the picture drawn of the verb and its functions in FSP within the limits of this paper. — If not stated otherwise, all observations offered in this chapter fall within the provisos and limits set down in the present paragraph.

The above observation about the non-thematic verbal form and its non-thematic partner of the described type appears to be of considerable importance for a better understanding of the relations existing between FSP and word-order. Provided we bear in mind the limits specified in the preceding paragraph, we shall be able to

explain why a non-thematic verb, though occurring finally, does not assume a higher amount of CD than a preceding non-thematic element of the described type, and *vice versa* why a non-thematic element of the described type, though non-final, does not carry a lower amount of CD than a non-thematic verb that follows. Provided we bear in mind the specified limits, we shall also be able to understand why a verbal form, though capable of becoming rhematic, cannot function as rheme proper as long as a non-thematic partner of the described type is present in the given sentence as well.

As to the non-thematic verbal partner of the described type, it is necessary to emphasize that it conveys an absolutely essential amplification of the meaning of the verbal form. In order to distinguish it from other non-thematic partners of the verbal form which in their turn also to a certain extent "essentially amplify" the meaning implied in the verbal form, but do not appear more dynamic, we shall describe it as a non-thematic first-rank amplificative partner (for short FRA partner) of the verb.

Before we start examining other types of FRA partners of the verb in order to be able to distinguish them better from the non-FRA elements, we wish to make two observations.

The first concerns the application of the term FRA partner. It should be stressed that we do not at all suppose that this term must necessarily be restricted to elements qualifying verbs. (It might be used, e. g., about non-thematic elements conveying an essential amplification of the meaning of an adjective as well. Thus in "He¹⁰ was²¹ conscious of- *scme mischief*⁰⁰", *scme mischief* appears to be an FRA partner of the non-thematic adjective.) Although we do not propose to deal with this problem here, we should like to point out that within the verbal form itself, an FRA partner can be found. It is the notional part of a verbal form, which acts as an FRA partner of its non-thematic auxiliaries. It follows that, e. g., in "Er¹¹ hat²¹ ihm¹² hübsche Geschenke⁰ *gemacht*¹¹" and in "Als er¹ ihm¹² hübsche Geschenke³⁰ *gemacht*²² hat¹¹", the non-thematic *gemacht* functions as FRA partner of the non-thematic *hat* and — regardless of position — carries a higher amount of CD than *hat*. *Hübsche Geschenke*, of course, functions in its turn as an FRA partner of the entire non-thematic group *gemacht hat*.

Our second observation wants to call attention to the fact that the non-thematic verb and its FRA partner function as valuable SC means of FSP. In co-operation with other means of FSP (including the basic distribution of CD, which in fact provides "the field" for this co-operation), they mould the FSP of a sentence into the required shape. Let us demonstrate it on the German version of 8, whose FSP may be interpreted as follows.

As a personal pronoun which refers to a notion known from the preceding context, *ich* serves as a SC means of FSP, thematizes its position and functions as theme proper. As time indicator, *hale* also functions as a SC means, and regardless of position appears as the weakest transitional element. In addition to it, it necessarily carries a lower amount of CD than its FRA partner, the notional part of the verb *zeichnen*. This in its turn — and in fact the entire verbal form, *habe* included — is overshadowed by its FRA partner, the object *ein Bildchen*. Furthermore, the rhematic character of the latter is indicated by the presence of the non-generic indefinite article, another SC means (accompanying nouns that imply notions not known from the context). Under the circumstances, in consequence of the outlined co-operation of means of FSP, the indefinite article may mark out the object as rheme proper.

Similar analyses could be carried out on the English and Czech counterparts of

the examined version (both of which are in greater accordance with the basic distribution of CD, their rhemes proper coming to stand at the end) and on other German, English and Czech sentences. Our main intention, however, was to show how the non-thematic verb and its FRA partner can operate within the sentence, or to put it more exactly, how they actually co-operate with other means of FSP in bringing about the FSP of a sentence.

Having offered the two observations, let us attend to some other types of FRA partners of the verb and examine some of the ways in which the semantic relationship existing between the verb and its FRA partner may manifest itself. In fact, we have so far examined two types already: the object group and the one that might be termed complement group (44). The former has been illustrated by 6—10, the latter by 3—5. In the following section of this Chapter we intend to deal with the subject and the adverbial phrase groups. In naming the groups, we have resorted to syntactical criteria. This will prove convenient when an attempt is made to draw conclusions about the relations of grammar to FSP. — First, then, to the subject.

Whereas we have been in a position to show that every object operates as an FRA partner of the verb, the full extent to which the subject may be associated with this function will have to be ascertained by further research. One group of subjects functioning as FRA partners of verbs may, however, be established with positive certainty. 11 and 12 below exemplify such subjects.

11. *Ein inniger Ausdruck*³⁰ war²¹ in das Gesicht der alten Dame¹⁰ gekommen²², ... — F 24.23
*A very sweet look*³³ had²¹ come into²² the old lady's face¹⁰, ... — FS 16.4
*Na tváři staré dámy*¹⁰ se objevil²⁰ velmi sladký úsměv³⁰, ... — FS₂ 28.14
12. [Hier ist die Straße nicht das interessanteste Lokal, wo man tausenderlei Sehenswertes trifft] und wo¹⁰ tausend Abenteuer³⁰ zu einem¹⁰ sprechen²⁰; ... LE 20.3
 [Here the street is not the most interesting of places,] where a thousandfold spectacle³⁰ meets²⁰ your gaze¹⁰, and where a thousand adventures³⁰ address themselves to²⁰ you¹⁰; ... — LE 22.14
 [Tady ulice není ten nejzajímavější lokál,] kde vás¹⁰ potká²⁰ tisícera podivná³⁰ a promluví k²⁰ vám¹⁰ tisíc dobrodružství³⁰; ... — LE 17.23

It may be gathered from 11 and 12 that the subject acquires the function of an FRA partner of the verb if accompanied by a verb which unmistakably implies the notion of “emergence (or simply ‘existence’) on the scene” (45). Now if both the subject and the verb are non-thematic, it is quite obvious that it will be the emerging (or existing) object itself on which the reader's/listener's attention will concentrate, not the act of its emerging (or fact of its existence). As for the notion of “emergence (or simply ‘existence’) on the scene”, it need not necessarily be carried by verbs that primarily and explicitly express it (cf. the verbs *kommen*, *come into*, *objeviti se* in 11, and cf. such English verbs or verbal phrases as *come*, *come into view*, *come on the scene*, *come in*, *come up*, *appear*, *present oneself*, *emerge*, *crop up*, *arise* etc., and their German and Czech counterparts). It may be conveyed also by verbs that are capable of expressing it secondarily, implicitly, and yet in due co-operation with the context quite unmistakably (cf. *sprechen*, *meet*, *address oneself*, *potkat*, *promluvit* in 12 and examples in our paper dealing with non-thematic subjects — cf. (5); *treffen* in 12 has been bracketed as it is accompanied by an object and therefore does not come into comparison).

We can now turn to the adverbial phrase. It may also serve as an FRA partner of a verb, provided its semantic relation to the given verb permits it. This means that not every non-thematic adverbial phrase entering into the sentence together with

a non-thematic verb will function as its FRA partner. This can easily be accounted for by a comparison drawn between adverbial phrases on the one hand and objects and complements (cf. note 44) on the other. Adverbial phrases contrast with the latter in that they do not form such a homogeneous group, some adverbial types standing in less close relation to the verb than others. As we shall see later, this phenomenon may materially affect the FSP.

Coming back to those adverbial phrases that can function as FRA partners of verbs, we do not want to pretend to be able to give an exhaustive list of types. We just wish to demonstrate on three groups (each exemplifying a special sort of semantic relation existing between the adverbial phrase and the verb) how an adverbial phrase performs its function of an FRA partner of the verb. The first group is represented by 13 and 14.

13. [... man rannte durch neue Katakomben bis zu den Rolltreppen,] die¹⁰ wie eine Mühle²⁰ lärmten²⁰ ... — LE 23.17
[... they rushed me through new catacombs to a moving staircase,] which¹⁰ clatters²⁰ like a mill²⁰ ... — LE 27.2
[... a běželi novými katakombami až k pohyblivým schodům,] jež¹⁰ rachotí²⁰ jako mlýn²⁰ ... — LE 20.16
14. [... , und dann steckte man mich in einen Gitterkäfig,] der¹⁰ wie eine Rinderwaage²⁰ aussah²⁰; ... — LE 22.7
[... and thrust me into a barred cage] which¹⁰ looks²⁰ like scales for weighing cattle²⁰, ... — LE 26.9
[... a strčili mne do mřížové klece,] jež¹⁰ vypadá²⁰ jako dobytčí váha²⁰, ... — LE 20.7

The close semantic relationship existing between the non-thematic verb and the non-thematic adverbial phrase is obvious as they are both engaged in instituting a comparison. And it is equally obvious that it is the adverbial phrase which, semantically, is the pivotal point of this construction. Hence in all the three examined languages it overshadows the verb irrespective of position. — 15, 16, 17 present another type of semantic relation.

