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I. INTRODUCTION

1. Purpose and Scope

The purpose of this study is twofold: first, to collate a method for dealing with word-order and functional sentence perspective in Russian and English; second, to analyze the prevalent word-order patterns in Russian and to contrast them against their English equivalents.

The term 'word-order' is used here in the sense of 'the order of sentence components', i.e., of the subject group, verb group, object group, and adverbial groups, as, e.g., in Adamec (1966:5-7). As for 'functional sentence perspective', the study deals mainly with bipartition of the sentence into the thematic and non-thematic components, rather than with the degrees of communicative dynamism of the individual sentence elements. The analysis is further limited to deal only with the syntactic structures that correspond to the simple declarative binomial sentences (prostye povestvovatel'nye dvusostavnye predloženiya) in the Russian texts. The data is taken from Soviet short stories with published English translations.

2. Relationship between Word-Order and Functional Sentence Perspective

Functional sentence perspective (FSP) pertains to what is often called the 'psychological' or 'logical' level of the sentence (cf. Panfilov 1971:138). In Russian, this is best known as 'actual (or 'functional') sentence analysis' (i.e., aktual'noe členenie predloženiya,

There are numerous other terminological equivalents and related concepts, most of which throw some light on one or the other aspect of the so-called psychological structure of the sentence. In this respect the terms of interest to the present study are: 'linear modification' (Bolinger 1952); 'point of view', 'underlying question' (Hatcher 1956:5); 'dynamic structure' (i.e., dinamičeskaja struktura, as in Čičagov 1959); 'logical analysis' (i.e., logičeskoe, smyslovoe členenie, cf. GRJa 1960:90); 'information-bearing structure of the sentence' (cf. Garvin 1963:502n5); 'actual sentence bipartition' (cf. Dahl 1969:7); 'communicative structure' (i.e., kommunikativnaja struktura, cf. Gak 1968:70); 'contextual segmentation of the sentence', 'thematic organization of the utterance' (cf. Danes 1971:145); 'communicative intention' (cf. Kirkwood 1969:85).

In Russian, which may still be considered basically a synthetic language (cf. Reformatskij 1967:316), word-order is generally said to be relatively free. This is especially evident on the level of the sentence components (see III.2.1)--in fact, it may even be said that there are no restrictions on this level, since even in cases like:

```
bytie opredeljaet soznanie
existence (Nom./Acc.) determines consciousness (Nom./Acc.)
```

the syntactic function of word-order is not absolute, but depends on the co-operation of other factors, notably the context. Hence, given a six-component sentence, it may be potentially presented in 720 (6 factorial)
different ways. In stylized language, e.g., poetry, the differences in linear arrangements may be due to rhyme or rhythm, but in what might be called 'everyday prose' ('povsednevnaja proza'), i.e., the language used basically for communicative purposes, word-order would be governed by the communicative importance of individual elements, i.e., by FSP.

Although the relationship between word-order and FSP is not a recent discovery (see II.2.), the wide acceptance of that notion can be limited in time to only the current generation of linguists. Thus, in his introduction to the 1960 edition of the Academy Grammar, V.V. Vinogradov notes the importance of FSP for word-order in Russian (GRJa 1960:90), but the main body of the Grammar as yet leaves this issue aside. In contrast, the new (1970), revised edition not only acknowledges the importance of FSP by opening its chapter on word-order with the statement "Word-order in the sentence is connected with the communicative intention", but subsequently deals with word-order only in terms of FSP (cf. GSRLJa 1970:596-610, 616-21).

As for Contemporary English, which is considered no longer a synthetic, but rather an analytic language, word-order is determined basically by the syntactic and coherence principles (cf. Firbas 1957:73). Thus, the signalization of FSP is in the main left to certain other means, e.g., the articles, sentences with the 'preparatory there' (cf. Barxudarov 1966:190-1), 'the splitting sentence' (Firbas 1967:145n5), etc.

Nevertheless, word-order cannot be divorced from FSP even in languages like English:

... 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. (Firbas 1957:94)

It is obvious, then, that an adequate translation of a sentence not only has to be equivalent semantically (cf. Xolodovič 1966:10), but should also have the same FSP, i.e., the same communicative intention (cf. Pumpjanskij 1972:66). A comparison of word-order in Russian and English would therefore bring into focus the different means by which FSP is expressed.

The study also owes much to Promysl Adamec, another 'Praguean', for the methodology of the combined presentation of the abstract schemes of word-order and FSP, and for his notions on the application of the theory of FSP specifically to Russian. These are set out in his monograph Zorjašok slov v sovremennom russkom jazyke (Word-Order in Contemporary Russian) which may still be considered, as Dahl (1969:7) has noted, "one of the . . . most systematic papers in the field".

Firbas's approach is chosen here not only for his prolific contributions to the theory in question, but also because, in my view, he comes the closest to actually explaining the phenomenon of the 'psychological' structure of the sentence. Granted that Firbas is not explicitly preoccupied with meeting the formal requirements of an analysis in the Chomskian vein, I would nevertheless venture to note in Chomsky's terms, that Firbas's approach allows one to transcend the empirical level, touching not only on the descriptive, but also on the explanatory adequacies of grammar (cf. Chomsky 1965:26-7).

Firbas has been developing his theory in over a score of publications spanning some sixteen years. His publications have always been limited in scope, and, to my mind, no single work of his is sufficiently
II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

1. Firbas; Adamec

For analyzing the so-called psychological structure of the sentence, this study adopts the theoretical framework of Jan Firbas, a 'Prague School' linguist. The study also owes much to Přemysl Adamec, another 'Praguean', for the methodology of the combined presentation of the abstract schemes of word-order and FSP, and for his notions on the application of the theory of FSP specifically to Russian. These are set out in his monograph Porjadok slov v sovremennom russkom jazyke (Word-Order in Contemporary Russian) which may still be considered, as Dahl (1969:7) has noted, "one of the . . . most systematic papers in the field".

Firbas's approach is chosen here not only for his prolific contributions to the theory in question, but also because, in my view, he comes the closest to actually explaining the phenomenon of the 'psychological' structure of the sentence. Granted that Firbas is not explicitly preoccupied with meeting the formal requirements of an analysis in the Chomskian vein, I would nevertheless venture to note in Chomsky's terms, that Firbas's approach allows one to transcend the empirical level, touching not only on the descriptive, but also on the explanatory adequacies of grammar (cf. Chomsky 1965:24-7).

Firbas has been developing his theory in over a score of publications spanning some sixteen years. His publications have always been limited in scope, and, to my mind, no single work of his is sufficiently comprehensive for the reader to adequately appreciate his theory. A digression on my understanding of studies in the theory of FSP would therefore be pertinent.
comprehensive for the reader to adequately appreciate his theory. A digression on my understanding of the salient points in the theory of FSP would therefore be pertinent.

2. Historical Note

Firbas (1957:72) traces the roots of his theory to H. Weil's monograph De l'ordre des mots dans les langues anciennes comparées aux langues modernes (1844) in which

. . . Weil has demonstrated the importance of the principle according to which the order of words is determined by the progression of ideas . . . the most natural and unemotive order being that proceeding from what is known to what is unknown. . . . 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.

Weil's concepts were taken up and developed by V. Mathesius, "the founder of the Prague school" (Firbas 1966:239), who avoided the psychological premises on which other scholars, e.g., H. Gabelentz, F.F. Fortunatov, relied in dealing with this phenomenon (cf. Panfilov 1971:138-45). Mathesius distinguished the grammatical structure of the sentence, or "what is generally called parsing" (Firbas 1957:72), from the "information-bearing structure of the sentence" (Garvin 1963:502n5) which, when writing in Czech, Mathesius referred to as aktuální členění větné (whence the Russian term aktuel'noe členienie predloženija). In one of his German articles Mathesius spoke in terms of 'Satzperspektive', and it is from here that Firbas (1964a:117) arrived at his English version 'functional sentence perspective'.
3. Communicative Dynamism

A common feature among the various approaches to the analysis of the 'psychological' structure of the sentence is the distinction between the 'theme' and the 'rheme' of the sentence, or tema, rema in Russian (cf. Lapteva 1972:38). Some of the terminological equivalents for the theme-rheme opposition are: 'topic - comment' (cf. Daneš 1967:500); 'basis - core' (i.e., osnova - jadro, as in Adamec 1966:20); 'given - new' (i.e., dannoe - novoe, as in Krušel'nickaja 1956:58); 'logical or psychological subject - logical or psychological predicate' (cf. Panfilov 1971:138); 'auxiliary information - main information' (i.e., vspomogatel'naja informacija - osnovnaja informacija, as in Pumpjanski 1972:66).

The theme is generally considered to consist of the sentence elements that can be inferred from the context or the situation, or "that which in the given communicative intention constitutes the starting point of an utterance" (GSRLJa 1970:596)--and the rheme as the 'new' part of the sentence, "that which is being said about the theme" (GSRLJa 1970:596), or, generally, that which in the given communicative intention constitutes the core of the sentence. Such notions on the theme and rheme are basically correct. But the vagueness of "that which in the given communicative intention constitutes the starting point or the core" needs no comment. And even the criterion of 'context-givenness' or 'newness', and more so of the 'inference from the situation', may often present difficulties in its interpretation (see further).

This is where the advantage of Firbas's approach comes to light. He would explain the division of the sentence into theme and
rHEME in terms of the degrees of 'communicative dynamism' (CD), the
lowest degree of CD corresponding to the theme-proper and the highest to
the rheme-proper (cf. Firbas 1964b:270,272). True, the concept of the
relation between the 'psychological' parts of the sentence and the
degrees of CD has been known to other scholars independently of Firbas
(cf. smyslovoj ves in Kružel'nickaja 1956:55). The importance of Firbas's
contribution is that he is able to explain the difference between theme
and rheme in concrete terms of the communicative function of language,
rather than in terms of such vague concepts as 'intention', 'sense' (i.e.,
smysl), etc. And concerning the view that Firbas touches on the explana-
tory adequacy of grammar, I see it in his postulations for predicting the
degree of CD in terms of the prosodic, semantic, and linear structures of
the sentence and the linguistic context within which the sentence occurs.

The communicative function is incorporated in most definitions
of language, e.g., "Language is a purely human and non-instinctive method
of communicating ideas, emotions, and desires by means of a system of
voluntary produced symbols" (Sapir 1949:8). Language can thus be viewed
as consisting of 'communicative fields'. A field in turn comprises
'communicative units' which formally correspond to the linguistic
elements that convey information about facts of objective (extra-
linguistic) reality (cf. Trnka 1967:2053). These elements develop, or
"push" the communication forward, and since the development, or "pushing"
of the communication is not a static, but a dynamic phenomenon, the
elements are thought of as being 'communicatively dynamic', or as
'carriers of communicative dynamism' (cf. Firbas 1966:240; Svoboda 1968:
55,57,58).
4. 'Perspective'

Not all elements share equally in contributing to the development of the communication. Some elements may merely provide a setting for the event being discussed, some may re-state the topic of the discussion so as to facilitate orientation: such elements contribute but little to the actual development of the discourse, i.e., of the communication. On the other hand, there are elements that make a substantial contribution to this development, and, as will be shown below, it is even possible to isolate the element that carries the highest degree of CD within a given communicative field. Although the linear order of the elements may be restricted, e.g., in languages with a 'fixed' word-order, the distribution of the intensity of CD, i.e., the linear arrangement of the degrees of CD, seems to have no such restriction at least in the Indo-European, if not in all known languages (Firbas 1968:39n12). Since it may appear in various arrangements, any given distribution of degrees of CD "makes the field in question function [in the act of communication] in a definite kind of PERSPECTIVE" (Firbas 1967:142; my emphasis).

Distributional fields (being concerned mainly with the 'perspective', i.e., with the distribution of CD, Firbas (1968:42n41) talks in terms of the 'distributional', rather than the 'communicative' field of Svoboda) correspond to various levels of grammatical structure: "In providing distributional fields, grammatical structure as it were, cuts longer or shorter sections out from the linear flow of the discourse" (Firbas 1967:142). The "longer sections" refer to the distributional fields "of a paragraph, chapter, or of an entire article or book. Even such fields are in the end set off by grammatical structure" (Firbas
1967:142). The "shorter sections", on the other hand, refer to the grammatical structures with an implicit predication, "e.g., such as are provided by attributive words and phrases and their headwords" (Firbas 1967:142; cf. also Svoboda 1968:50-1). It would therefore be possible to deal in terms of functional perspective of the paragraph and higher orders on the one hand, and of functional perspective of the semipredicative constructions and lower orders on the other.

The basic type of distributional field, however, is taken to be that which is provided by the minimal grammatical structure with an explicit predication, i.e., the simple sentence or clause. The reason for choosing this particular structure as basic becomes apparent once the role of the semantic structure and of the context played in the distribution of degrees of CD has been considered. (Briefly, the roles are:

first, that the interpretation of semantic relations depends largely on the nature of the verb, which alone has the essential categories for expressing explicit predication; second, the operation of the context in eliminating distributional fields (as in 'second-instance sentences') does not normally extend beyond the boundaries of the sentence--cf. Firbas 1967:144).

As used in the term 'FSP', the essence of the notion of 'perspective' is perhaps best expressed in the following remark:

In connection with rises and falls in CD within the sentence, it is perhaps not quite inappropriate to think of a relief-map showing the elevations and depressions of the earth's surface. In examining the rises and falls in CD and the subsequent levels, or even peaks of CD attained by the various sentence elements, we are, in a sense, 'relief-mapping' the sentence. And we do not think it an exaggeration to maintain that such 'relief-mapping' may promote better knowledge of the function of language in the very act of communication. (Firbas 1961:97n6.)
(The parallel between "relief-mapping" and "rises and falls in CD" would perhaps be seen more readily, if one remembers Svoboda's view of the sentence as constituting a 'communicative field'.)

Firbas illustrates the 'perspective' by assigning numerical values to the linguistic elements according to their degree of CD: the higher the degree, the higher the number. At the same time, Firbas (1970a:744) emphasizes that "the degrees (amounts) of CD do not constitute multiples of some basic unit or quantity of information. They are to be understood in terms of mutual relations of the elements in regard to CD within a distributional field." Here are some illustrations from Firbas (1959a:42-3; (4) and (5) are mine):

1. Father has gone for a walk with John.
2. A haze hovered over the prospect.
3. She did not want him.
4. Am I hungry?
5. They have it under control.

(The numerical values are explained in more detail below.) It is evident from these examples that the curve formed by the values of the degrees of CD can be of various shapes. In (1) it is a gradual rise, in (2) a gradual fall, in (3) a 'peak', in (4) a 'trough', in (5) a series of 'peaks' and 'troughs' ('peak' and 'trough' are terms applied to 'communicative loads' by Nida 1964:141-2). It follows that a sentence may have a specific kind of perspective that need not be repeated in another sentence.
5. **Theme, Transition, Rheme**

The numerical values used by Firbas fall into three sets: 10s, 20s, 30s.

The 10s constitute the theme of the sentence. Thematic elements are those which contribute but little to the development of communication. They provide a setting for an event, reiterate something from the preceding context (or point at something in the speech situation) for the benefit of the hearer's orientation, or they may even introduce a new topic which is being elaborated on in the same sentence. The least dynamic element within the theme, and therefore within the entire sentence, is called 'theme-proper'.

The counterpart of theme-proper, i.e., the most dynamic element within the entire sentence, is called 'rheme-proper'. (Rheme-proper is more readily understood in terms of the prosodic structure of the sentence: it is the word that carries the so-called logical stress, on which see further.) As with the thematic section of the sentence, apart from rheme-proper there may be other rhematic elements which also significantly contribute to the development of the discourse. The entire section consisting of rheme-proper and any other rhematic elements is called the 'rhematic section', or simply the 'rheme' of the sentence. It is on account of this section of the sentence that the speaker (or writer) is motivated to deliver his utterance. In other words, the rheme constitutes the core of the communicative purpose of the sentence. Since rhematic elements are the most dynamic in the sentence, Firbas gives them the highest numerical values, viz., the 30s.

The 20s designate the elements that, in regard to the amount of
CD carried, rank "above theme on the one hand, and below rheme on the other" (Firbas 1965:171). The section of the sentence made up of these elements is called 'transition', and the element with the least CD within the transition is called 'transition-proper'. Although transition-proper is like theme-proper insofar as they both convey the lowest degree of CD within their sections, the essential characteristic of transition-proper is that it functions as the lowest limit of the non-thematic section of the entire sentence (Firbas 1970a:743). It is important to bear this feature in mind when comparing the approach of Firbas with other approaches, e.g., of Adamec (1966) or Kovtunova (1969), where the communicative analysis of the sentence is considered only in terms of thematic and non-thematic dichotomy, by-passing the notion of transition.

As for the numerical values within the parts of the trichotomy, Firbas assigns zero to the digital place when there is no further differentiation within the theme, transition, or rheme, i.e., when the entire part of the trichotomy functions as theme-proper (10), transition-proper (20), or rheme-proper (30). If, however, there is a further differentiation, the lowest degree within the section that shows the differentiation has '1' in the digital place of its numerical value, and the rest of the elements have '2', '3', etc.

Although the investigation in the present study, rather than involving the recognition of the entire gamut of degrees of CD between the theme-proper and rheme-proper, is limited to the analysis of mainly the thematic and non-thematic components, the rather detailed digression above on the individual carriers of CD is nevertheless warranted. These are the details which, in my view, not only help the student of FSP in his evaluation of the entire thematic and non-thematic sections of the
sentence, but also substantially remove the element of arbitrariness (especially when the correlation of the degrees of CD with the prosodic weight is considered, cf. Firbas 1968, 1969, 1970b) for which the theorist of FSP is occasionally criticized (cf. Francis 1963, 1966).

6. **FSP Defined**

To this point in the present study, the phenomenon of FSP has been referred to in broad terms as an account of the 'psychological' components within the sentence. Now that communicative dynamism (CD), perspective, theme, transition, and rheme have been discussed, a more precise definition can be given: "FSP is the distribution of degrees of CD over the elements within the sentence" (Firbas 1966:241). FSP can also be defined in terms of theme, transition, and rheme, which are merely sentence elements grouped according to the intensity (degrees) of CD carried by them: 'FSP is the account of the linear distribution of the thematic, transitional, and rhematic elements within the sentence.'

7. **Means of FSP**

The degree of CD of the elements, and therefore the 'perspective' itself, is signalled by an interplay of various means provided by language. The means are: the ordering of sentence elements, the context within which the sentence occurs, the semantic, and prosodic structures of the sentence.

The first two examples also show how the sentence elements 'John' and 'walk' are subjected to variation in their degrees of CD by the operation of FSP:
7.1 Word-Order Means of FSP (Basic Distribution of CD)

The foremost of the FSP means is the ordering of the sentence elements. However, its importance lies not so much in the sphere of determining the degrees of CD, as in the theoretical basis for the entire concept of FSP. Linearity, or to be more specific, D. Bolinger's (1952) concept of 'linear modification', forms the basic assumption on which Firbas (1966:240) develops his theory:

... it is in accordance both with the character of human thought and with the linear character of the sentence that sentence elements follow each other according to the amount (degree) of communicative dynamism (=CD) they convey, starting with the lowest and gradually passing on to the highest.

Developing Mathesius's views on this point, Firbas notes throughout his works that a consistent theme - transition - rheme sequence is the most natural arrangement of elements in non-emotive, relaxed speech. For that reason a distribution of CD that begins with the lowest degree and gradually proceeds to the highest is called by Firbas (1959a:42) the 'basic distribution of CD':

If not interfered with by other means, WORD-ORDER creates what we call the basic distribution of CD. This means that in distributing CD the sentence positions as they follow each other from beginning to end, tend to run through the basic gamut, starting with theme proper and finishing with rheme proper. The sentence then stands in consistent theme - rhyme perspective. Cf.

Father_{10} has_{21} gone_{22} for a walk_{31} with John_{32},
Father_{10} has_{21} gone_{22} with John_{31} for a walk_{32},
John_{10} has been_{21} taken_{22} out_{23} for a walk_{31} by Father_{32}.

The first two examples also show how the sentence elements "John" and "walk" are subjected to variation in their degrees of CD by the operation
of the 'basic distribution'.

Every position in the sentence may thus be thought of as having an ability to impart a certain amount of CD to the element placed in it, the amount being greater, the nearer the position is to the end of the sentence. It is evident even from the term 'basic distribution of CD' that other, non-basic, distributions exist. Deviations from the basic distribution occur on account of emotiveness, grammatical requirements, or for stylistic purposes, e.g., for rhyme or rhythm. If basic distribution is natural to non-emotive, relaxed speech, one of the ways to indicate emotiveness then, is to deviate from the usual pattern of word-order, i.e., to disturb the consistent theme - rheme sequence of the sentence.

This principle applies particularly to Slavic languages, but only to a certain extent in English (cf. Firbas 1964a:117-22). Thus, provided that in each of the following two sentences:

(6) udivilsja starik

(7) starik udivilsja

then (6) will be an expressive variant of (7) (Adamec 1966:55).

In English, however, deviations from basic distribution occur usually not on account of emotiveness or style, but on account of the relative rigidity of the grammatical structure, e.g., the subject - verb - object pattern when case relations are morphologically unexpressed. Thus, Firbas's (1959a:42-3) examples:

(8) A haze hovered over the prospect.
show a marked deviation from the basic distribution of CD, and yet these sentences cannot be considered anything but stylistically neutral. On the contrary, what might be considered an expressive variant of (9):

(9a) Him\textsubscript{12} she\textsubscript{11} did\textsubscript{21} not\textsubscript{32} want\textsubscript{31} him\textsubscript{12}

is closer to the basic distribution than the original, neutral variant. (Admittedly, (9a) would require much poetic license, and even then could be used only in a restricted context, as with "him Ye scarce can over-praise", cited in Jespersen 1933:135.)

This may seem to contradict Firbas's primary assumption that basic distribution of CD is in accordance with the linear character of both the human thought and the sentence in non-emotive speech. However, there is yet ample evidence that, grammar permitting, the elements in an English sentence still tend to be arranged according to the basic distribution of CD, as, e.g., illustrated in Firbas's (1959a:42) examples:

(10) Father\textsubscript{10} has\textsubscript{21} gone\textsubscript{22} for a walk\textsubscript{31} with John\textsubscript{32}.

