RECENT DEVELOPMENTS OF SYNTACTIC THEORIES IN CZECHOSLOVAK LINGUISTICS

Rudolf Zimek

A Talk given for the Melbourne Linguistic Circle on 15th May 1968.

When talking about the Prague Linguistic School most historians of language science (mainly – or sometimes solely) have in mind the investigations by Prague linguists of the problems of phonology where there have been such achievements as Trubetzkay's Grundzuge der Phonologie or the well-known studies in phonology by R. Jakobson.

Indeed, during the classical period (from 1928 to 1938) the Prague structuralists had not managed to create a complete methodological system to investigate all the higher levels of language, although many original ideas were voiced in this field also. The famous "Thèses du Cercle Linguistique de Prague" of 1929 (reprinted in A Prague School Reader in Linguistics, Indiana University 1964, pp.33-58, or (in Russian translation) in Kondrašov's anthology, Pražskij lingvističeskij kružok, (1967) provide a new general conception for all levels of language study.

Although the approach suggested then ought to have been carried out gradually, in the first decade Prague linguists focussed mainly on phonology, morphonology, on some basic questions of morphological catergories (verb, noun, adverb) and on some problems concerning the various functions and styles of language, especially poetic language. Many other questions had also been outlined and set up as tasks. It is here that we can find, in nucleus, important fresh thoughts concerning the word-level and the sentence level; thoughts, which have been taken over by the followers (second and third generation) of the Prague School founders, been re-examined, developed and elaborated by them in the postwar period and in the last decade, marking the new phrase when we may perhaps no longer speak of the Prague School as a direct continuation of the original one. A survey of the recent activity of linguists in Czechoslovakia is given in a chapter by Paul Garvin in "Current Trends in Linguistics", vol. I, Soviet and East European Linguistics, The Hague 1963, pp.499-521.

Let me first trace some fundamental concepts of the theory of syntax in contemporary Czechosolovakian linguistics.

The key-topics on which syntactic research is concentrated are:

A. the interrelation of the syntactic level with other language levels
(relation of syntax to morphology and lexicology),

B. the concept of the sentences as the principal syntactic unit,

C. the description of sentence structure, and

D. the problems of word-order.

Recently, all these traditional questions have been viewed from the angle of transformational generative grammar.

In all these questions (except the last one, of course) penetrating and stimulating ideas have been professed by the originator and one of the main organizers of the Prague Circle, Vilém Mathesius, Professor of English Language and Literature at Charles University in Prague. His merits have not been appreciated enough in international linguistics, and are relatively unknown outside his country, mainly because almost all of his rather short, concise contributions were written in Czech. He died in 1945, without completing his work on a functional and structural analysis of English as compared to Czech. The posthumous edition of his monograph, in which he summarized his findings, The Contents Analysis of Modern English on a General Linguistics Basis, appeared, again in Czech, in 1964 only (edited by his pupil Prof. J. Vachek, with up-to-date commentaries by I. Poldauf). But a selection of his most important papers was edited in 1947.

Mathesius introduced the aspect of potentiality and functionality into structural linguistics. Let us sketch briefly his opinions:

Potentiality was stated by Mathesius (as early as 1911, i.e, long before the Prague School began) to be an important feature of language phenomena, on various language levels. By the term "potentiality" he meant static (we would say synchronistic) oscillation of speech among individuals inside language communities, i.e, instability in a given period. It is opposed to dynamic (=diachronic) changebility, manifested by alterations, occuring in the course of time. In view of this feature of potentiality Mathesius warned against the excessive, mechanical simplification of language phenomena. Unfortunately this essential feature of language, potentiality, was not given sufficient consideration in the exploration of other members of the Prague School, until it was reassumed in a modified and new shape, as 'linguistic vagueness' by Prof. J. V. Neustupný. Many other contemporary Czech linguists have likewise realised how important it is to bear in mind the steady tension between the centre and the periphery of the language

system. The papers of the second volume of the postwar <u>Travaux Linguistiques de Prague</u> were all written with this aspect in mind.

Mathesius professed that the systematic analysis of any language must be carried out on a strictly synchronic basis, yet understanding the synchrony as an inherent feature of potentiality. Mathesius also emphasized the importance of analytical comparison, i.e., comparison of languages of different types without any regard to their genetic relations. He was the founder of contrastive language study in Czech linguistics, and his method of an analytic comparison of English as contrasted with Czech was later applied with good results to the analysis of Russian, German, French, Spanish and Japanese.