15. ... er¹¹ ... ließ²¹ seine Augen¹² zu der Gruppe an der Tür²⁰ wandern²². — FS 21.7
..., he¹¹ let²¹ his eyes¹² wander²² to the group by the door²⁰. — FS 11.38
... zabloudil²¹ z akem²² k skupince u dveří²⁰. — FS₂ 2'.28
16. [...; es ist eine beispiellos ehrliche Gasschiffstraße, die kein höheres Ziel hat,] als in den Regents Park²⁰ zu münden²¹, ... — LE 22.12
[... it is a business thoroughfare of unexampled respectability, which serves no higher purpose] than to lead²¹ to Regent's Park²⁰. — LE 25.10
[...; je to bezpříkladně počestná obchodní ulice, jež nemá vyššího cíle] než ústít²¹ do Regent's Parku²⁰. — LE 19.19
17. [... , wie England aussieht,] wenn man sich¹² ihm¹¹ vom Kanal her²⁰ nähert²¹. — LE 10.17(46)
[... a little picture of how England looks] when you¹² approach²⁰ it¹¹ from the English Channel²⁰. — LE 11.3
[... , jak vypadá Anglie,] když se k ní¹⁰ blížíte²⁰ z Kanálu²⁰. — LE 10.15

The verbs in 15–17 all express motion, the accompanying adverbial phrase specifying the direction, i. e. the place to which or from which motion proceeds. The adverbial phrase therefore conveys a highly essential, and quite indispensable extension of the semantic content of the verb. Hence it is most natural that, provided that both the verb and the adverbial phrase are non-thematic, the reader's/listener's attention should concentrate first and foremost on the statement concerning the direction, not on that about the motion itself. Once again, as displayed by the three examined languages, differences in positions shown by the verb and by the adverbial phrase do not entail changes in the respective amounts of CD.

Another interesting type of semantic relationship existing between the verb and the adverbial phrase is revealed by 18, 19 and 20.

18. ...; aber als ich¹⁰ *unter der Steineiche im Hampton-Park*³⁰ saß²⁰, [fühlte ich...] — LE 14.14
 ...; but sitting²⁰ *under an ancient oak tree in the park at Hampton Court*³⁰ [I was seriously tempted to...] — LE 15.17
 ...; ale sedě²⁰ *pod dubem křemelákem v Hampton Parku*³⁰, [pocítil jsem...] — LE 13.13
19. [Ich wäre wahrscheinlich ein leidenschaftlicher Labourist,] wenn ich¹⁰ *in der Gasse der eisernen Balkone oder in der Gasse der grauen Ziegel*³⁰ wohnen²¹ würde²¹. — LE 14.12
 [I should probably be a rabid Radical] if I¹⁰ lived²⁰ *in the Street of the Iron Balconies or in the Street of the Grey Bricks*³⁰; ... — LE 15.14
 [Byl bych asi náruživým labouristou,] kdybych²¹ bydlil²² *v Ulici Železných Balkonů nebo v Ulici Šedivých Cihel*³⁰ ... — LE 13.11
20. [Die größte Überraschung für den Reisenden ist es, wenn er in dem fremden Land das findet, wovon er schon hundertmal gelesen] oder was er¹⁰ hundertmal²² *auf Bildern*²² gesehen³¹ hat²¹. — LE 9.17
 [The greatest surprise for a traveller is when he discovers in a foreign country what he has read about] or seen²⁰ *in pictures*³¹ hundreds of times³². — LE 10.1
 [Největší překvapení cestovatele je, najde-li v cizí zemi to, o čem stokrát četl] nebo co stokrát²⁰ viděl³¹ *na obrázků*³². — LE 9.18

It is again the notion of existence (47) that plays a decisive part in the instances under examination. Provided both the verb and the adverbial phrase are non-thematic, it is the place in which people or things find themselves, not the fact of their existence in that place, which arrests the reader's/listener's attention (cf. inst. 18 and 19). Similarly, when a statement is made to the effect that such a place (in which a person or thing exists) is being perceived, it is in the place perceived, not in the act of perceiving, that the reader/hearer is chiefly interested (cf. inst. 20). As we have seen already, notions that may be classified under the heading of "existence" play an important part in the semantic structure of the sentence and considerably affect its FSP.

20 requires special comment which will anticipate our argument on p. 51. The adverbial element *hundertmal/hundreds of times/stokrát* does not constitute an FRA partner of the verb. If the word-order principles and the co-operation of means of FSP permit it, it may therefore attain a higher degree of CD by moving towards, or even by taking up, the end of the sentence. This is evidenced by the English version. Occupying the end of the sentence and being used only once, the adverbial element *hundreds of times* comes to function as rheme proper.

We hope to have shown convincingly that within the limits specified on p. 46 a non-thematic partner will — irrespective of position — carry a higher amount of CD than the verb it accompanies. In other words, although a non-copulative verb may carry a comparatively high amount of CD, in the presence of a non-thematic FRA partner it will never have travelled far enough from the dynamically weak end of the gamut to become rheme proper. The absence of an FRA partner is therefore an important item in the co-operation of means that permit the verb to function as rheme proper, i. e. allow it to perform the most essential communicative role a word can be entrusted with in the sentence. — Verbs performing this function are instanced in 21, 22 and 23.

21. Und als ich¹⁰ begriffen³⁰ hatte²⁰, [was los war, war mir bald frher zumute.] — LE 29.13
 And when I¹⁰ realized³⁰ [what was happening, I at once felt more cheerful.] — LE 33.17
 A když jsem³⁰ pochopil³⁰]¹⁰, [co se děje, bylo mi hnedle radostnější.] — LE 25.13
22. Inzwischen²¹ habe²² ich¹⁰ unter anderem²³ enträtselt³⁰, [daß der wilde Schrei „o-ei-ó“ auf der Straße Kartoffeln bedeutet:] ... — LE 27.23
 In the meanwhile²¹ I¹⁰ have²² found out³², among other things³¹, [that the wild cry „o-ei-ó“ in the street means potatoes:] ... — LE 31.20
 Zatím²² jsem³¹ mimo jiné²³ rozluštil³⁰]¹⁰ [že divý křik „o-ej-ó“ na ulici znamená brambory,] ... — LE 23.29

23. ... was¹² ihr¹¹ nach langem Bemühen²⁰ beinahe gelingt²⁰. — LE 22.13(48)
 ... which¹², after a long endeavour²⁰, it¹¹ almost manages²¹ to achieve²². — LE 25.13
 ... což¹² se jí¹¹ po dlouhém úsilí²⁰ téměř povede²⁰. — LE 19.21

In 21 the verb "holds undisputed sway" over the FSP of the clause in which it occurs. It can, however, easily adopt this role as there is no other element present that could possibly become bearer of a higher amount of CD than of that carried by the verb. In 22 and 23, the verbs are not preceded by any element that could operate as an FRA partner. Consequently, unhampered by semantic content and in accordance with the position they occupy, they can — at least in the German and Czech instances — unmistakably become rhemes proper. As to the English verbs, *found out* in 22 also functions as rheme proper, but the adverbial element *among other things* (whose Czech and German opposite numbers precede their respective verbs) assumes its position after the verb, and propped up by commas (49) does not allow it to assert itself with such intense force as its Czech and German counterparts do. As to the phrase *manages to achieve* in 23, the following observation could be made. Whilst both in English and in German rheme proper is conveyed by a finite verb only, the English version expresses it by means of a finite verb plus an infinitive, the latter functioning as rheme proper. No doubt, similar instances could be adduced from Czech and German as well, but judging by the marked disposition of English to weaken its finite verb, we may safely state that they will be more frequent in English than in the other two languages. The two notes passed on *found out* and *manages to achieve* respectively, together with the comment offered on the English version of 20, give a glimpse of the share FSP and the nominal tendencies may have in the process that leads to the weakening of the English finite verb.

By way of ending this chapter, let us briefly state that the type containing a non-thematic verb and a non-thematic FRA partner of the verb (and falling, of course, within the limits specified on p. 46) is by far the most frequent in our materials. On the other hand, the type containing a verb in the function of rheme proper is of comparatively low frequency. But it is of special interest to us as it covers instances in which uncertainty may arise as to the degree of closeness of the semantic relationship existing between the verb and the adverbial phrase. We shall take up this problem in Chapter IV.

III.

In the preceding chapter we have studied the non-thematic verb in its relation to a non-thematic partner, excluding from our observation second instance sentences and sentences that contain special rhematizing means of FSP (cf. p. 46). In other words we have not covered all the levels of FSP on which the verb and its partners may operate.

These observations raise the problem of what we call instance levels. The terms First and Second Instances have already been used in the First Chapter, where the opinion was voiced that in all probability they cover a whole hierarchy of levels. The following lines are an attempt to offer some thoughts on this hierarchy. (Its methodological value will be discussed at the end of the present chapter.)

To begin with, let us comment on types falling within the First Instance. The type with which we want to start may be illustrated by the sentence *A girl broke a vase*. As we have already shown (see p. 42), all the components of the quoted sentence are comparatively very dynamic, as each of them conveys a new piece of information. It needs little proof that under the circumstances the context

affects the FSP of the studied sentence very little, if at all. (Theme, transition and rheme, however, are marked out through the operation of the basic distribution of CD, which is to be regarded as an inherent linear quality of every sentence.)

Let us pass on to another type. The sentence *The girl broke a vase* admits — within the First Instance, of course — of at least three interpretations. Occurring at the beginning of a narrative, it may be almost on the same level as the preceding sentence (though not quite, as the definite article may suggest a pseudo-knowledge of the subject and therefore indicate a somewhat lower degree of CD than the indefinite article). Occurring within a context in which the girl has been spoken about, it will have its FSP affected by the context and be removed a marked step away from the basic level on which the first version (with the indefinite article in the subject) finds itself. Occurring within a context in which not only the girl but also the action (the breaking) has been spoken about, it will have its FSP still more affected by the context and will be removed another marked step away from the basic level.