(11) Father\textsubscript{10} has\textsubscript{21} gone\textsubscript{22} with John\textsubscript{31} for a walk\textsubscript{32}.

Further support for the resolution of the seeming contradiction is the relative abundance of various passive constructions in modern English (cf. Firbas 1966:239) which have their sentence elements arranged according to the basic distribution of CD, whereas their active voice counterparts would run counter to or at least deviate from the basic distribution. For example, Adamec notes that in translating a sentence like:
where Petra has been given by the context, "one should resort to the passive voice", viz.:

(13) Peter_10 was_21 bitten_22 by a dog_30,

rather than the active voice variant:

(14) A dog_30 bit_20 Peter_10.

It was noted in connection with Weil's observation, although in somewhat different terms, that the extent of application of the principle of the basic distribution of CD would vary from language to language. In Russian this principle is still dominant for word-order, but in English it became substantially restricted in the course of historical development, in which English took to analytic expression of its syntactic relations. This does not mean, however, that English is no longer susceptible to FSP, for such a claim would imply that the language has lost its power of communication. It is necessary to recall that word-order, however important, is not the only means available in language for imposing a certain perspective upon the sentence, but that ultimately the perspective is achieved through an interplay of the prosodic, linear, semantic, and contextual means. The loss of word-order flexibility in English necessitated greater reliance on other FSP means, in particular on the semantic structure of the sentence. Such reorganizations had repercussions elsewhere, e.g., on the "shift towards nominal expression" which was shown by Firbas (1961:90) to be related to the need for an increased contribution from the semantic structure in its FSP role and "to be a
satisfactory compensation for the possibilities offered in other languages by relatively free word-orders".

7.2 Context Means of FSP

The operation of the context as an FSP means consists in lowering the CD of elements that can be inferred from it. The lowering of CD is carried to the extent that, regardless of the linear position, context-given elements become lower in their degree of CD than any contextually unaffected element within the same sentence. Context-given elements are therefore essentially thematic in the presence of 'new' elements in the sentence: "Thus in 'He wanted to please Mary', 'Mary' will be rhematic or thematic according to whether it has not or actually has been mentioned in the preceding context" (Firbas 1966:240). From this example we see that "Mary" can become thematic despite its basically (i.e., according to the basic distribution of CD) rhematic position. It follows that in determining the degrees of CD, context is a 'stronger' FSP means than is word-order.

The depth of the context seems to have no boundary: it may be the preceding word, sentence, paragraph, book (cf. Pala 1966:82). In general, one must agree with Svoboda (1968:54), who notes that "Contextual dependence is a rather complex phenomenon." A few illustrations of what is understood by contextual dependence would therefore be pertinent.

An explicit case of contextual dependence may be exemplified as follows:

(15) [Father$_{11}$ has$_{21}$ gone$_{22}$ with John$_{31}$ downtown$_{32}$, promising that]

later$_{11}$ in the afternoon$_{12}$ he$_{13}$ will$_{21}$ take$_{22}$ Mary$_{30}$ downtown$_{14}$. 
As we saw in (11), "downtown" in the first sentence of (15) should be rheme-proper because of its sentence-final position, which, all things being equal, imparts the highest degree of CD in the sentence. In the second sentence, however, "downtown", being clearly known from the context, becomes thematic, despite its sentence-final position. Moreover, the explicitness of contextual dependence would remain (or perhaps even increase), if instead of "downtown" the second sentence contained a pronoun:

(16) ... he \( _{13} \) will \( _{21} \) take \( _{22} \) Mary \( _{30} \) there \( _{14} \). \n
An example of a less obvious contextual dependence is:

(17) Then perhaps there'll just be time for a cigarette. . . . I'm longing for a smoke.

Here the words "cigarette" and "smoke" are evidently related, but are not necessarily synonymous. Still, in this context "smoke" is to be taken as contextually affected (Firbas 1969:53-4). In this respect, Svoboda's (1968:54) note on the 'semantic context' is illuminating:

We distinguish between grammatical context and semantic context, subsuming under the former the repetition of grammatical formations and under the latter the semantic affinity of naming elements (elements naming or referring to some part of the extra-linguistic reality). These two kinds of contexts co-operate with each other, the result of their co-operation being a certain degree of contextual dependence.

A still less explicit instance of contextual dependence is the notion of the 'thematic layer', exemplified by the following passage from K. Mansfield, quoted and commented on by Firbas (1966:251-2):
"A heavy dew had fallen. The grass was blue. Big drops hung on the bushes and just did not fall; the silvery fluffy toi-toi was limp on its long stalks, and all the marigolds and the pinks in the bungalow gardens were bowed to the earth with wetness. Drenched were the cold fuchsias, round pearls of dew lay on the flat nasturtium leaves."

... [the underlined words] denote objects making up the scene of Crescent Bay ... The name of the bay is known from the opening of the story, occurring about eight lines earlier than the beginning of the extract. In this respect all the [underlined] expressions are linked up with the preceding context and are contextually dependent. ... In this way, a distinct THEMATIC LAYER is effected. It presents a scene, which is depicted as soaked by a heavy dew. [The notion of wetness thus presenting the RHEMATIC LAYER.]

On the other hand, an element that may seem to be contextually dependent need not be taken as such. For example, assuming that in:

(19) Peter\textsubscript{10} turned\textsubscript{20} to Mary\textsubscript{30}

both "Peter" and "Mary" are known from the context, only "Peter" is to be understood as thematic, while "Mary", functioning in the semantic amplification of a new development in the discourse, viz., Peter's turning, is no longer thematic, but in the example at hand, it actually becomes rheme-proper. Thus, what often matters in understanding contextual dependence is the way the elements are 'presented' as contextually dependent or independent in accordance with the communicative intention of the speaker-writer:

Strictly speaking, CONTEXTUAL DEPENDENCE OR INDEPENDENCE IS DETERMINED BY what I have called THE NARROW SCENE, i.e. in fact, THE VERY PURPOSE OF THE COMMUNICATION. Thus in the sentence "John has gone up to the window", "the window" may be well known from the preceding context, but the purpose of the communication being the expression of the direction of the movement, "the window" necessarily appears contextually independent. (Firbas 1970a:742; my emphasis.)
A sentence may admit any number of contextually dependent elements, as long as at least one element is presented as or actually is unaffected by the context and functions as rheme-proper. Sentences with an extreme degree of contextual dependence, i.e., such that have only one element unaffected by the context, usually serve to contrast some linguistic element (which may even be sub-morphemic, cf. Firbas 1970a: 741-2) with a parallel element in the preceding context. For example:

(20) A: John is reading the local paper.
    B: You mean, John was reading the local paper.

(Adapted from Firbas 1970a:742.) Here the rheme-proper of the second sentence is merely the time exponent expressed through an auxiliary verb, while the rest of the sentence functions as an extended theme-proper. Sentences of this kind, viz., consisting of an extended theme-proper and a one-element rheme, are referred to after Bolinger (1952:1123) as 'second instance' sentences. It would be possible to establish intermediate degrees of contextual dependence of the entire sentence between the first and the second instances, as was suggested by Firbas (1959a:52-3) and is apparently awaiting further development.

In addition to the lexical context, contextual dependence may also be determined by the extra-linguistic speech situation. An object may become contextually dependent without there necessarily being a lexical reference, if one of the participants of discourse merely points at it, or if at the time of the discourse the object makes itself felt, e.g., by affecting the visual or the hearing senses. To account both for the lexical context and the extra-linguistic situation, the term
'consituation' (con[text]-situation) is sometimes used (cf. Adamec 1966:20). Thus, referring to the context as 'linguistic or extra-linguistic environment' (jazykovoe ili vnejazykovoe okruženie), K. Pala asserts that "In actual linguistic communication there are no contextually independent utterances."^{5} Although it is conceivable that sometimes even in the written language the extra-linguistic speech situation may be present (e.g., it seems that the notion of "the Crescent Bay effecting a 'distinct thematic layer'", as illustrated in (18), verges on the border of the concept of the 'extra-linguistic situation'), for Firbas (1970a:744) there do exist sentences without contextual dependence, where the thematic nature of elements, in addition to the basic distribution of CD, is signalled by the semantic structure of the sentence.

7.3 Semantic Means of FSP

In this study the semantic means of FSP are broken down into three groups called here as the 'primary', 'additional', and 'special' semantic means.

7.3.1 Primary Semantic Means

The reference in (19) to "semantic amplification of a new development" and to "direction of movement" (i.e., "Peter's turning") has in fact introduced the notion of the operation of the semantic structure of the sentence as an FSP means. By 'semantic structure of the sentence' Firbas (1970a:742) understands "the semantic contents of the elements and the semantic relations into which they enter".

The operation of the semantic means is in a way similar to the operation of the word-order means of FSP: just as any sentence position
has an inherently higher or lower degree of CD with respect to other sentence positions, so certain semantic contents have inherently higher or lower degrees of CD in relation to the semantic contents of other elements. Another similarity is that both these FSP means are inferior to the operation of the context which renders the affected elements thematic regardless of their sentence position or semantic contents.

The most important principles of the operation of the semantic structure of the sentence as a means of FSP are:

If contextually independent, an object will carry a higher degree of CD than the finite verb. This is because the former expresses an essential amplification of the latter, and consequently becomes communicatively more important. . . . similarly, a contextually independent adverbial element of place will exceed in CD a verb expressing motion. Indicating the direction of the motion, the adverbial element is communicatively more important than the verb. . . . As to the subjects of the two discussed grammatical structures, each will carry a lower degree of CD than the verb and/or object/adverbial element of place provided, either the verb or the object/adverbial element of place, or both are contextually independent. This is understandable, for a known or unknown agent expressed by the subject appears to be communicatively less important than an unknown goal (expressed by the object or the adverbial element of place) at or towards which the action is directed. . . . The situation is different if the subject is accompanied by a verb expressing 'existence or appearance on the scene' and possibly also by an adverbial element of place or time. Under these circumstances, provided the subject is contextually independent, it will carry the highest degree of CD. This is understandable, for an unknown person or thing appearing on the scene is communicatively more important than the act of appearing and the scene itself, i.e. the local and temporal settings. . . . If, however, the subject of the discussed semantic and grammatical structure is contextually dependent, a contextually independent adverbial element of time or place becomes an important local or temporal specification, exceeding in CD both the subject and the finite verb. (Firbas 1970b:28B.)

The FSP characteristics of the semantic contents as described above are not restricted only to English, but are likely to be valid in all Indo-European languages (Firbas 1969:49).
It should be possible to work out, as Pala (1967:58) demonstrates, a limited number of semantic schemes which would represent the essential skeletons of the various types of sentences in language. Rearranging Pala's examples so that the semantic contents follow each other progressively according to the degree of CD, such schemes would look as follows:

subject - possession - quality
subject - action - object
subject - motion - direction
subject - action - manner

place/time - existence - subject

(In the last scheme the positions of "place/time" and "subject" change, if "subject" is context-given, while "place/time" is new--cf. Firbas as quoted above.)

It seems, however, that the essential mechanism of the operation of the semantic means can be reduced to a formulaic representation, as follows:

(21) Setting $\prec$ V esse $\prec$ Subject $\prec$ V non-esse $\prec$ FRA.

The sign "\prec" denotes here 'element on the left is communicatively less dynamic than element on the right'; "esse" denotes 'existence' (in broad terms--for details see 7.312).

7.311 'Setting' stands for any sentence component that has the semantic content of temporal or local background for the event discussed in the same sentence; such backgrounds are sometimes referred to as
'situational adverbs' (cf. Dvořáková 1964:129). Grammatically they are expressed either by adverbs, e.g., 'now', 'here', or by adverbial phrases, e.g., 'at the Club', 'on Sunday', as in:

(22) I'll never use the lift at the Club

(23) If you've nothing better to do on Sunday

(from Dvořáková 1964:133). The examples show that, although the situational adverbs are in the sentence final position and, as Dvořáková informs, are independent from the context, their degree of CD is rather small. However, if such situational adverbs are extended by a clause, a series of homogeneous adverbials, or simply by a number of attributes, as in:

(24) this guard of men, all attached to the dead by the bond of kinship, was an impressive and singular sight in the great city of London with its overwhelming diversity of life, its innumerable vocations, pleasures, duties, its terrible hardness, its terrible call to individualism

(from Dvořáková 1964:136)--their degree of CD is raised, since, taking the trouble to specify the situation "in the great city of London" at such depth, the speaker obviously wishes to attract a particular attention to it.

A mere temporal setting must be distinguished from cases when:

In addition to its basic semantic content, i.e. that of the temporal setting, the adverb of time is characterized by a certain semantic ADUMBRATION (colouring) of degree, evaluation or manner proper, the adumbration of degree being present also in the precise determination of time. An adverb of time is coloured by an adumbration of degree mostly when denoting
the length of an action, i.e. the degree of duration of an action, or that of its frequency. (Dvořáková 1964:135; my emphasis.)

In such cases an adverbial specifies the event, rather than merely provides a background, and carries a fairly high degree of CD; e.g., 'so long' in:

(25) ... of which he had so long been chairman

(from Dvořáková 1964:136). (For the actual FSP nature of such adverbials see 7.317.)

The degree of CD of a potential temporal setting is also raised when it occurs with a V esse and a thematic subject. Firbas (1964a:115) notes that in a sentence of the type:

(26) Chaucer lived in the fourteenth century

the adverbial element even becomes the rheme of the sentence.

Similarly, a mere local setting must be differentiated from an adverbial expression with the semantic content of the direction or medium of motion, as, e.g., 'along the streets' in:

(27) The cab rattled gaily along the streets

(from Dvořáková 1964:135). Moreover, in certain contexts, or for certain communicative purposes, a potentially situational adverb, too, may become an important specification of, e.g., the place of existence or appearance of something known, or presented as known, as in:

(28) Jo lived in St. John's Wood

(from Dvořáková 1964:134). In such cases the expression of locality functions as an 'adverbial complement', rather than as a situational
adverb, and its degree of CD is raised similarly to the adverbials expressing the direction of motion.

Situational adverbs, then, are merely "a piece of purely concomitant information" (Firbas 1968:32); syntactically they are loosely connected to the entire sentence and they can be easily omitted without detracting from the semantic content of any other sentence component. This weakens the degree of CD carried by them, and their normal FSP function is to constitute the thematic section of the sentence.

7.312 'V esse', as used in this study, embraces not only verbs denoting existence, but also--because of similarity of FSP function and, to a certain extent, semantic content--verbs denoting appearance, emergence into view, eventuation, coming to motion or rest, e.g., "to present oneself", "to take place", "to arise", "to gather", "to settle"--which after all express "a kind of COMING INTO EXISTENCE ON THE SCENE" (Firbas 1966:143; my emphasis). In addition, even verbs that are usually used to denote action, may, in co-operation with other FSP means, also be interpreted as V esse, and actually function as such; one such verb (zaigrat') is discussed in (32)-(34).

The essential characteristic of V esse as an FSP means is that its degree of CD is lower than the degree of the element denoting the thing or concept existing or appearing (i.e., the grammatical subject of V esse). On the other hand, in the presence of a non-thematic subject, V esse carries a higher degree of CD than a local or temporal setting (for an illustration of both these points see (2)).

However, if the subject is contextually thematized, but the situational adverb is 'new', the degree of CD of V esse becomes lower
than that of the potential temporal or local setting, which, as was noted above, functions then as an important specification (cf. (26), (28)).

7.313 'Subject' is a somewhat unsuitable word in the proposed formula (21) because of its established usage in the grammatical and logical rather than the semantic sense. Nevertheless, it allows to combine under one term such notions as 'a thing or concept that acts or exists' ('I think, therefore I am'), or is being described ('She is something'), or whose possession of something is being stated ('She has something').

From the notes on V esse it follows that the subject is inherently higher in its degree of CD than both the V esse, and the temporal and local settings.

7.314 'V non-esse' is used here in the sense of 'other than V esse', e.g., a 'verb of action', as in (22), (23), or a 'copulative verb', as in (25).

From (21) we see that the semantic content of V non-esse has a higher degree of CD than other semantic contents, save for FRA. Thus, the degree of CD of V non-esse falls between the degrees in the subject and the FRA. This is best understood when due consideration is given to the generally 'transitional' nature of the verb on the one hand, and the 'amplificative' nature of FRA on the other.

The semantic content of one type of auxiliary verb deserves a special note. It is the 'temporal and modal exponent' (TME), which was found by Firbas (1965:76) to have a rather fixed FSP role of the transition-proper (cf. (20A), (23), (25))--except, of course, in contrastive or emphatic sentences of the (20B) type.
Whether the degree of CD of TME is higher or lower than in the subject, in other words, whether it behaves like V non-esse or V esse, depends on the notional part of the verb group in which the auxiliary occurs. Thus, in (20), (23), and (25) the notional parts have the semantic characteristic of a V non-esse; consequently, the whole group, including the TME, has inherently a higher degree of CD than the subject or any setting. However, in the following example:

(29) [From time to time, by dint of infinite patience, I managed to reach a stand.] New Zealand apples WERE BEING SOLD, or rice-brooms from Australia WERE EXHIBITED (from Firbas 1966:244; square brackets show context; my emphasis), "... the subjects ... constitute the rhemes, the verbs expressing 'appearance or existence on the scene'; consequently, not only the notional parts of the verb groups, but also the TME auxiliary has an inherently lower degree than the subject (or the setting, if subject is contextually thematized).

TME functions as the transition-proper regardless of whether it is expressed analytically as an auxiliary verb, or whether it is manifested only as an inflexion of the notional verb form. The following illustrates this point and throws further light on the FSP function of the semantic contents of verbs (the Czech examples are here perfectly suited to illustrate also the Russian verbs):

The verb is not excluded from the rheme ("Mother protested," "Maminka protestovala"), nor is it excluded from the theme. (Cf. the following sentences with the meaning of 'It was Mother who protested': "Mother protested", "Maminka protestovala".) Moreover, IT MAY SIMULTANEOUSLY OCCUR IN MORE THAN ONE OF THE THREE BASIC SECTIONS (th, tr, rh [i.e., theme, transition, rheme]) of the gamut. We have arrived at this conclusion while consistently developing Mathesius' idea that the theme may be
reflected by the morphological make-up of the verb . . . Maintaining that the morpheme is capable of carrying a degree of CD at any point of the gamut of CD, we interpret the -a of protestovala of the first version of the Czech example just quoted as thematic, the TME -l- as transitional, and the rest, protest-, as rhematic. In its function of a transitional element, the TME -l- corresponds to "was" in the example "George was very rude" . . . It is worth noticing that AS LONG AS THE VERB FUNCTIONS WITHIN AT LEAST TWO SECTIONS ONE OF WHICH IS TRANSITIONAL, IT KEEPS UP ITS RELATION TO THE TRANSITIONAL SPHERE: THIS IS DUE TO ITS CONTAINING THE TME('s). (Firbas 1965:172-3; my emphasis.)

The pre-eminently transitional nature of the finite verb is important to bear in mind, first, when comparing Russian with English, in which, e.g., because of the more elaborate system of tenses, the TME is much more frequently expressed through an auxiliary verb; second, when reconciling Firbas's trichotomy with the dichotomy into only the thematic and non-thematic components, which has been the usual manner of dealing with word-order in Russian.

7.315 'FRA' is "an absolutely essential amplification of the verbal form. . . . we shall describe it as a non-thematic first-rank amplificative partner (for short FRA partner) of the verb." (Firbas 1959a:47).

A verb is not the only form that may be amplified in this way. The following quote from Firbas (1959a:47) illustrates this point and adds to a better understanding of what is meant by a FRA:

. . . we do not at all suppose that this term must necessarily be restricted to elements qualifying verbs. (It might be used, e.g., about non-thematic elements conveying an essential amplification of the meaning of an adjective as well. Thus in "He was conscious of some mischief", some mischief appears to be an FRA partner of the non-thematic adjective.
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However, dealing with sentence components, rather than with the individual words, this study is primarily concerned with FRA of the verb forms. Thus, on the grammatical level, a FRA is most frequently expressed by the objects of transitive verbs; by adverbs or adverbial phrases denoting the medium or direction of motion or those that "institute a comparison", as in:

(30) clatters like a mill
(from Firbas 1959a:49); by the notional parts of the compound nominal predicates; by the complements of factitive verbs, e.g., 'to make', as in:

(31) He was made king
(from Firbas 1959a:62n44).

Strictly speaking, the grammatical subject of V esse and the temporal and local specifications of V esse must also be considered as FRA (cf. Firbas 1959a:48,50), which lends additional understanding to why the subject is communicatively more dynamic than V esse, but less than V non-esse.

7.316 It was noted above that the semantic means overrule the operation of word-order as an FSP means, e.g., a FRA will have a higher degree of CD than the verb it amplifies, even if it occurs in the sentence initial position while the verb is at the end of the sentence. However, in cases of semantic ambiguity, word-order can become the deciding factor for the distribution of the degrees of CD. A case of such an interaction between word-order and semantic structure can be exemplified as follows:

(32) Zaigral orkestr
(begine-play-PAST orchestra)
Adamec (1966:34) notes that the verb in (32) is \textit{esse}, but in (33) \textit{non-esse}. In terms of FSP I would explain this as follows. In (32) the verb occurs in basically a thematic position by virtue of the operation of word-order means, and this contributes to the interpretation of the verb as being weaker than the subject and to its being intuitively understood as belonging to the \textit{esse} class. On the other hand, in (33) the verb is in basically a rhematic position, which contributes to the idea that it has a higher degree of CD than the subject and, therefore, to understanding its semantic content as action rather than as 'coming into existence by playing music'.

At the same time word-order should not be thought of as being able to overrule on its own the operation of \textit{esse} as a semantic means. The operation of word-order in (32)-(33) is ultimately dependent upon the co-operation of other aspects of the semantic structure, which in this case is the semantic affinity, or predictability, between the verb and the subject. Cf. Pirbas (1966:244):

An interesting variant [of verbs that on the level of FSP function as \textit{esse}] is represented by the examples 9, 10 and 11.

9 A wave of the azalea scent drifted into June's face, . . .

10 [Swithin stared at her;} a dusky orange dyed his cheeks.