Mathesius's conception was functional and structural. By functional he meant that in each case the starting point of the investigation should be the communicative needs of the speaker. The linguist's first task is to explore how ideas about reality are conveyed by the formal means of language. By the structural approach he meant that the real function of a linguistic fact must be considered and ascertained within the grammatical system of a given language.

From this point of view Mathesius suggested a new division of the theory of language into disciplines. Unlike the traditional division into phonetics, lexicology and grammar (with the subdivision of the latter into morphology and syntax), he proposed to distinguish only two sections of linguistics: "functional onomatology" and "functional syntax". These two sections correspond, according to him, to two different processes which every communicative act of speech involves, before it comes to the real utterance. These two processes, of course, merge into one in the mechanized state of human speech and can only be detected when an obstacle appears which makes their pace unusually slow or even frustrates their completion (this was explored later e.g. by Jakobson in his studies of aphasia phenomena).

The first of the two basic linguistic operations is selection; elements are selected from the given reality, concrete or abstract, which fulfil the double condition of having focused the attention of the prospective speaker and of being able to be expressed by means of the vocabulary in the given language. The speaker makes a selection from the linguistic repertory of names (namings in the broadest sense of the word) and applies the names in the concrete acts of speech. This is the paradigmatic aspect of language (as it was called later). Problems of this kind are dealt with in functional onomatology, i.e. theory of naming (théorie de la dénomination linguistique).

The second basic linguistic operation is combination. The linguistic signs representing the selected elements of the given reality are put into mutual realtions (usouvztažnění, in-Beziehung-Setzen), are organized so as to constitute an organic whole, a sentence. This is the modern syntagmatic aspect of language which in Mathesius's theory represents the subject matter of functional syntax. Nowadays, of course, the principles of linguistic selection and combination have become commonplace in linguistics.

For Mathesius the way of linguistic investigation will lead first from speech, as something which is immediately given, to language, as a system having an ideal reality only (i.e. from la parole to la langue), and second, from the functional necessities to the formal means by which they are satisfied.

The selection of units or of their combinations is a purposive operation (it is in this sense that functionality should be understood, not in the sense of mathematical function). The Prague Circle emphasized the purposiveness of language and studied the various linguistic aims (hence the poetic function obtained the most fruitful treatment). This approach to language, according to Jakobson's paper of 1962, was typical for all members of the Prague Circle in that period, not only those in Prague, but linguists outside Prague such as de Groot, Benveniste, Sommerfelt, Kurylowicz, Rosetti, Laziczius, Polivanov and others, and this common drift was aiming, in Jakobson's evaluation, towards a means-ends (means-function) model of language.

Mathesius himself was quite modest in the self-evaluation of his conception. He said (in his paper "On Some Problems of the Systematic Analysis of Grammar", TCLP VI, 1936): "It would be absurd to maintain that all problems falling under the head of functional onomatology and functional syntax respectively are entirely new and have never been discussed before. It would be equally absurd, however – he added – to deny that the functional reformulation of the questions involved can throw much fresh light upon them and that it puts us into the position of systematically rearranging the known facts and of discovering new ones."

As we notice, in this conception of the theory of language, there is no third section of equal rank besides onomotalogy and syntax; in other words morphology is not regarded as an independent part of language theory.

Morphology, in Mathesius's view, as it deals with groupings of the means of expression on the basis of formal affinities, cuts across the two mentioned fields, for different parts of the same morphological system may have different functions, onomatological and syntactical.

The question is similarly worded in the Thèses:

"La morphologie = théorie des systèmes des formes de mots et de groupes. Les formations lexicales et les formations des groupes lexicaux resultant de l'activité linguistique dénominatrice et syntagmatique se groupent dans la langue en systems de caractère formel. Ces systèmes sont étudiés par la morphologie, bien entendu au sens large du mot, laquelle ne prend pas place auprès de la théorie de la dénomination et de la théorie syntagmatique comme une discipline parallèle (division traditionelle en formation des mots, morphologie et syntaxe), mais les croises l'une et l'autre."