The sentence *The girl broke the vase* definitely admits of more interpretations than the preceding version and is capable of being still further removed from the level on which the first example occurred. Without going into all the possibilities, let us just mention that it is the definite article occurring with the noun *vase* that allows of a further shift away from the basic level. As has been shown (on p. 43) the definite article cannot prevent its accompanying noun from becoming rheme proper. For this reason, the type under discussion may come very near the type *The girl broke a vase*. However, whereas the non-generic indefinite article is capable of marking out an entirely new idea, the definite article will indicate at least some degree of definiteness (which will imply a certain amount of familiarity and consequently a somewhat lower degree of CD); this will not hinder the definite article from occurring within the rheme (cf. p. 43), but will prevent the sentence from coming as near the basic level as the type *The girl broke a vase*. Another difference existing between the two types consists in the range of their applicability within the gamut of levels. Whereas only two elements ([*the*] *girl* and *broke*) of the three in *The girl broke a vase* allow of thematization, any of the three elements occurring in *The girl broke the vase* can be thematized. Owing to this wider range of applicability the type with the definite article before the noun *vase* seems to come up higher in the gamut, beyond the sphere occupied by the other type.

Still further from the basic level, though with a smaller range of applicability, can be found the type *The girl broke it*. Under the circumstances, it is chiefly the pronoun *it* that places the sentence so far away from the basic instance level. The pronoun no longer functions as an element that can possibly be weakened by the context; it is weak in itself and therefore standing in more or less constant relation to the context. This also means that whereas in the type *The girl broke the vase* any of the three components could function as rheme proper, in the case of *The girl broke it* only two components (*the girl*, *broke*) could do so. (Of the discussed types, the type *The girl broke the vase* evidently possesses the widest range of applicability within the gamut of levels.) It follows that various sentence types may acquire ranges of applicability of different width and take up different places within the gamut of of levels.

Another step away from the level on which we started would be the type *She broke it*, and still another type *She did it*. They both show very narrow ranges of applicability. A free operation of the basic distribution of CD is excluded altogether, whereas the links with the preceding context have been strengthened to a very high degree.

We propose to call the types of levels which have been discussed above ordinary instance levels. All of them, of course, fall within what was formerly roughly termed First Instance. Another type of levels that would also come under the heading of First Instance is what we should like tentatively to call special instance levels — without daring at the moment to draft an outline of levels similar to that offered above. The existence of special instance levels is suggested to us by the fact that there exist intensifying elements of the type of Engl. *even*, G. *sogar*, Cz. *i*, etc. If removed from the sentence, they leave it formally complete. They are, as it were, superimposed on the sentence structure, considerably changing its FSP by rhematizing (frequently even turning into rheme proper) the element to which they are made to refer. Thus the adverb *even* if employed in the function of an intensive particle changes the FSP of a sentence, regardless of the ordinary level, on which the sentence — if not containing the intensifying element — might occur; cf. *Even the girl broke a vase*, *She even broke the vase*, *Even she did it*. (In all these instances, *even* is marking out the rheme proper. Note that the sentences would be formally complete if the intensive particle were removed: *The girl broke a vase*, etc.) The German *selbst* behaves in a similar way, cf. *Selbst die Kinder haben sich neulich daran erinnert*, ... (SK 13.14). *Nur* produces a similar effect; as e. g. in [*Fünf Schaufeln Kohle waren uns zugebilligt, die nur auf Minuten die zugige Baracke anwämen konnten* ... (SK 8.20). If the *nur* were removed, the sentence would be formally complete and its FSP entirely different. (It would be in accordance with the basic distribution of CD, *die zugige Baracke* being a thematized FRA partner of the verb.) Needless to say, the adverb *nur* could be made to intensify also other elements of the examined sentence. Another means of FSP operating on special instance levels are the various types of negations (cf., e. g., the *not* in 2). The special SC means (i. e. such as operate on special instance levels) do not prevent the ordinary SC means (i. e. such as operate on ordinary levels) from functioning; the latter, however, have to restrict their operations in accordance with the ends pursued by the former.

The scanty remarks on the special instance levels will have to be put to the test and further elaborated. (F. Daneš's observations on the words *také*, *zase*, *přece*, *sotva*, etc. on pp. 82 ff. of his book on Czech intonation would prove of great value.) We only wanted, tentatively, to point out a layer of instance levels that might be placed in the suggested hierarchy between the ordinary instance levels and what we have so far termed Second Instance, which ranks highest among all instance levels.

Within the Second Instance, as has already been explained (see p. 43), any word may become rheme proper or part of an extensive theme proper. In other words any sentence may pass from its ordinary or special level into the Second Instance. It is evident that on this level which we propose to call superinstance level, all SC means, ordinary and special, cease to function. It is on this level that the context asserts itself with greatest force.

We have attempted to sketch an outline of instance levels on which FSP operates. We are well aware that further research will have to map out the types with greater accuracy and in greater detail. Yet, we believe that even at this tentative stage the conception of instances may prove of methodological value.

Before pursuing this observation any further, let us comment on two other types that fall within the ordinary instance levels but have so far not been dealt with.

24. [Das tat mir einigermaßen leid, darum ging ich,] es¹² mir¹¹ anzusehen³⁰, ... — LE 28.10
[I felt rather sorry for it,] so I¹¹ went²⁰ to inspect³⁰ it¹²; ... — LE 33.12
[Bylo mi jí poněkud líto,] i šel²² jsem²¹ se¹¹ na²² ni¹² podívat³⁰ ... — LE 25.10

25. [Wie eine Herde, wenn ein Hund ins Feld läuft, standen sie Kopf an Kopf und Schulter an Schulter,] bereit³⁰ den Eindringling¹⁰ niederzurennen und totzutrameln³⁰. — FS 18.28
[Like cattle when a dog comes into the field, they stood head to head and shoulder to shoulder,] prepared³⁰ to run upon and trample³¹ the invader¹⁰ to death³². — FS 9.6
[Podobai stádu dobytka, když pes přiběhne na pole, stáli těsně u sebe, hlavu u hlavy a rameno u ramene,] hotovi³⁰ porazit³⁰ vetřelce¹⁰ a k smrti³² jej¹⁰ ušlapati³¹. — FS₁ 16.9
[Jako dobytek, přijde-li na louku pes, stáli hlava vedle hlavy, bok po boku,] připraveni³⁰ rozbohnout se a udupat³¹ vetřelce¹⁰ k smrti³². — FS₂ 22.16
26. [Er sprach mit Behagen, als fühle er,] daß er¹¹ die alte Tante¹² aufheiterte³⁰. — FS 26.14
[He spoke with relish, as though he felt] he¹¹ was³⁰ cheering up³⁰ his old aunt¹². — FS 18.4
[Vyprávěl s chutí, jako by cítil,] že tím¹¹ rozveseluje³⁰ svou starou tetu¹². — FS₁ 23.12
[Mluvil s potěšením, jako by si myslel,] že starou tetu¹⁰ obšťastňuje³⁰. — FS₂ 29.25

All the examples above occur on ordinary instance levels, but differ from those examined in the previous chapter in that they contain verbal forms which are accompanied by FRA partners (objects) that are no longer non-thematic. These thematic FRA partners are either expressed by personal pronouns which function as thematic SC means, or by nominal elements thematized by the preceding context (the latter applies also to the version of FS₂ of 26). In consequence, the verbal forms carry higher amounts of CD, and in a majority of cases even become rhemes proper. A comparison of the German, English and Czech versions shows that once again the positions of the verbal forms and their objects differ from language to language: the German verb occurs finally, following the object; the English verb medially, preceding the object; the Czech verb occurs both finally and medially, following and preceding the object respectively. However, the differences in position alter nothing about the fact that the verbal form carries a higher amount of CD than its object.

It follows that not only on a level on which the verb appears as non-thematic and is accompanied by a non-thematic FRA partner, but also on a level on which a non-thematic verb appears with an FRA partner that has been thematized, the basic distribution of CD may be counteracted and an adequate estimate of the various amounts of CD successfully secured. On the former type of level it is the semantic content of the verb that makes its carrier (i. e. the verbal form) function as an SC means; on the latter it is the context itself that functions as a means of FSP. To sum up. In regard to the relation existing between the verb and its FRA partner, the facts adduced above place the verb in such a position within the structure of language that it may comply not only with the demands of FSP, but also with those of grammatical structure (which may vary from one language to another; just compare the fixed positions of the verb in German and English respectively) and possibly also with other factors (e. g. of the rhythmical principle). This clearly shows that in spite of its various positions in the sentence, the verb cannot be regarded as an element insusceptible to FSP.

The reader will have observed that in studying the examples quoted so far we started with verbs which carried a very small amount of CD and have finished with verbs functioning as rhemes proper. In order to continue along the gamut, we could pass on to verbs functioning as rhemes proper on special instance levels (cf. the negated verb in 2 on p. 42 and in 32 on p. 58) and to verbs functioning as rhemes proper on superinstance levels. But these types have been excluded from our observation. There is, however, a type that ought to be mentioned, a type that is near the starting point of the gamut but has so far not been dealt with. It contains a verb thematized by the context. One example will suffice.