11 A goldfinch flew over the shepherd's head . . . .

It will be easily noted that all the above-quoted instances display an evident semantic affinity between the subjects and the verbs. Thus, to a certain extent the noun "wave" expresses the same idea of motion as the verb "drift"; both the noun "orange" and the verb "dye" convey the notion of colour; the verb "fly" expresses the manner in which a bird ("a goldfinch") appears on the scene. In this way, the verb adds little information to that conveyed by the subject except for the meaning of appearance on the scene.
Thus, in the case of:

(34) Zaigrali bol'nye
    (begin-play-PAST ill-people),

occurring in an unmarked sentence, the verb can only be understood as denoting action, but which is context-given, or at least presented as such. On the other hand, in:

(35) Zastonali bol'nye
    (begin-moan-PAST ill-people)

the verb is clearly esse and not at all necessarily context-given.

Regarding this feature, I would venture to postulate that, at least in Russian, any verb has a potential of being understood as V esse, provided it has no grammatical object, and its subject is post-posed (or at least bears the so-called logical stress) and has a strong degree of semantic affinity with the verb. Thus even verbs that are referred to by Adamec (1966:53) as однозначно processual'nye (singularly processual): kašljat' (cough), kurit' (smoke), proigrat' (lose a game)—can, in my interpretation, be understood as V esse in the following expressions:

(36) [Obyknoveno bol'nica pusta, no vot zasvireptstvoval gripp, i] v palatax 10 zakašljali 20 bol'nye 30

(37) [Balkon zanjat:] tam 10 kurjat 20 mužčiny 30

(38) [V kazino treščali ruletki,] proigryvalis' 20 bogači 30

(In (38) one could postulate an 'implied' theme, or, in terms of Adamec (1966:22), 'zero' theme (see further).) Even such a typically 'active' verb as treščat' in (38) also functions as V esse in the given context.
Similarly, word-order in Russian may differentiate between the local setting, e.g., na ploščadke, as in:

(39) Na ploščadke_{10} igrali_{20} deti_{30}

and the local specification (in fact, a FRA), as in:

(40) Deti_{10} igrali_{20} na ploščadke_{30}.

Again, word-order is powerless without the co-operation of semantic affinity. For example, in:

(41) Deti_{10} igrali_{20} na lune_{30}

na lune can be interpreted only as a local setting, but this time functioning as rheme, since the rest of the sentence would be presumed contextually affected (such a sentence could hardly initiate an utterance in our time--unless, of course, used as the stylistic device in medias res).

7.3.17 Not all semantic contents are able to function as an FSP means. For this reason the adverbials expressing cause or purpose have not been included in (21). With the exception of the 'absolute infinitive of purpose', which behaves similarly to the temporal and local settings, the degree of CD of the adverbials of cause and purpose, cf. (10), (11), depends solely on their position in the sentence (cf. Golková 1968:126); the same applies to adumbration of time, cf. (25). According to Firbas, the direct and indirect objects also depend on word-order for their degree of CD--but only in relation to each other, since, constituting a FRA of the verb, their degree of CD in relation to non-FRA elements is determined by the semantic structure:
(42) He gave a boy an apple

(43) He gave an apple to a boy

(from Firbas 1970b:29A; my evaluation. This may be true for FRA's in general, but the inclusion here of the direct object meets with some reservation resulting from the analysis carried out in the present study --cf. VII. 1.21.)

7.3.18 As for the adverbial of manner, it seems that there is no certainty as yet on whether it is a semantic means of FSP or whether its degree of CD is determined by word-order, cf. Firbas (1970b:29A; the setting out of (44) and (45) and the evaluation of the degrees of CD are mine):

. . . a contextually independent adverb of manner ending in -ly evidently carries a higher degree of CD when following a finite verb than when preceding it

(44) He ate it up hastily

(45) He hastily ate it up

(I venture to suggest that under the indicated contextual conditions the adverb always carries a higher degree of CD than the finite verb, but does so conspicuously only when following it.)

7.3.19 The assumptions on the inherent properties of the semantic contents to impart a certain degree of CD have been criticized for arbitrariness, e.g., by Francis (1966:149). Even the Prague School scholars themselves admit: "In spite of so many ingenious contributions the study of semantics may be said to be still in its infancy" (Trnka 1967:2053). Nevertheless, Firbas's findings in his recent works (1968, 1969, 1970b) on the correlation of prosodic weight and the degree of CD of the sentence elements substantially remove the element of arbitrariness
and leave no doubt in my mind that the semantic structure of the sentence indeed plays a role in the distribution of the degrees of CD.

7.32 Additional Semantic Means

There is an important proviso to the condition that the semantic structure operates only on the contextually unaffected elements:

There is a special group of words predisposed by their semantic content to function in the theme. This group is formed especially by the personal, possessive, demonstrative and reflexive pronouns and the definite article. Under favourable conditions, they effectively signal contextual dependence . . . ; in this way, they in fact serve as media through which the semantic structure may operate even within that section of the sentence which has become contextually dependent. (Firbas 1966:241.)

In his earlier works Firbas (1959a:43,46,47) wrote in terms of 'semantic-contextual' means of FSP by which he understood:

. . . words that on account of their specific semantic character show quite a particular relation to the context and may—in co-operation with other means—either weaken or strengthen the positions in the sentence in a more or less invariable way . . . .

These words included the 'special group' as quoted above, the indefinite article and its zero plural variant, negations—as well as words whose semantic contents and FSP roles were just described, i.e., esse, etc.

In a later article, however, Firbas (1962:139) notes that just because the verb conveys a lower amount of CD than its object, that "does not prevent it from conveying new information". It is obvious that the term 'semantic-contextual means' was not an altogether suitable one for reference to the entire sphere of the operation of the semantic structure of the sentence, and since then Firbas avoids the term 'semantic-contextual',
using the term 'semantic structure of the sentence' instead. Nevertheless, words that indicate a certain relation to the context do remain, and to my view, are best accounted for separately from the semantic means discussed so far. But rather than continue with the term 'semantic-contextual means', this study, drawing on Adamec's (1966:53) reference to dopolnitel'nye sredstva and on Firbas's (1959a:53) notes on 'special semantic means', proposes to refer to some of them as 'additional semantic means', and to others as 'special semantic means'. In contradistinction, the semantic means dealt with in 7.31 have been referred to in this study as 'primary semantic means'.

The additional semantic means comprise two groups: (a) words that indicate the likelihood of contextual dependence, thus tending to lower the degree of CD of the sentence position they occupy—they may be referred to as 'dedynamizing means', or simply as 'dedynamizers'; (b) words that indicate the unlikelihood of contextual dependence, thus tending to raise the degree of CD of the sentence position they occupy—these are referred to as 'dynamizing means', or simply 'dynamizers'.

7.321 Dedynamizers

The most typical of the dedynamizers is the personal pronoun. This is obvious, since its use requires, at least in Russian and English, a lexical antecedent or the situational presence of the referent(s). In this respect, together with the personal pronoun can be grouped the demonstrative, reflexive, relative pronouns, the pro-adverbs of the 'there', 'then', 'so' type, and the prop-word 'one', as in:

\[
\begin{align*}
(46) \quad &_{11}^{I} \quad _{20}^{\text{'ve}} \quad _{31}^{\text{always}} \quad _{32}^{\text{wanted}} \quad _{12}^{\text{one}}
\end{align*}
\]
(from Firbas 1968:31,34; my evaluation). Here also belongs the definite article in English (once merely a short version of the demonstrative pronoun 'that'—cf. Jespersen 1933:161). Definiteness, and therefore frequently the likelihood of context-affectedness, is also inherent in 'individualized' words such as 'Father' and proper nouns (cf. Adamec 1966:36). In Russian, a poorly represented counterpart of the English definite article is the post-posed particle -to (cf. Meillet 1934:478; de Bray 1969:32), as can be exemplified by the following:

(47) Včera₁₀ by₁₂₀ dožd'₃₀

(48) Včera₃₀ by₁₂₀ dožd'·to₁₀.

Perhaps also connected with the semantic content of definiteness is "such a seemingly remote device" (Adamec 1966:36) as the use in negative constructions of the accusative object, instead of the genitive, the former suggesting definiteness—compare (49) with (50):

(49) Moloko ja ne dopil

(50) Moloka ja ne p'ju.

Another means of signalling context-affectedness in Russian is the use of ēto before verbs, as in:

(51) Ėto vzdoxnula sestra
     (thematic) (non-thematic)

(Adamec 1966:36).

Although the dedynamizers lower the degree of CD of the elements they occur with (or the sentence positions they occupy), they cannot
actually thematize them without the co-operation of some other FSP means (thus supporting the term 'additional' means). Their function is particu-
larly useful in unclear cases of contextual dependence, as in K. Mansfield's passage quoted in 7.2. Neither can a dedynamizing means prevent an ele-
ment from functioning in the rheme, as, e.g., in response to the question: 'Who wants an apple?'--the personal pronoun (a dedynamizer) functions even as rheme-proper in:

(52) I would like one/an apple

(note the preference, under the given contextual conditions, for the dedynamizer "one" in place of the context-given "an apple"). Moreover, it is necessary to bear in mind two kinds of semantic contents in the definite article in English. The definite article is a ded dynamizer only when it refers to the 'ad hoc knowledge' in a specific context or situa-
tion. It is not a dedynamizer when it refers to the 'broad knowledge' contained in such expressions as "The Queen", "the Earth", or "the word 'fisherman'", as in:

(53) The word "fisherman" came into his head

where, despite the sentence initial position and the presence of the definite article, the subject, occurring with a verb that under the circumstances functions as V esse, is nevertheless rhematic (Firbas 1966: 246). (More on dedynamizers in the closing part of the following section.)

7.322 Dynamizers

The most typical of the dynamizers is the indefinite article in English (and its 'plural zero variant'--cf. Firbas 1966:251). Owing to
its semantic content of indefiniteness, this article suggests novelty of
the word it occurs with, signalling the unlikelihood of context-
affectedness and thereby raising the degree of CD of its sentence posi-
tion. As with the semantic content in the definite article, the indefi-
nite article must also be differentiated for its 'generic' and 'non-
generic' content, only the latter functioning as a dynamizer (Firbas 1966:
245). Another general similarity with the dedynamizers is that the
dynamizers, too, can neither rhematize their sentence position without
the co-operation of other FSP means, nor prevent it from functioning in
the theme, as in:

(54) A girl\textsubscript{10} broke\textsubscript{20} a vase\textsubscript{30}

where three factors operate against "A girl" being rhematic: word-order,
the primary semantic means (V non-esse), and the non-generic indefinite
article in the object. A comparison of (54) with (55) further illus-
trates the dynamizing property of the indefinite article:

(55) A girl\textsubscript{30} broke\textsubscript{20} the vase\textsubscript{10}.

A dynamizing function is also performed by words that express a
certain quantity or contrast. Once again, the co-operation of other FSP
means is necessary for them to be effective. The following examples by
Firbas (1957:96n34) show how the dynamizing power of quantity is as though
cancelled by the definite article, i.e., by the lack of co-operation of
other means; compare (56) with (57):

(56) Few people
     (rheme)
     came
     (transition)
     there
     (theme)

(57) The few people
     (theme)
     came
     late
     (transition)
     (rheme)
As for 'contrast', the following serves as an illustration:

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 feawa [in "soplece manega synt geclypede, and feawa gecoren" ("for many are called, but few are chosen"—Matthew 20:16)], which in addition function as means of functional sentence perspective themselves as they are expressing quantity. (Firbas 1957:79,80)

The following note by Firbas (1966:248) and the comments offered immediately below serve as a summary on both the dedynamizing and dynamizing means:

In addition to the definite and indefinite articles, English has at its disposal a number of other expressions (such as 'some', 'any', 'every', 'each', 'no', 'this', 'that', 'my', 'your') that come very near to them in function. Apart from the word 'no' (considered here a rhematizer), it seems reasonable to class these expressions either as dedynamizers, or as dynamizers, utilizing the classification of pronouns in Jespersen (1933:152-3).

Thus, the words 'this', 'that', together with other demonstratives, as well as the words 'same', 'such', the personal and relative pronouns, and the definite article, are grouped in Jespersen as 'pronouns of definite indication', and can safely be considered as dedynamizers. On the other hand, the words 'some', 'any', as well as 'other', 'certain', 'either', 'one' (but not in the function of the 'prop-word' as in (46)), the interrogative pronouns, and the indefinite article are grouped as 'pronouns of indefinite indication' and thus are obviously dynamizers. Although Jespersen (1933:184-7) groups the words 'every' and 'each' separately from the indefinite pronouns and calls them 'pronouns of totality', he nevertheless points out their relation to the word 'any', and they, too,
are readily recognized as dynamizers, especially that they, as well as other 'pronouns of totality', can be considered 'expressions of quantity', and in this way also a dynamizing means (cf. (56), (57)).

A conspicuous omission from Jespersen's classification of the definite and indefinite pronouns are the so-called possessive pronouns 'my', 'your', etc. It seems that Firbas (1964:116) is inclined to consider them as dedynamizers:

> There is a special group of words predisposed by their semantic content to function in the theme. This group is formed especially by personal, possessive, demonstrative and reflexive pronouns and the definite article. (My emphasis.)

At the same time, Firbas (1966:249) acknowledges the need for further investigations regarding this matter: "It would be worth while to inquire into their relations to FSP." An attempt at such an inquiry has been made in the course of the present study, but the preliminary results offer no convincing support for considering the possessive pronoun either a dedynamizer or a dynamizer. The tentative contention must therefore be that, with respect to FSP, the possessive pronoun functions as an adjective, rather than as a 'pronoun of definite (or indefinite) indication'.

Although most of the illustrations of the 'additional means' offered in this study have been based on English material, it is obvious that the same criteria, e.g., of definiteness and indefiniteness of pronouns, the semantic content of quantity, contrast, etc., apply equally well to Russian.
7.33 Special Semantic Means (Rhematizers)

Not unlike the dynamizers function the various intensifying words and negations, which also raise the degree of CD of their sentence positions. The difference is that these words do not rely on the co-operation of other FSP means, but have their own power to rhematize the elements they refer to or positions they occupy (excepting, of course, in 'second instance' sentences--see further). For example:

(58) Even the girl broke a vase
(59) She even broke the vase
(60) Even she did it

for which Firbas (1959a:53) notes: "In all these instances 'even' is marking out the rheme-proper."

A similar function is performed by negations, provided that the negation actually conveys new information. (It would not do so in the enumeration occurring in the following passage: "There were many things I did not know. I did not know the author's name, I did not know his most important books, I did not know the century he lived in." ) With the proviso just stated, negation is a rhematic element and may be imposed on any positive sentence, putting its semantic and grammatical structures, already complete in themselves and capable of showing some definite contextual dependence, into a special kind of perspective. (Firbas 1962:142-3.)

The point of interest in negations, however, is that they not only are inherently rhematic themselves, cf. (3), but, similarly to the word 'even', they also rhematize the element(s) they refer to. Substituting a negation for the word 'even' in (57)-(59), the Russian versions have an identical FSP (the morphology of Russian is better suited to illustrate
(61) Ne devočka razbila vazu

(61a) Vazu razbila ne devočka

(62) Devočka ne razbila vazu

(63) Devočka razbila ne vazu

((61a) is the non-emotive variant of (61).)

The word tože and its bookish variant, the stressed takže (Boguslavskij 1969:117), deserve a special note. In standard usage the word tože always bears the so-called logical stress, e.g.:

(64) On napisal sočinenie. Ona tože napisala sočinenie

(from Boguslavskij 1969:115). Yet it would seem incorrect to interpret tože as the bearer of the highest degree of CD, i.e., as the communicatively most important word in the sentence. The explanation for this is that, by taking the logical stress onto itself and yet not functioning as rheme-proper, the word tože in effect signals that the actual rheme of the sentence is analogical or even identical to a rheme in one of the preceeding sentences, as in (64). Note that without tože, the rheme of the second sentence within the context of (64) would be different. The most natural way of reading would then be with a contrastive stress on ona, i.e., as a 'second instance' sentence, not unlike (20B):

(65) On napisal sočinenie. ONA napisala sočinenie

In (64) we saw that tože can operate on a whole section of a
sentence which may be composed of not only the rheme, but also transitional elements. Strictly speaking, then, the essential property of tože is to render certain elements non-thematic rather than rhematize them in Firbas's sense of the word. It seems that other words, too, can operate on more than one sentence element which are then not necessarily all rhematic, but may include transitional elements. For example:

(66) [That girl was in a destructive mood.] She\textsubscript{10} was\textsubscript{21} even breaking\textsubscript{22} vases\textsubscript{30}.

Without 'even', the interpretation of FSP within the given context is rather open: first, "She" could have been rhematic and the rest thematic, save for the transitional TME; second, "breaking" could have been thematic together with "She". Thus, the use of 'even' renders both "breaking" and "vases" non-thematic, and it is then left to the operation of the primary semantic means (and word-order) to determine the rheme of the sentence.

The use of rhematizers considerably narrows the type of context in which the sentence can appear, and owing to this special condition, such sentences have been duly referred to by Firbas (1959a:53) as functioning on 'special instance levels' (which can be understood as a level just below the second instance, or 'superinstance', in its degree of contextual dependence) and the rhematizers themselves as 'special semantic means'. It follows that on the highest degree of contextual dependence, i.e., on the 'superinstance', even the rhematizers cease to operate (Firbas 1959a:53). For example:

(67) A: Even John\textsubscript{30} is\textsubscript{21} reading\textsubscript{22} the local paper\textsubscript{10}.

B: You mean, even John\textsubscript{10} WAS\textsubscript{30} reading the local paper\textsubscript{10}.
To summarize on the semantic FSP means, three kinds of semantic means are differentiated in this study. First, there are the 'primary' means, which refer to the semantic relations between the sentence components; they can be expressed by the formula: Setting <$V$ esse $<$ Subject $<$ $V$ non-esse $<$ FRA. Second are the 'additional' means, which refer to words that suggest either a connection with the context (dedynamizers), or the lack of it (dynamizers). Third, there are 'special' means, which refer to words that have the power to rhematize their sentence position, or to render non-thematic an entire section of the sentence.

Prosodic Means of FSP

There is a great deal of coincidence between the communicative load of the sentence elements (i.e., their degree of CD ascertainable by the FSP means discussed above) and their prosodic weight (Firbas 1968, 1969, 1970b). The general principle is: the higher the degree of CD, the heavier the prosodic weight. The prosodic feature of primary concern to this study is that which marks out the rheme-proper of the sentence or clause. From the general principle it follows that rheme-proper coincides with the weightiest, or to be precise, with the 'functionally weightiest' prosodic feature. The difference between 'weightiest' and 'functionally weightiest' is explained by Firbas (1970b:30B) as:

The prosodic features, however, which within a distributional field are phonically equivalent . . . do not appear equivalent functionally. An important trait indicating the difference in functional importance is once again supplied by the linear character of the distributional field. The following general statement can be tentatively made in this connexion. Of two
The functionally weightiest prosodic feature is sometimes referred to as the 'logical stress', or simply as 'sentence stress'. Adamec (1966:7) refers to it as frazovoe udarenie (phrase stress), but admits its shortcomings, his choice of the term being a compromise due to the want of a better term in the linguistic literature. In reference to the 'functionally weightiest prosodic feature', the word 'logical' is unsuitable for at least two reasons: first, it is frequently used in the meaning of only the marked stress, such as 'contrastive', or 'emphatic' stress; second, it has connotations of dealing with non-linguistic phenomena. Nor are the words 'sentence' and 'phrase' suitable, since they may pertain to the syntactic and rhythmic, rather than communicative spheres, and since the presence of a contrastive stress (always on rheme-proper) does not necessarily rule out the additional presence of the rhythmic stresses in the same sentence (cf. Osokin 1968:32-42). From Firbas's description of the 'functionally weightiest prosodic feature' it can be inferred that the term 'stress' is also unsuitable, since the essential characteristic of that feature is not 'physical stress'--i.e., the intensity of pulmonic pressure or the loudness achieved through resonance control of the speech apparatus--but mainly the movements of
pitch up or down from the mean line of the intonation pattern of the sentence. Thus, Firbas (1968:41n30) differentiates between 'accent' and 'stress', stress being regarded merely as one of the factors constituting accentuation" (cf. also Isačenko 1967:967n2; Bryzgunova 1969:16).

What is needed then, is some term that would uniquely refer to the 'functionally weightiest prosodic feature', i.e., to the accent born by rheme-proper regardless of whether it does or does not coincide with the rhythmic, logical, emphatic, or any other stresses or accents. This study proposes to refer to it as the 'rheme-proper accent', or simply as the 'rheme-accent'.

In spoken language, rheme-accent may be said to be the strongest FSP means, since it explicitly marks out the rheme-proper and therefore the very communicative purpose of the sentence. In written language the writer may also use various typographical devices, e.g., italics and underlining, to emphasize the importance of certain words (cf. Ickovič 1971:182-5). Since such devices are seldom resorted to, one may query the need to consider the prosodic structure in the written language at all. Nevertheless, this study takes the view that every proficient user of language is able to reconstruct if not the entire melody of the sentence as the writer intended it, then at least the place of the rheme-accent (cf. Raspopov 1957:22n2). Boguslavskij (1969:117) goes even as far as to say that with most people the feeling of the 'logical stress' is well developed, that the logical stress itself is in many ways international insofar as its place usually coincides in various languages, and that, on the whole, a foreigner is able to predict the place of the logical stress in a Russian sentence. This may seem far-fetched, but considering that the means that are most responsible for the distribution
of CD in the written language, i.e., the context and the semantic structure, are indeed universal, his claim deserves at least some attention. The intuitive knowledge of the rheme-accent is an important feature in the analysis undertaken in this study, and the following consideration would contribute to a better understanding of it. To be sure, people do make 'mistakes' in reading a sentence aloud. Osokin (1968:10) notes that, although it would be incorrect to maintain that there are no people who are able to read and speak with the "right expression", it would be equally erroneous to ignore the fact that "the figure of the monotonously muttering orator with eyes sunk in the text" is a more typical sight. Certainly, one must agree with Osokin that such 'orators' exist all around us. Therefore, a note would be pertinent for a qualification of the view taken in this study on the intuitive knowledge of the place of the rheme-accent. First, the shortcomings of the 'orator' have evidently not escaped the ear of someone more proficient in the use of language, hence it should be stressed again that the user must be proficient (granted that the extent of 'proficiency' is difficult to specify). Second, the reader must be interested in and capable of deriving the full meaning from the text, and not one who is either utterly disinterested, or affected by stage fright. In Chomsky's terms it may be said that what this study has in mind is linguistic competence rather than performance (see also II. 10).