Recently, in 1962, another view has been expressed on the substantive character of morphology and syntax by an old member of the Prague School, Prof. V. Skalička. Skalička claims that morphology is a mere transposition of lexis, deixis and syntax, and that, for this reason, morphology is (from the standpoint of language economy) quite superfluous, redundant, whereas syntax is indispensable for any language. Morphology serves simply for the orientation of words in the sentence. Still Skalička recognizes the dichotomy of morphology and syntax even for languages of isolative and polysynthetic types where it is very difficult to delimit the two systems. In Skalička's persuasion, syntax (universally) is built on an anthropological principle manifesting itself in segmentation into sentences (their length being comfortable to human speakers) and, secondly, in the sentence structure based primarily on the human action pattern.

The idea of the dispensability of morphology is not in full contradiction with Mathesius's understanding of the place of morphology in language systems, but his, Mathesius's, attitude was rooted more in the structure of the flexive languages.

This theoretical foundation of conceiving language levels in the Prague School theory is nowadays expressly avowed as an underlying linguistic conception of the new multi-level theory, elaborated on the basis of function and form conception by Daneš and Sgall. What was only drafted or outlined by Mathesius, has been explored and elaborated deeply and widely over the last decade.

F. Daneš, first in co-operation with M. Dokulil and K. Hausenblas and later himself (cf. his paper A Three-Level Approach to Syntax), distinguishes the following three levels in syntax:

(1)   The level of semantic structure of the sentence, where we deal with such semantic relations as actor and action, bearer of a quality or of a state, action and object resulting from the action, various circumstantial determinations (place, time, etc) then such generalized abstract categories as living being, individual, etc.

(2)   The grammatical level, comprising the grammatical categories, so called parts of the sentence, such as grammatical subject, predicate, attribute, object. Daneš stresses that this grammatical level is not onesidedly dependent on the semantic content, but is rather self-contained, autonomous and determining for the sentence structure; this is witnessed by the syntactic diversities of languages, whereas the semantic catergories, being extra-linguistic, seem to be universal, or nearly so. Naturally, there is a certain correspondence between the semantic and the grammatical level, but it is only a relation of affinity, not identity. Danes is critical of Chomsky who apparently does not respect the differences between the grammatical and semantic level in syntax (or rather – did not respect it in his papers in the fifites). Chomsky uses terms like subject, object in a very vague manner.

(3)   The third level is that of the organization of utterances. It accounts for the functioning of the semantic and the grammatical structures in the very act of communication. This third level is characterized by its dynamism; into its domain pertains all that is connected with the processual aspect of the utterance in contrast with the abstract and static character of the first two levels. To the third level belong the linear materialization and perception of utterance, relation to the extra-linguistic content of the message, condition of context and situation, speakers attitude towards the message, and all extra-grammatical means of organizing the utterance such as rhythm, intonation, word and clause order.

        P. Novák appreciates the three-level theory as a positive achievement in Czechoslovak postwar linguistics, but in his critical remarks points to some questions which have remained open – first of all the relationship between the respective levels. In this respect he gives a complementary exposition, reminding the reader that from the functional point of view we have to bear in mind that the semantic level units must have some means of formal expression and the grammatical level means must have some functions, and it is proper to say that the syntactic structure serves the purpose of the semantic structure, or – in other words – the relation between the grammatical and semantic levels is that of form and function. This is in accordance with the phenomenon of asymmetrical dualism. Novák emphasizes that two different approaches must be kept apart; the functional one and the structural one. By the former he means that attention must be focused on what semantic differences are rendered at all, what meanings does a given set of means have, e.g. is the sentence a statement (not a question or desire), what set of contrastive information is covered by a statement in contrast with other logically possible messages. By the latter,

the structural approach, he means the examination of the inner motivation of the use of the linguistic means, such as invariant, primary and secondary function or form, etc. These comments are indeed very important. Even Chomsky and his groups are now aware of the relationship of the semantic and grammatical levels.

Novák doubts, examining Daneš' ideas, that detaching the third level, especially the functional sentence perspective, from the joint study of semantic and grammatical levels is justified. In his opinion such detachment is admissible in Slavic languages with grammatically uncharged word-order, but hardly right for other languages, e.g. Albanian, where the functional sentence perspective is rendered also by grammatical means. Therefore we must be careful in formulating universal syntactic theories.