27. ..., und seit der Zeit¹³ habe³⁰ ich¹¹ unzählige Male³⁰ die Londoner Straßen überquert¹³... — LE 24.17

..., and since then¹³ I¹² have²⁰ crossed the London streets¹² on countless occasions²⁰, ... — LE 27.24

... a od té doby¹³ jsem²⁰ bezpočtkrát²⁰ překřížoval londýnské ulice¹². — LE 21.11

The sentence should be read in a wider context which would show that the author describes the abominably heavy London traffic and recalls the horror "which was then aroused in him by the idea that he must get at the other side of the street". It is clear why both the verb and its FRA partner have been thematized. All three examples occur on one instance level; the arrangement of the German and Czech sentences, however, shows a distinct emotive colouring (50).

Having travelled through the gamut extending between the lowest and the highest degree of CD a verbal form can carry, and having sketched an outline of levels on which FSP may operate, we should like to offer a few thoughts on the methodological value of these observations.

In our opinion, the conception and establishing of levels may contribute towards a more detailed description and better understanding of mutual interrelations between FSP on the one hand and the grammatical and semantic planes on the other. It allows, for instance, of a deeper insight into the relations existing between the verb and the other sentence elements (the subject, object, complement, adverbial phrase) and examines them not only from a purely syntactical point of view, but from that of the very act of communication. Similarly, in regard to the semantic plane, the conception of levels may contribute to a better understanding of how certain lexical units, or even parts of speech, function in actual communication. (Just cf. the established possibility of using the non-thematic verb as an SC means on those levels on which it appears as non-thematic and is accompanied by a non-thematic FRA partner.) In these and other ways, the grammatical and semantic structures of the sentence can be studied in their relations to FSP, which will no doubt be in accordance with the views of those scholars [J. Vachek (51), e. g.] who regard the structure of language as a system of systems.

From the gamut recording degrees of CD within the structure of language and from the gamut of instance levels, conclusions may be drawn as to the rôle played by the verb in the very act of communication. As we have seen, the verb is mostly surpassed in CD by another element. A verb can become rheme proper, but only under conditions that are rather external than dependent on the character of the verb itself (i. e. on conditions involving, e. g., the absence of an FRA partner, the thematization of such partner, the absence of following non-FRA partners strengthened through the operation of the basic distribution of CD, the presence of special rhematizing SC means, etc.).

In this connection, we wish to recall an observation made earlier in this paper. In English — on a larger scale than in Czech or in German — the verb is surpassed in CD by other elements. This is due to the fixed medial position of the English verb, which allows a greater number of non-FRA partners to follow in its wake; these non-FRA partners, if non-thematic, may acquire a higher amount of CD through the operation of the basic distribution of CD. On the part of the English verb, this does not make the verb insusceptible to FSP, but detracts from its importance in the act of communication.

In contrast with the verb, a noun is upon the whole dynamically stronger. It attains the rheme-proper end of the gamut of CD with greater ease. This is not only because of its function as an FRA partner of the verb, but also because of its wider applicability in syntactical functions.

All the facts adduced above contribute to an explanation why not only in English

but also in Czech and in German tendencies can be observed that testify to a shift from verbal to nominal expression. The degree to which this shift is being carried out will of course differ, as has been indicated above, from one language to another in accordance with the structure of every particular language (52). The facts adduced above, and the entire argument advanced in this paper, have perhaps demonstrated that such a shift from verbal to nominal expression cannot be examined without due regard to the function of the verb and other elements within FSP. In fact, the degree with which the tendency of removing the verb from the rheme-proper end of the gamut asserts itself co-determines, and is in its turn co-determined, by the entire structure of the concerned language.

IV.

We cannot close our notes without at least touching upon the question intimated in Chapter II (p. 51), viz. upon the problem of cases that show uncertainty as to the closeness of semantic relationship existing between the verb and the adverbial phrase. We propose to broach this problem in a somewhat wider setting, which will make it possible to offer a few thoughts on the insusceptibility of language to FSP. Let us first examine the example 28 below. (The sequences of four figures above the line of the German versions of 28 and 29 indicate the possibility of a double interpretation. Thus ¹⁰³⁰, e. g., should be read as:¹⁰ or ³⁰.)

28. [Er (i. e. Soames — J. F.) entfernte sich bei öffentlichen Gelegenheiten nur selten von Irenens Seite; und wenn sie im Drang des gesellschaftlichen Verkehrs einmal getrennt wurden, konnte man sehen] wie seine Augen¹² ihr¹¹ mit einem seltsamen Ausdruck von Wachsamkeit und Verlangen²⁰³⁰ folgten³⁰²⁰. — FS 20.21

He¹¹ [was seldom, indeed, far from Irene's side at public functions; and even when separated by the exigencies of social intercourse,] could be²¹ seen²² following²³ her¹² about²³ with his eyes³⁰, in which¹⁰ were²⁰ strange expressions of watchfulness and longing³⁰. — FS 11.10 [Zřídka se vůbec na veřejnosti vzdaloval od Irenina boku, a dokonce i tenkrát, když ho od ní nezbytnosti společenské zábavy odloučily, bývalo ho vídat,] jak ji¹² sleduje²⁰ zrakem³⁰, v němž¹⁰ byl²⁰ podivný výraz ostražitosti a touhy³⁰. — FS₂ 24.10

As we see it, the semantic relationship existing between the non-thematic *mit*-phrase and the non-thematic verbal form *folgten* is not close enough to admit of the former being classified as an FRA partner. Occurring after a non-FRA partner (cf. p. 55) the verbal form *folgten* should accordingly be regarded, as no doubt many readers would actually interpret it, as rheme proper. The matter, however, is not so simple. Though perhaps not an FRA partner of the verb, the *mit*-phrase conveys a very material amplification of the meaning of the verb, so essential in fact that the phrase may consequently pass into the border strata between non-FRA and FRA partners. This, together with the pressure within the system of the language (exerted by the majority of cases in which a final verb is considered less dynamic than its preceding non-thematic nominal partner), does not preclude the possibility of interpreting the *mit*-phrase as rheme proper.

Neither in the English nor in the two Czech versions (FS₁ does not substantially differ from FS₂) similar uncertainty can arise. Occurring finally and preceded by less dynamic elements, the Czech and English counterparts of the German *mit*-phrase undoubtedly function as rhemes proper. But even the idea of Soames's constantly keeping his eyes on Irene gets into prominence in the Czech and English versions. In their own separate spheres of basic distribution of CD, the words *with his eyes* and *zrakem*, which partake in expressing this idea, function as rhemes proper as well. It is, however, the respective counterpart of the *mit*-phrase that functions as rheme

proper of the entire complex sentence (which is to be considered a sphere of basic distribution of CD as well, but one of higher order).

The means of FSP employed by the English and Czech versions mark out the degrees of CD in such a way as to leave no room for uncertainty in interpretation. In the German version, on the other hand, the co-operation of means is such as not to offer an unequivocal, and therefore wholly adequate, communication about the extra-linguistic reality referred to.

Cases in which the means of FSP fail to mark out the degrees of CD unequivocally are not confined to German only (53); they have been observed in English as well (54). As they potentially allow of more than one interpretation (as even in the very act of communication, i. e. written communication, they potentially occur on more than one instance level), they are regarded by us as cases of potentiality. In our opinion, it is within this sphere of the structure of language that insusceptibility to FSP has to be sought for. As we have shown at greater length elsewhere, the nature and frequency of the phenomenon of potentiality in a language seems to be an indicator of the degree of susceptibility shown by that language towards FSP.

True enough, at the present state of research some cases might be relegated to the sphere of potentiality simply out of insufficient knowledge of all the means of FSP and their ways of operation; the phenomenon of potentiality, however, exists and language may even tend to remove the causes that bring it about. Before pointing out a "remedy" (55) that may be resorted to by German to remove the causes of potentiality or other causes leading to certain degrees of insusceptibility to FSP, let us offer at least one more specimen (29 below) instancing the phenomenon of potentiality.

29. [Ja, ich gestehe ohne weiteres, daß ich Angst hatte: Angst, ...] daß die Menschheit¹⁰ durch irgendeine furchtbare Katastrophe²²³⁰ zugrunde³⁰²² geht²¹, ... — LE 25.6
[... I was afraid ...,] that mankind¹⁰ would²¹ perish²² as the result³¹ of some dreadful catastrophe³², ... — LE 28.18
[...: báł jsem se, ...,] že lidstvo¹⁰ vyhyne²⁰ nějakou hroznou katastrofou³⁰ ... — LE 21.24

Although *zugrunde* is an evident FRA partner to *geht*, uncertainty arises whether the *durch*-phrase performs such function in relation to the entire verbal phrase *zugrunde gehen*. The answer seems to be in the negative. But what has been stated about the *mit*-phrase of 28 could — with the necessary alterations — be repeated about the adverbial phrase introduced by *durch* in 29. Hence the possible double interpretation: the *durch*-phrase serving as a highly dynamic transitional element, *zugrunde* as rheme proper; and vice versa. As to English and Czech, the co-operation of means marks out the counterpart of the *durch*-phrase as rheme proper.

The German versions of 28, 29 betray a clash between the grammatical principle (strictly requiring a final position of the verb) and the demands of FSP. The grammatical principle getting the upper hand, the marginal cases of verbal partners in 28 and 29 go without having their degrees of CD marked out unequivocally.

In both cases the demands of FSP would be complied with and the phenomenon of potentiality removed if the rigid grammatical word-order were loosened and the positions allotted according to the degrees of CD. It is not without interest that such a solution is not an impossible one within the structure of German, since it can be observed not only in everyday conversational speech, but quite frequently also with esteemed and accomplished writers (56). It is worth notice that it serves not only as a remedy for potentiality (see 30 and 31 and the comments below), but also for another type of cases (see 30 and 32, containing non-FRA partners of the verb, and the comments below) equally displaying some degree of insusceptibility

to FSP (caused by an element having to occur in a fixed position, and thereby incurring a loss in CD).