Finally, it is worth noting that the use of parentheses, as well as parenthetic expressions between commas or dashes, is similar in effect to the acoustic dampening of the corresponding expression in speech. Their FSP role within the sentence can therefore be disregarded, since although they, in the words of Firbas (1968:35), "provide basic
distributional fields of their own [i.e., have their own perspective], but having the character of an additional or parenthetic remark, play an insignificant role in the communication".

8. Hierarchy of FSP Means

Bearing in mind the possibility of interdependence between the various FSP means as exemplified in (19), (32)-(33), it is nevertheless evident that the means of FSP form a hierarchy. We saw that, on the whole, the semantic means (especially the 'primary means') operate only on the contextually unaffected elements, and that word-order means operate only if the semantic structure and the context permit it. Thus, the hierarchy is (in the order of progression):


The prosodic structure occupies a special place in this hierarchy. On the one hand, in the spoken language the prosodic structure has the most effect in determining the communicative importance not only of the element functioning as rheme-proper, but also of other elements in the sentence. In the written language, however, the reader determines the place of the rheme-accent, and possibly other melodic features of the sentence, only on the basis of the interplay of the context, the semantic structure, and word-order. Therefore, if one had to find a place for the prosodic structure in the hierarchy of FSP means in the written language, it would have to be the lowest level—obviously, a paradox. It seems, then, that rather than functioning as a means of FSP and thus occupying a certain place in the hierarchy, the prosodic structure in the written
language (i.e., the mental reconstruction of it) is merely a reflection, an organic attribute of the distribution of the degrees of CD determined by an interplay of the other FSP means.

9. External and Internal FSP Means

Owing to the broadness of the notion 'context' and especially 'situation', as compared with the more tangible linear, semantic, and prosodic structures of the sentence, it seems useful to adopt another differentiation to which Adamec refers as 'external' and 'internal' means. The internal means are those that are discernible within the sentence itself: its linear, semantic, and prosodic structures. Without implying that the context is essentially a non-structural phenomenon, it nevertheless has to be sought for in what is often an indefinite outer depth of the sentence environment, as compared with the linear and semantic structures which in the written language are as readily and explicitly available as the sentence itself. The context is thus the 'external' FSP means.

10. Multifunctionality

In interpreting difficult cases of FSP, it is necessary to bear in mind that, just as there is ambiguity in the various systems of language, e.g., grammatical or semantic, so it is reasonable to expect ambiguity in the communicative sphere. Thus, one may occasionally expect that two readers of the same sentence would offer a different interpretation of the FSP, i.e., would have at least a different place for the rheme-accent. In such cases we are dealing with the phenomenon referred
to by Firbas (1966:253) as 'multifunctionality'. However, just as an occasional syntactic ambiguity does not invalidate the whole system of syntactic relations, so, to quote Firbas (1966:253): "True multifunctional cases . . . are to be interpreted as peripheral phenomena of the partial system constituted by the means of FSP."

From the theoretical framework it follows that in simplified terms the process for recognizing the essential factors of FSP, i.e., the differentiation between the thematic and non-thematic elements, begins with the thematization of the contextually dependent elements. It is then for the semantic and word-order means to determine which context-unaffected elements will join the theme of the sentence and which are to function as the transition and rheme. Finally, one is able to isolate even the rheme-proper which, in the mental reconstruction of the sentence prosody, would bear the functionally weightiest prosodic feature, i.e., the rhyme-accent.

However, in analyzing the data for the present study, it was discovered that if the degree of CD is assigned strictly on the basis of the non-prosodic means, the result sometimes yields a counter-intuitive rhyme-accent (see, e.g., VI.4.41). This might be due to the occasionally too implicit nature of contextual dependence, or to the variable involved in the idiosyncratic nature of memory limitation. Again, it could possibly be due to the failure to account for any markedness, especially emotive, the recognition of which, at least in Russian, normally requires the knowledge of the position of rhyme-accent to begin with. In such cases the help of other native speakers was sought. First, without any briefing on the nature of the problem, they were asked to read aloud the paragraph within which the sample occurs; not surprisingly (cf. II. 7.4).
III. METHODOLOGY

1. Basic Criterion

From the theoretical framework it follows that in simplified terms the process for recognizing the essential factors of FSP, i.e., the differentiation between the thematic and non-thematic elements, begins with the thematization of the contextually dependent elements. It is then for the semantic and word-order means to determine which context- unaffected elements will join the theme of the sentence and which are to function as the transition and rheme. Finally, one is able to isolate even the rheme-proper which, in the mental reconstruction of the sentence prosody, would bear the functionally weightiest prosodic feature, i.e., the rheme-accent.

However, in analyzing the data for the present study, it was discovered that if the degree of CD is assigned strictly on the basis of the non-prosodic means, the result sometimes yields a counter-intuitive rheme-accent (see, e.g., VI.4.41). This might be due to the occasionally too implicit nature of contextual dependence, or to the variable involved in the idiosyncratic nature of memory limitation. Again, it could possibly be due to the failure to account for any markedness, especially emotive, the recognition of which, at least in Russian, normally requires the knowledge of the position of rheme-accent to begin with. In such cases the help of other native speakers was sought. First, without any briefing on the nature of the problem, they were asked to read aloud the paragraph within which the sample occurs; not surprisingly (cf. II. 7.4),
in the interpretation of the informants the place of the rheme-accent virtually always coincided. Second, they were asked to comment on which words in a given sentence could be thought of as being affected by the context. Here lengthy discussions often ensued and the interpretations were frequently diverse. This could demonstrate that the intuitive knowledge of the rheme-accent is a more reliable criterion than the awareness of contextual dependence.

Thus, in spite of the fact that the context takes precedence over the operation of the basic distribution of CD and of the semantic means, this study finds that a reliance on the context as a basic criterion for determining the degrees of CD could be undesirable. It seems that such a devaluation of the context finds support in Adamec, who observes that not only can FSP be recognized without considering the context, but the context itself can be reconstructed, once the FSP has been determined by other means available within the sentence. 14

It was therefore decided to consider the intuitive knowledge of the rheme-accent to be the basic criterion for recognizing the rheme-proper—and not only in the difficult cases, but, for the sake of consistency, in all sentences of the data.

The context nevertheless remains an important consideration in the analysis carried out in this study. This is because the context may be called upon to account for the intuitive placement of the rheme-accent in cases when the latter 'clashes' with the semantic and/or word-order FSP means, i.e., when the rheme-accent is placed on an element that, according to the operation of one or both the internal FSP means, should not have been interpreted as rheme-proper. To this end, the present study proposes to differentiate between two kinds of contextual dependence:
'context-givenness' and 'context-affectedness'. 'Context-given', or simply 'given' elements are those whose inference from the context can be linguistically attested by the possibility of their idiomatic pronominalization in a given sentence and within a given context (as in (16)). On the other hand, 'context-affected', or simply 'known' elements are those whose pronominalization within a given sentence and context would be unidiomatic, even if they had a lexical antecedent; cases when an element is 'felt' to be implied in the context (even if without a lexical antecedent) will also be considered as belonging to this category of contextual dependence. In contradistinction to 'given' and 'known', elements that are felt to have no connection with the preceding context are referred to as 'context-unaffected' or simply 'new'.

2. Actual Syntactic Types

In order to make an abstract representation of both the word-order and FSP of the sentences in the data, this study uses a somewhat adapted version of the method employed by Adamec. This involves the reduction of the sentence to what Adamec (1966:48) calls its 'actual-syntactic type' (aktual'no-sintaktičeskij tip), which can be understood as the simultaneous representation of three aspects of the sentence: 1) 'linear-syntactic structure', 2) 'actual sentence bipartition', 3) 'type of actual information'.
2.1 Linear-Syntactic Structure; Sentence Components

Strictly speaking, Adamec talks in terms of 'linear-dynamic' (linejno-dinamicheskaja) rather than linear-syntactic structure. By linear-dynamic structure he understands "a generalization of a set of concrete sentences in which the syntactic components, linear order, and the place of phrase stress are the same". However, in the understanding of this study, 'phrase stress' (i.e., rheme-accent) pertains to the actual sentence bipartition (i.e., FSP) aspect of the sentence. By taking out the prosodic features from the linear-dynamic structure, we are left with what this study refers to as the linear-syntactic structure, i.e., an abstract representation of the structure of a set of sentences with identical syntactic components and their linear order, but with no account of the place of rheme-accent.

Adamec's (1966:5-7) classification of the sentence components entering into the linear-syntactic structure is not unlike that of the 'New' Academy Grammar (GSRLJa), which has incorporated Švedova's (1964, 1968) notions on the sentence determiners. The sentence components are:

(69) V, S, I, P, Pa, C, Q, D, A.

V is the finite form of the verb.
S is the grammatical subject of the sentence.
I is the infinitive of the imperfective future predicate (in Russian) and of predicates qualified by modal and phase verbs, e.g.:

(70) budu/xoču/našinaju smejet'sja.

(An infinitive object is considered a semi-predicative transform and is
excluded from the data.)

P is the notional part of the compound nominal predicate (i.e., the part other than V copula).

Pa is the predicative attribute, i.e., such an attribute that refers simultaneously to a substantive and the verb, as in:

(71) Avtobusy edut perepolennye

(from Adamec 1966:7). Pa should not be confused with an adjective functioning in the notional part of the predicate, i.e., a P.

C is "any syntactic component which is directly related to the verb and stems from its valency, and which is grammatically governed by the verb and semantically predictable from it".\(^\text{16}\) C thus includes not only the traditional objects of the verb, but also the adverbial components that function as FRA. Adamec finds it convenient to distinguish sometimes between the 'objective complement' (объектное дополнение (Co)) and the 'adverbial complement' (подобительное дополнение (Cd)). Co is a "syntactic component that is grammatically bound to the verb by the so-called strong government and whose semantic content is that of the object of action, without adverbial nuances".\(^\text{17}\) Cd, on the other hand, is "bound to the verb by so-called weak government and its semantic content has definite adverbial characteristics"\(^\text{18}\)--thus substitutable by pro-adverbs of the type туда, сюда, там, здесь'. In addition, this study finds it convenient to make further distinctions between the semantic contents within the adverbial complement, notably the adverbial complement of 'place' (Cpl) and 'direction' (Cdi).

Q are the quantitative and qualitative characteristics of the verb; they correspond to the traditional adverbials of manner and degree.
D is the sentence determining adverbial, i.e., the remainder of the traditional adverbials to the exclusion of Cd and Q. Since the FSP function of the semantic contents of D may differ from one to the other (e.g., 'setting' vs. 'cause', cf. II. 7.311 vs. 7.317), this study makes further distinctions within D, e.g., T, L (temporal and local setting); Tad (temporal adumbration); Dc, Dpu (adverbials of cause and purpose), etc.

'A' is the same as the traditional attribute. On the level of the sentence, A is considered to have no syntactic function, constituting merely a part within the subject, object, adverbial, or predicative groups: in such cases A is omitted from the canonic representation of the sentence components. However, A becomes functionally important when, for contrastive or emphatic reasons, it bears the rheme-accent, or when it functions in a different FSP role from its head word; in addition, it presents a point of interest when, usually for stylistic reasons, it is detached from the head word: in such cases A is shown in the data (as well as when it functions as Pa, see above).

The same can be said for the functionally unmarked combinations of I, P, and Q with V, e.g., the V - I, V - P, Q - V sequences in Russian (cf. Adamec 1966:32)—provided that the members of the group are both thematic or both non-thematic and that neither is the rheme-proper of a verificative sentence (for which see 2.43-2.44). As with the attribute, I and P are omitted under the conditions specified above. As for Q, sentences containing it are altogether by-passed in this study, since the as yet unresolved problem of ascertaining the FSP function of its semantic content (cf. II. 7.318) is felt to be of a magnitude extending beyond the limitations of the present study.
Thus, for a sentence like:

(72) Odnazdy Vlasovu ostanovil na ulice traktirščik Begunov

(from Adamec 1966:83) the representation of its linear-syntactic structure is:

(73) T - Co - V - L - S.

If in addition it is also necessary to show the rheme-accent within such a structure, the symbol (') is placed on the accented component, and the representation then corresponds to the 'linear-dynamic structure' of Adamec, which for (72) is:

(74) T - Co - V - L - Š.

To distinguish between the unmarked and the marked rheme-accents, the latter is shown as (") which denotes that, in addition to functioning as rheme-proper, the element is emphasized for contrast or emotiveness (cf. (94)).

2.2 Actual Sentence Bipartition

The second aspect of an actual-syntactic type is the representation of the FSP nature of the sentence components. However, rather than the degrees of CD of the individual sentence elements, Adamec distinguishes only the thematic and non-thematic nature of the components. To this he refers as aktual'noe členenie; in English this can be called 'actual sentence bipartition' (as, e.g., in Daneš 1967:504-5). In spite of the surface differences between the representations of FSP by Firbas vs. Adamec, the two will be shown to correspond for the most part.
Referring to the thematic and non-thematic sections of the sentence, Adamec uses the terms *osnova* (base, foundation) and *jadro* (core, nucleus) respectively. None of the potential English translations are entirely suitable for terminological usage: the difficulty of forming adjectives from 'foundation' and 'core'; the broadness of application of the adjective 'basic', which could lead to confusion in such expressions as 'basic subject', 'basic verb' alongside Firbas's notion of the 'basic distribution of CD'); the narrowness of the term 'nucleus' which could suggest, as was noted by Firbas (1957:94n9), "only the very core of the new piece of information [i.e., rheme-proper] instead of covering it all". Nor is Firbas's term 'rheme' adequate for translating *jadro*, since it does not correspond to the entire non-thematic section. One could follow Dahl (1969) in using the terms 'topic' and 'comment' for *osnova* and *jadro*, but there is again awkwardness in forming adjectives and, more important, the undesirability of terminological conglomeration. Consequently, this study remains contented with the terms 'thematic' and 'non-thematic'.

The linear structure, which underlies an actual-syntactic type, allows Adamec to make generalizations on the relationship between syntactic components and actual sentence bipartition. Thus, the non-thematic section may be either simple or complex. A simple non-thematic section may consist of any one sentence component, in which case the latter functions as rheme-proper. A complex non-thematic section consists primarily of V and either C or S (but only when S is also a FRA). Owing to the transitional character of the verb, the rheme-proper within a complex non-thematic section can only be C or S regardless of their linear position in relation to V.

The primary members of a complex non-thematic section, i.e., V
and either C or S, can admit between them any other sentence component. Adamec calls such components *intrajadernaja osnova*, which in this study is referred to as 'interpolative theme'. Adamec notes: "From one point of view such components have definite thematic characteristics, but on the other hand, they are undoubtedly included in the non-thematic section and form a constituent part of it." This is a rare instance when Adamec's notion is difficult to reconcile with that of Firbas. The latter would unambiguously mark such components either thematic, if, e.g., it is context-given as in (5), or rhematic, if, e.g., it is a contextually unaffected FRA, as in (1).

Any component may function in the thematic section (or simply, the 'theme') either singly, or alongside other components. Once again, V and its FRA may be considered as forming a complex FSP unit, in this case a complex theme, together with any interpolative components, but here the latter unquestionably retain their thematic character. Thematic components that do not enter into a complex theme may be considered as forming a 'compound theme' in which each component functions separately as the theme for the rest of the sentence--hence the notion of 'primary', 'secondary', 'tertiary', etc., themes in Adamec (1966:21-2).

### 2.3 Symbolization

For the symbolic representation of the thematic and non-thematic components Adamec uses the following method. Each thematic component is superscripted by one of the initial letters of the Greek alphabet, e.g.:

(75) $D^\alpha C^\beta D^\gamma$

(75a) $D^\alpha C D . . .$

((75a)-(80a) are the adapted representations for use in this study--see
The non-thematic section is superscripted by the small omega, e.g.:

\[(76) \, V^\omega \]  \hspace{1cm} \[ (76a) \, V \]

A complex non-thematic section is bracketed and the plus sign is used between its components, e.g.:

\[(77) \, (V + S)^\omega \]  \hspace{1cm} \[ (77a) \, V S \]

An interpolative theme is also superscripted by the next available letter of the Greek alphabet, e.g.:

\[(78) \, D^\alpha C^\beta (V + D^\gamma + S)^\omega \]  \hspace{1cm} \[ (78a) \, (D C) V D S \]

The rheme-proper, i.e., the component that carries the rheme-accent, is printed in boldface, e.g.:

\[(79) \, (V + D^\alpha + S)^\omega \]  \hspace{1cm} \[ (79a) \, V D S \]

The boundary between the thematic and non-thematic sections is shown by a hyphen, e.g.:

\[(80) \, D^\alpha C^\beta - (V + D^\gamma + S)^\omega \]  \hspace{1cm} \[ (80a) \, <(D C) V D S> \]

The combined representation of the linear-syntactic structure and of the actual sentence bipartition given in (80) underlies a sentence like (72).

The symbolization used in this study (e.g., (75a)-(80a)) is simpler, but no less adequate. The Greek letters in the theme are not used, since \( \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \text{ etc.} \), always correspond to the first, second, third, etc., themes according to their order of occurrence from left to right, and the primary, secondary, tertiary, etc., nature of the thematic
components is predictable without the Greek letter superscripts ((75a)). Nor are the rheme-proper and the interpolative theme marked in any way, since they are always predictable from the composition of the non-thematic section: in a complex non-thematic section the furthest component from V is always rheme-proper, and any components occurring between them are the interpolative themes. For example, if the non-thematic section contains C D S V in that order, rheme-proper is C, while D and S are the interpolative themes (cf. also (76a)-(79a)). Brackets and plus signs in the complex non-thematic section ((77a)-(79a)) as well as the hyphen between the thematic and non-thematic sections ((80a)) are also considered here redundant. Instead, round brackets will be used to designate thematic components ((77a), (78a), (80a)), while the entire actual-syntactic type, i.e., the thematic and non-thematic sections together, is enclosed in angular brackets ((80a)) which differentiate an FSP structure from merely a linear-syntactic ((72)) or linear-dynamic ((74)) structures.

Another example, this time of a sentence with the simple thematic and non-thematic sections, as in Orkestr zaigral, is:

(81) <(S) V> (as compared with $S^\alpha - V^\omega$ of Adamec).

It must also be noted that at least in Russian there may be sentences without a theme, e.g.:

(82) Nastupila _vesna_20 -- <V S>,

which has no thematic element, since the FSP function of a contextually independent verb is that of the transition and therefore V belongs to the non-thematic section. In such cases it is convenient to think in terms of a 'zero theme' (cf. Adamec 1966:22) for the reason that the lexical
absence of the theme in one language may in other languages correspond to words that are virtually void in meaning and thus can hardly be considered as the 'theme of conversation' or the 'setting for the event'—cf. the similarity of such themes in:

(83) Bylo₂₀ xolodno₃₀ ← ⟨(zero) V P⟩

(84) It₁₀ was₂₀ cold₃₀ ← ⟨(it) V P⟩.

For simplicity, this study does not show zero themes where there is no lexical expression for the theme, but the English 'it/there' devices will be shown as in (84).

2.4 Actual Information

The third aspect of an actual-syntactic type is the 'type of actual information' of the sentence. Adamec (1966:26-8) deals in terms of four basic types: 1) general-informative (обще-инformatивныe), 2) specific-informative (частно-инformatивныe), 3) general-verificative (обще-верификативныe), 4) specific-verificative (частно-верификативныe). These form two sets of oppositions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informative</th>
<th>Specific</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(общее-сообщение)</td>
<td>(частные аспекты факта)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informative</td>
<td>Specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(реакции на</td>
<td>(частные аспекты факта)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>предположение собеседника)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(numbers refer to the types listed above).
2.41 General-informative are sentences in which the speaker (or writer) presupposes the hearer's unawareness of a fact as a whole. This does not imply the total absence of contextual dependence: the hearer (or reader) may be aware of the situation in which the event to be discussed takes place and of the objects that participate in this event. What he does not know is how these realities are related to the event as perceived by the speaker. In other words, the hearer may be aware of, e.g., certain substantives, let us say "Mary", but—until he knows the semantic nature of the verb, i.e., essentially its lexical content, and in the analytic languages its position in relation to the substantives—he does not know whether "Mary" is to be the actor:

(86) Mary₁₀ saw₂₀ John₃₀ -- (S) V C>,

the 'object appearing' (in (86)-(91) a preceding example is not to be taken as the context for an example that follows it):

(87) Mary₃₀ came₁₀ in₁₀ -- (S) V (C),

or being described:

(88) Mary₁₀ is₂₀ nice₃₀ -- (S) V P>;

or whether she is the goal:

(89) John₁₀ spoke₂₀ to Mary₃₀ -- (S) V C>,

the cause:

(90) John₁₁ was₁₂(20) there₁₃ because of Mary₃₀ -- (S V Cpl) Dc>,

or even the local setting:
(91) A dog_{30} was_{20} beside Mary_{10} \quad -- \quad <S \ V \ (Cp1)>.

For this reason, in general-informative types V (and possibly C or S) is always within the non-thematic section which may be simple or complex, as in (81), (82) respectively.

2.42 In specific-informative types the speaker presupposes the hearer's awareness of the main part of the event or fact (and therefore of the nature of the verb) and that it is only some specific detail that needs focusing on. Thus, only the non-verb component in need of attention appears in the non-thematic section, e.g.:

(92) Petju_{11} ukusila_{12} žučka_{30} [, a ne Šarik] \quad -- \quad <(C \ V) \ S>.

2.43 A feature common to both of the informative types is that the speaker presupposes the knowledge of certain facts. There are situations, however, when the speaker merely wishes to verify or correct the hearer's opinion about a fact presumed known to them both. Once again, if the verification or correction is with respect to the whole fact, i.e., of a general nature, then V is non-thematic (but differing from the general-informative type, no other component can be non-thematic, since in the first place the event was presumed known in its entirety). An example of a general-verificative actual-syntactic type is:

(93) Ne kusala_{30(20)} naša žučka vašega Petju_{10} \quad -- \quad <V \ (S \ C)>.

