

Firbas, Jan

## Some thoughts on the function of word-order in old English and modern English

*Sborník prací Filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity. A, Řada jazykovědná.* 1957, vol. 6, iss. A5, pp. [72]-100

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/100662>

Access Date: 16. 02. 2024

Version: 20220831

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

JAN FIRBAS

SOME THOUGHTS ON THE FUNCTION  
OF WORD-ORDER IN OLD ENGLISH  
AND MODERN ENGLISH

I.

A great deal of research still remains to be done into the semantic-contextual structure of the sentence and into its relation to word-order. A pioneer work in this field is H. Weil's book *De l'ordre des mots dans les langues anciennes comparées aux langues modernes. Question de grammaire générale*, published in Paris in 1844. In this treatise,<sup>1</sup> Weil has demonstrated the importance of the principle according to which the order of words is determined by the progression of ideas (pp. 12, 132), the most natural and unemotive order being that proceeding from what is known to what is unknown (p. 25).<sup>2</sup> The reverse order, on the other hand, i. e. that proceeding from what is unknown to what is known, usually serves as a vehicle of emotion (p. 49). Although Weil holds the described principle to be universally valid in all languages, he is well aware that the manner and degree of its application will always depend on the structure of the language in question (p. 38). Taking Weil's researches as his starting point, V. Mathesius distinguishes formal sentence analysis from functional ("actual") sentence analysis.<sup>3</sup> According to him,<sup>4</sup> the former is concerned with what is generally called parsing, whereas the latter examines the semantic structure of the sentence with regard to the actual situation, i. e. in fact to the context, both verbal<sup>5</sup> and situational. It might be said that the latter examines the functional perspective of the sentence.

Viewed thus, those sentence elements which convey something already known or something that may be taken for granted, in other words, those elements that may be inferred either from the verbal or from the situational context, are to be regarded as the communicative basis<sup>6</sup> of the sentence. They are referred to in this paper as the theme<sup>7</sup> of the sentence and marked by a dotted line (...) placed below the words. On the other hand, those sentence elements which convey the new piece of information are to be regarded as the communicative nucleus<sup>8</sup> of the sentence. They are referred to in this paper as the rheme<sup>9</sup> of the sentence and marked by a full line (—) placed below the words. Needless to say, the thematic elements are less important in the given situation, being communicatively less dynamic than the rhematic elements. The former as a rule contribute nothing or very little to the development of the discourse, whereas the latter, conveying the new piece of information, undoubtedly develop it very substantially. Elements belonging neither to the theme nor to the rheme form a kind of transition (by which term they are also referred to in this paper). In our examples they are indicated by means of an interrupted line (- - -) placed below the words.<sup>10</sup> 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 long gamut of degrees of varying importance, of varying communicative dynamism. 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 analyzed sentence.<sup>11</sup>

Let us apply the described method of analysis to the following illustrative example. The letters behind the lines represent the gamut of the communicative dynamism as displayed by the elements within theme, transition, and rheme.<sup>12</sup>

1. Every evening he used to come and see her, and stop to supper at the farmhouse. —  
 ..... c . a ..... a . . . . . b ..... b ..... c .....

The Three Sillies (English Fairy Tales, coll. by J. Jacobs),<sup>13</sup>

As to the elements before the comma, *he* is undoubtedly the theme proper; *her* and *every evening* are also thematic, but communicatively more dynamic than *he*, *every evening* being in its turn more dynamic<sup>14</sup> 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.

However, Mathesius' merit lies not only in the recognition of the impact exercised by functional sentence perspective on word-order.<sup>15</sup> He has also determined the places occupied by functional sentence perspective 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,<sup>16</sup> functional sentence perspective operates as the chief principle, predominantly determining both the unemotive and 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,<sup>17</sup> it is the grammatical principle and the principle of coherence of certain sentence elements that rank first, whereas the principle of functional sentence perspective, 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.

Although D. L. Bolinger does not approach the problems of English word-order from exactly the same angle as V. Mathesius, his study *Linear Modification* (PMLA 1952, pp. 1117—1144) has to be regarded as a very valuable and highly suggestive contribution to the theory of functional sentence perspective. By linear modification Bolinger understands a tendency owing to which "elements as they are added one by one to form a sentence progressively limit the semantic range of all that has preceded. This causes beginning elements to have a wider semantic range than elements towards the end" (p. 1117). In other words, elements towards the beginning of the sentence will be broader in meaning, those towards the end will be narrower than the same elements would be if their respective positions were reversed (p. 1119). Grammatically or semantically stereotyped word-orders may work counter to this tendency (p. 1118). In order to show how linear modification operates, let us quote at least two from Bolinger's examples: *Why did you abruptly back away?* and *Why did you back away abruptly?* (p. 1120). "The first asks essentially 'Why did you back away at all?' while the second asks 'Why, having decided to back away, did you do it abruptly?'" (ib.). Interpreted in the light of the functional sentence perspective theory: whereas in the first example *back away* is more dynamic than *abruptly*, in the second it is the other way round.

In our own analyses (see note<sup>11</sup>) we have arrived at the conclusion that the significance of functional sentence perspective extends far beyond the sphere of

word-order. If language is to function as an efficient instrument of thought and communication, is it not of vital importance that it should secure — at least to some degree — a reliable appreciation of the distribution of communicative dynamism, in other words that it should aid its users to discriminate between thematic, transitional, and rhematic elements? We have also shown that word-order is not the only, though perhaps the most important, means of functional sentence perspective. If not interfered with by other phenomena, it creates what we call the basic distribution of communicative dynamism. This means that in distributing communicative dynamism 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 has gone for a walk with*

*John, Father has gone with John for a walk, John has been taken out for a walk*  
 by Father, the given notations holding good, of course, only in case we take the

sentences at their face value, without putting them into special contexts.<sup>18</sup>

The context itself (verbal and situational) is another important means of functional sentence perspective. Its operation is especially obvious when it acts counter to the basic distribution of communicative dynamism. 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<sup>19</sup> basically thematic positions if they occur in them; they, so to speak, “dynamize” them, rendering them transitional or “rhematizing” them respectively.

The majority of words are pliant instruments of the context, being able to carry any amount of communicative dynamism. There are, however, words which, on account of their specific semantic character, display quite a particular relation to the context. Under special circumstances created by their semantic character and by their relations to other means of functional sentence perspective (and with a proviso given below), these words may accordingly either weaken or strengthen the positions in the sentence in a more or less invariable way. Because of these characteristics, they have to be regarded as special semantic-contextual means of functional sentence perspective. The pronouns *he* and *her* and the article *the*, in <sup>20</sup>, all function as such means, for in accordance with their semantic character they refer to something already known from the context, weakening the positions in which they occur.

Although our discussion of means of functional sentence perspective cannot be continued,<sup>21</sup> at least a few words should be added about the means of functional sentence perspective employed by the spoken language, and a note on a sentence type covered by the proviso alluded to above.

By this sentence type we mean what D. L. Bolinger calls second-instance sentences (p. 1123). Sentences coming under this heading 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/hearer's minds). Viewed from the angle of functional sentence perspective, the heavily contrasted word constitutes the rheme proper, while all the other elements form an extensive theme proper. Any word may function as rheme in these sentences, even such as otherwise serves as a thematic semantic-contextual means of functional sentence perspective. For instance, any word in 1 might become the heavily contrasted word, if the sentence passes into the second instance.

This distinction made by D. L. Bolinger between first and second instance sentences is of great methodological value to the theory of functional sentence perspective, for it facilitates a more accurate classification of means of functional sentence perspective. In our opinion, further research might establish transitional types between the first and second instances, which would undoubtedly yield another significant contribution to the classification of means. It should be pointed out here once for all that in this paper, unless expressly stated, we are dealing only with first-instance sentences.

As to the spoken language, we can but mention in passing the important part that may be played by such phenomena as intonation, stress, and pauses in acting counter to the basic distribution of communicative dynamism.<sup>22</sup> It is clear that in effecting functional sentence perspective the written and spoken forms of language do not employ identical sets of means.

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 communicative dynamism and the other means of functional sentence perspective. If properly handled, however, this tension may result in a truly manifold, but effective co-operation of all the means concerned. We hope to be able to give at least a glimpse of this co-operation in the following chapters of the present study.

To sum up. Since word-order is not the only means of functional sentence perspective, we cannot agree with V. Mathesius' opinion that the susceptibility of a language to functional sentence perspective depends solely on the degree to which its words are capable of being arranged in accordance with the progression from theme to rheme. Consequently, example 1 cannot be adduced as a proof of English being less susceptible to functional sentence perspective than Czech; it cannot, for it is in perfect compliance with functional sentence perspective in as much as it leaves no doubt about the distribution of communicative dynamism within its sphere.

We do agree, however, with Mathesius that the degree of susceptibility to functional sentence perspective will differ from language to language. It is to be expected that languages, or even various stages of one and the same language, will vary in the means of functional sentence perspective and in the ways of employing them. We also agree with Mathesius that a proper insight into the laws of word-order, and into the laws of the semantic-contextual structure of sentences for that matter, will be gained only after the relations between the various principles have been sufficiently expounded. Following the path broken by Weil, Mathesius and Bolinger, we intend this study to be a modest contribution towards this end. It is to offer some thoughts on the relations obtaining between the principle of functional sentence perspective and the grammatical principle in OE and ModE with special regard to the function and position of the subject in independent sentences. Our observations will be based on a comparison of seven English versions of the *Gospel according to St Matthew*.<sup>23</sup>

A word has to be said about these versions. We are well aware of the disadvan-



11. . . . , him tō genēalāhton *hys leorningcnihtas*, [and him tō cwādon], . . . —  
 14.15
12. Of þære heortan cumað *yfle geþancas*, *mannslyhtas*, *unrihtwæmedu*, *for-*  
*ligru*, *stale*, *læse gewitnyssa*, *tāllice word*: . . . — 15.19

Examples with subjects placed medially.