30. [Vielleicht wird man später nicht verstehen,] wie so Franz¹⁰ vergnügt²³ sein²¹ konnte²² in der Haut³⁰, [in der er steckte.] — SK 9.11
31. [Zwanzig Jahre später stand auf der Mainzer Schiffsbrücke ein alter Soldat Posten. Wie sie an ihm vorüberzogen, die letzten der Großen Armee, zerlumpt und düster, da fiel ihm ein, wie er hier Posten gestanden hatte,] als sie¹⁰ eingezogen²² waren²¹ mit den Trikoloren und mit den Menschenrechten²⁰, [und er weinte laut auf.] — SK 12.25
32. [„... und er hat erst heut ganz früh heimgemacht,] da ist²⁰ er¹⁰ nicht²³ durchgelassen²² worden²⁰ bei Gustavsburg²¹.“ — SK 15.13

Being a non-FRA partner, the phrase *in der Haut* (in 30) could not, so to speak, on its own assume the function of rheme proper if it came to stand before the group *vergnügt sein konnte* (in which *vergnügt* is an FRA partner of *sein konnte*). On the other hand, in such a case, the possibility (potentiality) would have to be admitted of the relative clause (*in der...*) strengthening its antecedent, the adverbial phrase *in der Haut* (in other words, the possibility of the reader's concentrating on the semantic and grammatical coherence of the relative clause and its antecedent). The only way, however, how to mark out the adverbial phrase *in der Haut* as unequivocal rheme proper is to place it — in accordance with the basic distribution of CD — after the verb. This is actually the solution which the author has adopted in the discussed example.

Like the phrase *in der Haut* in 30, the *mit*-phrase of 31 is no FRA partner of the verb either. It is therefore highly probable that it would incur a loss in CD if it came to be placed before the verbal form *eingezogen*. (All the more so, as *eingezogen* apparently stands in contrast to *vorüberzogen*, which occurs earlier in the sentence. Should *eingezogen* appear at the end, the contrast would become more manifest, which would make *eingezogen* still more dynamic.) As the sentence stands, however, the final position of the *mit*-phrase leaves no doubt as to its degree of CD, excluding the phenomenon of potentiality altogether. In accordance with the basic distribution of CD, the *mit*-phrase becomes rheme proper.

Neither the adverbial phrase *bei Gustavsburg*, occurring in 32, is an FRA partner of the verb. As the verb has been marked out as rheme proper by *nicht*, a special SC means, the *bei*-phrase has no chance of surpassing it in CD. But in occurring at the end, it may attain a degree of CD that in the circumstances is almost as high as that of the verb. (Incidentally, 32 may serve as an illustrative example of co-operation of means, ordinary and special, on a special instance level.)

Having at least indicated how language may set about rendering its means more adequate to the communicative needs of its user, we have perhaps proceeded far enough to add some closing remarks to our discussion.

We have not covered the whole field (e. g., the FRA and non-FRA partners of the verb invite further research, much remains to be said about the various positions of the verb (57), the final position not exempted, and about the relation of these positions to other word-order principles than those discussed in this paper (58), etc.). Still, we hope to have shown that it is possible to square the different positions as revealed by the verbs in English, German, and Czech with the theory of FSP. Although the English, the German, and even the Czech verb, may be at evident variance (not called forth by emotive reasons) with the gradual arrangement of words “from the known to the unknown”, they are not in disagreement with, and consequently not insusceptible to, FSP. True enough, there are cases that cause potentiality, but even those cannot be regarded as insusceptible in the full sense of the word.

The phenomenon of potentiality is the outcome of a kind of not wholly adequate co-operation of means, but not proof of a total failure of these means to function within FSP.

The reason why the differences in position as revealed by the verb may be squared with the theory of FSP is to be sought for in the specific semantic character of the verb. Owing to it, the verb may function as a SC means of FSP on those instance levels on which it appears as non-thematic and is accompanied by a non-thematic FRA partner. We believe that this conception may throw new light also on the changes in position as observable with verbs in the course of the historical development of language. Viewed in the light of FSP theory, the overwhelming majority of such changes could apparently be carried out as they were not at variance with FSP. The truly manifold character the co-operation of means of FSP displays seems to have provided one of the channels through which the changes in word-order could have come about without paralyzing the power of language reliably to mark out — at least to a considerably high degree — the degrees of CD carried by its semantic components.

The semantic character of the verb also affects its position within the gamut of degrees of CD. As has been shown, the verb ranks below the noun, showing a definitely lower frequency at the rheme-proper end of the gamut. This indicates the share FSP may have in the promotion of the shift from verbal to nominal expression within the structure of language.

This proves that FSP does not operate independently of phenomena belonging to other language planes, which brings us to the following conclusion. Although we are aware that the co-operation of FSP does not show hundred-percent consistency on all instance levels, the fact remains that the co-operation is highly organized. With the proviso concerning the degree of consistency and recalling the results presented in our papers on FSP, we therefore venture to suggest that the means of FSP form a system within the structure of language, a system linked up with, and not independent of, other systems within the whole system of language itself. A further inquiry into this system of FSP means must needs throw valuable light not only on the functions of the verb, but also on those of the sentence and of the entire language structure.

NOTES

(1) The second part, entitled *More Thoughts on the Communicative Function of the English Verb*, and the third part, entitled *Further Thoughts on the Communicative Function of the English Verb*, are to appear in the *Sborník prací filosofické fakulty brněnské university* A 7, 1959, and in some other philological periodical, respectively.

(1a) A term modelled on V. Mathesius' German designation *Satzperspektive* (see his paper *Zur Satzperspektive im modernen Englisch*, *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen* 115, pp. 202–210) and used in our paper *Some Thoughts on the Function of Word-Order in Old English and Modern English*, *Sborník filosofické fakulty brněnské university* 1957, A 5, pp. 72–98.

(2) Translating V. Mathesius' term *aktuální členění větné*.

(3) Cf. the English rendering of the title of Mathesius' study *O tak zvaném aktuálním členění větném* (published in the *Slovo a slovesnost* 5/1939, pp. 171–174), *On the so-called Actual Division of the Sentence*, as given by the *Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature* 21/1940 (sic!).

(4) Cf. the English summary of F. Daneš's monograph *Intonace a věta ve spisovné češtině* (*Sentence Intonation in Present-Day Standard Czech*), Prague 1957, pp. 139–147. Daneš's monograph contains a valuable survey of the work done in the field of FSP (55–62).

(5) See (1a, 3, 6), but also V. Mathesius, *Čeština a obecný jazykozpyt* (*The Czech Language and General Linguistics*), Prague 1947, a selection from Mathesius's papers, where also other contributions dealing with FSP can be found. For further literature on the subject see our papers *Some Thoughts on the Function of Word-Order in Old English and Modern English* (a), *Poznámky k problematice anglického slovního pořádku s hlediska aktuálního členění větného* (*Some Notes on the Problem of English Word-Order from the Point of View of Actual Sentence Analysis*), *Sborník prací filosofické fakulty brněnské university* 1956, A 4, pp. 93–107, and *K otázce nezákladových podmětů v současné angličtině, Příspěvek k teorii aktuálního členění větného* (*On the Problem of Non-Thematic Subjects in Contemporary English, A Contribution to the Theory of Functional Sentence Perspective*), *Časopis pro moderní filologii* 39/1957, pp. 22–42 and 165–173.

(6) See, for instance, V. Mathesius' paper *Ze srovnávacích studií slovosledných* (*From Comparative Word-Order Studies*), *Časopis pro moderní filologii* 28/1942, p. 182.

(7) See op. cit., pp. 183–190 and 302–306.

(8) See op. cit., p. 188.

(9) See op. cit., p. 185.

(10) In her paper *О порядке слов в немецком языке* (*On the Order of Words in German*), *Иностранные языки в школе* 1957, No. 1, pp. 8–20.

(11) Krushel'nitskaya speaks of the semantic function of word-order (*смысловая функция порядка слов*).

(12) See his monograph *Neue Untersuchungen zum Wesen und zur Struktur des deutschen Satzes* (*Der Satz als Spannungsfeld*), Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Deutsche Sprache und Literatur, 1955, Lieferung 4.

(13) Boost uses the expressions *das Wissen des Sprechers* and *das Noch-nicht-wissen des Hörers*.

(14) Boost speaks of two *Spannungsführungen*.

(15) Translating Boost's term *Mittelungswert. Communicative dynamism* (= CD), degrees of CD, are the designations used in our papers.

(16) For further details see our *Bemerkungen über einen deutschen Beitrag zum Problem der Satzperspektive*, an extensive discussion of K. Boost's book in the *Philologica Pragensia* 1/1958, pp. 49—54.

(17) *Základy české skladby (Fundamentals of Czech Syntax)*, Praha 1952, p. 25.

(18) See *Sentence Intonation in Present-Day Czech* (), p. 65.

(19) Cf., e. g., F. Vodička, *Počátky krásné prózy novočeské (The Beginnings of Modern Czech Polite Prose)*, pp. 78 ff.