Referring to the conceptions of Mathesius, Skalička, Dokulil, Daneš and also Kurylowicz, P. Sgall arrives in his papers and in his monograph at a system which is very near to Lamb's stratificational grammar. Sgall assumes that there are at least two levels of sentence structure: one is the tectogrammatical level, the so-called semantic structure of sentence, with units (a) corresponding to the syntactic relations, such as actor, action, patiens, logical object etc; (b) lexical units handled as elementary, (c) morphological units (such as plural, preterite, comparative). But Sgall realizes himself that for an integrated linguistic description even higher levels may be needed. The second sentence level is the phenogrammatical one, i.e. the level of sentence parts. This is actually a level of the "form" in relation to the first level. This second level has elementary units of three kinds again, corresponding to the units of the tectogrammatical level.

The other levels, lower than syntactic, are according to Sgall the morphemic one (with units such as stem morphemes, cases, prepositions etc), then the morphophonemic level with the morphoneme and the morph as main units, and last--a phonetic level. For every pair of adjacent levels some units are in the relation of form and function, which is a many-to-many relation (asymmetrical dualism).

The structural description of the sentence is given by Sgall simply by a sequence of representations of this sentence on all individual levels. He does not use the transformational rules of Chomsky.

A very important innovation in the Prague School syntactic theory is the distinction by Mathesius between <u>sentence</u> (as a unit of la langue) and <u>utterance</u> (as a parole unit). A similar distinction was made by Karcevskij (<u>la proposition</u> vs. <u>la phrase</u>). Mathesius expounded his views on this difference in 1936, in his comments on Gardiner's

book The Theory of Speech and Language, published in 1932. Thus Mathesius gave precision to his own definition of the sentence in 1924: "The sentence is an elementary speech utterance, through which the speaker (or writer) reacts to some reality, concrete or abstract, and which in its formal character appears to realize the grammatical possibilities of the respective language and to be subjectively, that is from the point of view of the speaker (or writer), complete."

Mathesius showed the difference between the sentence as a concrete individual utterance belonging to the sphere of speech and the sentence as an abstract pattern, depending in its general form on the grammatical system of the given language, (belonging to the field of language, la langue). Or, we may say, in speech we find utterances which have a specific morpho-syntactic structure pattern, expressing the categories of predicativeness formally, but also unstructurized utterances, without any grammatical expression of predicativeness (in a certain situation even an isolated word or an attributive syntagm can serve the purpose and function as an utterance), with a communicative intonation. So we have to speak of utterances with and without sentence character.

Languages mostly have more than one sentence pattern. And there is still much uncertainity as to what should be regarded as existing sentence patterns in a given language and what not. Mathesius was expressly against the superstition that the sentence must contain a finite verb. In his view a verbless sentence pattern is an essential part of the grammatical system of Russian, but only an occasional sentence type in English or Czech.

The problem of the delimitation of utterances and sentences was tackled several times by other Czech and Slovak linguists after World War II, e.g. by E. Pauliny, "La phrase et l'énonciation", RLB 1947, reprinted in the Prague School Reader, then by Dokulil, Daneš, Hausenblas, Horálek, and recently by Grepl in Voprosy jazyko znanija. (1967). There is no unanimity in defining the concept of the sentence as opposed to the non-sentence, i.e. utterance. And it is still more difficult to apply the theory to other languages, such as Russian for example. Generative transformational grammar does not distinguish these two linguistic sides but Chomsky seems to have in mind sentences as units of la langue in the underlying structures. Daneš has recently (1964) re-examined this question in connection with his three-level approach and has distinguished in the context of the term "sentence" three different basic concepts: (1) utterance-event, (2) utterance and (3) sentence pattern (see the paper for details). The last one is defined as a syntactic

structure of the kind which converts a sequence of words into a minimum communicative unit (an utterance) even outside the framework of connected discourse, i.e. even beyond the context and the situation. From the point of view of its function, the sentence pattern is a specifically communicative structure, an utterance-making device.

The sentence pattern in Daneš'interpretation is an abstract and static invariant structure (scheme), not a sequence of particular words in a particular utterance, therefore the word-order does not belong in the sentence-pattern, unless it has a grammatical function. The invariant pattern can be accompanied by facultative syntactic variants.