13. . . . ; þē beōþ *þine synna forgyfene*. — 9.2
14. [Ðis synt sōðlice þæra twelf apostola naman: . . . ] Ðās twelf sē *Hælynd*  
 sende, him bebēodende and cweþende, . . . — 10.2
15. [And ic secge þē þæt þū eart Petrus,] and ofer þisne stān ic timbrige mine  
 cyrcean; . . . — 16.18

In all the sentences examined above, the position of the subject is in agreement with the basic distribution of communicative dynamism (i. e. with the consistent theme-rheme perspective), the subject functioning accordingly as theme, transition, or rheme. There seems to be no interference on the part of the grammatical principle.

From the phenomena that would deserve special comment, let us mention at least two. First, a note on the postpositive "preposition" *to* in 11. By occurring after *him*, the *to* (incidentally?) enables the sentence to open with theme proper and so contributes to bringing the sentence into perfect harmony with the basic distribution of communicative dynamism. Second, it will be remembered that words like *synna* and *forgyfene* in 8 cannot be regarded as what we have termed semantic-contextual means of functional sentence perspective. It may therefore be expected that unless weakened by the context, they will be subject to the basic distribution of communicative dynamism. This supposition is borne out by 8 and 13 having different rhemes proper.

Let us now examine the position of the subject in independent declarative sentences whose word-orders are diametrically opposed to the basic distribution of communicative dynamism, i. e. in sentences that stand in consequent rheme — theme perspective.

Examples with subjects placed initially.

16. *Supdæles cwēn* ārist on dōme mid þysse cnēorysse, [and hēo genyþeraþ  
 hig;] . . . — 12.42
17. . . . ; *ān God* ys gōd; . . . — 19.17

Examples with subjects placed finally.

18. [La licceteras,] wel be ēow witegode *Isaias sē witega*, [pā hē cwāð,] . . . —  
 15.7
19. . . . , [Eālā þū wif,] mycel ys *þin gelæafa*; . . . — 15.28
20. . . . ; swylcra ys *heofena rice*. — 19.14





concentrate on the emerging object. They behave in this way on condition that the fact of "emergence on the scene" is implied obviously enough and that the accompanying noun expresses a notion unknown from the previous context.<sup>31</sup> The final position in 22 is consequently weakened as well. These weakenings in 22 and 25, however, are not weighty enough to outbalance the theme-rheme perspective, which is carried by a sufficiently long sequence of preceding words. In 23, 24, and 26 the deviations are caused by the themes proper (i. e. the subjects *heofena rice*, *sē Hǣlend*, *hē*). They come medially after elements which are definitely more dynamic because developing the discourse by stating facts not known from the preceding context. These initial elements, however, are not capable of rendering the sentence emotive, for in their turn they are of considerably minor importance than the finally positioned rhemes. In fact, together with the themes proper, they merely provide a setting for them.

Very near the emotive end, on the other hand, stand types whose deviations from the consistent rheme-theme perspective, i. e. from the perspective characteristic of this end of the gamut (cf. p. 77), are so insignificant that the sentences will have to be regarded as emotive to a very high degree. The following examples will serve as illustration.

27. [Sōþlice pā sundorhālgan cwādon,] On dēofla ealdre hē drifð üt dēoflu. —

9.34

28. Witodlice micle mā *mann* ys scēape betera! — 12.12

29. ... sōþlice of pære heortan willan sē mūþ spicþ. — 12.34

30. ...; bütan intingan *hig* mē wurpiap, ... — 15.9

31. ...; wiperræde þū eart mē, ... — 16.23

A look at the wider context of these examples would make it abundantly clear that the initial elements have to be interpreted as rhemes proper. Although the following elements deviate from the consistent rheme-theme perspective by setting out in the theme-rheme direction, they possess too little of communicative dynamism to counteract the emotive effect created by the rhematic element occurring initially.

Halfway between the two ends of the gamut are independent declarative sentences that end up with rheme proper, but have another rhematic or at least a weighty transitional element at the beginning or near it. This is an important enough deviation from the basic distribution of communicative dynamism to impart a definite emotive colouring to the sentence. Illustrative examples follow.

32. ..., and pærrihthe fērde *eall sēo heord* myclum onræse niwel on pā sǣ,  
 ... — 8.32

33. ...; gewordenre gedrēfednesse and ēhtnesse for þām worde, hrædlice *hig*  
 bēoð geuntrēowsode. — 13.21<sup>32</sup>

34. ...; Unēapelic *þæt* ys mid mannum; ... — 19.26

35. ...; sōþlice *manega* synt geclypede, [and *fēawa* gecorene.] — 20.16

36. [Ēalā Ierusalem, ēalā Ierusalem, ...!] swiðe oft ic wolde þine bearn  
 gegaderian, ... — 23.37

The elements responsible for the emotive colouring are *þærrihte*, *hrædlice*, *unēapelic*, *manega*, *swi ðe oft*. 32 and 35 may require a further word of comment. It is interesting how the position of *eall* in 32 becomes strengthened owing to the semantic character of that word. In fact, any word that at least in some of its uses<sup>3</sup> or meanings unmistakably expresses a certain quantity may, under certain conditions,<sup>34</sup> contribute to the further development of the discourse and therefore come under the heading of the semantic-contextual means of functional sentence perspective. — Another interesting means of functional sentence perspective is that of contrast. Words in contrast assist each other in strengthening the sentence positions they occupy. This applies to *manega* and *fēawa* of 35, which in addition function as means of functional sentence perspective themselves as they are expressing quantity (cf. note<sup>34</sup>).

Although further research will have to define more precisely the share functional sentence perspective possesses in rendering OE sentences emotive, we hope to have made the principle of analysis sufficiently clear. The more evident is the weakening of positions basically transitional or rhematic (or inversely, the more evident is the strengthening of positions basically thematic), the more emotive becomes the character of the sentence.

Coming back to the positions of the subject in the examples so far discussed in this chapter (2—36), we find three patterns — SVC, VCS, CSV<sup>35</sup> — in regard to the positions of the finite verb of the predicate and of the complement, and five patterns — SVO, SOV, VSO, OSV, OVS — in regard to the positions of the finite verb of the predicate and of the object. It has been shown that much valuable light may be thrown on these “free” positions by the functional sentence perspective theory. As for the grammatical principle, though not quite out of play, it can hardly offer a satisfactory explanation. The question arises, however, how the principle of functional sentence perspective operates in sentences which display, or at least unmistakably tend to display, a regular word-order and in which the grammatical principle obviously plays an important part. In order to be able to cope with this question, we propose to follow the paragraphs about the positions of the subject, object (or complement) and verb (§§ 144—147) of the excellent concise *Old English Grammar* by R. Quirk and C. L. Wrenn (Methuen’s Old English Library, London 1955)<sup>36</sup> and concentrate on those sentence types which have, or tend to have, a regular word-order. The following types (A — I) answer this description: the order *VSO/C* (A) after the adverb *ne* (*ne mihte hē gehæaldan heardne mēce*),<sup>37</sup> (B) after the adverb *þā* (*þā sende sē cyning ... þām fear/um þone ... disc*), (C) after the expletive *bær* (*bær bið swiðe mycel gewinn betwēonan him*), (D) in questions (*Eart þū se Bēowulf sē þe ... ?*), (E) in jussive and volitional expressions (*Lære mon siððan furður on Lædengēdiode*), (F) in conditional clauses without subordinating conjunction (*āhte ic minra handa geweald*); the verb similarly comes first in (G) imperative expressions (*Forgif nū, Drihten, ūrum mōdum; Swiga ðū*); (H) the order *O/CVS* in questions where *O/C* is an interrogative pronoun or an interrogative plus noun (*Hwæt sægest þū?, Hwilce fixas gefēhst ðū?*); (I) the orders *SO/CV* or *SVO/C* in subordinate clauses (*þe æt his mæzes slege ... fylste; for þām hiora cyning wæs gewundod on þām gefeohte*). All the enumerated types are represented in our materials, the only

exception being the type F, of which no instances have come to our notice.<sup>38</sup> The other types will be discussed here in the following order: D, H, E and G,<sup>39</sup> A, B, C, I.

#### Type D.

37. Cwyst þū gaderað man winberian of þornum, oððe ficæppla of þyrn-  
cinum? — 7.16  
a b
38. Ongyte gē ealle þās þing? — 13.51  
a b
39. Eart þū Iudea Cyning? — 27.11  
a b

#### Type H.

40. Hwæt pence gē betwux ēow, ...? — 16.8  
c a b
41. Oððe hwylc gewrixl sylþ sē mann for hys sāwle? — 16.26  
b a
42. Hwæt wylt tū? — 20.21  
a b

Both in the questions of the D-type (i. e. in positive verbal<sup>40</sup> questions) and in those of the H-type (i. e. in positive pronominal<sup>40</sup> questions), inversion has become grammaticized and has come to serve as one of the means signaling OE questions. As to the functional sentence perspective of these types, it will suffice to observe that they do not open with theme proper.<sup>41</sup> This as a rule removes them far enough from the non-emotive end of the gamut to give them at least a definite emotive colouring.<sup>42</sup> This may seem odd at first, but if we take "emotiveness" to cover not only the speaker's/writer's feelings but also his appeal to the listener/reader, then the very character of the question has to be described as emotive.<sup>43</sup> Is not the very fact of seeking information from another person an act of appeal? As we shall see in Chapter Three, in the course of its development a language may change the degree of intensity with which it expresses the appeal in questions (cf. p. 92). As to the OE questions under discussion, they present an interesting example of co-operation of the grammatical and the functional sentence perspective principle in establishing the emotive character of questions (although it must be admitted that the stereotyped question form somewhat reduces this emotiveness).