(20) See her paper quoted in (10) and also the papers *Смысловая функция порядка слов в немецком языке — сравнительно с русским (The Semantic Function of Word-Order in German — A Comparison with Russian)*, Ученые записки Военного института иностранных языков, Moscow 1948, No. 5, pp. 21—36; *Смысловая функция артикла в современном немецком языке (The Semantic Function of the Article in Contemporary German)*, Труды Военного института иностранных языков, Moscow 1955, No. 7, pp. 38—52; *К вопросу о смысловом членении предложения (On the Question of the Semantic Structure of the Sentence)*, Вопросы языкознания Moscow 1956, No. 5, pp. 55—67.

(21) Cf. our paper *On the Problem of Non-Thematic Subjects in Contemporary English* (5), p. 29.

(22) Its significance for the problem in hand has been prompted to us by F. Kopečný's conception of transitivity (transitivnost), by I. Poldauf's conception of the indispensable verbal complement (nutné doplnění slovesa), and by F. Daneš's able comments on the researches concerning the position of the Czech verb. See F. Kopečný, *Základy české skladby (Fundamentals of Czech Syntax)*, Prague 1958, pp. 29—34, I. Poldauf, *Mluvnice současné angličtiny I (A Grammar of Contemporary English I)*, Prague 1951, pp. 161 ff., I. Poldauf, *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, p. 70; for F. Daneš, see note (36).

(23) Translating Sechehaye's "complément" (avoiding the term "complement", which might be misleading).

(24) The example is being quoted from V. Mathesius' paper *From Comparative Word-Order Studies* (6), p. 186. Our interpretation of its FSP, however, is different. Cf. also our paper *Some Thoughts on the Function of Word-Order in OE and ModE* (5), p. 75.

(25) We have as a rule refrained from interpreting the degree of CD of conjunctions and of similar introductory words at the head of clauses, leaving it to further research. Insignificant as these elements may seem, they may not be quite devoid of communicative dynamism, for they function as "key signatures", imparting, as it were, a certain semantic tuning to the sequence of words they introduce. Much, of course, depends on the semantic character of the conjunction or its equivalent. Just compare the dynamically weak *and/und/a* with the comparatively strong *but/aber/ale*.

(26) An element communicatively more dynamic, i. e. an element carrying a higher degree of CD. Whenever *dynamic* occurs further on in this paper, the qualification *communicatively* is to be understood.

(27) On the onomatological (naming) function of morphemes cf. V. Skalička, *Vztah morfologie a syntaxe (The Relation of Morphology to Syntax)*, *Slovo a slovesnost* 18/1957, pp. 65—70.

(28) I. e. in example 2 following below. When referring to examples, we shall only give their numbers.

(29) Cf. our paper *Some Thoughts on the Problem of English Word-Order from the Point of View of Actual Sentence Analysis* (5), pp. 94—95.

(30) On the FSP means employed by the spoken form of language see F. Daneš's fundamental monograph *Sentence Intonation in Present-Day Standard Czech* (4).

(31) *Linear Modification*, *PMLA* 1952, pp. 1117—1144.

(32) Quoted from J. Galsworthy, *The Forsyte Saga*, Heinemann, London 1922, p. 32.

(33) For a more detailed discussion of this instance, see *On the Problem of Non-Thematic Subjects in Contemporary English* (5), p. 32.

(34) For a detailed discussion of various types of co-operation as displayed by SC means, see our papers quoted in (5).

(35) Op. cit., p. 1123.

(36) Closing Chapter One, we feel the following point ought to be made. We trust to have convinced the reader that in spite of the vast literature concerning the problem of word-order in general, and the position of the verb in particular, there is still room for a study of the present kind. We hope that the consistent functional approach from the angle set forth in Chapter One will justify the existence of our *Thoughts*. For the literature dealing with word-order in English, see our papers (1a, 5). A serviceable account of the research in the positions of the Czech verb

will be found in F. Daneš's *Sentence Intonation in Present-Day Standard Czech* (4), pp. 64—69. (It contains valuable comments on the views of V. Ertl, F. Trávníček, F. Kopečný, J. Mukařovský, and others.) As to the position of the verb in German, see esp. the bibliography given by O. Behagel in *Deutsche Syntax*, Band II, Heidelberg 1932, pp. 10—11, and F. Maurer's and K. Schneider's monographs, *Untersuchungen über die deutsche Verbstellung in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, Heidelberg 1926, and *Die Stellungstypen des finiten Verbs im urgermanischen Haupt- und Nebensatz*, Heidelberg 1938, respectively.

(37) The language of the examined instances itself indicating which version is concerned, the same abbreviation has been used with the original and with the translations.

(38) The figures give the page and line on which the quoted instance begins. (The lines taken up by the headings of chapters count as well.)

(39) In 3—20, the examined non-thematic verbal forms have been spaced out and the examined non-thematic partners of the verb italicized. Throughout the paper, in all instances, those parts that are not under discussion have been bracketed.

(40) Considerations of space have compelled us to limit the number of instances (which as a rule have to be given in three versions). We hope, however, not to have thereby impaired the argument in any way.

(41) Strictly speaking, *nakreslil jsem vám* should be interpreted as follows: *na²³kresli^{2/11} jse³¹m¹¹ vám¹²* (cf. p. 8). As the setting of small letters, however, involves technical difficulties and as such detailed analysis is not necessary for the purposes of this paper, we shall resort to the indicated way of interpretation only exceptionally.

(42) Under normal circumstances, that is. Cf. the provisos given below (cp. p. 19).

(43) For the moment, cf. at least one example instancing a subject rhematized through *even*, a special SC means of FSP: "Even the girl lost her key".

(44) For the purpose of the present paper, the term "complement" is used in its narrowest grammatical sense; it is "applied only to the noun or adjective predicated by means of a copulative verb (*be, become, &c.*) or of a factitive verb (*make, call, think, &c.*) of the subject (He is a fool; He grew wiser; He was made king) or for the object (Call no man happy; ...)" (H. W. Fowler, *Modern English Usage*, Oxford University Press 1944, pp. 602—(603).

(45) For further examples see the present author's paper *On the Problem of Non-Thematic Subjects in Contemporary English* (5).

(46) For the preceding context of 17, see 8 on p. 45.

(47) On the importance played by the notion of existence in communication, see the highly valuable contribution on Spanish word-order by A. G. Hatcher, *Theme and Underlying Question, Two Studies of Spanish Word-Order, Supplement to Word*, vol. 12, December 1956. Cf. also A. G. Hatcher's article *Syntax and the Sentence*, *Word* 1956, 234—250.

(48) For the preceding context of 23, see 16 on p. 49.

(49) A problem worth attacking seems to be the relation of punctuation to FSP. Some interesting thoughts on this question have been offered by K. Boost, op. cit., p. 74—79.

(50) For some more observations on word-order emotiveness and FSP, see *Some Thoughts on Word-Order in Old English and Modern English* (1a), Chapters Two and Three.

(51) Cf. J. Vachek, *Notes on the Development of Language seen as a system of systems*, *Sborník prací filosofické fakulty brněnské university* A 6, 1958, pp. 94—106.

(52) On nominal tendencies in English, see J. Vachek, *Some Thoughts on the So-Called Complex Condensations in Modern English*, *Sborník prací filosofické fakulty brněnské university* 1955, A 3, pp. 63—77. On the character of the English verb, cf. also J. Vachek, *Obecný zápor v angličtině a v češtině (Universal Negation in English and Czech)*, *Příspevky k dějinám řeči a literatury anglické sv. 6 (Práce z vědeckých ústavů Karlovy university LI)*, Prague 1947, pp. 50 ff.

(53) Neither, of course, are they confined to cases of verb — adverb relation. Cf. at least the following example showing a case of verb — object relation.

[Wie der beliebte Swithin war er (James — J. F.) über sechs Fuß hoch, aber sehr hager, als sei er von Geburt an dazu bestimmt,] das Gleichgewicht²⁰¹⁰ herzustellen²³⁸⁰ und den Durchschnitt²⁰¹⁰ aufrecht²²³² zu erhalten²³³¹ — [den Dicken und den Dünnen nannte der alte Jolyon diese beiden.] — FS 15.13

The question arises whether to take the objects for notions to be gathered from the situational context, and consequently classify them as transitional, or to regard them as FRA partners and classify them as rhemes proper.

(54) For cases of potentiality in Czech and in English, and for a more detailed study of this phenomenon, see *Non-Thematic Subjects in Contemporary English* (5), pp. 41—42 and 165—169 and *Some Thoughts on the Function of Word-Order in Old English and Modern English* (1a), p. 85.

(55) On "therapeutic" means adopted by language on another plane, i. e. within the sphere

of homonyms, see. B. Trnka: *O homonymii, její terapii a profylaxi (Homonymy, its Therapy and Profylaxis)*, *Časopis pro moderní filologii* 17/1931, pp. 141—147.

(56) The phenomenon in hand is well known and has been correctly interpreted as a solution of the clash between the grammatical principle and FSP by K. G. Krushel'nitskaya in *On the Order of Words in German* (10), pp. 15—16. and by E. Beneš in *Větná rámcová konstrukce a její uvolňování v odborném stylu současné spisovné němčiny (The Frame Sentence Construction and its Relaxation in the Technical Style of Present-Day Literary German)*, *Cizí jazyky ve škole* II/1958, May we point out that our contribution to the knowledge of this phenomenon is an attempt at a more detailed account of the forces that may call it into being (the semantic character of the verb, its relation to non-thematic partners, its relation to means of FSP in general).

(57) Other positions than final have been touched upon in *Some Thoughts on Word-Order in Old English and Modern English* (1a).