The constitutive grammatical distinctive features of the sentence pattern are: the parts of speech (in morpho-syntactic classification), some morphological categories and two relations of syntactic connection: dependence (=subordination) and adjoining (=co-ordination). The former is syntagmatic, the latter an unsyntagmatic relation.

The above three stages or three concepts of the sentence represent three steps in the process of generalization, from concrete to abstract.

The description of sentence structures of a given language may be then given in the form of hierarchically ordered system of patterns, supplemented by a set of rules. To these rules belong not only word-order rules, but also expanding rules (primarily pronominalization which refers not only to the substitution of the subject noun by a personal pronoun, but to any other pronominalization, e.g. in place of an object noun, adverbial modifier, etc.) Finally, we have the expanding rules, based on adjoining, i.e. the co-ordinating addition of homofunctional elements. In present-day Czechoslovakian linguistics Daneš has given the most complex syntactic description. It is, however, a tentative and sketchy exposition only, which needs elaboration.

In a previous monograph (1957) Daneš gave a detailed investigation of the sentence intonation in Czech. An English summary was published in Word (1960).

He also tackled, in a paper in the Soviet journal Voprosy jazykoznanija (1964), the problem of the interpretation of syntactic ambiguity (homonymy). He states his view again briefly in this English paper, claiming that syntactic homonymy does not exist in grammar, in sentence patterns, but merely in utterances, and there only from the viewpoint of the hearer (decoder), because the speaker always knows what syntactic relations he has expressed. This may be true, but can we simply bypass the analytical problems of the hearer in syntactic theory?

My own research is concerned with the problem of sentence patterns in Modern Russian, basing my approach on Daneš' theory. But I see a great difficulty in the procedure of discovering sentence patterns. This is to be done, according to Danes, from a corpus of utterances, fulfilling the condition that they employ the communicative function even outside the context and situation. Now here comes the most difficult question: how to ascertain the constitutive features of sentence pattern, i.e. which of the grammatical elements contained in a given utterance should be included into the sentence pattern as necessary (obligatory) constitutents and which should one exclude from it, so that the requirement of a complete and at the same time minimal unit could be met. Certainly, we have to keep to the principle of considering the syntactical system and partial systems of oppositions in the given language, as Daneš states. But this direction is too common.

I have come to the conclusion that, as a matter of fact, on the highest level of abstraction, as the sentence pattern should be by definition, we can hardly find several different patterns, since the necessity or non-necessity of including a constituent part of the sentence structure is closely related to the semantic class of the respective constituent, mainly of the semantic valency of the finite verb as the kernel of the sentence structure. Hence follows that we can set in Slavic languages only one abstract sentence pattern:

$$N \text{ -- } V_{fin} \text{ -- } Compl \qquad \text{(Compl = complementation of objectiva, adverbial}$$
$$\text{or predicative character)}$$

And only one level lower, that is on the utterance level, after filling in a particular verb, or a particular verb, or a particular verb class (e.g. transitive verb, verb of state etc) we can differentiate the pattern and ascertain which other parts (to the left and to the right) belong to the pattern as obligatory constituents:

N	V_{fin}	Compl
+	+	+
+	+	-
-	+	-
+	-	-

So we actually can speak only of utterance types or models, not of sentence types.

Besides, I see one contradiction in Daneš' exposition, viz. the requirement of a minimum communicative unit in a pattern still deprived of concrete lexical units.

Such a pattern as Pro – VF – S_4 (in his symbolization) does not convey any communication at all. (Moreover, Pro in the position of subject is a pronominalization substitution bound to the context). So I think we should not insist on the communicative function in sentence pattern and, second, we find a diversity of patterns only on the utterance level.

Another syntactic topic raised by Mathesius is the problem of word-order, the so-called "functional sentence perspective", or "topical articulation" of the sentence, to translate verbatim the Czech original term aktuální členění, later also named contextual segmentation.