#### Types E and G.

43. [Ðā cwað sē Hælend tō him,] Gang þū sceocca on bæc; ... — 4.10  
a b
44. ..., læt þær þine lác beforan þām altare, and gang ær and gesybsuma  
wið þinne brōðer, and þonne cum þū syððan and bring þine lác. — 5.24<sup>44</sup>  
b a
45. And gefylle gē þæt gemet ēowra fædera. — 23.32  
a b

What has been said about the co-operation of the grammatical and functional sentence perspective principles with regard to the D and H types could be repeated here. The element of appeal is especially strong in the case of purely jussive or imperative sentences.

## Type A.

46. [pā cwæð sē Hælend tō him,] Nabbað hī nēode to farenne; [syllē gē him etan.] — 14.16  
a-----b-----a-----b-----a-----b-----c
47. [Būton gē bēon gecyrrede, and gewordene swā swā lytlingas,] ne gā gē on heofena rice. — 18.3  
-----b-----a-----
48. [... and gē cwepað, Gyf wē wærun on ūre fædera dagum,] nære wē heora gefēran on pāra witegena blōdes gyte. — 23.30  
-----b-----a-----

Although prevailing, the order *ne VS* ...<sup>45</sup> is by no means an iron-clad rule. Examples can be found, esp. after the conjunction *and*, but also in other cases, when the subject precedes the negative verb. As to the adverbial *ne*, its semantic character forces us to regard it as a semantic-contextual means of functional sentence perspective. Negating the statement, it is endowed with a high degree of communicative dynamism, which makes it often function as rheme proper. Provided the rest of the sentence has been sufficiently weakened, the adverbial *ne*, together with its verb (which in its turn frequently overshadows a thematic subject), is capable of creating an unmistakably emotive effect. We are inclined to think that — either consciously or subconsciously — the OE speaker/writer availed himself of this opportunity to lend greater emphasis to his words.<sup>46</sup>

## Type B.

49. [Ðā sē Hælend cōm on Petres hūse,] pā geseah hē hys swegre licgende, and hripgende. — 8.14  
-----a-----b-----
50. [Ðā sē Hælend pæt gehyrde,] pā ferde hē panon onsundron on ānum scype; [and pā pā gangendan mænigeo pæt gehýrdon, hīg fyligdon him of pām burgum.] — 14.13  
-----a-----b-----a-----b-----a-----b-----
51. pā andswarodun hīg, [Wē nabbað hēr būton fif hlāfas and twēgen fixas.] — 14.17  
-----a-----b-----
52. ...; and pā genēalæhton tō him his leorningcnihtas, ... — 13.36  
-----a-----b-----
53. Ðā cōmon tō him fram Hierusalem pā bōceras and Fariseisce, ... — 15.1  
-----a-----b-----

Although L. L. Schücking<sup>47</sup> has doubted the validity of J. Bosworth and T. N. Toller's<sup>48</sup> observation that "when the word [i. e. *pā* — J. F.] stands at the beginning of a clause and may be translated by *then*, the verb generally precedes its subject; if it is to be translated by *when* the subject generally precedes the verb", we find that — thanks to the cautious insertion of the qualification "generally" — the dictum is well applicable to our material.<sup>49</sup> It invariably holds good for cases of *pā*—*pā* correlation (see 49 and 50) in which the conjunctive *pā* subordinates its clause to the principal (independent) sentence opened by the adver-

bial *pā*. The share of the word-order in bringing about the grammatical distinction between the principal and subordinate *pā*-clauses in our material is evident. As to the distribution of communicative dynamism within the principal clauses — in which we are chiefly interested in this paper —, it tends to deviate from the consistent theme-rheme pattern. This is due to the subject being in most cases thematic and at the same time coming after a more dynamic verb. (It is worth noting that if a rhematic subject has moved towards the end of the clause, its position after the verb is not infrequently taken by a non-subjective element, which at least partly functions as theme. See the words *tō him* in 52 and 53.) Provided the verb is rhematic or intensively transitional, so that both the marked thematic character of the initial *pā* and the stereotyped nature of the word-order pattern are being counteracted, one may be faced with a special emotive effect. Such an effect contrasts with the straightforwardness of those sentences which open with a thematic subject and whose other elements do not bring about an outbalance towards the emotive end of the gamut. A comparison of the principal sentences of 49 and 54, and of the principal sentences occurring in 50 (*pā fērde hē . . .* and *hig fyligdon him . . .*), may serve as illustration.

54. [And *pā hē* þanon fērde,] *hē* geseh mycele mænigu; [and *hē* him gemiltsode,  
 . . . . . a . . . . . b  
 and gehēlde *pā* untruman. — 14.14  
 . . . . . b . . . . . a

Let us also compare 51 with 55 following below. (The latter is an extremely rare type in our material as the verbs of saying such as *cwēðan* and *ondwyrdan* as a rule occur in *pā*-sentences. It is, however, the type used, for instance, in Aelfric's Colloquies, where we find *Sē smið sægð*, *Sē geðeahtend andswarað*, *Sē smið ondwyrt*.)<sup>50</sup>

55. Hig andwyrdon ealle [and *cwædon*, *Hē* is dēapes scyldig]. — 26.66  
 . . . . . b . . . . . a

Under the conditions indicated above, the independent *pā*-clauses seem to contribute to the dignity of the gospel text. Still more effective, because tending to stand nearer the emotive end of the gamut, would probably be the *VS* . . . -order (i. e. without the initial thematic *pā*) in independent sentences of other OE literary monuments. This seems to be borne out by Quirk and Wrenn's remark (op. cit., p. 94) that "individual writers were fond of this style" and that "it is especially common, for instance, in the Aelfredian Bede and in some of the poetry".<sup>61</sup>

Type C.

56. . . . ; and *pær* wearð geworden mycel smyltness. — 8.26  
 . . . . .

57. . . . ; *pær* byp wōp and tōþa gristbitung. — 13.42  
 . . . . .

The expletive *pær*-clauses differ from the types so far discussed in that their *V—S* order does not admit of an emotive effect. This is due to the semantic character of the verb, which carries the notion of "emergence on the scene". It is quite natural that it should be so, for the very function of the expletive *pær*-clause is to state the existence, or the emergence, of somebody or something on the scene.

## Type I.

As subordinate clauses, which constitute this type, are not the subject of the present study, we abstain from treating them here. One important inference, however, has to be made about them. Their subject being mostly initial and thematic (see e. g. the subordinate *pā*-clauses in 4 and 6 on p. 76, and the *būton*-clause and the *gyf*-clause in 47 and 48 respectively, on p. 82), they unmistakably tend towards the non-emotive end of the gamut. But it is not always such plain sailing with subordinate clauses. The following example contains a *gyf*-clause with emotive word-order.

58. [Wā pē, Corozaim! wā pē, Bethsaida! for pām] gyf on Tyro and Sydone

wærun gedōne *pā mægmu þe gedōne synt on ēow*, [gefyrn hī dydun dædbōte  
on hāeran and on axan.] — 11.21

We have now proceeded far enough to attempt a brief summary of the results arrived at in this chapter. Although the types D, H, E and G, A, B, C, and I, have or tend to have a regular word-order, they do not prevent functional sentence perspective from asserting itself. The operation of the semantic-contextual means and of the context in general provide a channel through which co-operation of the grammatical and functional sentence perspective principles may come into being. And it is the operation of the semantic-contextual means and of the context in general thanks to which the subject can perform its main, though by no means the only, function, i. e. that of acting as theme,<sup>52</sup> without depending wholly on its position in the sentence. Owing to the co-operation of the two mentioned principles, the examined sentence types can take up positions within the gamut that are compatible with their functions in the language.

Although we have concentrated on the relation of only two word-order principles, we hope to have found a common denominator for a number of phenomena that otherwise could perhaps hardly be connected. Other sentence types will have to be examined and causes sought for that prevent functional sentence perspective from functioning, but it seems even now that functional sentence perspective is a factor to be reckoned with in OE word-order studies. It undoubtedly figures as a major principle at least in those OE independent sentences that show a "free" order of words. And it virtually controls the gamut of OE word-order types.

## III.

Let us now turn our attention to Modern English. It is a commonplace that ModE word-order is comparatively fixed, *SVO/C* being the most common pattern. From this observation the following two inferences, substantiated by the examined material, may be drawn in regard to the problems discussed in this paper. (i) Cases of rhematic subjects coming finally will be less numerous in ModE than OE. This raises the question of what corresponds to the OE final rhematic subject in ModE. (ii) It may be expected that a decrease in frequency will also be displayed by cases in which a thematic subject contributes to the emotiveness of the word-order by coming to stand after a considerably more dynamic element. If this is so, how does it affect ModE structure? Each of the two outlined problems involves enough material for a separate monograph. We shall have to content ourselves with setting down the most obvious conclusions.

First, a few notes on some ModE equivalents to OE final rhematic subjects. The examples (59—61) are quoted from Matt. 3.1 (59), 9.27 (60), 12.22 (61).

59. On þām dagum cōm *Iohannes sē fulluhtere*, [and bobude on þām wēstene Iudee, and cwæð, Dōþ dædbote;] ... — WS

In those daies came *John the Baptist*, preaching in the wilderness of Iudea, and saying, [Repent yee:] — AV

In those days came *John the Baptist*, preaching in the wilderness of Iudea, [“Repent, ...”] — RSV

In those days *John the Baptist* appeared, and preached in the desert of Iudea. [“Repent!” he said, ...] — G

About this time *John the Baptist* made his appearance, preaching in the Desert of Iudea. [‘Repent’, he said, ...] — W<sup>53</sup>

In those days *John the Baptist* came on the scene, preaching in the desert of Iudea, [“Repent ...”] — M

In those days *John the Baptist* appeared, preaching in the wilderness of Judaea; [Repent, he said,] ... — K<sup>54</sup>

Leaving W aside for the present, we find that only AV and RSV observe the basic distribution of communicative dynamism by placing the rhematic subject after the transitional verb. In spite of their positions, however, the subjects in M, G, and K are evidently rhematic thanks to the semantic character of the following verbs, which under the circumstances (cf. p. 78) function as semantic-contextual means of functional sentence perspective. (They imply the notion of “emergence on the scene”.) The same applies to the verbal phrase *made his appearance* in W. But the fact of *appearance* possessing a certain amount of prominence on account of the preceding weak *made* may open the door to another interpretation: the meaning of the noun *appearance* does not recede into the background (i. e. does not function as a semantic-contextual means, cf. p. 78), and consequently weakens, though not entirely, the notion presented by the subject. (A not impossible solution since John the Baptist is a figure well known to the Bible reader, so that in the case under discussion it might be rather John’s appearance than John himself that would attract attention.) As we see it, both interpretations are possible; they are potentially there. In our opinion the phenomenon of potentiality cannot possibly be eliminated from the language (especially from its written form).<sup>55</sup> But the nature and frequency of its occurrence might be an indicator of the degree of susceptibility a language displays towards functional sentence perspective.