(58) No doubt, valuable results would be produced by adequate statistical analysis; cf. B. Trnka, *Kvantitativní lingvistika (Quantitative Linguistics)*, *Časopis pro moderní filologii* 34/1951, pp. 66—74.

VÝTAH

Ke komunikativní funkci slovesa v angličtině, němčině a češtině

Článek tvoří část větší práce, která se zabývá otázkou posunu od vyjadřování slovesného k vyjadřování jmennému v systému anglického jazyka, a to z hlediska komunikativní funkce anglického slovesa.

I. V první kapitole si autor klade otázku, zdali je možno různá postavení anglického, německého a českého slovesa (určitého i infinitivu, participia, popř. gerundu) uvnitř věty, popř. polovětné vazby smířit s funkční perspektivou věty (= FPV), či zdali je třeba alespoň v některých případech považovat postavení slovesa, zvl. v němčině a v angličtině, za důkaz jeho necitlivosti k FPV.

[Na vysvětlenou je třeba uvést, že FPV rozumí autor ono uspořádání složek ve větě, které vzniká na základě různé výpovědní dynamičnosti těchto složek (morfémy v to počítajíc). Výpovědní dynamičnost větné složky je tím větší, čím více složka obohacuje, rozvíjí, „posunuje kupředu“ danou promluvu. Nejdynamičtější složku věty nazývá autor vlastním jádrem, nejméně dynamickou složku pak vlastním základem. Obecně řečeno, mezi vlastní základovostí a vlastní jádrovostí lze pozorovat celou stupnici výpovědní dynamičnosti, tvořenou odstíny základovosti, přechodovosti a jádrovosti.

FPV vydatně přispívá k tomu, aby jazyk mohl úspěšně plnit svůj úkol, být nástrojem myšlení a dorozumění. To se jeví také v tom, že slovní pořádek je jen jedním, byť snad nejdůležitějším prostředkem FPV. Mezi jiné (neslovosledné) prostředky FPV patří např. sám kontext a tzv. kontextově-sémantické prostředky, tj. např. slova, která si v různých kontextech zachovávají více méně stejný stupeň výpovědní dynamičnosti. Pokud jde o mluvenou formu jazyka, patří mezi prostředky FPV např. intonace a přízvuková linie věty. Nepůsobí-li „rušivě“ žádný z neslovosledných prostředků, může se ve větě uskutečnit základní rozložení větné dynamičnosti: větné složky se stavějí do perspektivy důsledně hledící od vlastního základu k vlastnímu jádru. Neslovosledné prostředky FPV však mohou působit tak, že se tato základní větná perspektiva všelijak obměňuje. — Autor se těmito otázkami podrobněji zabýval v *Sborníku filosofické fakulty brněnské university* A-4, 1956, str. 93—107, tamtéž A-5, 1957, str. 72—98, v *Časopise pro moderní filologii* 39/1957, str. 22—42 a 165—173 a ve *Philologica Pragensia* 1/1958, str. 49—54.]

Klíčem k řešení daného problému je autorovi pozorování A. Sechehaye (v *Essai sur la Structure Logique de la Phrase*, str. 80—81) o transitivity charakteru slovesa. (Transitivním rozumí Sechehaye každé sloveso, jehož význam potřebuje *nutně* doplnění.) Při svém srovnávání vychází autor z těch případů, v nichž se německé sloveso vyskytuje na konci věty, popř. polovětné vazby, na rozdíl od slovesa anglického a českého, která stojí v takových případech zpravidla uprostřed nebo na začátku (hlavně v polovětných vazbách).

II. Nepřehlédneme-li k větám patřícím do oblasti zvláštních instančních rovin a instančních rovin nejvyšších (viz o nich více v kap. III), platí o nezákladovém slovese toto: vstoupí-li nezákladové sloveso do věty spolu s nezákladovou složkou, která vyjadřuje *nutné*, nezbytné doplnění jeho významu, pak se toto doplnění jeví výpovědně dynamičtější než samo sloveso. (Uvnitř složeného slovesného tvaru jsou takovým nutným doplněním složky významové ve vztahu k složkám pomocným, srov. [er] hat ← *gezeichnet*.) Tento rozdíl v stupních výpovědní dynamičnosti platí bez ohledu na větné místo, takže ve větách *So habe ich ein Bildchen gezeichnet*, *Als ich ein Bildchen gezeichnet habe*, ..., *Ich zeichnete ein Bildchen*, *I have drawn a little picture*, *Nakreslil jsem vám obrázek* si jednotliví nositelé různých stupňů výpovědní dynamičnosti odpovídají i lexikálně; předmět zůstává vlastním jádrem, sloveso pak složkou přechodovou

(podrobný rozbor viz na str. 46). Za podmínek uvedených v první větě tohoto odstavce jeví se sloveso jako sémanticko-kontextový prostředek FVP, což znamená, že může působit proti základnímu ozložení výpovědní dynamičnosti. Kapitola II zkoumá několik typů nezbytných doplnění slovesa a analyzuje je z hlediska syntaktického a sémantického.

III. V této kapitole se autor zabývá problémem instančních rovin. (Instanční rovinu, na které věta je, určuje intenzita i způsob, jak na větu působí kontext.) D. II je prozatímne na prosté, zvláštní a nejvyšší. V oblasti prostých rovin je základní ta rovina, na níž se vyskytují věty, v nichž je vliv kontextu nejménš patrný, popř. není patrný vůbec (např. věta *A girl broke a vase*, jejíž všechny složky tlumočí nové představy). Nejvýše ve zmíněné oblasti je pak ta rovina, na které jsou věty, v nichž je působení kontextu nejpatrnější (např. věta *She did it*, jejíž všechny složky — aš nikoli v stejné míře — odkazují na předcházející kontext). Mezi těmito dvěma rovinami je ovšem řada rovin přechodných. — Zvláštními instančními rovinami se pak zdají ty, na nichž působí zvláštní sémanticko-kontextové prostředky FVP. Tyto prostředky signalisují, že spolu se složkou, na kterou se vztahují, patří k jádru, či dokonce samy nebo spolu se zmíněnou složkou tvoří vlastní jádro, a to bez ohledu na to, na které prosté rovině by daná věta byla, kdyby se v ní zvláštní prostředek nevyskytoval. (Zvláštní prostředek je jakoby „dodatečné“ vestavěn do věty, jinak již formálně úplné, srov. *even* ve větách *Even a girl broke a vase*, *Even she did it* a *nicht* ve větě *Sie haben ihn nicht durchgelassen*.) — V oblasti nejvyšších instančních rovin se každé slovo může stát vlastním jádrem nebo součástí rozšířeného vlastního základu. Nejvyšším útvarem, a to v jeho nejtypičtější podobě, rozumí auto takový útvar, který je vlastně kopií (opakováním) věty, ať již proslouvené nebo jenom myšlené, kopií, která ostře vytýká jedno slovo (které se stává vlastním jádrem, kdežto ostatní slova se stávají rozšířeným základem, např. *They have answered all the questions*). V oblasti nejvyšších instančních rovin, která je nejintenzivněji zasažena kontextem, už nepůsobí žádné sémanticko-kontextové prostředky.

Pojetí instančních rovin umožňuje lepší pochopení vztahu FVP k plánu gramatickému (viz kap. II o syntaktických vztazích mezi nezákladovými slovesy a jejich nezákladovými nezbytnými doplněními). V oblasti prostých rovin se může sloveso stát např. vlastním jádrem jen tehdy, nebrání-li tomu přítomnost nezákladového nutného doplnění, při čemž jiná (ne zcela nezbytná) nezákladová doplnění musí sloveso předcházet. Pojetí instančních rovin pomáhá zjistit rozsah působení jednotlivých sémanticko-kontextových prostředků FVP a slov vůbec ve vlastním sdělovacím aktu.

Ve srovnání se slovesem se podstatné jméno stává vlastním jádrem snáže a častěji, což jistě souvisí s jeho širokou uplatnitelností v různých syntaktických funkcích. V tomto vztahu FVP ke gramatické stavbě je nutno spatřovat i jednu z příčin způsobujících posun od vyjadřování slovesného k vyjadřování jmennému. Takový posun se, jak známo, projevuje obzvlášť silně v současné angličtině.

IV. Poslední kapitola se dotýká problému potenciálnosti, tj. jevu, který vzniká, připouští-li věta, aby se stupně výpovědní dynamičnosti jejích složek interpretovaly alespoň dvěma způsoby. Autor si všímá těch německých případů, v nichž možnost alespoň dvojí interpretace je dána nejistotou o těsnosti sémantického spojení nezákladového slovesa a jeho nezákladového adverbialního doplnění (nejistotou o tom, zdali adverbialní doplnění je nezbytné). Němčina se může nejednoznačností vystříhat tím, že proti běžnému usu postaví také adverbialní určení na konec věty, a tak je signalisuje v oblasti prostých instančních rovin dokonce jako vlastní jádro (srov. ... *als sie mit den Trikoloren und Menschenrechten eingezogen waren* s *als sie eingezogen waren mit den Trikoloren und Menschenrechten*).

Ačkoliv práce neobsáhla všechny možné typy případů, přece jen prozkoumaný materiál svědčí o tom, že různé postavení slovesa v angličtině, němčině a češtině lze uvést v souhlas s teorií o FVP, což je dříve specifickým sémantickým charakterem slovesa. Ani tam, kde jde o případy potenciálnosti, nelze sloveso považovat za neotlivé k FVP, neboť tu běží jen o ne zcela jednoznačnou souhrnu prostředků FVP. Ačkoliv prostředky FVP nefungují s bezvýhradnou jednoznačností, přece jen tvoří vysoce organizovaný systém jazykových prostředků, který je vzájemnou závislostí spojen s jinými systémy jazykových prostředků a spolu s nimi pak vytváří jeden jazykový systém.