The idea of functional sentence perspective (FSP) is explained in Vachek's book (chapter V) and in the first section of Sgall's paper (1967). It is, briefly, the distinction of two poles (parts) in the utterance from the informative point of view: the theme (as something already known or evident) and the rheme (as the new information given by the utterance). Topic and comment correspond to these notions in the American terminology. In the normal, "objective" word-order the sequence is T –> R, in the "subjective", emphatic order it is reversed: R --> T. It is essential to investigate in what relations these two parts stand to the grammatical parts of sentence. This was outlined by Mathesius on some illustrations contrasting English and Czech. After the war this study was developed and deepened for English, especially in a series of very good papers by Prof. J. Firbas (Brno University) who discovered various interesting facts in the English word-order, e.g. the conditioning of article using by FSP, transitional component between theme and rheme, hierarchy of the FSP in the whole sentence and in its parts etc. I think, his studies are worth more attention abroad.

The idea of FSP has been applied to other languages as well in the last decade. Thus, we have a recent remarkable monograph "Word-order in Russian" by P. Adamec (Prague 1967, written in Russian). The approach of functional sentence analysis was applied to German in a series of papers by E. Beneš, to Spanish by J. Dubský and to Albanian by P. Novák.

Recently P. Sgall made a valuable theoretical contribution to this problem showing the necessity of incorporating the FSP into the complete language description, because, as he points out, the different word-order is often a grammatical matter (even in languages with the so-called free word-order), or belongs to the facts of language system anyway. It would be unwise to overlook such instances where utterance with different FSP should be regarded not as variants of one sentence, but as two different sentences (utterances), sometimes with different semantic interrelations. Then Sgall makes an

attempt to formulate principles for a formal system including the main features of the FSP into a generative description of a new type. The FSP belongs to the competence of the language users and it is clear that there exists some mechanism of its application internalized by the user of the language. Usually, in the process of generating propositions, the newly attached part has the character of the rheme ·in respect to words standing to the left. And this phenomenon is of recursive nature. Sgall proposes a possible formal description of the mechanism used by the speaker or hearer, in theoremes operating with the procedures of mathematical logics.

The method proposed by Sgall is, I believe, a remarkable contribution to language description by exact methods. At the same time, it is an example of a fruitful combination of the achievements of our structural linguistics with the methods in the newest trends in world linguistics. It is, of course, open to discussion, especially as concerns the ways of formalization.

Another approach to investigation of word-order through the methods of mathematical linguistics (this time not algebraic, but quantitative linguistics) has been attempted by L. Uhlířová in two papers in Prague studies in Mathematical Linguistics, vol. I and II.

Worthwhile reading are, without doubt, the word-order studies by K.Pala, written in Russian in the same volumes of Prague Studies in Mathematical Linguistics.

There is one more syntactic problem in which the way was initiated by Mathesius and developed by the younger generation: it is the so-called condensation of the sentence by a "semi-predicative" construction, i.e replacing of clauses or sentences with full predicativeness by half-predicative means such as participles, gerund, infinitive, which are termed "condensers". This point gets a new importance again in the light of transformational grammar (nominalization, embedding transformations). These questions are explored for English by M. Renský and for Russian in the monograph by V. Hrabě (half-predicative constructions and the condensation of the "second communication" in Russian).

Some partial results have been achieved in a tentative description of Russian syntax by methods not quite identical, but very near to transformational grammar (nearer to Z.S.Harris rather than to Chomsky). This research is conducted by a group in the Russian Department of the Charles University, Prague, by P. Adamec, V. Hrabě, H. Křížková, M. Kubík and others (with my participation). A modified theory of a generative description of sentence structure has been drafted and some particular spheres

described, especially complex sentences, special autonomous adverbial modifiers etc.
The conception of describing the simple sentence in Russian (distinguishing within the
sentence structure: (a) kernel components, (b) non-kernel components = determinants,
(c) dependent parts of complex sentence components - attributes and qualificants, (d)
elements introduced as a result of generalized transformations) was presented (by Adamec
and Hrabě) at the VI Slavists Congress in Prague, in August 1968. The functional approach
is underlying in this theory and real transformations are distinguished here from other
operations changing sentence structure (for a certain purpose in each case):
modifications (expanding the verbal kernel by some modificators), variations (in tenses,
aspects) and permutations (in word-order). A hierarchy in a "syntactic paradigm" is
sought for.