2.44 If, on the other hand, the verification concerns merely a part of the total event, the non-thematic section contains only the required non-verb component, and the type is 'specific-verificative', e.g.:
2.45 There is no need to mark the actual-syntactic types for their general vs. specific character, since this feature is also predictable from the composition of the non-thematic section: if \( V \) is in it, the type is general; if in the theme, the type is specific. As for the recognition of verificative vs. informative types, apart from sentences with complex non-thematic sections, which cannot be verificative, there is no way of recognizing them but through the context, and occasionally by the special semantic means, as in (58)-(60). Whenever necessary, the verificative types are therefore marked by ('), as in (93), (94).

3. Non-Emotive Deviations from the Basic Distribution of CD

It has been mentioned in II. 7.1 that in the synthetic languages deviations from the basic distribution of CD, i.e., from a consistent theme - transition - rheme sequence, occur generally on account of emotiveness. However, in order to account for the deviations in Russian, it would be insufficient to say that they signify emotiveness only. Restricting to the level of sentence components, other reasons for the deviations are as follows:

3.1 In spoken Russian three types of deviations deserve attention. First, the order of \( V \) and \( C \) or \( S \) in a complex non-thematic section
is inverted, e.g.:

(95) \[ \text{Ja}_{10} \text{samovár}_{30} \text{postavila}_{20} \quad -- \quad \langle(S)\ C\ V \rangle \]

(96) \[ \text{Lesnika}_{10} \text{medvěd’}_{30} \text{zadrál}_{20} \quad -- \quad \langle(C)\ S\ V \rangle \]

(from Adamec 1966:71,72). This type of 'inversion' is peculiar not only to the dialect-colloquial varieties, but is also quite common in the 'spoken literary language'.

3.2 Second, some "unimportant" (therefore essentially thematic) component is tagged to the end of the sentence, e.g.:

(97) \[ \text{Oni}_{12} \text{ego}_{13} \text{ispětváli}_{30} \text{sejčas}_{11} \quad -- \quad \langle(S\ C)\ V\ (D) \rangle \]

3.3 Third, the attribute (A) in the function of rheme-proper is placed at or near the beginning of the sentence, e.g.:

(98) \[ \text{Trůdnaja}_{30} \text{ej}_{11} \text{vypala}_{12} \text{žizn’}_{13} \quad -- \quad \langle(A\ C\ V\ S) \rangle \]

(from Adamec 1966:45).

3.4 In yet another type of inversion a verb that forms a part of a complex non-thematic section with an interpolative theme is placed in sentence initial position. This type is characteristic of, first, the epic and folklore narratives, e.g.:

(99) \[ \text{Priexali\ s\ rubki\ kazaki} \quad -- \quad \langle V\ C\ S \rangle \]

and second, the descriptions of nature and settings, e.g.:

(100) \[ \text{Stojal\ nedaleko\ ot\ doma\ odinokij\ dub} \quad -- \quad \langle V\ C\ S \rangle \]
3.5 The remaining deviation of concern to this study is of particular interest, since it does not pertain to the sphere of expressiveness (i.e., emphasis or style) at all. In this type, V in the function of rheme-proper is preposed to a thematic C or S, e.g.:

(101) Igor'11 obožal30 etu devočku12 -- <(S) V (C)>

(102) Ej11 mešali30 postoronne12 -- <(C) V (S)>

According to Adamec, this structure is even more neutral than the one with the accented V in the final position, and is especially common when V denotes a relationship or influence between the subject and object in the psychological, emotional, etc., spheres.

4. Description of Data

The analysis of concrete material undertaken in this study falls into two parts: 1) the communicative function of the possessive pronoun, 2) actual-syntactic types. For the possessive pronoun the entire anthology was examined and 222 extractions of simple declarative binomial sentences made. For the analysis of the actual-syntactic types extractions were restricted to short stories written in the post-war period (see Bibliography); these extractions in the first place amounted to 446 cases, but later considerations necessitated withdrawal from the analysis of sentences containing Q (85 cases), Tod (21 cases), and other than temporal and local adverbials (14 cases). Observations on the possessive pronoun are described in Chapter IV and on the actual-syntactic types in Chapters V-VIII. Chapter V deals with sentences consisting of S and V;
Chapter VI--S, V, and C; Chapter VII--S, V, C, and one or more additional complements; Chapter VIII--sentences containing D. The individual chapters are sub-divided into sections that deal with a particular linear structure, in which further sub-divisions are made for the actual-syntactic types formed by the linear structures. The sub-sections within chapters are presented in the order of regressive frequency, i.e., the more numerous groups preceding the less numerous ones.

In the present study, it was observed that there is no marked statistical difference between the possessive pronoun occurring in the thematic and the non-thematic sections. This—together with Pirbas's note on the need for further studies on the relationship between what amounts to be the various pronominal words and TSP, as well as the omission of the possessive pronoun in Jespersen's grouping of the definite and indefinite expressions—was felt to warrant a preliminary investigation of the problem of the communicative function of the possessive pronoun.

Chapter I. The first aspect of the problem is merely a statistical one: what is the incidence of the possessive pronoun occurring in the thematic as against non-thematic sections?

Typical examples of the possessive pronoun in the thematic are:

(103) Ego ljubimaja byla prekrasna.  His beloved was beautiful /2376/

(104) Vnuzato v našim rjadom poslyšnaja udavlenýj vyzok. Suddenly a suppressed sigh was heard in our midst /23/

(105) posteldnuju svoju kartinu Don'ku Tropinina nazvala "Žižn-pštšen". Donika Tropina called her last picture "The Firebird" /191/

and in the non-thematic section:
It was noted in II. 7.322 that Firbas is inclined to consider the possessive pronoun as a dedynamizer on account of its semantic content predisposing it to function in the theme. However, in the course of analyzing the actual-syntactic types of the data in the present study, it was observed that there is no marked statistical difference between the possessive pronoun occurring in the thematic and the non-thematic sections. This—together with Firbas's note on the need for further studies on the relationship between what amounts to be the various pronominal words and FSP, as well as the omission of the possessive pronoun in Jespersen's grouping of the definite and indefinite expressions—was felt to warrant a preliminary investigation of the problem of the communicative function of the possessive pronoun.

1. The first aspect of the problem is merely a statistical one: what is the incidence of the possessive pronoun occurring in the thematic as against non-thematic sections?

Typical examples of the possessive pronoun in the theme are:

(103) Ego ljubimaja byla prekrasna
His beloved was beautiful /25/ 26

(104) Vnezapno v našix rjadax poslyšalsja sdavlennyj vzdox
Suddenly a suppressed sigh was heard in our midst /23/

(105) poslednjaju svoju kartinu Dun'ka Tropinina nazvala "Žar-pticej"
Dunka Tropinina called her last picture "The Firebird" /191/;

and in the non-thematic section:
The data shows 116 examples with the possessive pronoun in the thematic and 106 in the non-thematic sections, i.e., 52% vs. 48%—hardly convincing statistics for considering the possessive pronoun as being "predisposed to function in the theme".

2. More important than the matter of statistics is the consideration of cases in which the possessive pronoun might be crucial for the interpretation of the thematic or non-thematic nature of the sentence components. Examples (103)-(105) fall out of this consideration, since in them the intuitive place for the rheme-accent is not counter to the primary semantic means, and furthermore, the removal of the possessive pronouns would not alter the distribution of the degrees of CD. True, it might be suggested that in (105) "her last picture" would have been non-thematic had it not been for the possessive pronoun, but this is an instance of the 'interpolative theme' the FSP function of which is in any case ambivalent (cf. note 19).

On the other hand, there are also cases in which a sentence component with a possessive pronoun is thematic, contrary to the operation of the primary semantic means, thus suggesting the dedynamizing nature of the possessive pronoun:
(109) Ona ... stala celovat' ego ruki
She ... began to kiss his hands /157/

(110) Odnako trudnye pereživanija naši ne zakončilis'
However, our troubles were still not over /201/

(111) Legkie sedye protuberancy dymilis' nad ego lbom
Gossamery grey sun-flares smoked above his brow /17/.

There are 23 such cases. However, in some, e.g., (109), the thematic nature of the FRA is determined by the possibility of its pronominalization, i.e., by context-givenness, which by the postulated principle of the hierarchy of the means of FSP (cf. (68)) renders the semantic content of the affected sentence component, and therefore of the possessive pronoun, ineffectual with respect to FSP. In other cases, e.g., (110), it is the rheme that is signalled by some special semantic means, in this case a negation, which are also higher in the hierarchy than the primary and additional semantic means.

Discounting such instances, we are left with only three cases, of which (111) is one, where the possessive pronoun could conceivably be considered responsible for the thematic function of the sentence component. This is especially evident in the English version of (111) where the plural variant of the indefinite article adds to interpreting the subject as rhematic and the verb as existential. As for the Russian sentence, the absence of a dynamizer in the subject group placed in the basically thematic position (i.e., sentence initially), makes it more difficult to interpret dymilis' as V esse, and in this case a deliberation on the context is necessary to account for the place of the rheme-accent, i.e., for the rheme-proper. Here is the context:
After reading this passage, the most likely interpretation of the relative importance of the sentence components in (111) would be that the main point of interest is the sun-flare quality of the teacher's hair rather than his brow, and therefore the subject group should be the rheme. Such an impression could be explained as follows. In the first sentence of this passage one of the themes, which in this case can also be called 'the topic of discussion', is the "teacher", while rheme is the "nebulosity of expression and the circular movements of the stars". The next sentence, which is the example under consideration, involves two parallel motifs: the physical manifestation of the stars vs. the physical embodiment of the teacher (i.e., his brow, and in the next sentence his nose and eyes). Although at this point both motifs have been brought into the story for the first time, the "teacher", having been introduced as a thematic element, provides the 'thematic layer' (cf. (18)), while the stellar phenomena, introduced as the rheme, continues to provide the 'rhematic layer' for the subsequent sentences in the passage. Thus, it cannot be said that it is only the possessive pronoun which is responsible for a thematic FRA in (111), especially since in the Russian sentence it can be altogether omitted without harming either the meaning or the idiom of the sentence. The remaining two cases pose similar problems of interpreting their FSP. Such cases clearly come close to being multifunctional, and therefore cannot be considered as a legitimate media through which the assumed dedynamizing property of the possessive pronoun can be judged.
Additional evidence in support of the contention in this study is provided by cases where the possessive pronoun occurs in a rheme that also lacks the co-operation of other internal FSP means:

\[(112)\] mozg moj dal im formu  
\[\text{It was my brain that gave them shape} /71/\]

(the context is not provided, since the rhematic function of the subject group in the Russian sentence is reflected by the 'splitting sentence' of the translation--on the evaluation of the degrees of CD within such a construction see Firbas 1967--while the possibility of the rheme-accent falling on "my" in the English sentence is in turn excluded by the post-position of moj in the original). We see once again that even with the co-operation of the primary semantic and word-order means, the possessive pronoun is still ineffectual in dedynamizing a sentence position to the extent that it would become thematic.

3. Similar conclusions may be drawn from examining certain other features of the possessive pronoun. Thus, with respect to redundancy (cf. kommunikativno neznačimye mestoimennye prilagatel'nye in Sirotinina 1965:16-20) the data shows that a thematic possessive pronoun can be considered redundant in 44% (51 instances), e.g.:

\[(113)\] Ee tonen'koe lico ozabočeno i rešitel'no  
\[\text{Her thin face is preoccupied and determined} /165/\]

(in the English version, too, the substitution of "her" by "the", although improbable in the present context, nevertheless cannot be ruled out completely).
cases), e.g.:

(114) Uxodjašcie vešči ostavljali umirajuščemu tol'ko svoi imena
To the dying man things as they departed left only their names

To the dying man things as they departed left only their names

4. The same must be said with respect to contextual dependence:
there are 56 cases (48%) when, despite the presence of the possesive pro-
noun, the theme can be considered 'new', e.g.:

(115) Naša promyšlennost' teper' izgotovljaet motornye
Our industry's now producing them

In rheme, the ratio is, expectedly, weighted more heavily in favour of
the 'new' components, viz., 91 instances (86%), e.g.:

(116) On razmetal po steklu svoi kryl'ja
It dashed its wings against the glass wall

--but this only underlines the contention that the possessive pronoun is
hardly a signal of contextual dependence.

5. At the same time, there seems to be somewhat of a tendency
for the possessive pronoun occurring with the 'inalienable' nouns (cf.
Fillmore 1968:61) to function less in the theme than in the rheme. The
data shows 42 (36%) such cases in the theme, e.g.:

(117) za ee spinoj peregovarivalis' stariki
at her back she heard the old people talking

as against 62 (59%) in rheme, e.g.:

(118) my uvideli ego sognutuju spinu
we viewed his bowed back
Perhaps, it is this feature of inalienability that would, after an appropriate study of the problem, lend support to the notion that under certain conditions, viz., the non-inalienability of nouns, the possessive pronoun is indeed predisposed to function in the theme. Such a distinction would not be unlike Firbas' differentiation between the generic and non-generic indefinite articles, and the 'common knowledge' vs. 'ad hoc' definite articles in English, with the ensuing significance in their FSP roles.

6. Another point of interest for the possibility of a predisposition of the possessive pronoun to function in the theme is the post-position of the possessive pronoun with respect to its head word (this feature, of course, does not concern English). The theme shows 25 such instances (22%), e.g.:

(119) v luče ego koso letel dožd'
in its ray the rain flew obliquely /39/,

but rheme has only 3 (3%), e.g.:

(120) glaz moj i slux upravljajut veščami
things were governed by my eyes and ears /71/.

The post-position of the possessive pronoun can be associated with its redundancy (cf. Sirotinina 1965:16-20). The difference in percentage could therefore be significant, in view that the total distribution of the redundant possessive pronouns was approximately equal (44% vs. 40%).
On the whole, the possessive pronoun does not seem to be predisposed to function either in the thematic or non-thematic sections. From this one could conclude that the semantic character of the possessive pronoun is unlike that of the definite or indefinite articles in English, which are predisposed to signal the degree of definiteness, or determinedness (or simply 'context-givenness') of their head word. Instead, it seems that the possessive pronoun has merely an adjectival function and 'describes' rather than 'defines' its immediate constituent.

On the other hand, further study could show that the post-posed possessive pronoun in Russian and the one occurring with the non-inalienable nouns are indeed predisposed to function in the theme and, therefore, could act as a dedynamizing FSP means. However, until an exhaustive treatment of this problem (perhaps itself warranting a work larger in scope than the whole of the present study) is carried out, this study, after the preliminary investigation described above, considers it safer to exclude all possessive pronouns from the group of the dedynamizing words.

(121) Он кричал.
He began shouting.

(122) Самолет прилетит.
A plane will come.

Also, the thematic function of S is frequently underlined by the additional semantic means, e.g., by a 'definite pronoun', as in (121), or by the occurrence of a proper noun, as in:
V. SENTENCES CONSISTING OF S AND V

Two linear structures are possible: S - V and V - S; both are represented in the data.

1. Linear Structure S - V

In the present data Russian sentences with linear structure S - V form four actual-syntactic types: 1) <(S) V>, 2) <(S) V (P/I)'>, 3) <(S V) A>, 4) <S (V)>.

1.1 Actual-Syntactic Type <(S) V>

1.1.1 In this group of sentences rheme-accent was always found to be reflected both by the internal, and external FSP means. Thus, V is more dynamic than S by virtue of the operation of the primary semantic means. It is either amplified by FRA:

(121) On stal kričat'  
He began shouting  /133/

or, with the co-operation of word-order means, i.e., by being placed after S, it can be interpreted as V non-esse:

(122) samolet priletit  
a plane will come  /193/.

Also, the thematic function of S is frequently underlined by the additional semantic means, e.g., by a 'definite pronoun', as in (121), or by the occurrence of a proper noun, as in:
The examination of the context revealed that even where no additional semantic means are present, S is usually context-given, i.e., a pronominalization or sometimes even the omission of the head word would not be inappropriate, e.g.:

(124) Drugie deti igrali
The other children were playing /173/

(124a) Drugie igrali
Others were playing.

In a few exceptions S cannot be inferred from the context, as in:

(125) Vyxodnoj den' vydal'sja pasmurnym, skuchnym
The day-off turned out to be cloudy and dreary /159/,

but here the presence of FRA and the sentence final position of the verb group leave no doubt as to the thematic function of S on the one hand, and the non-thematic function of V on the other.

There is no reason to assume from the texts, that any sentence in this group is expressively marked—not even:

(126) "Ty dura," [- bez obidy skazal Maksim]
"You're a fool," [replied Maxim, without resentment] /143/,

since from the context of the story we know that these words are being spoken by a phlegmatic person; in addition, evidence in support of non-markedness of the above example is provided by the content of the dicendi remark shown here in square brackets. The neutrality of the sentence is
in each case reflected by the co-operation of all the FSP means in distributing the degrees of CD in a consistent theme - transition - rheme sequence.

1.12 The actual-syntactic type of the translations is in every case identical with that of the originals (cf. (121)-(126)). The only point of interest is that in the English sentences the contrast between the thematic and non-thematic sections is usually reflected by additional semantic means that are altogether lacking in Russian, viz., the articles. Thus, a dedynamizer, frequently the definite article, is used in all but two English sentences (cf. (125)). The two exceptions, of which (122) is one, involve the generic indefinite article—but since it has no dynamizing effect, the contrast between the thematic and non-thematic sections is not lessened. This contrast is in many cases accentuated further by the use of an indefinite article in the nominal part of the predicate, e.g., in (126).

In the interpretation of this study, the presence in the English sentences of the additional means that are unmatched in Russian, does not render the contrast between the thematic and non-thematic sections greater. In (33) we saw that, since word-order in Russian is practically relieved of syntactic function (cf. note 1), its role in FSP and in the semantic interpretation of V is more influential than it is in English. Thus, initial position for S in an unmarked Russian sentence is virtually an automatic signal for its thematic function, whereas this is not the case in English, as further data will show. It may be assumed that at least with respect to S, V, and C, word-order in English is a weaker signal of FSP than it is in Russian, and the additional means merely
compensate for this weakness rather than increase the overall contrast between the thematic and non-thematic sections.

1.2 Actual-Syntactic Type <(S) V (P/I)'>

1.21 In his representation of the actual-syntactic types, Adamec (1966:49-85) shows no sentences with compound predicates. Nevertheless, from his discussion on the relation between the syntactic nature of the sentence components and their FSP roles (1966:32), it can be gathered that sentences like:

(127) Da èto že i est' Kostja
But it really is Kostya /175/

(128) Ja ved' soglasna ezdit'
I don't mind commuting /123/

are <(S) V (P)'> and <(S) V (I)'> respectively. Although P and I are FRA's of the verb, and by the operation of primary semantic means (and word-order means) their degrees of CD should be higher than those in verbs, rheme-accent is nevertheless intuitively placed on V. In the above two examples the exclusion of P and I from the non-thematic section is reflected by the occurrence of the rhematizing particles i and ved'; in addition, as can be gathered from Adamec (1966:25), the occurrence of the present tense copula est', rather than its zero variant, can also be understood as a rhematizing device in Russian.

However, in the example:

(129) No Semen Eremeevic ne stal ni kričat', ni branit'sja
but Semyon Yeremeyevich did not begin shouting or arguing /125/

the rhematizer, in this case the negative particle, occurs not only with
V, but also with I. Here, in order to support the intuitive placement of rheme-accent, one has no recourse but to appeal to the external FSP means, i.e., to the context. The examination of the context shows that S is in each case context-given: if it is not already a definite pronoun, as in (127) and (128), pronominalization would not be inappropriate, e.g., in (129) where not only S, but also P can be considered context-given, since by the same criterion, the co-ordinated infinitives are substitutable by a semi-pronominal expression of the type delat' étogo.

Moreover, as suggested by (129), context-dependence in each case affects almost the entire sentence, and the type dealt with in this section can thus be recognized as verificative.

A point of interest in this actual-syntactic type is its deviation from the basic distribution of CD. One explanation is that, being usually a reaction to some presumed opinion, a verificative sentence is expected to be somewhat more emphatic in comparison with an informative type. Thus, emphasis, or even emotiveness, is justified in (128), which is spoken by a woman desperately in need of employment.

On the other hand, emotiveness alone is insufficient to account for the non-final rheme-proper in such sentences. In fact, (129) would lose much in style if it were read with any sort of emotion: if anything, of interest here is the calmness with which Semyon Yeremeyevich responds to an accusation. At this point one should recall (III. 3.5) that in Russian, a sentence with a stressed verb placed before S or C is even more neutral than the one with a verb in the final position. From this it can be inferred that the parallel structure S - V - P/I, in which P and I are FRA's, could be considered expressively and stylistically
neutral. Perhaps, this is why if the components in (127) are rearranged to approximate the basic distribution of CD, the resultant sentence:

(130) Da êto_{11} Že Kostja_{12} i est'_{30}

becomes somewhat less natural than (127).

Thus, rather than be thought of as an automatic feature of stressed verbs placed before a final FRA, any expressiveness, which is obviously present in some sentences of this type, must be accounted for at least by the context, but better still by some particles such as da . . . i, in (127) or ved' in (128).

1.22 The actual-syntactic type of the translations was found to correspond to the original in each case, although the lexical nature of the rhematizer was not always the same. For example, in (128) the intensifier ved' is replaced by the negation "don't"; but as far as signalling the verificative nature is concerned, the result is the same.

True, by not using some such intensifier as "really", the English version of (128) does not explicitly convey some sort of markedness that was argued to be present in the original. At the same time, it must be granted that emotiveness in Modern English is generally subdued not only as compared with the non-Germanic languages, but even if one compares the Modern English versions with the Old English texts (cf. Firbas 1957:90).

1.3 Actual-Syntactic Type <(S V) A>

(131) mysli lezut vse kakie-to neveselye
the thoughts which keep coming to her are all cheerless ones /175/.

1.31 The attribute here has a predicative characteristic, but
it is still A rather than Pa, since putting it in the instrumental case would not be acceptable in this sentence. Perhaps, it would be possible to interpret V as also non-thematic, but without at least a preliminary investigation, I shall accept the inference which may be drawn from Adamec (1966:7,32,45), that V does not form a complex unit with A.

Another consideration in favour of a thematic V is its strong semantic predictability from S, as a result of which V 'hardly pushes the communication forward' (cf. Firbas 1966:244).