РЕЗЮМЕ

К вопросу о коммуникативной функции глагола в английском, немецком и чешском языках

Статья представляет собой одну часть более обширного труда, в котором рассматривается вопрос о сдвиге от глагольного способа выражения в системе английского языка, а именно с точки зрения коммуникативной функции английского глагола.

1. В первой главе автор ставит вопрос о том, возможно ли установить определенные взаимоотношения между положением английского, немецкого и чешского глагола (в определенной и неопределенной форме, а также в форме причастия или герундия) в пределах предложения или полупредложения и между функциональной перспективой предложения (ФПП — обозначаемой также термином „актуальное членение“, „смысловое членение“, „контекстуальная организация“), или же следует считать положение глагола — по крайней мере в некоторых случаях, в особенности в английском и немецком языках — необусловленным со стороны ФПП.

[Для пояснения необходимо отметить, что динамичность высказывания элемента предложения увеличивается в зависимости от того, насколько элемент обобщает, развивает, „продвигает“ данное высказывание. Наиболее динамичный элемент предложения автор называет собственно ядром (новым, „ремой“), наименее динамичный — собственно основой (данном, „темой“). Вообще говоря, между собственно о новой и собственно ядром можно наблюдать целую шкалу динамики высказывания, создаваемую оттенками динамичности в членах основы, ядра и в переходных членах.

ФПП способствует тому, чтобы язык мог успешно исполнять свою функцию и быть орудием мышления и общения. Это проявляется в том, что порядок слов является лишь одним, хотя и самым важным средством ФПП. Наряду с порядком слов, ФПП пользуется и другими средствами, как напр. контекстом и т. наз. контекстуально-семантическими средствами, т. е. напр. словами, которые в разных контекстах сохраняют более или менее одинаковую степень динамики высказывания. Что касается устной формы языка, то к средствам ФПП принадлежит напр. интонация и линия ударения в предложении. Если порядок слов может быть вполне применим как средство ФПП, то в предложении осуществляется основное расположение динамичности высказывания: элемент предложения ставится в перспективе, последовательно направляющей от собственно основы, к собственно ядру. Остальные средства ФПП могут, однако, действовать таким образом, что основная перспектива различным образом изменяется. Более подробно автор рассмотрел указанные вопросы в Сборнике трудов философского факультета университета г. Брно 1956, А-4, стр. 93—107, там же 1957, А-5, стр. 72 до 98, в журнале *Časopis pro moderní filologii* 39, 1957, стр. 22—42 и 165—173 и в журнале *Philologica Pragensia* 1, 1958, стр. 49—54.]

Отправным пунктом для разрешения данной проблемы являются наблюдения А. Сешей (в *Essai sur la Structure Logique de la Phrase*, стр. 80—81) от анативного характера глагола. (Под термином транзитивный глагол Сешей понимает всякий глагол, значение которого нуждается в смысловом раскрытии, „дополнении“.) При своем сравнении автор исходит из таких случаев, в которых немецкий глагол стоит в конце предложения, в отличие от чешского и английского глаголов, которые, как правило, в подобных случаях стоят в середине или в начале (особенно в полупредложениях).

II. Если оставить в стороне предложения, относящиеся к особым плоскостям инстанций, или же находящиеся в высших плоскостях инстанций (ср. о них подробнее в III гл.),

то о нетематическом глаголе (т. е. о глаголе вне состава основы высказывания = данного = темы) можно установить следующие закономерности: если нетематический глагол вступает в предложение вместе с нетематическим элементом, выражающим необходимое, обязательное раскрытие его семантического значения, то такой раскрывающий элемент представляется в данном высказывании более динамичным, чем сам глагол. (При сложной глагольной форме подобным необходимым раскрытием являются знаменательные компоненты по отношению к вспомогательным компонентам, ср. [er] hat — gezeichnet.) Это различие в степенях динамичности элементов высказывания имеет силу независимо от положения в предложении, так что в предложении *So habe ich ein Bildchen gezeichnet. Als ich ein Bildchen gezeichnet habe...*, *Ich zeichnete ein Bildchen, I have drawn a little picture, Nakreslil jsem vám obrázek* отдельные носители динамичности соответствуют друг другу также лексически; раскрывающий элемент остается собственно ядром (подробный анализ см. на стр. 46). При условиях, указанных в первом предложении настоящего абзаца, глагол служит семантико-контекстуальным средством реализации ФПП, откуда вытекает, что он может оказаться в противодействии по отношению к основному, нормальному расположению динамичности частей предложения. Во II главе автор рассматривает несколько типов необходимых раскрывающих элементов и анализирует их с синтаксической и семантической точек зрения.

III. В этой главе автор рассматривает проблему плоскостей инстанций. (Плоскость инстанций, в которой находится данное предложение, определяется интенсивностью контекста и способом воздействия контекста на построение предложения.) Он разделяет их — не претендуя на окончательное решение — на простые (нормальные), особые и высшие (сверхинстанционные). В области простых плоскостей основной является та плоскость, в которой находятся предложения, где влияние контекста обнаруживается наиболее ярко или же вовсе не обнаруживается (напр. предложение *A girl broke a vase*, составные части которого передают новые представления). В указанной области на самом вершине помещена та плоскость, где воздействие контекста на соответственные предложения является наиболее ярким (напр. предложение *She did it*, все составные части которого — хотя и не в одинаковой мере — указывают на предшествующий контекст.) Между обеими плоскостями имеется, естественно, ряд переходных плоскостей. — Особыми плоскостями инстанций представляются автору те, в которых действуют особые семантико-контекстуальные средства ФПП. Эти средства сигнализируют, что они — вместе со связанной с ними составной частью — относятся к ядру, или же — либо сами по себе, либо с отмеченной составной частью — образуют собственно ядро, независимо от того, в какой простой плоскости данное предложение находилось бы, если бы в нем особое средство не встречалось. (Особое средство как будто добавочно вставляется в предложение, формально уже законченное в других отношениях, ср. *even* в предложениях *Even a girl broke a vase, Even she did it*, и *nicht* в предложении *Sie haben ihn nicht durchgelassen*.) — В области высших, сверхинстанционных плоскостей каждое слово может стать собственно ядром или компонентом распространенной собственно основы. Сверхинстанционным в его наиболее типичном виде автор считает такое предложение, которое представляет, собственно, копию (повторение) предложения, либо уже высказанного, либо существующего только в мысли, копию, которая, однако, резко выделяет одно слово (и оно становится собственно ядром, в то время как остальные слова становятся распространенной основой, напр. *They have answered all the questions*. В области высших плоскостей инстанций, наиболее интенсивно затрагиваемой влиянием контекста, не действуют уже никакие семантико-контекстуальные средства.

Концепция плоскостей инстанций делает возможным лучшее понимание отношения ФПП к грамматическому плану (см. II гл. о синтаксических отношениях между нетематическими глаголами и их нетематическими необходимыми раскрывающими элементами). В области простых плоскостей глагол может стать ядром лишь тогда, если нет препятствия со стороны нетематического необходимого распространяющего элемента, причем другие, не совсем необходимые элементы — в случае их наличия — должны предшествовать перед глаголом. Концепция плоскостей инстанций помогает установить диапазон воздействия отдельных семантико-контекстуальных средств ФПП и вообще всех слов в собственном акте сообщения.

По сравнению с глаголом имя существительное становится собственно ядром легче и чаще, что стоит, несомненно, в связи с его широкими возможностями применения в разных синтаксических ролях. В этом взаимоотношении ФПП к грамматическому строю предложения следует усматривать одну из причин сдвига от глагольного способа выражения к именному способу выражения. Такой сдвиг, как известно, особенно сильно проявляется в современном английском языке.

IV. Последняя глава затрагивает проблему потенциальности, т. е. такого явления, которое возникает тогда, когда предложение допускает, чтобы степени динамичности его составных частей передавались по крайней мере двумя способами. Автор обращает внимание на те случаи в немецком языке, где возможность передачи по крайней мере двумя способами обусловлена неясностью тесной или свободной связи нетематического глагола и его нетематического адвербиального раскрывающего элемента — обстоятельства (неясностью, является ли адвербиальное „дополнение“ необходимым). В немецком языке налицо возможность избежать двусмысленность таким образом, что в отличие от нормального приема здесь ставит такое адвербиальное дополнение на конец предложения и, таким образом, сигнализируют его в области простых плоскостей инстанций, даже если оно обозначает собственно ядро. (Ср. ... als sie mit den Trikoloren und Menschenrechten eingezogen waren и als sie eingezogen waren mit den Trikoloren und Menschenrechten).

Несмотря на то, что настоящий труд не охватил всех возможных типов случаев, всё же исследованный материал свидетельствует о том, что различное положение глагола в английском, немецком и чешском языках можно привести в соответствие с теорией о ФПП, что обусловлено специфическим семантическим характером глагола. Даже там, где налицо случаи потенциальности, глагол нельзя считать индифферентным к ФПП, ибо здесь речь идет о не вполне однозначном взаимодействии средств ФПП. Хотя средства ФПП не функционируют с безоговорочной однозначностью, они всё же образуют в высшей степени организованную систему языковых средств, взаимосвязанную с другими системами языковых средств и создающую вместе с ними одну общую систему языка.

Перевод: Роман Мразек