60. [pā sē *Hælend* þanun fōr,] pā fyligðun hym *twægyn blinde*, hrȳmynde  
 and cweðende, ... — WS

[And when *Iesus* departed thence,] *two blinde men* followed him, crying,  
 and saying, ... — AV

[And as *Iesus* passed on from there,] *two blind men* followed him, crying  
 aloud, ... — RSV

[As *Iesus* was passing along from there,] *two blind men* followed him,  
 calling out, ... — G

[As *Iesus* passed on,] *two blind men* followed him, shouting and saying, ...  
 — W

[As *Iesus* passed along from there,] *he* was followed by two blind men who  
 shrieked, ... — M

[As *Iesus* was passing further on his way,] *he* was followed by two blind  
 men, who cried aloud, ... — K

M and K observe the theme-rheme perspective by keeping the subject of the preceding sentence and resorting to the use of the passive voice; a rhematic *by*-phrase expressing the agent corresponds to the OE rhematic subject. Though initial, the subjects in AV, RSV, G, and W are also rhematic, as the following verb is weakened by the context (both the verb *pass*, which occurs in the subordinate clause, and the verb *follow* express motion) and in the given situation clearly implies the idea of “emergence on the scene”. The “emergence” of the two blind men is further brought into relief owing to the use of the plural zero variant of the non-generic indefinite article. Accompanying nouns that express new ideas, i. e. such as have not yet been stated,<sup>56</sup> the two variants of the indefinite article (the *a*-form and the zero form) are valuable semantic-contextual means of functional sentence perspective. As to the numeral *two*, it also functions as a semantic-contextual means of functional sentence perspective; it expresses a definite quantity and under the given conditions contributes to the further development of the discourse (cf. p. 80 and note<sup>54</sup>).

61. Ðā wæs him brōht ān dēofolsēoc man [sē wæs blind and dumb;]... — WS

Then was brought vnto him *one possessed with a deuill, blinde, and dumbe*:  
 ... — AV

Then a *blind and dumb demoniac* was brought to him, ... — RSV, M

At that time *some people* brought to him a man blind and dumb, [*who*  
 was possessed by a demon,] ... — G



At that time *a demoniac* was brought to him, blind and dumb;... — W  
 ..... b ————— a ————— b ..... a  
 Then *they* brought to him a man possessed, [*who was both blind and*  
 ..... c ..... b ..... a ..... a  
 dumb.] ... — K

Of all the six ModE versions only AV places the rhematic subject finally, thus following the basic distribution of communicative dynamism. G and K observe the basic distribution of communicative dynamism as well, but express the rheme proper by means of an object. In RSV, M, and W, the co-operation of the non-generic indefinite article and of the verb, which expresses the notion of "emergence on the scene", brings out the pre-verbal subject as rheme proper. It is significant that in RSV, M, and W the use of the passive voice construction cannot be accounted for by the intention to keep up the theme-rheme perspective.<sup>57</sup> It is often used in this function, but under different co-operation of means of functional sentence perspective.

The discussed examples (59—61) have shown fairly well that in ModE, functional sentence perspective has been limited in its power as word-order principle, the grammatical principle having gained the upper hand in determining the order of words. In comparison with OE, ModE resorts on a much larger scale to such means of functional sentence perspective as are capable of indicating the dynamic character of sentence elements by working counter to the basic distribution of communicative dynamism. This may serve as another proof that the susceptibility of English to functional sentence perspective does not depend on the order of words alone. As to the rising importance of the grammatical principle in ModE, the following remark will be of interest.

It may have been observed that ModE rhematic subjects of the pattern *SVO* (cf. 60 and 61) can head a rheme-theme sequence without creating a marked emotive effect. This may be due to the fact that the following verbs, though weak, are not yet weakened enough (cf. p. 78) as they still contribute to the development of discourse by at least stating the "emergence on the scene". On the other hand, it must be remembered that, viewed in the light of ModE structure, the word-order under discussion has nothing unusual about itself. In full accordance with the requirements of the main principle of ModE word-order, it constitutes the most common "unmarked" ModE pattern. We may conclude this note by raising the following question, which has to be left to further research: To what extent has the grammatical principle replaced the principle of functional sentence perspective in deciding the amount of word-order emotiveness? (Cf. also p. 93.)

Let us now turn to our second problem and examine the degrees of emotiveness as displayed by the order of words in the following four sets of examples (62—65) quoted from Matt. 15.9 (62), 8.32 (63), 12.33 (64), and 16.23 (65). Whereas the OE version is clearly emotive, its ModE counterparts show an evident tendency towards the non-emotive end of the gamut. Needless to say only those instances come into comparison that may be supposed to have had an emotive word-order<sup>58</sup> in the version (Greek or Latin)<sup>59</sup> they have been rendered from.

62. . . . *μάτην δὲ σέβονται με, διδάσκοντες διδασκαλίας ἐντάλματα ἀνθρώπων.* —  
 ..... a ————— b ..... a ..... b

NTG<sup>60</sup>

Sine causa autem colunt me, docentes doctrinas, et mandata hominum.

— V<sup>60</sup> ..... a ..... b

...; būtan intingan *hig* mē wurpiap, [and l̄ærað manna l̄ara]. — WS

But in vaine *they* do worship me, teaching for doctrines, the commandments of men. — AV

...; in vain do *they* worship me, teaching as doctrines the precepts of men.

— RSV

But *their worship of me* is all in vain, [for the lessons they teach are but human precepts.] — G

In vain do *they* worship Me, [while giving as doctrines the mere precepts of men.] — W

...: vain is *their worship of me*, [for the doctrines they teach are but human precepts.] — M

*Their worship of me* is vain, [for the doctrines they teach are the commandments of men.] — K

The word-orders of AV and of RSV are clearly emotive, and so are those of W and M. G and K, on the other hand, refrain from rendering the emotive character of the Greek and the Latin original respectively.

63. ...καὶ ἰδὸν ὄρμησεν πᾶσα ἡ ἀγέλη<sup>27</sup> τῶν χοίρων<sup>80a</sup> κατὰ τοῦ κρημοῦ εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, ... — NTG

..., et ecce! impetu abiit *totus grex* per praeceps in mare; ... — V

..., and p̄ærrihthe f̄erde eall s̄eo heord myclum onr̄æse niwel on p̄ā s̄æ,

... — WS

...: and behold, *the whole herd of swine* ranne violently downe a steepe place into the Sea, ... — AV

...; and behold, *the whole herd* rushed down the steep bank into the sea, ...

— RSV

And suddenly, *the whole drove* rushed over the steep bank into the sea, ...

— G

..., whereupon *the entire herd* instantly rushed down the steep into the lake ... — W

..., and *the entire drove* rushed down the steep slope into the sea ... — M

...; and with that, *all the herd* rushed down the cliff into the sea, ... — K

"*᾿Ωρμησεν, impetu, h̄ærrih̄te* are elements weighty enough to cause an emotive deviation from the consistent theme-rheme perspective. None of the six ModE translations, however, follows suit. Both the sequence of ideas and the order of words in them have to be described as normal. An emotive effect similar to that of the original can hardly be achieved by the initial *behold* of AV and of RSV, or by the *suddenly* of G, or by the *whereupon* of W. M makes the preceding sentence emotive by translating *So out [sic!] they came and went into the swine* (which contrasts with the quiet flow of K's *and they came out and went into the herd of swine*). This emotive feature, however, has no counterpart in the original text.

64. ... ἐκ γὰρ τοῦ καρποῦ τὸ δένδρον<sup>27</sup> γινώσκειται. — NTG  
 ...; siquidem ex fructu arbor agnoscitur. — V  
 ...; witodlice be pām wæstm̄e byð þæt trēw oncnāwen. — WS  
 ...; For the tree is known by his fruit. — AV  
 ...; for the tree is known by its fruit. — RSV, W, M  
 ...; a tree is judged by its fruit. — G  
 ...; the test of the tree is in its fruit. — K

None of the six examined NE versions has employed an emotive word-order. That such an order would not be entirely impossible seems to be indicated by the Basic English version, which reads: *For by its fruit you will get the knowledge of the tree.*<sup>61</sup>

65. ... [Ἔπαγε ὀπίσω μου, σατανᾶ·] σκάνδαλον εἰ ἐμοῦ ... — NTG  
 [Vade post me, satana!] scandalum es mihi! — V  
 [Gang bæftan mē, Satanas;] wiperræde þū eart mē, ... — WS  
 ... [Get thee behind mee, Satan,] thou art an offence vnto me: ... — AV  
 ... [Get behind me, Satan!] You are a hindrance to me; ... — RSV  
 ... [Get out of my sight, you Satan!] You hinder me, ... — G  
 ... [Get behind me, Satan;] you are a hindrance to me, ... — W  
 ... [Get behind me, you Satan!] You are a hindrance to me! ... — M  
 [Back, Satan;] thou art a stone in my path; ... — K

Once again, none of the six NE versions has an emotive word-order. Although some emotive effect is being created by G and M adding *you* before *Satan* and by K employing the harsh, abrupt *Back*, these phenomena are not word-order devices and do not render the original emotive word-order of the section under discussion.