1.32 I analyze the actual-syntactic type of the translation as <(S) V P>, where S is "the thoughts which keep coming to her". "Which keep coming to her" is an attributive clause and has an FSP of its own. However, on a higher level it is a constituent of the subject group and functions as a single FSP element with S. S is thematic on all counts: the basic distribution of CD, the primary and additional semantic means. V is non-thematic on account of its transitional nature; and P, being a FRA, is the rheme itself.

On the surface, this actual-syntactic type is different from the original. However, if TME in the Russian sentence is considered separately from the root morpheme, there is no functional difference between the Russian and English versions:

(131a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>thematic</th>
<th>non-thematic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russian:</td>
<td>S lez-</td>
<td>TME (-ut) A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English:</td>
<td>S A-clause</td>
<td>TME (are) P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This diagram shows that the difference is on the grammatical and lexical
levels, but not on the level of FSP. The two sentences must therefore be considered functionally equivalent, especially that the difference in CD between P and V of the English sentence is heightened by the dynamizing quantitative expression "all".

1.4 Actual-Syntactic Type <S (V)>

(132) Moj otec byl šaxterom
My father was a miner /179/.

1.4.1 The rheme-accent is placed counter to all the internal FSP means, viz., against the operation of primary semantic means, since šaxterom is a FRA, and against word-order means, since rheme-proper is in the basically thematic position. Therefore, the external factors have to be looked to for supporting the intuitive placement of the rheme-accent.

Here is the context:

[Children from a kindergarten are making snowmen. Minaev's snowman is taking an unusual shape, and the teacher shows concern.]
"Look here, Minayev, what's this?"
"A miner," answers Minayev reluctantly.
"But have you ever seen any miners?"
"When I was little, we used to live in Gorlovka. . . ."
"But where are his legs?"
"There!" Minayev poked down with his finger. "He's getting out of the pit."
"Miners are brought up in a cage. You must have forgotten. . . ."
"Forgotten? . . ." The narrow black eyes look angrily at the teacher. "My father was a miner."

It is obvious that "miner" (šaxter) is context-affected in (132). In fact, it may even be considered context-given, since a pronominal substitution of the kind:

(132a) Moj otec byl ODNIM IZ NIX
My father was ONE OF THEM
would not be inappropriate. The context thus supports the intuitive placement of the rheme-accent on S.

The resultant actual-syntactic type <S (V)> has its thematic and non-thematic sections arranged in what is known in FSP studies as the 'subjective', or 'emotive' order. Considering even the short context given above, there is hardly a need to justify emotiveness in this sentence.
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1.42 The actual-syntactic type of the translation is also <S (V)>. The same factors apply in arriving at this interpretation: "miner" is the topic of the discussion (the indefinite article here is generic) and can be pronominalized as "one of them". Hence, the rheme-accent has also been placed counter to the internal FSP means within the subject group.

However, differing from Russian, the 'inverted' order of FSP elements in English does not necessarily imply emotiveness. If any emotiveness is present in the English sentence, it can only be inferred from the external means, viz., the context, and not from the structure of the sentence itself. 27

1.5 Summary: Linear Structure S - V

The linear structure S - V was found to be unique in that it is the only one where word-order of the two languages always coincides. Moreover, all actual-syntactic types were found to be functionally equivalent; in fact, save for only one case (131), they were also formally identical.

Except for <S (V)> and the verificative sentences in...
<(S) V (P/I)'>, the internal FSP means reflect the intuitive placement of the rheme-accent. And even in the exceptions the contextual dependence is explicit and allows complete or partial pronominal substitutions of the unaccented components.

From the point of view of frequency of occurrence (for statistical figures see Appendix), it can be said that the basic actual-syntactic type for the linear structure S - V is <(S) V>, others being merely occasional. Such a distribution suggests that the main function of language is communicating new information rather than its verification or the expression of emotions. This picture is somewhat blurred by <(S V) A>, which in spite of being of an occasional nature, is also an informative type without necessarily expressive or verificative nuances.

It must be admitted, however, that Adamec's (1966:32) notion on the FSP must be admitted, however, that Adamec's (1966:32) notion on the FSP nature of A has influenced the present analysis, and that an exhaustive investigation of this problem could show that a non-thematic A, too, can combine with V to form a single FSP unit, or at least to function with it in the same non-thematic section; consequently, even (131) could then be interpreted as <(S) V>.

2. Linear Structure V - S

Three actual-syntactic types are formed by sentences with this linear structure: 1) <V S>, 2) <V (S)>, 3) <(V) S>.

2.1 Actual-Syntactic Type <V S>

2.11 An example of this actual-syntactic type is:

(133) Priedet, naprimer, revizija
A revision committee might arrive /121/.
The essential feature of the Russian sentences forming this actual-syntactic type is that both components are context-free and the verb has the semantic characteristic of esse or is at least potentially interpretable as such. V is thus lower in CD than S, but is still non-thematic on account of its transitional nature. The theme here is lexically unexpressed, and for simplicity of representation is not shown (cf. (82), (83)).

2.12 Although, to my knowledge, Firbas does not deal in terms of 'zero' themes in English, I feel that for sentences like (133) this concept could be usefully employed even in English. True, the notional part of "arrive" (i.e., to the exclusion of TME) in (133) could be considered thematic on account of being 'presented as contextually affected'. However, I see no advantage in it, especially that it is just the interpretation of what is 'presented' as being contextually affected that finds the least agreement in intuitive interpretations. Therefore, as in the Russian sentences, no theme is shown where there is no lexical expression of it. The translations were thus found to form two actual-syntactic types: <S V> and <(it/there) V S>.

2.121 <S V> underlies the translation of (133). Another example is:

(134) pritupilas' bditel'nost'
your vigilance has been lulled /121/.

The non-final position of the rheme-accent does not render the English sentences expressively marked. This actual-syntactic type for English sentences must therefore be considered in all respects equivalent
to \(<V S>\) of the Russian sentences.

2.122 Examples of \((it/there) V S\) are:

(135) Byl temnyj sentjabr'skij večer
It was a dark September evening /133/

(136) Bylo odno mgnovenie neproizvol'noj radosti
There was one moment of unthinking joy /141/.

The \(V - S\) order in these English sentences is again unmarked, since it is part of the unmarked existential construction 'it/there - \(V - S\)', and the actual-syntactic type of these translations is again in all respects equivalent to \(<V S>\) of the Russian sentences.

2.13 To sum up on \(<V S>\) of the Russian sentences and its translations: both components are context-free; \(V\) is esse or potentially esse; the additional semantic means are absent in Russian, but an indefinite article is used in the subject group of the English sentences whenever possible; if \(V\) has the semantic content of 'appearance', the English sentence has \(<S V>\), and if 'existence', the translation has \((it/there) V S>\); despite the surface difference between the actual-syntactic types, they are all functionally and expressively equivalent.

2.2 Actual-Syntactic Type \(<V (S)>\)

2.21 In most cases the rheme-accent is supported by primary semantic means: verb is either amplified by a FRA:

(137) "Očen' tjaželoe bylo vremja"
"It was a very hard time" /125/

or, lacking any semantic affinity with \(S\), the verb can hardly be
interpreted as esse:

(138) "Rebjačitsja starik"
"The old man is behaving like a child" /151/.

In one case V potentially has an esse character:

(139) zakončilas' razgruzka
the unloading was over /195/

and owing to the lack of any additional semantic means, one has to turn to the context itself, where there is ample evidence to consider "the unloading" as being context-affected. Still, seeing that zakončit'sja has also a strong suggestion of process (in fact, basically it is a process verb), it would be difficult to say without reservations that the rheme-accent is placed in this sentence contrary to the operation of primary semantic means.

None of the sentences in this group seem to be emotive or emphatic. The marked order rheme - theme can be accounted for by stylistic reasons: most sentences are in direct speech, and the remainder is in first person narrative, in which a trait of the spoken language is quite in order.

2.22 The translations fall into two actual-syntactic types: <(S) V> and <(it) V A (S)>.

2.221 Examples of <(S) V> are (138) and (139). The actual-syntactic types of the originals and of the translations are functionally equivalent, but colloquial flavour seems absent in the English sentences.

2.222 An example of <(it) V A (S)> is (137). Despite the
difference in the grammatical structures, the actual-syntactic types of (137) are functionally equivalent. This becomes clear if Firbas's method of evaluating the CD of FSP elements is used:

\[(140) \quad \begin{array}{c|c|c}
P & V & S \\
očen' tjaželoe & bylo & vremja \\
\end{array}\]

The non-esse (in this case copulative) nature of V in the Russian sentence suggests a thematic function of S. In the English sentence, however, the verb is part of the 'existential it' construction, and the thematic function of S must be inferred from the context: the topic of the entire passage preceding (137) is war-time difficulties, and the actual information in (137) is merely a summary of that.

Colloquial trait is again not evident from the structure of the English sentence. However, the translation has the word "very", which can be considered an adequate means for stylistic colouring, since the use of 'loaded' expressions in English is more restrained than it is in Russian.

2.23 In Russian sentences forming <V (S)>, the inverse order V - S is due to colloquial flavour. Since the same device cannot be employed to add colloquial flavour to English sentences, it is understandable that most translations simply have the basic linear structure S - V. Nor is the 'existential it' construction inappropriate for (137), since the copulative verb in the Russian sentence may be thought of as being a derivative of V esse from the postulated 'deep structure':
(141) Bylo očen' tjaželoe vremja.

It is not my intention to argue that (137) is indeed a derivative of (141), but the fact that the two are synonymous and can be used in identical contexts, offers sufficient explanation for the existential construction in English (cf. 2.13).

2.3 Actual-Syntactic Type <(V) S>

(142) ěto stučit ee naxolodavšee serdce it is her chilled heart beating /175/

(143) menjalis' tol'ko geografičeskie nazvanija only the geographical names varied /155/.

2.31 The verb, being placed before S, tends to be interpreted as esse, and it cannot be said with certainty that primary semantic means do not co-operate with rheme-accent.

Moreover, the thematic function of V is in each case supported by its being 'known' from the context--this is the only factor that distinguishes the present actual-syntactic type from <V S>. In the above examples, the contextual dependence of V is reflected by the internal FSP means: the dedynamizer ěto of (142) and the rhematizer tol'ko of (143). In some cases, however, the contextual dependence of V can be accounted for only in terms of a 'thematic layer', e.g., as initiated by the reference to the destruction caused by a bomb in the following context which immediately precedes (144) and (145): "One of Hitler's bombs had destroyed his house on University Embankment",

(144) pogibla žena his wife had perished /193/
2.32 The translations form two actual-syntactic types: 
\(<S (V)> \) and \<(it) V S (Rel)\>.

2.321 The actual-syntactic type \(<S (V)> \) underlies the translations of (143), (144), and (145).

As with the Russian sentences, the rheme-accent on S is accounted for if not by the potential esse character of the verb ("burnt", i.e., "ceased to exist", "disappeared in flames"), then by the thematic layer of the passage. In addition, S in (143) is rhematized by the special semantic means "only".

S - V sequence being neutral for English, the translations are equivalent not only functionally, but also expressively.

2.322 The actual-syntactic type \<(it) V S (Rel)\> underlies (142), which can also be shown as:

\[(146)\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>thematic</th>
<th>non-thematic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>èto stuč-</td>
<td>-it (TME) ee naxolodavšee serdce</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>thematic</th>
<th>non-thematic</th>
<th>thematic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>it</td>
<td>is (TME) her chilled heart</td>
<td>beating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The expression "beating" is interpreted here as a contraction of the relative clause "which/that is beating". Apart from "beating" (stučit) being affected by the context, the splitting sentence 'it is X that Y' contributes to interpreting 'that Y' as thematic (just as èto additionally dedynamizes V in the Russian sentence) and 'X' as being singled out for
"particular attention" (Firbas 1967:141,145n5). I take 'particular attention' to mean not necessarily emphasis, but primarily communicative importance. If this is correct, the translation is both functionally, and expressively equivalent to the original. In any case, there would be no justification from the text for considering (142) as being marked for style or emotiveness.

2.33 Having different actual-syntactic types in the translations again seems to be related to the semantic character of the verb: <S (V)> for verbs of appearance, and <(it) V S (Rel)> for the existential verbs (semantic affinity and predictability between "heart" and "beating" in (142) are at its highest, and "beating" can be easily interpreted as "living", i.e., "existing"--in fact, in the Russian sentence, stuchit can be omitted altogether, which shows its strong affinity in this context with the existential verb byt').

2.4 Summary: Linear Structure V - S

In the majority of cases the linear structure V - S underlies unmarked Russian sentences where V is either contextually dependent, or is at least potentially an esse verb. The same linear structure is used for colloquial stylization or for emphasis when S is contextually dependent.

Word-order in the translations usually changes to S - V in accordance with the grammatical requirements of English. However, in the case of verbs with existential characteristics, the translators prefer the 'existential it/there' construction, or the splitting sentence 'it is X that Y'.

The best represented actual-syntactic type in this group is
<V S>, but unlike with <(S) V>, the difference in ratio is not sufficiently
great to refer to it as the basic actual-syntactic type for linear
structure V - S. Nor, in spite of the subjective order of the FSP ele-
ments, can the relatively well represented type <V (S)> be considered
occasional--on the contrary, this seems a standard general-informative
type from the point of view of direct speech or first person narrative.
Trailing not far behind in numbers is <(V) S>--also purely an informative
type without any expressive or verificative nuances, but differing from
<V S> in that the verb, if not explicitly context-given, is at least
'known' from the context.

3. **Summary: Sentences Containing S and V**

3.1 For the Russian sentences the choice of one or the other
linear structure was found to be dependent on the following factors:
1) S - V is chosen if: (a) S is context-affected; (b) V is context-
affected and the sentence is at the same time emotively coloured.
2) V - S is chosen if: (a) neither S nor V are context-affected and the
latter is interpretable as V esse; (b) V is context-affected; (c) S is
context-affected and at the same time the sentence has a colloquial trait.

As for the co-operation of the FSP means, it was found that in
the expressively neutral sentences all means co-operate with the basic
distribution of CD. In the marked sentences, however, the rheme-accent
always clashes with the basic distribution of CD and, apart from the
colloquially flavoured sentences, also with the primary semantic means.

3.2 In the English sentences the choice of the linear structure
was found to be determined by the semantic nature of the verb, regardless
of which component is context-affected: \( S - V \) for non-existential verbs (but including verbs of appearance); and \( V - S \) (as part of the 'existential it/there' construction or of the splitting sentence) for the existential verbs.

As for the co-operation of the FSP means, there seems to be no consistency in its relation to the markedness of the English sentences.
VI. SENTENCES CONSISTING OF S, V, C

The maximum number of permutations with three components is six, and all are represented in the data. The linear structures are:
1) S - V - C, 2) C - V - S, 3) S - C - V, 4) C - S - V, 5) V - C - S, 6) V - S - C.

1. Linear Structure S - V - C

The Russian sentences with the linear structure S - V - C form the following actual-syntactic types: 1) \( <(S) \ V \ C> \), 2) \( <(S) \ V \ (C)> \), 3) \( <S \ (V \ C)> \), 4) \( <(S \ V) \ C> \).

1.1 Actual-Syntactic Type \( <(S) \ V \ C> \)

1.11 In this section the complement \( (C) \) is dealt with under separate headings, according to its semantic sub-classes Co, Cpl, and Cdi (cf. p. 58).

1.111 Actual-syntactic type \( <(S) \ V \ C> \) with the Co variety. In this group of sentences S has the least degree of CD, as reflected by the two internal FSP means: semantic structure and word-order. In addition, S was found to be context-affected, with the following single exception:

(147) "Montery torgujut kazennym provodom"  "The electricians are selling government wire" /135/.

However, it may be argued that in a number of cases not only S, but also Co is known from the context:
and yet the rheme-accent is intuitively placed on C rather than V. These are the instances when it is the communicative intention of the speaker that renders a sentence element the rheme-proper whether context-affected or not. But since it cannot be predicted when it is to be understood that a context-affected element is intended to function as the rheme-proper, the present study chooses to rely on intuitive knowledge of the rheme-accent as the primary criterion for recognizing the rheme-proper. Sentences containing complements that express direction (Cdi) and place (Cpl) add further evidence for the unreliability of the context as the primary criterion for an FSP analysis.

There are also sentences in which the entire V - C group is context-affected, but the group becomes rhematized by some special semantic means such as tože:

(149) "Ja tože xotela svjazat'sja s partizanami"  
"I wanted to join the partizans, too" /127/.

1.112 Variety with Cdi. The occurrence of context-affected C is three times as frequent when C denotes direction, e.g.:

(150) Vera Ivanovna idet sledom za devočkoj  
Vera Ivanovna follows the little girl /171/

in which the head word of the complement group can be pronominalized as:

(150a) Vera Ivanovna idet sledom za NEJ  
Vera Ivanovna follows HER.

In this example S is also known from the context and one could expect...
that the rheme-proper should be the verb. However, the rheme-accent on V would be counterintuitive, and this can be accounted for as follows. In the sentence under discussion the semantic content of the complement is not the involvement of девочка in the action denoted by the verb, but девочка is here merely one of the co-ordinates by which the reader knows the path of Vera Ivanovna's walking, and as such, i.e., in the semantic content of a co-ordinate for a point of direction, the complement may be considered as 'new' with respect to the presented information.

1.113 Variety with Cpl. This group has the highest ratio of context-affected complements, e.g.:

(151) Всё её справки и характеристики остались здесь /131/.
All her papers and references were there /131/.

In fact, in only half of the cases Cpl is context-free with any degree of certainty, as in:

(152) Он стоял в сторонке
He stood at one side /193/.

1.114 The intuitive placement of the rheme-accent on C despite its context-affectedness (and, in (151), the non-co-operation of the additional semantic means) can perhaps also be accounted for by the fact that S, too, is in each case context-affected, as well as by the semantically weak nature of the verb, which is usually of the быть type:

(153) Я была в оккупации
I stayed in occupied territory /125/.

and is in need of amplification. This could also apply to the verbs of motion, as in (150), where, without the complement, the sentence could
only be used for emphatic or verificative purposes, e.g.:

(154) Ona idet."

There is no reason to assume expressive or stylistic markedness in any of the sentences. This is consistent with the co-operation of primary semantic and word-order means to achieve the basic distribution of CD.

1.12 The translations have the same actual-syntactic type as the Russian sentences, cf. (147)-(153). This is in accordance with the grammatical requirements of English and with the neutrality of the sentences. The only difference is the transposition of the rhematizer "too" (cf. (149)), but since this particle is not a sentence component, its place within the sentence is of no concern to this study.

1.2 Actual-Syntactic Type <(S) V (C)>

1.21 Variety with Co. In the majority of sentences the thematic nature of C can be accounted for by the general-verificative type of the sentence, often signalled by a modal expression, such as možet byt':

(155) [A možet byt',] on ne obognal žizn'

[Or maybe] this latter-day artistic prophet isn't so avantgarde

or some particle:

(156) "Veđ' ja ljubljju tebjaw" "You know I love you" /157/.

When the sentence is not verificative, the thematic function of the complement is either signalled by a dedynamizer, such as an anaphoric
pronoun:

(157) "Ona izvodit menja"
"She exasperates me" /157/,

or a proper noun:

(158) Takaja postanovka dela vozmutila Sergeja Eremeeviča
This state of affairs outraged Semyon Єremeyevich /123/,

or the sentence is such that pronominalization of C would be admissible:

(159) Ja poterjala Andreja
I lost Andrei /207/

(159a) Ja poterjala EGO
I lost HIM.

1.212 Variety with Cdi. Here the rheme-accent can also be accounted for either by the general negation in combination with such conjunctions as no in verificative sentences:

(160) no šum ego ne doxodil sjuda
but its noises did not reach this place /149/,

or by the dedynamizing anaphoric pronoun in the informative types:

(161) Deti ogljadyvajutsja na nix
The children look back at them /183/.

1.213 Variety with Cpl. This group is represented by only two sentences, both verificative. In one, the verificative nature is signalled by the interjection net:

(162) "Net, on ne ostalsja tam!"
"No, he did not stay there!" /179/
and in the other, by the modal word dejstvitel'no:

(163) Dokumenty Efimovoj dejstvitel'no naxodilis' u nego
Yefimova's papers were indeed with him /117/.

As mentioned previously (III. 3.5) the medial position of the
rHEME-accent in the linear-dynamic structure S - V - C is not an automatic
signal for expressive markedness, especially when the verb denotes an
attitude or influence of S on C (cf. note 25). On the other hand, some
sentences in this group are indeed emphatic, as in (162), or have a
colloquial colouring, as in (158). However, markedness is usually sig-
nalled here by some additional means. For example, emphasis may be sig-
nalled by a particle, such as ved' in (156), and the colloquial trait is
suggested by the quotations of the direct speech or by the first person
narrative as in (159).

1.22 The translations, with a proviso noted below, have in
each case the same actual-syntactic type, which is consistent with the
grammatical requirements for word-order in English. The proviso is that
occasionally there may be some lexico-grammatical differences as in (155),
the actual-syntactic type for which is <(S) V (F)'>, rather than
<(S) V (C)'>. In the main, such differences are merely due to the require-
ments of idiom and have no significance for the comparison of word-order
or FSP. In order to avoid unnecessary atomization of the data, such
differences will subsequently be left without comment.

1.3 Actual-Syntactic Type <S (V C)>

1.3.1 For this actual-syntactic type the data has only two
varieties of C: Co and Cpl.
1.311 Variety with Co. The initial place of the rheme-accent can in each case be accounted for by the special semantic means, e.g., by a partial negation (which at the same time signals the thematic function of the verb, i.e., the 'specific' nature of the actual-syntactic type):

(164) ne vse my ponimali istinnoe znachenie etogo slova  
not all of us understood the real significance of this phrase

or by an intensifying particle:

(165) Dazhe detiski ponimali nevynosimju tjahest' polozenija  
Even children understood the unbearable gravity of the situation

1.312 Variety with Cpl. Here the rheme-accent is again supported by the internal FSP means, this time by an indefinite pronoun:

(166) chto-to rasterjannoe, zhalkoe mel'knulo v nix  
something confused and pathetic flickered in them

In this sentence the subject group has its CD raised still further by being extended with a co-ordinate adjective.

1.321 Except for one case, the translations have the same actual-syntactic type as the Russian sentences (cf. (164)-(166)), as well as the same additional or special semantic means that help to account for the non-final rheme-accent.