In the last few years, the establishment of a new discipline - theory of
enunciation (or utterance) - comes to the foreground in Czechoslovak linguistics. It
should deal systematically with language facts standing outside the framework of syntax in
the purely grammatical sense, that means a linguistics of la parole is under way, alongside
the study of la langue. From this new sphere, launched by the Prague School theory of
language many years ago, serious papers are now beginning to appear, e.g. some articles
by Prof. K. Hausenblas. Into this category goes the new monograph by M. Grepl, "The
emotionally motivated foregrounding in the syntactic structure of utterance", (Brno 1967).

In this informative survey I have tried to give an image of Czechoslovakian
syntactic investigation in the past forty years, pointing out the development of the
classical Prague School heritage. I would be happy if this might instigate a deeper
interest and more penetrating study of the authors mentioned in my paper by linguists
here in Australia.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adamec P.,   Porjadok slov v russkom jazyke (The Word Order in
                          Russian), Prague 1967.

Bulygina, T.V.,   Pražskaja lingvističeskaja škola (The Prague Linguistic
                          School), in: Osnovny je napravlenija strukturalizma (The
                          Main Directions of Structuralism), Moscow 1964.

Daneš F.,   Intonance a věta ve spisovné češtině (The Sentence
                          Intonation in Standard Czech), Prague 1957.

Daneš F.,   Sentence Intonation from a Functional Point of View,
                          Word 16, 1960, pp.34-54.

Daneš F.,	Syntaktický model a syntaktický vzorec (Syntactic Model and Syntactic Pattern), in: Československé přednášky pro V. mezinár. sjezd slavistů (Czechoslovak Contributions to the Fifth Congress of Slavists), Prague 1963, pp.115-124.
Daneš F.,	A Three-Level Approach to Syntax, in: Travaux Linguistiques de Prague, vol.1, 1964, pp.225-240.
Daneš F.,	Opyt teoretičeskoj interpretacii sintaksičeskoj mnogoznačnosti (An Attempt of Theoretical Interpretation of the Syntactic Ambiguity), Voprosy jazykoznanija, Moscow, 1964, No.6, pp.3-16.
Daneš F.,	Some thoughts on the Semantic Structure of the Sentence, in: Lingua 21 (1968), pp.55-69.
Dokulil M., - Daneš F.,	K tzv. významové a mluvnické stavbě věty (On the So-Called Semantic and Grammatical Structures of the Sentence), in: O vědeckém poznání soudobých jazyků (On the Research into Contemporary Languages), Prague 1958, pp.231-246.
Ďurovič L.,	Modálnosť (The modality), Bratislave 1956.
Firbas J.,	Thoughts on the Communicative Function of the Verb in English, German and Czech, in: Brno Studies in English 1, 1959, pp.39-68.
Firbas J.,	Thoughts on V. Mathesius' Conception of the Word-Order in English Compared with that in Czech, in: Brno Studies in English 4, 1964, pp.111-128.
Firbas J.,	On Defining the Theme in Functional Sentence Analysis, Travaux Linguistiques de Prague 1, 1964, pp.267-280.
Garvin P.L.,	Soviet and East European Linguistics, in: Current Trends in Linguistics III, The Hague 1963, pp.499-522.
Grepl M.,	Emocionálně motivované aktualizace v syntaktické struktuře výpovědi (The Emotionally Motivated Foregrounding in the Syntactic Structure of Utterance), Brno 1967.

Hausenblas K.,	On the Caracterization and Classification of Discourses, in: Travaux Linguistiques de Prague, 1, 1964, pp.63-83.
Havránek B.,	Studie o spisovném Jazyce (Studies on the Literary Standard Language), Prague 1963.
Hrabě V.,	Polovětné vazby a kondenzace "druhého sdělení" v ruštině a češtině (Half-predicative Constructions and the Condensation of the "Second Communication" in Russian and Czech), Prague 1964.
Karcevskij S.,	Sur la phonologie de la phrase (reprinted in A Prague School Reader in Linguistics, 1964, pp.206-251.
Kondrašov N.A.,	Pražskij lingvističeskij kružok (The Prague Linguistic Circle), Moscow 1967.
Kopečný F.,	Základy české skladby (The Foundations of the Czech Syntax), 2nd ed.1964.
Kubík M.,	Iz'jasnitel'nyje konstrukcii i sposoby ich poroždenija (The Content Clauses and the Ways of their Generation), in: Problemy sovremennoj lingvistiki (The Problems of the Modern Linguistics), Prague 1967.
Kubík M.,	Uslovnje konstrukcii i sistema složnogo predloženija (Conditional Clauses and the System of the Complex Sentence in: Studies of the Pedagogical Faculty of Charles University, Prague 1967.
Mathesius V.,	On Some problems of the Systematic Analysis of Grammar, in: Travaux du Cercle linguistique de Prague 6, 1936.
Mathesius V.,	Základní funkce českého pořádku slov (The Basic Function of the Czech Word-Order), A Prague School Reader in Linguistics, 1964.
Mathesius V.,	Obsahový rozbor současné angličtiny na obecnělingvistickém základě (The Contents Analysis of Modern English on a General Linguistics Basis), Prague 1964.
Mrázek R.,	Sintaksis russkogo tvoritel'nogo (The Syntax of the Russian Instrumental Case), Prague 1964.
Neustupny J.V.,	On the Analysis of Linguistic Vagueness, in: Travaux Linguistiques de Prague 2, 1966, pp.39-51.