A number of other examples could be adduced. It would be too pretentious,

however, to want to decide the exact degree to which OE and ModE differ in word-order emotiveness. In spite of the fact that all the ModE versions examined here display the same tendency (perhaps varying in intensity) to reduce the degree of emotiveness, it might be argued, and rightly so, that other types of prose should be examined, in the first place those taken from original, i. e. non-translated, prose. Yet even now it may be said with fair certainty that the phenomenon of reduced emotiveness, at least in some sections of the gamut, is not a matter of one prose type only. The causes of this reduction seem to be rooted in the very structure of ModE. This will come to light if one compares those OE sentence types whose word-order is both grammaticized and emotive with their ModE counterparts. From among the OE types discussed in the previous chapter the types A, B, D, E, H, and G would invite such comparison. We shall discuss them, concentrating first on the types D and H, whose functional sentence perspective involves a number of problems and therefore has to be treated at greater length. Afterwards attention will be paid to the types B, A, E and G in the indicated order.

Types D and H (positive verbal questions and positive pronominal questions). Mathesius holds that the rheme proper of a pronominal question is its initial interrogative word (i. e. its interrogative pronoun or adverb).<sup>62</sup> This is so because it stands for the unknown element which is going to be disclosed as the rheme proper of the reply. As for the elements placed after the interrogative word, they constitute the theme of the question. Disagreeing with Mathesius, F. Daneš<sup>63</sup> has put forth the view that these elements are not always necessarily thematic, and has even gone the length of maintaining that the rheme proper may be carried by another element than by the interrogative word. Let us compare at least two of Daneš's examples (translated and slightly adapted for the English speaking reader).

66. A: We intend to go to London. B: When are you going (there)?

67. A: Tomorrow, I am going to London. B: When are you going to Glasgow? According to Daneš, in 66 *when* really functions as rheme proper, all the other elements conveying notions known from the previous context. In 67, however, *when* is overshadowed by *Glasgow*, which is contrasted with *London*; it is also partly implied in the temporal adverb (*tomorrow*) of the preceding sentence; and last but not least it is one of the stereotyped openings of pronominal questions, which under the circumstances contributes to the weakening of its communicative dynamism as well. Daneš adduces other examples with a detailed discussion of their intonations.

It may be equally gathered from Daneš's paper that none of the elements making up a positive verbal question can be regarded as the constant bearer of rheme proper. Mathesius, on the other hand, would apparently interpret the initial verb of these questions either as rheme proper or at least as an important component of the rheme.<sup>64</sup> Applying Daneš's view to the OE question *Gaderað man winberian of þornum?* (cf. 37 on p. 81), we believe that in accordance with the context the questioner's chief interest could centre either on the gathering itself (*Gaderað...?*), or on the grapes, or on the thorns, and that he was expecting

\_\_\_\_\_ a..b..c

his informant's affirmation or denial accordingly. In our context (Matt. 7.16) the rheme proper is the word *þornum* provided it is the basic distribution of communicative dynamism that decides about its position (see 37 on p. 81). Another interpretation placing the rheme proper in *winberian* and in all probability causing

a different intonation would also be possible (*Gaderaš man winberian of þornum?*).  
 ----- a ----- b

Let us now add an observation of our own which, as we hope, will — at least to a certain degree — reconcile Mathesius's and Daneš's views. It seems to us that in the light of the theory of functional sentence perspective, questions reflect quite a different relation between speaker and listener than declarative sentences do. In the case of the latter, the speaker is in possession of some knowledge which he is imparting to the listener. In the case of the former, however, it is the listener who is supposed to be in possession of knowledge, and the question is the very means employed by the speaker in an effort to obtain that knowledge from the listener (i. e. to appeal to the listener to become speaker himself and reveal the knowledge).

In pronominal questions the interrogative word is always the indicator of the information the speaker (the questioner) desires to acquire from the listener (his prospective informant). All the other elements of the question convey knowledge which both the questioner and the informant may well be supposed to have in common. This is probably the reason why Mathesius regards them as thematic. Nevertheless, it must be borne in mind that not all the items of this common knowledge are of equal importance to the questioner, and he is obviously anxious to make it clear to his informant from which particular angle he desires to have his question approached. Now this angle may certainly be new to the informant and has to be communicated to him as such. It is natural that the means of functional sentence perspective (including intonation) should be used for this purpose. (Just cf. Bolinger's examples as well as his and our comments on them on p. 73!) As for the interrogative word, it will always represent the unknown item, and therefore function as a rhematic semantic-contextual means of functional sentence perspective. But the degree of its communicative dynamism will not remain unaffected either by its stereotyped character or by its relations to the possible thematic, transitional, and rhematic elements of the rest of the question. Neither will it remain unaffected by the special order of the rhematic character of the interrogative word, which serves as a mere substitute of real knowledge. From the point of view of functional sentence perspective, a pronominal question, and in fact any other type of question, consequently performs the following two functions: (1) to indicate the want of knowledge on the part of the questioner, and (2) to impart knowledge to the informant as to the particular angle from which the questioner wants him to approach the question (i. e. to satisfy the indicated want of knowledge). Mathesius seems to be overemphasizing the former. It is Daneš's merit to have led the way towards a better understanding of the latter.

A word has to be added about the finite verb in verbal questions of the type under discussion. It functions there as the main indicator of the want of knowledge on the part of the questioner,<sup>65</sup> i. e. as the main bearer of the request for an evaluation as to whether a statement is to be considered positive or negative. It is most dynamic (serving as rheme proper) when functioning as indicator and at the same time expressing the action on which the questioner centres his interest (cf. *Gaderaš . . . ?* on p. 90 and 38 on p. 81). But even if the questioner's interest

----- a - b - c  
 centres on another notion than that expressed by the finite verb, the verb will serve at the least as a weighty transitional element provided it is notional (see *gaderaš* in 37 and at the top of p. 91). It is interesting to find how in such cases the meaning of the verb and the function of indicating the want of knowledge

mutually strengthen each other. This no doubt would be in full agreement with Mathesius' interpretation of the initial finite verb as a highly dynamic element. Mathesius, however, does not take into account that the communicative dynamism of the finite verb is considerably weaker if the verb acts only as indicator, without the support of meaning. This can in fact be observed with ModE positive verbal *do*-questions (and with other ModE — and even OE<sup>66</sup> — positive verbal questions opening with an auxiliary<sup>67</sup> or with the copula). These *do*-openings are merely auxiliary elements (with weak forms in the spoken language). In comparison with the interrogative words, they operate less independently and are even more stereotyped. (They can function as rheme proper solely in the second instance when becoming the only stress-bearer in the question, as e. g. in <sup>11</sup>*Does one gather grapes from thorns?*, in order to indicate, for instance, that a repetition of the information is desired.) That is why we interpret them as lightly transitional and why we find ModE positive *do*-questions less emotive than their OE “*do*-less” counterparts. (Cf. 68, 69, and 70 below with 37 and 38 — both on p. 81 — respectively.)

68. ...; does *one* gather grapes from thorns or figs from thistles? — 7.16 — M  
 ---a---a---b---c---  
 . . . . . b . . . . . c

69. Do *you* understand all this? — 13.51 — G

Have *you* understood all this? — 13.51 — M  
 ---a---b---  
 . . . . . b

Considering the just exposed weak character of the auxiliary *do*,<sup>68</sup> together with all the circumstances that may weaken the communicative dynamism of the interrogative words (see p. 91), we find even the ModE pronominal *do*-questions upon the whole less emotive than their OE counterparts. This holds good especially when the elements following the interrogative word evidently state the “angle” from which the question is to be approached (see 70 and 71 below). It is worth noting that the smaller degree of emotiveness in both ModE question types under discussion is undoubtedly due also to the regularity of the order of words (with the subjects coming first and the notional verb afterwards) that stand after the auxiliary *do*.

70. [Ða cōmon tō him fram Hierusalem þā bōceras and Fariseisce, and cwædon,]  
 ---a---b---  
 Hwī forgȳmað þīne leorningcnihtas ūre yldrena lage? — 15.1 — WS

[Then *Pharisees and scribes from Jerusalem* came to Jesus, saying,] “Why  
 do *your disciples* transgress the traditions of the elders? . . .” — 15.1 — M

71. Hwæt wylle gē mē syllan [, and ic hyne belæwe ēow]? — 26.15 — WS

What will *you* give me for betraying him to you? — 26.15 — M  
 ---a---b---c---  
 . . . . . b . . . . . c

What are *you* willing to give me [if *I* betray him to you]? — 26.15 — W<sup>69</sup>  
 ---a---b---c---  
 . . . . . b . . . . . a . . . . . c

We do not therefore think that the ModE *do*-forms have managed to preserve the high degree of emotiveness (or to be more exact, of appeal) conveyed by the OE opposite numbers in the questions under discussion. Appeal, however, has not been eliminated altogether, the interrogative words and the *do*-forms functioning as safe indicators of the desired knowledge and reliably signaling the

discussed question types. Needless to say, they are to be regarded as means of functional sentence perspective.

Having disposed of the types D and H, we still have to discuss the types B, A, E and G (the last two having been grouped together). As they serve merely as a further illustration of what has already been set forth, we can do so very briefly.

Type B (independent *pā*-clauses), which on certain conditions (see p. 83) and in its special way (see *ib.*) contributed to the emotiveness of the OE gospel text, has disappeared altogether. Considering its high frequency in OE, its loss has to be recorded as an instance of reduction in the total amount of word-order emotiveness.

Type A (single negation sentences of the word-order *ne VS. . .*) has changed the order of its initial elements by placing the subject before the finite verb and making the negative particle stand third. (Cf. 46 on p. 82 with its translation as given in M: *They do not need to go away.*) As in most cases the weakly transi-

tional auxiliary is preceded by a thematic subject, the shifting away from the emotive end of the gamut is evident.

Types E and G. No such shift can be observed in the second person imperative clause, a representative of the E—G group (jussive, volitional and imperative expressions). This, however, is not applicable to all the sentences coming under this heading. For lack of space, one example must suffice (Matt. 26.42).