1.322 The exception involves a splitting sentence:

(167) "eto ty pomog ego osvobozdeniju!"  
"it is you who have helped to free him!"

The actual-syntactic type for this translation is <(it) V S (Rel)>. It
can again be shown, as in (146), that this actual-syntactic type is functionally equivalent to the one formed by the Russian sentence.

1.33 In the Russian sentences with the underlying actual-syntactic type \(<S (V C)\rangle\), the initial position of the rheme-accent is supplemented by the lack of co-operation of the primary semantic means, and the sentences are felt to be expressively marked. Emotiveness or emphasis are clearly suggested by the content of the story--see especially (167).

As for the English sentences, except for the splitting sentence (167) used here as an emphatic device, their structure simply follows the grammatical requirements for English--and where no special words, such as 'even', are used, the dramatic effect of the Russian sentences may sometimes be left unmatched:

(168) bol'še semidesjati čelovek podnjalos' po krutomu trapu bombardirovščika
more than seventy people climbed the steep gangway into the bomber /195/.

1.4 Actual-Syntactic Type \(<(S V) C>\)

1.41 The data contains only the variety with Co:

(169) "Ja živu s papoj i mamoj"
"I live with my Mum and Dad" /121/.

The rheme-accent is in each case supported by both the final position of the sentence component, and by the primary semantic means. The verb is interpreted as thematic on account of the context (cf. "semajnoe položenie" which precedes (169) in the text), as well as on account of the prosody of the sentence: considering it within its context, the most natural place
for a pause in this example is after živu, thus helping to delimit the thematic from non-thematic sections (cf. Adamec 1966:60).

1.42 In this actual-syntactic type the translations show no difference from the original sentences.

1.5 **Summary: Linear Structure S - V - C**

The data shows that the linear structure S - V - C is used in Russian in the following ways. In the majority of cases (71%) it underlies general-informative sentences with a thematic S, i.e., the actual-syntactic type <(S) V C>. It is also common (20%) in general-verificative sentences, or when, in addition to S, C is thematic, too. Sometimes (6%) it is used for the emotive specific-informative sentences <S (V C)> with S functioning as rheme-proper. Occasionally (3%), this linear structure serves for forming specific-informative types with a non-thematic Co.

With only one exception, the translations have the same word-order and the same actual-syntactic types. The exception concerns a highly emotive sentence for which the translator chose the splitting sentence construction 'it is X that Y', forming the actual-syntactic type <(it) V S (Rel)>.  

2. **Linear Structure C - V - S**

The Russian sentences with the linear structure C - V - S form the following actual-syntactic types: 1) <(C) V S>, 2) <(C V) S>, 3) <(C) V (S)>.
2.1 Actual-Syntactic Type \(<(C) V S>\)

2.1.1 The data contains all three varieties of C.

2.1.1.1 Variety with Cpl. In two cases the rheme-accent is supported by the context, as in:

\[(170)\] v kabinete naxodjatsja postoronnie ljudi
there are outsiders in the office /115/

where kabinet, having been described in some detail in the beginning of the story, is by now a familiar setting to the reader.

In most cases, however, the initial component is context-unaffected, as in:

\[(171)\] Po ulice idut deti
There are children going along the street /165/.

This sentence in fact begins the story and there can be no question of context-affectedness at that stage. If we are to maintain the analogy between Adamec's complement (C) and Firbas's FRA, we then have some difficulty in accounting for the neutrality of these sentences in view of the clash (i.e., non-co-operation) between the primary semantic means on the one hand, and the basic distribution of CD and the rheme-accent on the other. In the approach of Firbas, such a difficulty would not arise, since he would analyze an expression like "along the street" in (171) as a 'local setting' and therefore inherently lower in CD than the non-thematic verb and subject. However, in the case of Adamec's classification, it seems necessary to postulate that, with respect to its inherent amount of CD, the sentence component Cpl is ambivalent insomuch as it can be either higher, or lower in CD than the verb-subject group, depending on
whether or not the subject is thematized by the context and/or sentence position. If S is thematic, then Cpl indeed performs the function of a FRA and is thus higher in CD than the verb and subject. Otherwise, when there is no reason to assume that S is thematic, it is the complement that must be taken as thematic, functioning as a mere 'local setting'. Thus, provided that at least one of the components, Cpl or S, is context-unaffected and the underlying linear structure is S - V - C or C - V - S, the FSP role of the two components in question may be said to be mutually exclusive.

2.112 Variety with Co. With only one exception, the complement is dedynamized by the additional semantic means, e.g., by an anaphoric pronoun:

(172) U nego bylo polnoe simpatičnoe lico nekurjaščegu čeloveka
He had the nice, plump face of a non-smoker

while the subject is dynamized by its sentence position and frequently by the esse character of the verb. The place of the rheme-accent is thus adequately justified. In the exception:

(173a) rabotu tormozili neblagoprijatnje meteorologičeskie uslovija
work was hampered by inclement weather

the complement has no dedynamizer, but the examination of the context allows one to interpret rabotu as context-affected (cf. "set' . . . rabotala" in the same paragraph); in addition, the extension of the subject group by a co-ordinate attribute also has a dynamizing effect.

It has been noted above (cf. (32), (33)) that in the sequence V - S the verb is predisposed to be interpreted as V esse, provided that
both components are contextually unaffected and there is semantic affinity between them. This can also be maintained when the sentence contains Cpl, whose semantic content was postulated to be ambivalent (cf. 2.111). An attempt can be made to show that such complements as 'u + Gen.' in Russian (cf. (172)) are also ambivalent, since it can be argued that their semantic content is synonymous with that of the subject in an 'S has C' construction; the 'sentential', rather than 'FRA of verb' character of such objects is also suggested by their classification in GSRLJa (1970: 629) as 'sentence determiners', rather than as 'objects of verbs'. Moreover, the same kind of semantic ambivalence could exist even in objects whose case is governed by the idiosyncracy of the verb (accusative case being most typical). The test here would be the possibility of a reflexive or passive transformation resulting in the former object (FRA) becoming the subject of a verb amplified by another FRA, thus also becoming inherently lower in CD than the newly-formed V - C group. An example of such a test is:

(173a) rabota tormozilas' ... uslovijami

whereas the same cannot be performed on:

(173b) rabotu xotjat vse,

in consequence of which the object in the latter should not be considered ambivalent and thus interchangeable with S in its role of FRA. Perhaps this is one of the reasons why the sentence exemplified by (173b) is felt to have a contrastive or emphatic quality or at least would most likely be interpreted as a specific, rather than a general actual-syntactic type.

Further studies may show that even in the actual-syntactic type
under discussion the primary means do not necessarily clash with the rheme-accent and word-order, and perhaps this is why the sentences forming this group are in no way felt to be expressively marked.

2.113 Variety with Cdi. Here is an example:

Iz plotnoj zeleni sada vynyrnula malen'kaja strojnaja ženščina v sportivnymx tapočkax na bosu nogu
From the dense green foliage of the orchard there plunged out a slight, handsome woman with sports shoes on her stocking-less feet /147/.

Here the rheme-accent is again supported by the complement being known from the context, and also by the verb having the semantic characteristic of esse (in this case 'appearance'), which invites interpreting the subject as a FRA and perhaps accounts for the neutrality of the sentence, despite the apparent clash between the primary semantic means and the rheme-accent.

2.121 The translations of Russian sentences in which the variety of the complement is Cpl fall into basically two groups: those in which Cpl is in the sentence initial position--<((Cpl) V S) and <(Cpl) S V>--and those in which Cpl is in the sentence final position--<(there) V S (Cpl)> and <S V (Cpl)>.

2.1211 An example of <(Cpl) V S> is:

U dveri stojal stal sekretarši
By the door was the secretary's desk /111/.

All verbs in this group have the semantic characteristic of existence. The order V - S is grammatically fixed--cf. the unacceptable variant:
(175a) *By the door the secretary's desk was,

and the translations thus retain the neutrality of expressiveness evident in the Russian sentences. In fact, the two actual-syntactic types are identical.

2.1212 An example of $(Cp1) S V$:

(176) Na smuglom lice taet temnyj rumjanec
     On his dusky face the dark ruddiness is fading /183/.

Since the position of the rheme-proper in the sentence does not determine expressive markedness in the English sentence, this actual-syntactic type must be considered in all respects equivalent to the preceding $(Cp1) V S$.

The apparent reason for the difference is that there the order $V - S$ is grammatically fixed, whereas in the present instance the more usual $S - V$ order is maintained.

2.1213 The next actual-syntactic type $(there) V S (Cp1)$ underlies the most frequent way of translating the Russian sentences presently discussed. Its examples are (170) and (171), and the following:

(177) na lice ee igral svežij, molodoj rumjanec
     there was a fresh young blush on her cheeks /135/.

True, the expression after the subject in (171), i.e., in "There are children going along the street", is more like a participial phrase than $Cp1$, but what is essential to this study is that $Cp1$ of the Russian sentence is incorporated within that phrase; such cases are not treated here separately, especially since the '-ing' form can be inserted or omitted almost at will:
(177a) there was a fresh young blush PLAYING on her cheeks.

It can be shown in the manner of (131a) that the actual-syntactic types underlying the Russian and English sentences are functionally and expressively equivalent. What is of interest here is the reason for the translator's choice of this particular actual-syntactic type, rather than the one with Cpl in the sentence initial position. It must be noted that the actual-syntactic type of the translations discussed in this section is more frequent than those with the initial Cpl, which could suggest that the former is more usual for English. Indeed, the linear structure of the latter, C - V - S, owing to the sequence V - S, is relatively infrequent in English, whereas the 'existential there' construction is nothing out of the ordinary. Admitting that the size of the present data is too small for reliable generalizations, the translator's choice of the less usual linear structure seems nevertheless motivated.

In the case of (175) the final position for S can be justified, because it allows the unambiguous use of the anaphoric pronoun in the sentence immediately following it:

(178) By the door was the secretary's desk and on it stood a typewriter.

In another case:

(179) Pered nim ležala kopija žaloby žitelej sela Veselogo na plojuu rabotu transljacionnoj seti
In front of him lay a copy of a complaint from the villagers of Vesyoloye regarding the inefficiency of their relay broadcasting network /113/.

the choice of the final position for the subject seems motivated by the principle of cohesion, i.e., by keeping the head word of the subject
group as close as possible to the verb. Thus, the data is quite consistent with Firbas's observations that the main principles for word-order in English are the grammatical structure and cohesion of elements, rather than the principle of FSP. In one case, however:

(180) V glubine stojal širokij pis'mennyj stol s bronzovymi černil'nicami
At the far end was a wide desk with some bronze inkwells /110/,

the motivation for the sentence initial position of Cpl is not as readily explainable in terms of the context or idiom, and it could be that here the translator was influenced by the word-order of the original sentence.

2.1214 The remaining actual-syntactic type of the translations is <S V (C)>:

(181) po pjatam za nim xodila Liustra
Liustra followed at his heels /159/.

The existential character of the verb in the Russian sentence is at its minimum, and the translator is justified in disregarding this aspect and treating the verb as a processual one, arranging his sentence in the S - V - C pattern, rather than, e.g.:

(182) there was Liustra following at his heels.

2.122 When the complement in the Russian sentence is Co, the actual-syntactic type of the translations was found to be always <(S) V C>, as in (172), (173), and the following:

(183) U Andreja Polikarpoviča perexvatiло dyxanie
Andrei Polikarpovich caught his breath /143/.
Despite the surface differences, the actual-syntactic types of the translations are functionally and expressively equivalent to the original sentences. The differences are due to the reorganization of the correspondence between the syntactic and semantic contents: the complement and the subject in the Russian sentences are in the translations transformed into subject and complement respectively. In addition, when the complement of the Russian sentence is a direct object, rather than the 'u + Gen.' construction, the English sentence is made passive, as in (173).

2.123 The actual-syntactic type \( \langle \text{Cdi there} \rangle V S \rangle \) of the translation for the Russian sentence with Cdi (174) is essentially the same as the original. The 'existential there' element in the English sentence seems optional, although its insertion here could be justified by the esse character of the verb in the Russian sentence (especially because of the order of the components \( V - S \)).

2.2 Actual-Syntactic Type \( \langle \text{C V} \rangle S \rangle \)

2.21 The only variety of complement found here is Co. The thematic function of the C - V group is usually signalled by some special semantic means, e.g., the particle i:

\[
\text{(184) sred\'i posetitele\'j mogli naxodit'sja i slu\'cajnye ljudi there could easily be outsiders among those who had come to see him /111/}. \\
n\text{In one sentence:} \\
\text{(185) Na ka\'zdom \'u\'anka s podnjatym vorotnikom Each of them has on a winter coat with turned-up collar /169/},
\]

the thematic function of the verb is suggested by the occurrence of the
zero variant of the present tense existential verb byt' (cf. Adamec 1966: 25), while the thematic function of the complement/sentence determiner can be interpreted as in VI. 2.111, where the potential ambivalence of C has been noted.

2.22 The translations form the following actual-syntactic types: 1) <(S) V C>, 2) <(C) V S>, 3) <(there) V S>.

2.221 The actual-syntactic type <(S) V C> underlies (185); another example is:

(186) A na Vere Ivanovne pal'iško na ryb'em mexu
While Vera Ivanovna on the other hand is wearing a poor coat
with no warmth in it /171/.

As compared with the originals, the translations are again syntactically reorganized, transforming the complement and subject of Russian, respectively, into the subject and complement in English. This is not surprising, since the complements in the Russian sentence denote the possessor and are substitutable by the 'u + Gen.' expression, whose translations are prone to similar reorganizations (cf. (172)).

The only difference between the Russian and English sentences, then, is the degree of CD of the verb. V is felt to be non-thematic, especially in (186) where the interpolative "on the other hand" seems to divide the thematic from non-thematic sections. However, since the verb in the English sentences functions merely as a transition (as is, strictly speaking, TME in the Russian sentences), the two actual-syntactic types can still be considered functionally and expressively equivalent.

2.222 An example of <(C) V S> in the translations is:
(187) v nem različalis' tolok nadtresnutij skrip korostelja da neobyknovenno čistij golos kakoveto ptički [nastojčivo tverdijšej svoj polnyj tragičeskogo somnenija vopros: "Kak žit'? Kak žit'?"]

in it could be distinguished only the cracked cry of the land-rail and the unusually clear voice of some bird [which persistently repeated its question, full of tragic doubt: 'Kak zhit'? Kak zhit'?] /151/.

As shown previously in this study, and implied again in the preceding section, the difference between the verbs in the Russian actual-syntactic types of the kind <(C V) S> and the English types of the kind <(C) V S> reflects a different methodology of representation rather than a difference in FSP, and the fact of the functional equivalence of such actual-syntactic types need no longer be commented on. A point of interest here is the unusual C - V - S order of the English sentence. This can again be understood as being motivated by the principle of cohesion, since the extended nature of the subject group would remove the anaphoric "it" uncomfortably far from its antecedent in an S - V - C sequence.

2.223 The 'existential there' construction of <(there) V S> (the optional "easily" is ignored here), which occurs in (184), is consistent with the manner of translating the existential verbs in Russian.

2.3 Actual-Syntactic Type <(C) V (S)'>

2.31 This actual-syntactic type is represented by only two sentences:

(188) I vse že tut est' zamysel
And yet there is some conception here /177/

(189) "Značit, u vas byli vakansii"
"So you must have had some vacancies" /125/.
The general-verificative nature of the first example is signalled by the occurrence of est', rather than the zero variant of the existential verb byt'. In the second example the verificative nature is suggested by the modal word značit, but the recognition of the component functioning as the rheme-proper rests on the awareness of the context, viz., on the fact that vakansii can be inferred from naznačenie tehnika occurring in the immediately preceding sentence of the text.

The linear-dynamic structure C - V - S does not necessarily underlie only the expressive sentences, although in this case--since the types are verificative, and moreover represent either direct speech (188) or, in the case of (189), 'indirect interior monologue' (cf. Schaarschmidt 1966:144) a touch of emphasis and colloquial trait would be quite in order.

2.32 The actual-syntactic types of the translations are:
1) (S) V (C)', 2) (there) V (S C)'.

2.321 (S) V (C)' of the translation underlies (189). Once again, the 'u + Gen.' expression is syntactically reorganized, but the resultant actual-syntactic types are equivalent. On the other hand, it may be argued that, owing to the dynamizer "some", C is also non-thematic in the English sentence, or even that "some" itself is the rheme-proper, in view of the fact that "vacancies" is context-affected. This case is obviously multifunctional, and one could wonder whether the translator should not have avoided "some" which is not really called for by the Russian sentence.

2.322 The 'existential there' construction in the actual-syntactic type <(there) V (S C)'> reflects the general tendency to render
the Russian sentences with existential verbs. At the same time this seems a not altogether suitable choice of a construction in view of the thematic function of S in the Russian sentence. As a result, this case is also multifunctional, since there is a possibility—in fact, since it would be more natural—to interpret S as rhematic. The interpretation taken in this study is perhaps unorthodox in view of the occurrence of a thematic S in the 'existential there' construction, but one must remember that in this case we are dealing with a verificative sentence, the special status of which was pointed out in connection with (20).

2.4 Summary: Linear Structure C - V - S

2.41 The linear structure C - V - S of the Russian sentences underlies three actual-syntactic types, the best represented (75%) being the general-informative type <(C) V S>. Next (17%) comes the specific-informative type <(C V) S>, and finally, the general-verificative type <(C V (S)')> (8%). With the possible exception of the verificative sentences where a trait of emphasis or colloquial flavour was found not inappropriate, all sentences are expressively neutral. The neutrality of the sentences is reflected by the co-operation of rheme-accent with the basic distribution of CD and the primary semantic means (a postulation having been made that for certain semantic contents the operation of C as a semantic means is of an ambivalent nature).

2.42 In terms of the syntactic components, the translations fall basically into three patterns, depending on the semantic contents of C or V. First, the pattern is S - V - C when C has the semantic content of an 'objective complement' in the Russian sentences. Second, the
pattern may remain unaltered, i.e., C - V - S, when C functions as the 'local setting'. Third, the translations may have the 'existential there' construction, when the Russian sentences contain an existential verb. (For exceptions to these generalizations see individual sub-sections.)

It is more interesting to note that in most cases the linear distribution of the degrees of CD in the translations closely approximates the distribution in the Russian sentences. This may frequently be concealed in the abstract representations, owing to grammatical reorganizations which may take place in the English sentences, e.g., <(C) V S> of the Russian sentence, as in (172), vs. <(S) V C> of English, the 'deep' relations between the two being:

(190) Russian: $\downarrow$ C $\downarrow$ V ess $\downarrow$ S

English: $\downarrow$ S $\downarrow$ V poss $\downarrow$ C

('V poss' stands for 'verb denoting the act of possession', e.g., "to have").

A notable exception to such a similarity in the linear distributions of the degrees of CD is the use of the 'existential there' construction, as a result of which the thematic complement occurs in the sentence final position, as in (184). However, in its unmarked use, the 'existential there' construction is in itself a signal for a non-thematic V - S group and the place of other components is then virtually irrelevant for interpreting their degree of CD.

3. Linear Structure S - C - V

The Russian sentences based on the linear structure S - C - V
fall into three actual-syntactic types: 1) \(<(S) C V>\), 2) \(<(S C) V'>\), 3) \(<(S C P) V'>\).

3.1 Actual-Syntactic Type \(<(S) C V>\)

3.1.1 Some features common to all sentences in this group are: first, \(S\) is invariably expressed by a personal pronoun; second, the rheme-accent is always supported by the primary semantic means; third, the non-final position of the rheme-accent reflects a colloquial trait of the sentences, which all represent direct speech.

Two varieties of \(C\) are found in the data: \(Co\) and \(Cpl\).

3.1.1.1 Variety with \(Co\):

(191) "Ty s uma sošel!" "You've gone mad!" /175/.

In addition to the primary semantic means, the rheme-accent in this example is also supported by the fact that, being a set expression, the phrase sojti s uma, unless functioning in second instances, would always have the rheme-accent on uma, regardless of its sentence position.

3.1.1.2 Variety with \(Cpl\):

(192) "On tam ostalsja" "He stayed there" /179/.

The dedynamizing characteristic of the demonstrative pronoun would seem to detract from the CD value of the complement. However, this is counterbalanced by the weak (esse) semantic content of the verb, which, unless functioning as rheme-proper in second instances, is felt incomplete without a FRA.
3.12 Regardless of whether the variety of C in the Russian sentence is Co or Cpl, the actual-syntactic type of the translation is always <(S) V C>. Since the non-final rheme-accent in the Russian sentences reflects a peculiarity of the spoken language, rather than emotiveness, the neutrality of the English sentences is not an important discrepancy.

3.2 Actual-Syntactic Type <(S C) V'>

3.21 The only sentence representing this actual-syntactic type is:

(193) "oni tut est'"
"they're here" /153/,

in which the present tense variant est' serves both as the rhematizer and as a signal for verification.

3.22 The actual-syntactic type of the translation can be interpreted as <(S V) C'>, in which case it would seem that in the main there is no functional equivalence with the original sentence. On the other hand, the verificative nature of both sentences is rather weak, and, bearing in mind the possibility of occasionally having multifunctional cases, both sentences can also be interpreted as general-informative types, i.e., <(S C) V> for Russian and <(S) V C> for English. In this case the verbs of both sentences are non-thematic and the remaining difference can then be dismissed, first, as a matter of idiom in English, second, by the fact that the Russian version of (193) for all practical purposes can be considered synonymous with:
(193a) oni tut,

the actual-syntactic type for which would also be \((S V) C\).

3.3 **Actual-Syntactic Type \((S C P) V'\)**

3.31 The sentence representing this actual-syntactic type is:

(194) Ėto Savel'evu izvestno ne bylo
Saveleyev didn't know that /119/.

The accumulative effect of the negation and the post-position of the verb with respect to \(P\) signals both the function of \(V\) as rheme-proper, and the verificative nature of the sentence.

3.32 The actual-syntactic type of the translation is \((S) V (C)'\). Again, \(S\) and \(C\) have been syntactically reorganized, but since they are both thematic in the original as well as in the translation, this fact is of little importance, especially since the linear order of the semantic contents represented by these components remains the same.