Novák P., O prostředcích aktuálního členění (On the Means of Functional Sentence Perspective), Acta Universitatis Carolinae, <u>Philologica Pragensia</u> 1, 1959, pp.9-15.

Novák P., On the Three-Level Approach to Syntax, in: <u>Travaux Linguistiques de Prague</u> 2, 1966, pp.219-224.

Pala K., O nekotorych problemach aktual'nogo členenija (On Some Problems of the Functional Sentence Perspective), in: <u>Prague Studies in Mathematical Linguistics</u> 1, 1966, pp.81-92.

Pala K., Otnošeńije meždu porjadkom slov i aktual'nym členenijem (The Relation between the Word-Order and Functional Sentence Perspective), in: <u>Prague Studies in Mathematical Linguistics</u> 2, 1967, pp.51-64.

Pauliny E., La phrase et l'énonciation, in <u>Recueil Linguistique de Bratislava</u> 1, 1948, reprinted in <u>A Prague School Reader in Linguistics</u>, 1964, pp.391-397.

Sgall P., Functional Sentence Perspective in a Generative Description, in: <u>Prague Studies in Mathematical Linguistics</u> 2, 1967, pp. 203-225.

Sgall P., <u>Generativní popis jazyka a česká deklinace</u> (Generative Description of Language and the Czech Declension), Prague 1967.

Skalička V., The Need for a Linguistics of "la parole", in: <u>Recueil Linguistique de Bratislava</u> 1, 1948, reprinted in <u>A Prague School Reader in Linguistics</u>, 1964, pp.375-390.

Skalička V., Das Wesen der Morphologie un der Syntax, in: Acta Universitatis Carolinae, <u>Philologica, Slavica Pragensia</u> IV, 1962, pp.123-127.

Šmilauer V., <u>Novočeská skladba</u> (Modern Czech Syntax), Prague 2nd ed., 1966.

Uhlířová L., Statistics of the Word Order of Direct Object in Czech, in: <u>Prague Studies in Mathematical Linguistics</u> 2, 1967, pp.37-49.

Vachek J. - Dubský J.,	Dictionnaire de linguistique de l'École de Prague, Utrecht 1960.
Vachek J.,	A Prague School Reader in Linguistics, Indiana University Press, Bloomington 1964.
Vachek J.,	The Linguistic School of Prague (especially Chapter V., Problems of Syntax), Bloomington 1966.
Zimek R.,	Problematika spony v ruštině v porovnání s češtinou (The Problematics of the Copula in Russian as Compared to Czech), Prague 1963.
Zimek R.,	Druhy syntaktické transformace v ruštině (The Kinds of Syntactic Transformation in Russian), in : Bulletin Ústavu ruského jazyka a literatury, X, Prague 1966, pp.214-225.
Zimek R.,	Osnovnyje strukturnyje tipy prostogo predloženija v sovremennom russkom literaturnom jazyke (The basic structural types of simple sentences in Present-Day Russian), in: Melbourne Slavonic Studies 2 (1968) pp.39-62.
Zimek R.,	Větné typy v současné ruštině z hlediska transformační gramatiky (Sentence Types in Present-Day Russian from the Transformational Standpoint) in: Otazky slovanske syntaxe (Problems of Slavic Syntax) II, Brno 1968, pp. 229-242.