72. . . . , gewurpe þin willa — WS

. . . . , thy will be done. — AV, RSV, M, and similarly G (*your*), W (*Thy*),

and K (then *thy . . .*)

All the examined ModE versions open with the thematic subject, which shows that even the E—G group has not remained unaffected by the trend towards the non-emotive end of the gamut.

All this induces us to conclude that in the course of development, the distribution of English word-order patterns between the two ends of the gamut has changed. We have examined some sections in the emotive half of the gamut which testify to it. It is evident that this change is in connection with the altered relations between the functional sentence perspective and the grammatical principle, which has become the chief factor in determining ModE word-order. In other words, the loss of the possibility of shifting some sentence elements into different positions has brought about a reduction of word-order emotiveness in certain sections of the gamut. Further research will have to establish the full shape of the gamut in ModE, and to decide the degree to which the operation of the grammatical principle in ModE is employed as a vehicle of emotion. In OE it was first and foremost the deviation from the consistent theme — rheme perspective that could be used for that purpose. It remains to be seen whether in ModE, on the other hand, it is not — at least to a comparatively high degree — the deviation from the grammaticized word-order that creates an emotive effect. We have to leave the solution of this question to further research. To inquire into it seems desirable for the sake of better knowledge of ModE structure. Further research will also have to study, both from the synchronical and from the diachronical point of view, the relations of the principle of functional sentence perspective to other word-order principles. Although all these and many other

tasks remain to be tackled, we hope to have offered at least another proof that an interpretation of English word-order, and of the word-order of any other language for that matter, cannot afford to disregard the phenomenon of functional sentence perspective. For one cannot overlook the fact that functional sentence perspective is one of the most important means that make language equal to its task of communicating thought.<sup>70</sup>

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Cf. V. Mathesius, *Studie k dějinám anglického slovosledu I (Studies in the History of English Word-Order I)*, *Věstník České Akademie* 16/1907, pp. 261—262.

<sup>2</sup> H. Weil had done so twenty-five years before G. von der Gabelentz advanced his theory of the psychological subject and psychological predicate in *Ideen zu einer vergleichenden Syntax. Wort- und Satzstellung, Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie und Sprachwissenschaft* 6/1869. Cf. the preface to the 3rd ed. of Weil's *L'ordre des mots* (Paris 1879) and V. Mathesius, op. cit., p. 263.

<sup>3</sup> Translating Mathesius' term *aktuální členění větné*. We are employing the term *analysis* here in order to bring out the examining approach of the investigator. As to the phenomenon itself, we prefer to call it *functional sentence perspective* (cf. below and Mathesius' German term *Satzperspektive* in note<sup>15</sup>).

<sup>4</sup> See e. g. Mathesius' study *O tak zvaném aktuálním členění větném* [recorded by the *Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature* 21/1940 (sic!), entry 1109, as *On the so-called Actual Division of the Sentence*], published in the *Slovo a slovesnost* 5/1939 [not 1940!], pp. 171—174, and reprinted in V. Mathesius, *Čeština a obecný jazykozpyt (Czech and General Linguistics)*, Prague 1947, a selection from Mathesius' papers, where also other contributions dealing with actual sentence analysis (functional sentence perspective) can be found.

<sup>5</sup> To be understood as "of or pertaining to words".

<sup>6</sup> Translating Mathesius' term *základ výpovědi*.

<sup>7</sup> Translating Mathesius' term *tema výpovědi*. (Mathesius uses the terms *základ* and *tema* synonymously.)

<sup>8</sup> Translating Mathesius' term *jádro výpovědi*.

<sup>9</sup> We have decided in favour of *rheme* against *nucleus*, finding the connotation of the latter too narrow for the purposes of this paper. We fear the danger of *nucleus* suggesting only the very core of the new piece of information instead of covering it all. The connotation of *rheme*, on the other hand, is hardly so fixed and surely ready to lend itself to the required meaning. Besides, it has already been used to carry the meaning of "new piece of information" by authors treating of the semantic structure of the sentence. K. Boost uses it in his *Neue Untersuchungen zum Wesen und Struktur des deutschen Satzes* (Berlin 1955, see p. 31), following H. Ammann, who writes in *Die menschliche Rede II* (Lahr in B., 1928, see p. 3): "Auf einen früher von mir eingeführten Ausdruck zurückgreifend, werde ich den Gegenstand der Mitteilung im Folgenden gelegentlich als 'Thema' bezeichnen; das Neue, das was ich dem Hörer über das Thema zu sagen habe, könnte man entsprechend mit dem (scheinbaren) Reimwort 'Rhema' belegen." The term "rheme", however, can boast of a much longer tradition. Cf., for instance, what W. T. Entwistle has to say about it in *Aspects of Language* (London 1954, see p. 155): "The Logos, as a 'stream of expressions' was divided [by ancient Greek grammarians, that is — J. F.] into *μέγη λόγου*, which were as much parts of the sentence as parts of speech. Among the first to be recognized were *ὀνομαζήματα*, the name of some thing and a statement about that thing. This *ὄνομα* was rather a subject than a noun and the *ζήματα* included all that might be predicated of the *ὄνομα*."

<sup>10</sup> It must be pointed out that under special circumstances even thematic elements may contribute to the development of the discourse. They are, however, always communicatively less dynamic than the transitional and the rhematic elements. See also note.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>11</sup> To our knowledge, no attempt at such a consistent detailed functional sentence analysis of the kind has so far been made except in our papers *Poznámky k problematice anglického slovního pořádku a 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 nezakladových podmětů v současné angličtině, Příspěvek k teorii aktuálního členění (On the Problem of Non-Thematic Sub-*



jects in *Contemporary English, A Contribution to the Theory of Functional Sentence Perspective*, *Časopis pro moderní filologii*, 39/1957, 22—42 and 165—173. As we have already remarked, we are well aware of the difficulties involved in an attempt at such analysis; we hope, however, to have proved in the above mentioned contributions the value of such an attempt.

<sup>12</sup> The example is being quoted from V. Mathesius' paper *Ze srovnávacích studií slovosledných* (*From Comparative Word-Order Studies*), *Časopis pro moderní filologii* 28/1942, p. 186. For further comment on it see p. 75.

<sup>13</sup> If no letters are given, the elements concerned are estimated as carrying an approximately equal amount of communicative dynamism.

<sup>14</sup> *Communicatively dynamic* sounding rather awkward, we beg to be excused for using — from now on — *dynamic* only. Whenever *dynamic* occurs in this paper, the qualification *communicatively* is to be understood.

<sup>15</sup> In a number of papers — e. g. in *O passivu v moderní angličtině* (*On the Passive Voice in English*), *Sborník filologický* 5/1915, pp. 188—220; *Několik poznámek o funkci podmětu v moderní angličtině* (*Some Notes on the Function of the Subject in Modern English*), *Časopis pro moderní filologii* 10/1924, pp. 244—248; *Zur Satzperspektive im modernen English*, *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literatur* vol. 115, pp. 202—210 — Mathesius has dealt with constructions of which English avails itself in order to put the sentence elements into the theme-rheme perspective without having to change the normal order of words.

<sup>16</sup> See, for instance, *From Comparative Word-Order Studies* (note<sup>12</sup>), p. 182.

<sup>17</sup> See op. cit., pp. 183—190, and 302—306.

<sup>18</sup> It is worth notice that, for instance, in a sentence of the type *An old man has broken his*

*leg* the initial subject contributes considerably to the development of the discourse (the inde-

finite non-generic article signaling a new idea) and is therefore comparatively very dynamic. Yet as the other elements are more dynamic still, it is felt as thematic owing to the pressure exerted by the basic distribution of communicative dynamism.

<sup>19</sup> For short, we shall use only the verbs *weaken* and *strengthen* without the qualifier *communicatively*, whenever we refer to the communicative weakening or strengthening of sentence positions.

<sup>20</sup> I. e. in example 1 on p. 73. When referring to examples we shall give only their numbers.

<sup>21</sup> For lack of space we have been able to give only a rough outline. For further particulars the reader is referred to our papers quoted in note.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>22</sup> E. g., M. Schubiger's work *The Role of Intonation in Spoken English* (Cambridge 1935) would have to be taken into account if the problems of functional sentence perspective in spoken English were studied.

<sup>23</sup> The following editions have been used: *The Gospel of Saint Matthew in West-Saxon*, ed. by J. W. Bright, Boston and London 1904 (abbreviated here to WS); *The Authorised Version of the English Bible 1611*, vol. V, ed. by W. A. Wright, Cambridge University Press 1909 (= AV); *The New Testament, Revised Standard Version 1946*, New York 1946 (= RSV); *The New Testament, An American Translation* by E. J. Goodspeed, The University of Chicago Press 1942, first published 1923 (= G); *The New Testament in Modern Speech* by R. F. Weymouth, London 1948, first published 1929 (= W); *A New Translation of the Bible* by J. Moffatt, London 1953, The New Testament first published 1913, revised 1935 (= M); *The New Testament*, trans. by R. A. Knox, New York 1944, translation undertaken in 1939 (= K).

<sup>24</sup> To our knowledge the most recent work in which this principle is being dealt with is C. R. Barrett's study (see note<sup>25</sup>).

<sup>25</sup> For a serviceable bibliography of OE word-order studies see e. g. C. R. Barrett, *Studies in the Word-Order of Aelfric's Catholic Homilies and Lives of the Saints*, Cambridge 1953, pp. 132—133. The following two recent contributions might be added to the list: V. V. Paskov, *К вопросу соотношения между редуцией окончаний и выдвижением синтаксических средств в английском языке* (*On the Relation between the Reduction of Endings and the Rise of Syntactical Means in English*), *Вопросы грамматического строя* (*Questions of Grammatical Structure*), Moscow 1955, pp. 461—80; O. Funke, *Some Remarks on Late O. E. Word-Order*, *English Studies* 37/1956, pp. 99—104. However, Mathesius' *Studie k dějinám anglického slovosledu I—III* (*Studies in the History of English Word-Order I—III*), *Věstník České Akademie* 16/1907, pp. 261—275, and 17/1908, pp. 195—214, and 299—311, must also be recorded. All the more as they contain well founded critical evaluations of the works of E. Kube, C. A. Smith, A. Todt, G. H. McKnight, A. Dahlstedt, J. Ries, and others. A very able survey of OE word-order practice is contained in R. Qirk and C. L. Wrenn's *Old*

*English Grammar*, London 1955, pp. 87—95 Neither Bolinger, nor Boost, nor Barrett, makes any mention of Mathesius' contributions to the study of English word-order. This regrettable circumstance is quite understandable as the papers and studies of this eminent scholar have for the most part been written in Czech and remained unpublished in any world-language.

<sup>26</sup> *Initially* is used here to cover also positions immediately after a conjunction or after a word of similar function at the head of the clause, *medially* to cover any position except the initial and final positions.

<sup>27</sup> Throughout this paper the examined subjects (with the exception of those in the Greek examples in 63 and 64) are italicized, and those parts of the quotations that are not under discussion, bracketed.

<sup>28</sup> We have refrained from interpreting the degree of communicative dynamism 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* with the comparatively strong *ac*.

<sup>29</sup> The figures give the chapter and verse, where the quotation begins.

<sup>30</sup> Not wanting to tamper with the OE text as given in J. W. Bright's edition (see note<sup>23</sup>), we follow the editor's traditional way of indicating the length of diphthongs (e. g. *bēð*).

<sup>31</sup> This phenomenon has been treated of in greater detail in our paper *On the Problem of Non-Thematic Subjects in Contemporary English*. See note<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>32</sup> Viewed in their relation to other elements of the sentence, the words making up the absolute dative construction before *hræðlice* can be interpreted as one transitional element. On closer examination, however, they show at least two degrees of communicative dynamism, the nouns *gedrēfednes* and *ēhtnes* possessing the higher degree. In this connection the following important observation may be made. It must be remembered that the basic distribution of communicative dynamism is not limited in its operation to the spheres of single clauses. 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 communicative dynamism functions as well. On the other hand, there are spheres of lower order than that of a clause. The absolute dative commented on above would represent such a lower sphere. All these problems, however, cannot be possibly treated of within the narrow limits of this paper.

<sup>33</sup> For instance, *eall* may become part of a kind of cliché in the phrase *ealle þās þing*, which often means only "the things previously stated" and has to be interpreted as thematic. Cf. 38 on p. 81.

<sup>34</sup> Depending on interrelations existing between means of functional sentence perspective. Cf. the two examples: *Few people came there* x *The few people came late*. The latter shows

that *few* may become thematic owing to the definite article acting here as referent to an idea mentioned before. We cannot discuss these problems within the limits of this study and we have therefore once again to refer the reader to our paper *On the Problem of Non-Thematic Subjects in Contemporary English* (see note<sup>11</sup>).

<sup>35</sup> S = subject, V = the finite verb of the predicate, C = complement, O = object.

<sup>36</sup> Cf. the words of praise written about this grammar by O. Funke, op. cit., p. 99.

<sup>37</sup> The examples given in brackets are also quoted from Quirk and Wrenn's *Old English Grammar*.

<sup>38</sup> According to Quirk and Wrenn, op. cit., p. 101, this type of inversion occurs, but is not common in OE.

<sup>39</sup> As it is often impossible to distinguish between optative and imperative, we treat of these two types under one heading. (G. H. McK night has done the same in the Old English section of his *Primitive Teutonic Order of Words*, *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 1/1897, p. 191.) Cf. also B. Trnka, *Syntaktická charakteristika řeči anglosaských památek básnických* (*A Syntactical Analysis of the Language of Anglo-Saxon Poetry*), *Facultas Philosophica Universitatis Carolinae Pragensis, Práce z vědeckých ústavů* vol. 10, p. 101.

<sup>40</sup> Adopting the terminology used by R. W. Zandvoort in his *Handbook of English Grammar*,<sup>5</sup> Groningen, Djakarta 1953, § 605.

<sup>41</sup> We shall treat of the functional sentence perspective of these types in greater detail in Chapter Three, pp. 90—93.

<sup>42</sup> This colouring, however, does not appear to be so definite, for instance, in the case of forms of the copula *bēon*. This phenomenon, too, will receive attention in Chapter Three, p. 92.

<sup>43</sup> On the emotiveness of questions and commands see V. Mathesius, *Základní funkce pořádku slov v češtině (The Basic Function of Word-Order in Czech)*, *Slovo a slovesnost* 7/1941, p. 173, and *From Comparative Word-Order Studies* (see note<sup>12</sup>), p. 302.

<sup>44</sup> Occasionally the subject of the imperative remains unexpressed in OE. Cf. B. Trnka, *op. cit.*, p. 99.

<sup>45</sup> May we remind the reader that we are dealing only with the type given in Quirk and Wrenn's *OE Grammar*, i. e. with negative sentences containing only one negative element in the form of the adverbial *ne*.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. also C. R. Barrett, *op. cit.*, p. 5, where further references are given.

<sup>47</sup> See L. L. Schücking, *Die Grundzüge der Satzverknüpfung im Beowulf*, I. Teil, Halle 1904, p. 108–109.

<sup>48</sup> See their *Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*, Oxford 1898, p. 1030.

<sup>49</sup> As to the word-order in independent *þā*-clauses, see Quirk and Wrenn, l. c. For the word-order in dependent *þā*-clauses and for problems connected with the *þā*-clauses in general, see S. O. Andrew, *Postscript on Beowulf*, Cambridge 1948, p. 4. See also O. Funke, *op. cit.*, p. 101, where further references can be found.

<sup>50</sup> See F. Mossé, *Manuel de l'Anglais du Moyen Age*, Paris 1945, pp. 205–6.

<sup>51</sup> Italicized by us. There is certainly nothing unusual about poetry employing types tending towards the emotive end of the gamut. Is it not one of the chief functions of poetry to appeal to, and to arouse, the feelings and imagination?

<sup>52</sup> The thematic character of the OE subjects has been touched upon also by V. V. Passek, *op. cit.*, pp. 471ff.

<sup>53</sup> Another possible interpretation of the functional sentence perspective of this instance is offered among the comments below.

<sup>54</sup> The element *in the desert/wilderness of Judea* seems to be weaker than that of *preaching*. This is especially evident in RSV and M, where the direct communication has become the direct object of *preaching* within the sphere of one sentence.

<sup>55</sup> We have treated of this phenomenon in greater detail in our paper *On the Problem of Non-Thematic Subjects in Contemporary English* (see note<sup>11</sup>).

<sup>56</sup> Cf. e. g. H. Sweet, *A New English Grammar*, Part II, Oxford 1898, § 2014.

<sup>57</sup> Cf. our paper *On the Problem of Non-Thematic Subjects in Contemporary English* (see note<sup>11</sup>), pp. 34–35.

<sup>58</sup> In deciding the question of emotiveness in the Greek and Latin texts, we follow the criterion suggested by H. Weil (see p. 72 of this paper).

<sup>59</sup> The Greek and Latin versions are naturally being quoted here only for the sake of comparison. No claim is made that they represent the literally exact versions from which the texts under examination have been rendered. On the problem of the Latin original of the WS gospel versions see e. g. H. Glunz in *Die lateinische Vorlage der ws. Evangelienversion*, Leipzig 1928, and in *Britannien und Bibeltext*, Leipzig 1930.

<sup>60</sup> *Novum Testamentum Graece*<sup>17</sup>, ed. by Eberhard Nestle and Erwin Nestle, Stuttgart 1941 (= NTG); *Novum Testamentum Vulgatae Editionis*, Lipsiae 1840 (= V).

<sup>61</sup> The words *τῶν ῥημάτων* are given by NTG as an interpolation of some of the manuscripts.

<sup>62</sup> *The New Testament in Basic English*, Cambridge University Press 1944.

<sup>63</sup> See V. Mathesius, *The Basic Function of the Czech Order of Words* (see note<sup>43</sup>), p. 173. *Intonace otázky (The Intonation of Interrogative Sentences)*, *Naše řeč* 33/1949, pp. 62–68.

<sup>64</sup> Cf. *On the Basic Function of Czech Word-Order* (see note<sup>43</sup>), p. 173, and *From Comparative Word-Order Studies* (see note<sup>11</sup>), p. 302.

<sup>65</sup> In the following lines referred to as "indicator".

<sup>66</sup> Cf. the *eat*-opening in 39 on p. 81.

<sup>67</sup> See 68 and 69 below.

<sup>68</sup> The comparatively very light transitional character of the opening *do*-forms has not been specially marked in the examples.

<sup>69</sup> The OE form *wylle* is undoubtedly more dynamic than its ModE counterpart *will* in M. The latter serves as a future tense auxiliary and is approximately on the same level as *are* in W. W's translation, however, has succeeded in giving the notion of "willing" its proper degree of communicative dynamism.

<sup>70</sup> After the manuscript of the present study had been set up, the following three contributions to the theory of functional sentence perspective appeared: by K. G. Krushel'mitskaya, К вопросу о смысловом членении предложения (On the Question of the Semantic Structure of the Sentence), *Voprosy yazykoznanija*, 1956, No. 5, pp. 55–67; by the same author, О порядке слов в немецком языке (On the Order of Words in German), *Inostran-*

nye yazyki v shkole 1957, No. 1, pp. 8—20; and by O. I. Moskalskaya, Артикли в немецком языке (The Article in German), *Inostrannye yazyki v shkole* 1956, No. 5, pp. 17—37, of which see esp. pp. 22—26. We are pleased to find that in a number of points the authors have arrived at results similar to those offered in our own researches, especially in our paper on the non-thematic subjects in ModE (see note<sup>1</sup>). We hope to be able to comment on these three important contributions on some other occasion.

## НЕСКОЛЬКО МЫСЛЕЙ О ФУНКЦИИ ПОРЯДКА СЛОВ В СТАРОАНГЛИЙСКОМ И НОВОАНГЛИЙСКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ

I. Автор статьи рассматривает вопрос об отношениях между актуальным членением предложения и грамматическим построением в староанглийском и новоанглийском порядке слов.

Автор является последователем метода ученых Н. Weil, V. Mathesius и D. L. Bolinger и развивает свои собственные наблюдения напечатанные в Сборнике (1956, А — 4, стр. 93—107) и в журнале *Časopis pro moderní filologii* (39) 1957, стр. 22-42 и 165-173). По мнению автора значение актуального членения предложения выходит за рамки словорасположения. Актуальное членение предложения помогает говорящему и слушателю производить оценку динамичности высказывания элементом предложения, т. е. их принадлежность к основе („исходному пункту“), к „ядру“ или к переходным членам.

Для пояснения необходимо отметить, что динамичность высказывания элемента предложения увеличивается в зависимости от того, насколько элемент обогащает, развивает, „продвигает“ данное высказывание. Наиболее динамичный элемент предложения автор называет собственно ядром, наименее динамичный — собственно основой. Вообще говоря, между собственно основой и собственно ядром можно наблюдать целую шкалу динамики высказывания, созданную оттенками динамичности в членах основы, ядра и в переходных членах

Актуальное членение способствует тому, чтобы язык мог успешно исполнять свою функцию, и быть орудием мышления и общения. Это проявляется в том, что словорасположение является единственным, и быть может, самым важным средством актуального членения предложения. Наряду с порядком слов, актуальное членение пользуется и другими средствами, как напр. контекстом и т. наз. контексто-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 актуального членения принадлежит напр. интонация и линия ударения в предложении. Если словорасположение может быть вполне применимо как средство актуального членения, то в предложении осуществляется основное расположение динамичности высказывания: элементы предложения ставятся в перспективе, последовательно направляющейся от собственно основы, к собственно ядру. Остальные средства актуального членения предложения могут, однако, действовать таким образом, что основная перспектива различным образом изменяется. Материалом для автора были: семь английских евангельских текстов (1 староанглийский, 1 ранний новоанглийский и 5 текстов современного языка).

Динамичность высказывания элементов предложения (т. е. перспективу данного предложения) автор пытается отметить посредством особого обозначения.

II. Закономерность взаимодействия порядка слов и остальных средств актуального членения предложения могут быть различными в разных языках. Больше того, они могут отличаться между собой и в разных стадиях развития одного и того же языка. Автор показывает на многочисленных примерах, что порядок слов был в староанглийском языке гораздо более распространенным средством актуального членения предложения, чем в новоанглийском языке. Принцип актуального членения в староанглийском языке часто является общим знаменателем, к которому можно привести многие формы предложения, которые с точки зрения грамматического фактора имеют свободный порядок слов. Актуальное членение предложения является также главным решающим фактором в вопросе об эмоциональности староанглийских формаций словорасположения. Возможно, что и те староанглийские типы, которые обнаруживают явную тенденцию „грамматикализировать“ порядок слов, можно, с точки зрения актуального членения предложения включить в шкалу типов пред-

loženia, na jednom konci ktorých stojí typ s perspektívou ustremlenou postupne od osnovy k jadrú, a na druhom konci — typ s perspektívou postupne vedúcou od jadra k východnému bodu.

III. Obecné je známe, že v tvorbe novooanglického poriadku slov najväčším faktorom je princíp gramatický. Tento fakt je hlavnou príčinou toho, prečo porovnane s starooanglickým jazykom, novooanglický jazyk upotrebuje pre prenos stupňa dynamiky vyjadrovania prvkov vety častejšie iné prostriedky aktuálneho členenia ako poriadok slov. Zafixovanie („gramatická fixácia“) poriadku slov bolo tiež príčinou toho, že vo porovnaní so starooanglickým jazykom v novooanglickom jazyku niektoré typy vety stratili do určitej miery svoju emocionálnosť. Vyššie uvedené sa vzťahuje i na otázky, ktoré sa týkajú, napríklad, rozboru vety, z pohľadu aktuálneho členenia vety, ktoré sa týka, napríklad, významnej časti III kapitoly. Je možné, že v novooanglickom jazyku emocionálnosť poriadku slov má príčinu skôr v odklonení od zafixovaného slovosporiadku — než v odklonení od hlavného poriadku dynamiky vyjadrovania v vete, t. j. od perspektívy postupne smerujúcej od osnovy k jadrú. Do akej miery správne toto pozorovanie môže byť, jedinečne budú ďalšie synchronické a diachronické štúdie, ktoré budú analyzovať i vzťahy aktuálneho členenia vety k gramatickému faktoru, ako i k iným faktorom slovosporiadku.

*Preklad E. Pužľakovej*

## NĚKOLIK MYŠLENEK O FUNKCI SLOVNÍHO POŘÁDKU V STARÉ A NOVÉ ANGLIČTINĚ

I. Článok je príspevkom k otázke, ako sa v starooanglickom a novooanglickom slovníku poriadku jeví vzťahy medzi aktuálnym členením vety a gramatickou stavbou. Metodicky autor odkazuje na práce H. Weila, V. Mathesiusa a D. L. Bolingera a pokračuje vo svojich vlastných pozorovaniach, uverejnených v tomto Sborníku (1956, A-4, str. 93—107) a v Časopise pro moderní filologii (39/1957, str. 22—42 a 165-173). Ukazuje, že dôležitosť aktuálneho členenia vety presahuje oblasť slovného poriadku. Aktuálne členenie vety napomáha totiž hovädmu i poslucháčovi hodnotiť výpovednú dynamickosť vety (t. j. jej základnosť, prechodnosť alebo jadrovosť).

Na vysvetlenie je treba uviesť, že výpovedná dynamickosť vety je tým väčšia, čím viac složka obohacuje, rozvíja, „posunuje kupredu“ danú promluvu. Nejdynamickosťou složka jeví nazýva autor vlastným jadróm, najmenej dynamickou složkou pak vlastným základom. Obecné rečeno, medzi vlastnou základnosťou a vlastnou jadrovosťou je pozorovať celú stupnicu výpovední dynamickosti, tvorenú odstupňovanou základnosťou, prechodnosťou a jadrovosťou.

Aktuálne členenie vety výdatne prispieva k tomu, aby jazyk mohol úspešne plniť svoj úkol, byť nástrojom myslenia a dorozumenia. To sa jeví tiež v tom, že slovný poriadok je jen jedním, byť snad najdôležitejším prostriedkom aktuálneho členenia vety. Medzi inými (neslovoslednými) prostriedkami aktuálneho členenia vety patrí na pr. sám kontext a t. z. kontextovo-sémantické prostriedky, t. j. na pr. slova, ktoré sa v rôznych textoch zachovávajú v rovnakej miere v rovnakom stupni výpovední dynamickosti. Pokiaľ ide o mluvenou formu jazyka, patrí medzi prostriedky aktuálneho členenia vety na pr. intonácia a prízvuková línia vety. Nepôsobi-li „rušivě“ žiadny z neslovosledných prostriedkov, môže sa vo vete uskutočniť základná rozloženie vety dynamickosti: vety složky sa stavajú do perspektívy dôsledne hľadíc od vlastného základu k vlastnému jadrú. Neslovosledné prostriedky aktuálneho členenia vety však môžu pôsobiť tak, že sa tato základná vety perspektíva všelijak obmätuje.

Autorovým materiálom je sedem anglických evanjelijných textů (jeden starooanglický, jeden rané novooanglický a päť textů z doby súčasnej). Výpovedná dynamickosť vety (t. j. perspektíva vety) sa autor snaží zachytiť zvláštnymi notáciami.

II. Zákonitosť vzájomného pôsobenia slovostrojného a neslovostrojného prostriedkov aktuálneho členenia vety môžu byť v rôznych jazykoch rôzne, ba môžu sa líšiť i v rôznych štádiách vývoje jedného a tohož jazyka. Autor ukazuje na četných dokladoch, že slovný poriadok jeví v sta. v ďaleko väčšiu mieru prostriedkom aktuálneho členenia vety než v na. Princíp aktuálneho členenia je v sta. často spoločným jmenovateľom, na ktorý sa dáajú uviesť mnohé vety tvary, jež s hľadiska gramatického činiteľa majú „volný“ slovný poriadok.

Aktuální větné členění se také jeví jako hlavní rozhodčí v otázce emotivnosti a neemotivnosti sta. slovosledných formací. I ty sta. typy, které mají zřejmou tendenci k zgramatikalisovanému slovnímu pořádku, se dají podle hledisek aktuálního členění větného zařadit do stupnice větných typů, na jejímž jednom konci stojí typ s perspektivou hledící důsledně od základu k jádru a na jejímž druhém konci stojí typ s perspektivou důsledně hledící od jádra k základu:

III. Je dobře známo, že v na. je nejdůležitějším slovosledným činitelem princip gramatický. Tato skutečnost je hlavní příčinou toho, proč na. užívá pro tlumočení stupně výpovědní dynamičnosti větných složek v daleko větší míře než sta. neslovosledných prostředků aktuálního členění větného. Zgramatikalisování slovního pořádku způsobilo také to, že ve srovnání se sta. ztratily v na. některé větné typy na své emotivnosti. To obecně platí i o větách tázacích, jejichž rozboru s hlediska aktuálního členění větného je věnována podstatná část III. kapitoly. Zdá se, že v na. je emotivnost slovního pořádku často způsobována spíše odchylkou od gramatikalisovaného slovního pořádku než odchylkou od základního rozložení výpovědní dynamičnosti, t. j. od perspektivy důsledně hledící od základu k jádru. Míru platnosti tohoto tvrzení může rozhodnout jedině další synchronické i diachronické bádání, které bude muset zkoumat i vztahy aktuálního členění větného nejen k činiteli gramatickému, ale i k ostatním slovosledným činitelům.