It is the FSP function of the predicative components that again shows some discrepancy. The correspondence between the semantic contents and the syntactic components in the two sentences is:

![Diagram](image)

This diagram shows that the thematic \(P\) in the Russian sentence has not only been transformed into the non-thematic \(V\), but in fact "know" now functions as the rheme-proper. (The informants were unanimous in their intuition that the rheme-accent on "didn't" would at best be the second
choice.) It could be suggested that the translator could have used the full negation, viz., "did not", perhaps in this manner drawing the rheme-accent onto the element that is rheme-proper in the original sentence, i.e., onto the negation itself. On the other hand, the published translation can be justified by the fact that (194) is synonymous with:

(194b) Savel'ev ne znal etogo.

It is by now obvious that from the point of view of FSP, the matter of correspondence between an original and its translation, for example as evidenced in (193) and (194), goes beyond the surface representations of the sentences, and an exhaustive treatment of such cases could prove to be a most rewarding study.

3.4 Summary: Linear Structure S - C - V

3.41 The basic actual-syntactic type for the linear structure S - C - V underlying Russian sentences is <(S) C V>. The non-final rheme-accent reflects a colloquial trait of the sentences, which all represent direct speech; in addition, some sentences were found to be also emphatic or emotive. Other actual-syntactic types in the data are both of the general-verificative type, but owing to the poor representation, the use of this linear structure as a means of showing verification can be considered as merely occasional.

3.42 The linear structure of the translations changes in each case to the most typical structure for English: S - V - C. This change does not detract from the functional correspondence, but the stylistic or emotive colouring present in some Russian sentences has thus no reflection
within the structure of the English sentence itself.

4. **Linear Structure C - S - V**

There are six Russian sentences with this linear structure. If the verificative type is grouped together with its informative counterpart (4.11) and P and A are treated as alternatives (as with P and I in section V. 1.2), the sentences form four actual-syntactic types: 1) \(<(C \ S) \ V>\), 2) \<(C \ S \ V) \ P/A>\, 3) \<(C) \ S \ V>\, 4) \<(C) \ S (V)>\.

4.1 **Actual-Syntactic Type \<(C \ S) \ V>\**

4.11 The examples are:

(195) No na samolet ja vse-taki popala!
Yet all the same I got on board the plane! /199/

(196) Na etom razgovor zakončilsja
The conversation ended with that /121/.

In both sentences there are internal means to support the rheme-accent: in the former it is the rhematizer vse-taki; in the latter the verb, being post-posed to S, is interpreted as processual, rather than esse.

4.12 The actual-syntactic type of the translations is in both cases \<(S) \ V (C)>--an equivalent of the originals. The non-final rheme-accent does not necessarily mean expressive markedness, although in (195) a slight emphasis due to verification would not be inappropriate.

4.2 **Actual-Syntactic Type \<(C S V) \ P/A>\**

4.21 The examples are:
(197) no mne on pokazalsja neskonecnym
but it seemed to me endless /203/

(198) "pensiju ja poluchaju porjadocnuju"
"I get a decent pension" /143/.

Rheme-accent is again supported by the internal means: in (197) it is the negative particle in P in combination with the conjunction no; in (198), it is the unusual position for A, by which, in the terminology of Firbas (1961:79), it is 'thrown into distinct relief'.

The clash between the rheme-accent and the primary semantic means in (198) may have resulted in a stylistic colouring of the sentence, viz., a colloquial flavour which in this data so often accompanies sentences representing direct speech.

4.22 There are two actual-syntactic types in the translations:
<(S V C) P> and <(S V) A (C)>.

4.221 <(S V C) P> underlies (197). The interpretation of V as belonging to the thematic section (with the exception of TME) is suggested by the position of C, which as though separates the thematic from non-thematic sections. True, an allowance must be made for the multifunctionality of the verb in this sentence. However, as was noted in 2.222, even if V is interpreted as non-thematic, the translation would still be functionally equivalent to the original, since in addition to V it has a non-thematic FRA.

4.222 <(S V) A (C)> underlies the translation of (198). Unlike in the Russian sentence, there are no internal means in the translation that would indicate the special FSP role of the attribute. Nevertheless,
the first preference for the position of the rheme-accent is on "decent". This is supported by the context where the word "retired", occurring but a few lines before, can be considered a precursor to an expression like "to get a pension".

Since the non-final position of the rheme-accent is on its own irrelevant for markedness in English, the two sentences can be considered equivalent not only functionally, but also expressively.

4.3 Actual-Syntactic Type \((C) S V\)

4.3.1 The sentence forming this actual-syntactic type is:

(199) "K vam gosti priexali"

"You have guests" /141/. Although both S and V are non-thematic, V has a lower degree of CD than S on account of its esse (appearance) content. The thematic nature of C is supported by the sentence position, as well as by being expressed through the dedynamizing personal pronoun and by having the ambivalent nature of complement/sentence determiner. The marked position for the rheme-accent reflects a colloquial trait appropriate to direct speech (as well as to the house servant, to whom this utterance belongs).

4.3.2 As could be expected, the translation transforms the complement/sentence determiner and the subject of the Russian sentence into the subject and complement respectively, and arranges the components in the most usual order, forming the actual-syntactic type \((S) V C\). As is often the case, the translator is satisfied with functional equivalence, without attempting to reflect also the colloquial trait.
4.4 Actual-Syntactic Type \((C) S (V)\)

4.41 The example is:

(200) "U menja vot Sil'va byla takoj"  
"Silva was that dog for me" /145/.

Here the rheme-accent clashes with the primary semantic means. On their own, the internal FSP means are insufficient in this sentence to signal the position of the rheme-accent, since \(S\) itself is a proper noun, i.e., a dedynamizer, and in addition is known from the context. For that matter, even the examination of the context does not resolve the problem of finding either internal, or external support for the place of the rheme-accent -- it is cases like these that are responsible for the decision taken in this study to consider the rheme-accent, rather than the non-prosodic FSP means, as the basic criterion for determining the rheme-proper.

Once again, the medial position of the rheme-accent reflects a colloquial trait expected to accompany a sentence in direct speech; moreover, some kind of emotiveness (perhaps, best described in this context as zaduševnost') would not be inappropriate in the sentence under discussion.

4.42 The actual-syntactic type of the translation is \(<S V (P C)\>). Functionally the two types are equivalent. As for expressiveness, it could be present even in the English sentence on account of the clash between the rheme-accent and the primary semantic means.

4.5 Summary: Linear Structure \(C - S - V\)

4.51 It has been implied at the beginning of this section that, strictly speaking, each Russian sentence with the linear structure \(C - S - V\)
forms a separate actual-syntactic type, and that the grouping together of two sentences in 4.11 and 4.21 was done with a view to avoid atomization of the data. It is obvious that no predominant actual-syntactic type can be established for this linear structure.

4.52 The linear structure of the translations is in each case the most usual one for English, viz., $S - V - C$, with the provision that when $C$ is a sentence determiner rather than a true 'object of the verb', $C$ and $S$ of the Russian sentences may be transformed to $S$ and $C$ respectively.

In one instance ((200)) both the translation and the original show a clash between the rheme-accent and the primary semantic means, which could reflect the appropriateness in this case of some expressive colouring.

5. Linear Structure $V - C - S$

This linear structure is represented by three sentences, each forming an actual-syntactic type of its own: 1) $<V C S>$, 2) $<V C S>$, 3) $<V C (S)>$.

5.1 Actual-Syntactic Type $<(V C) S>$

5.11 The example is:

$(201)$ ne pol'zovals' uspexom u publiku (k velikomu moemu udvleniju i dosade) i moja "Zar-ptica" even my "Firebird" had no success with the public (to my great astonishment and chagrin) /187/.

Rheme-proper is signalled by the rhematizer $i$. The rheme-accent clashes with the primary semantic means, resulting in a mild emphasis, or at least a colloquial flavour which becomes apparent if (201) is compared with what
could be considered its more formal variant:

(201a) Moja Žar-ptica także ne pol'zovalas' uspexom u publiki.

The non-final position of the rheme-accent does not on its own add to expressiveness. Nevertheless, the sentence is felt to be somewhat emphatic, which perhaps can be accounted for by the fact that rheme-accent clashes with the primary semantic means.

5.2 Actual-Syntactic Type \( <V \ C S> \)

5.21 The example is:

(202) Zaskripeli po snegu ego udaljajuščiesja šagi
His retreating footsteps started crunching through the snow /177/.

In this sentence, \( C \) functions as an interpolative theme.

5.22 The actual-syntactic type of the translation is \( <S \ V \ C> \).

Although \( C \) is potentially a FRA and occurs in the sentence final position, it is nevertheless interpreted as a thematic setting. This can be explained by the fact that "snow" is known from the context, and therefore the word "crunching" hardly needs a FRA complement (which is in fact redundant in this sentence). The esse characteristic of \( V \) may not be obvious at first sight. Nevertheless, its strong semantic affinity with the context-unaffected \( S \) suggests such an interpretation, in this way accounting for the rheme-accent on \( S \).

5.3 Actual-Syntactic Type \( <V \ C \ (S)> \)

5.31 The example is:
The street helps the teacher. When the children come up to the cross-roads, the militiaman raises his baton, the traffic-signals over his head light up a yellow apple on all four sides, and all the traffic halts. The impatient taxis which are always belatedly on their way somewhere, the cars with their important passengers, the buses and trolley-buses packed tight with people hurrying to and from work stop dead, the white milk-tanker which distributes milk about the town, the enormous lorry with the towering container in the back, and even the tiny invalid carriage stop dead, and the motor-cyclist in goggles leans his motor-cycle slightly over on to one side and rests his foot on the ground. The iron bodies of the vehicles are impatiently tensed, the engines growl and moan subduedly, an electric shiver runs through the trolley-bus, the motor-cycle's silencer snorts blue smoke. But they all wait for the children to pass ....

In order to isolate the thematic and non-thematic layers, the relevant context can be summed up as:

(204) The militiaman stops the vehicles, WHICH show impatience, growl, moan, shiver, or snort--but which nevertheless all wait for the children to cross.

The thematic layer is summed up in the word WHICH, which, being a relative pronoun, is itself context-given, and to which S of (203) obviously belongs. On the other hand, the word "snort" constitutes the non-thematic
section of (203), but with a lower degree of CD than its complement FRA. Although the rheme-accent is in a non-final position, it does not clash with primary semantic means, and the sentence is not felt to be emphatically or emotively marked. In this case, its non-final position seems to be a stylistic device for bringing some variation into a series of short sentences.

5.3.2 The actual-syntactic type of the translation is \((S) V C\) --a functional equivalent of the original sentence. As for expressiveness, it is not evident within the actual-syntactic type itself, but since the preceding sentence has its rheme-accent in a non-final sentence position, a stylistic variation may be present even in the translation.

5.4 Summary: Linear Structure V - C - S

5.4.1 Owing to the poor representation of this linear structure, it is again impractical to draw generalizations on its use and on the predominant actual-syntactic types.

5.4.2 The linear structure of the translations invariably changes to \(S - V - C\), the most usual pattern for English.

6. Linear Structure V - S - C

This linear structure is represented with only two Russian sentences, both forming an actual-syntactic type of their own, and no generalization can thus be made.

6.1 Actual-Syntactic Type \(\langle(V S) C\rangle\)

6.1.1 The sentence is:
(205) Razdavalis' pozval'nye suždenija o "Zar-p'tice" i na vystavke Complimentary verdicts on "Firebird" were to be heard at the exhibition, too /189/.

Rheme-accent is supported by the rhematizer i.

6.12 The actual-syntactic type of the translation is <(S V) C> --an equivalent of the original.

6.2 Actual-Syntactic Type <V (S C)>

6.21 The example is:

(206) "Ne ponjat ty menja" "You didn't understand me" /147/.

Rheme-accent is supported by the rhematizer ne; its non-final position reflects a colloquial trait of the direct speech; in addition, since it clashes with the primary semantic means and occurs in the sentence initial rather than medial position, the sentence acquires an emotive colouring.

6.22 The translation is rendered as <(S) V (C)>. Here there is also a clash between the rheme-accent and the primary semantic means, and some markedness may thus be present.

6.3 Summary: Linear Structure V - S - C

6.31 This linear structure is represented with only two Russian sentences, both forming an actual-syntactic type of their own, and no generalization can thus be made.

6.32 The linear structure of the translations is in both instances changed to the usual sequence S - V - C, but the FSP function of the sentences remains unaltered.
7. Summary: Sentences Consisting of S, V, and C

7.1 The data shows that the Russian sentences consisting of S, V, and C may have their components arranged in every one of the six possible linear structures. The best represented linear structure is S - V - C which accounts for 67%. Next comes C - V - S with 18%. The frequencies of occurrence of the remaining linear structures drop radically: 6% for S - C - V, 5% for C - S - V, and representations by structures with V in the initial position are almost insignificant with 2.5% for V - C - S and 1.5% for V - S - C.

In the description of the data seventeen actual-syntactic types were dealt with, of which <S) V C> is the best represented accounting for 48%, followed by <C) V S> with 14%, then <S) V (C)> with 13%, while the frequencies of occurrence of the remaining fourteen actual-syntactic types again drop radically to 4% for <S (V C)>, etc.

A more revealing picture is obtained if all the actual-syntactic types are classed into the following five groups: 1) general type (both informative and verificative) with a rhematic C, 2) the same with S, 3) general type with a rhematic V (i.e., with V alone in the non-thematic section of the sentence), 4) specific type with a thematic S, 5) the same with C. In this way we have a more meaningful set of statistics: group one, i.e., <S) V C> and any of its expressive variants, e.g., <S) C V>, accounts for 53%; group two has 16%; group three--19%; group four--9%; and group five--3%.

We can now attempt to answer questions such as: which linear structure is most typical for any of the five groups isolated above? In group one, i.e., when both V and C are non-thematic, the vast majority of
sentences (91%) have the linear structure S - V - C, i.e., the actual-syntactic type <(S) V C>; the remaining 9% consists of the expressive variants, the choice of linear structure for which is always S - C - V, i.e., the actual-syntactic type <(S) C V>.

In group two, i.e., when both V and S are non-thematic, the basic variant (90%) is <(C) V S>; the expressive variants are either <(C) S V> or <V C S>.

In group three, i.e., when V is the only non-thematic component, the basic variant (72%) is <(S) V (C)'>, which adds support to an assertion by Adamec that an actual-syntactic type with a medially placed stressed V is an even more neutral variant than the one with the same V in the sentence final position (cf. note 25). This group is also represented by <(C) V (S)'>, <(S C) V'>, <(C S) V'>-8% each, and by the expressive variant <V (S C)>-4%.

The basic unmarked variant in group four is <(C V) S> with 36%, with an occasional variant <(V C) S> in 9%. Granting that the data representing this group may be inadequate for a reliable generalization, a conspicuous feature is that the majority of the sentences are expressive variants: <S (V C)> in 46% and <(C) S (V)> in 9%.

Finally, the basic variant (75%) of group five is <(S V) C> alternating every fourth sentence with <(V S) C>. An expressive variant of this group is not represented in the data.

7.2 In 92% the linear structure of the translations is S - V - C (as compared with 67% in Russian). The exceptions are mainly on account of the 'existential there' constructions (5%) that correspond to <(C) V S> of Russian, the remainder constituting but occasional cases, dealt with above in 1.322 and 2.121.
VII. SENTENCES CONSISTING OF S, V, C, C

In the present data sentences consisting of the four components S, V, C, C form the following linear structures: 1) S - V - C - C, 2) C - S - V - C, 3) C - C - V - S, 4) S - C - V - C, 5) S - C - C - V, 6) V - S - C - C.

1. Linear Structure S - V - C - C

The Russian sentences with the linear structure S - V - C - C were found to form two actual-syntactic types: "(S) V C C" and "(S) V C (C)".

1.1 Actual-Syntactic Type "(S) V C C"

1.1.1 In the majority of sentences the interpolative theme is either context-given, e.g.:

(207) Ja opustilas' pered letčikom na koleni
I fell before the pilot on my knees /199/,

in which the pronominalization of letčikom would be acceptable; or the interpolative theme is at least 'known' from the context, e.g.:

(208) nezrimaja žizn' ostrova napolnjala tisīnu svoimi tainstvennymi
the invisible life of the island filled the silence with its

(210) zvukami
tabulous sounds /149/,

in which "silence" (tisīna) can be inferred from a statement in the preceding sentence of the text, that the noises of the town did not reach the island.
Occasionally, the interpolative theme cannot be inferred from the context:

(209) on stjanul s golovy kožanyj šlem
he pulled off his leather helmet /205/

--but this context-unaffected interpolative theme was never found to be a direct object (see further in 1.21).

1.12 It has been noted in III. 2.2, that the interpolative theme is one of the differences which is difficult to reconcile between the approaches of Adamec and Firbas. Apart from matters of symbolization, this study has so far applied as far as practical the methodology of Adamec to the Russian sentences, and the methodology of Firbas to the translations. This will also be practiced in the present section, and a translation of a Russian sentence with actual-syntactic type \( <(S) V C C> \) will be interpreted either as the same, or as \( <(S) V (C) C> \), or even as \( <(S) V C (C)> \), depending on factors in addition to word-order. (In the approach of Adamec, it seems that word-order determines the interpolative theme practically on its own.) With this in mind, the translations form three actual-syntactic types: 1) \( <(S) V (C) C> \), 2) \( <(S) V C C> \), 3) \( <(S) V C (C)> \).

1.121 An example of \( <(S) V (C) C> \) of a translation is:

(210) molodaja podruga vzjala ego pod ruku
his young companion took him under the arm /209/.

According to Firbas's method of showing the degrees of CD, the non-final complement here is nothing but thematic.
1.122 An example of \( <(S) V C C> \) is:

\[
(211) \text{kto-to xodil po sadu s fonarem somebodYlO was 21 walking in the orchard with a torch /159/}.
\]

1.123 The remaining actual-syntactic type of the translation, \( <(S) V C (C)> \), is represented in:

\[
(212) \text{deti terjajut k nim interes the children lose interest in them /167/}.
\]

Here the difference between the actual-syntactic types of the translation and the original is due to a change in the linear structure of the translations, required by idiom; cf.:

\[
(212a) \text{*the children lose in them interest.}
\]

Otherwise, the two actual-syntactic types are functionally and expressively equivalent.

1.13 Having examined the actual-syntactic types of the translations, it is apparent that some 'interpolative themes' indeed function as thematic components occurring within the non-thematic section of the sentence, but in other cases (1.122) there is no reason (apart from convention) to interpret the non-final complement as thematic. The heterogeneity of the 'interpolative themes' can also be shown on the basis of the Russian sentences alone. If the linear position of the two complements is reversed with respect to each other and the sentence is then considered within the same context, the actual-syntactic type of Russian sentences corresponding to the translations with \( <(S) V (C) C> \) becomes an expressive variant (mainly with a colloquial flavour) \( <(S) V C (C)> \).
Compare (210) with the following:

(213) molodaja podruga vzjala pod ruku ego

(with rhyme-accent on pod ruku). However, if the same operation is performed on sentences that correspond to \(<(S) V C C>\) of the translations, we then have in fact a different actual-syntactic type, since, although still symbolized as \(<(S) V C C>\), the rhyme-accent would remain in the sentence final position, and therefore the rhyme-proper would then be a different component altogether. Compare (211) with:

(214) kto-to xodil s fonarem po sadu.

This test is not to be confused with the observation of Adamec (1966:75-6) that if the first complement (i.e., \(C_1\) in the sequence \(S - V - C_1 - C_2\)) is 'more individualized' (i.e., if it is dedynamized by some additional semantic means) and has less semantic affinity with the verb than the second complement, the actual-syntactic type is general-informative, i.e., \(<(S) V C C>\). But if the characteristics of the complements are reversed, the type is then specific-informative/verificative, i.e., \(<(S V C) C>\).

The difference between the observation of Adamec and the one made in this study is that in the former, the two actual-syntactic types obviously occur in different contextual environments, since the very nature of the two actual-syntactic types is different (general vs. specific)—whereas the difference between (210) and (213) is only that of the position of the rhyme-accent in the sentence, in other words merely an expressive difference.

Without an exhaustive investigation of this problem, this study
will make no changes in the manner of symbolization of the 'interpolative theme' in the Russian sentences, especially since the actual-syntactic types of the translations always provide a comparison and perhaps an indication of what should be a more accurate interpretation of the FSP function of the components in question.

1.2 Actual-Syntactic Type \((S) V C (C)\)

\[(215)\] Sekretars'ka stavila surgučnye pečati na paket
The secretary was putting wax seals on a package

\[(216)\] Ljudmila Ivanovna zaxlamila komnaty kakim-to trjap'em
Ludmila Ivanovna cluttered up the rooms with her gaily coloured pieces of clothing.

1.2.1 None of the complements are context-affected, and one would expect that in relation to each other their degree of CD would be determined by word-order, resulting in the rheme-accent being placed on the sentence final complement. This is especially suggestive in the second example, in which there is the dynamizing indefinite pronoun kakim-to. In addition, the rheme-accent on the non-final C may also become concealed by the enumerative intonation, which gives the sentence final component a certain prominence. One could thus argue that the rheme-accent on the sentence final component cannot be dismissed as totally unacceptable. This may be true for the above sentences--and yet, the non-final complement can be ultimately shown to possess an inherently higher degree of CD. This would result from placing it in the sentence final position:

\[(217)\] Sekretars'ka stavila na paket surgučnye pečati
In this case the rheme-accent can be placed on the non-final complement only if the direct object is context-affected. This leads to an inference that in its FSP function the direct object stands out from among other complements of the verb. In other words, Firbas's note on the degree of CD of the FRA's in relation to each other being determined by word-order may not apply to the direct object, since, all things being equal, the latter seems to have a higher degree of CD than any other complement regardless of the sentence position. Again, poor representation in the data allows of no reliable generalization, but the intuitive placement of the rheme-accent on a non-final direct object can be checked on many other sentences that come to mind:

(219) [Eto vlijatel'nyj chelovek.] On pomog mne ustroit' syna na rabotu

(220) [Ona istorik:] citaet Desjatyi vek na cetvertom kursе

(221) [On dobryj:] kazdoe voskresen'e razdaet den'gi niščim,

etc., etc.

Once again, the decision to rely on the intuitive feeling for the recognition of the rheme-accent seems to be bringing interesting results: rather than forcing the rheme-accent onto some component, relying solely on theoretical considerations (which are still virtually in an infant stage), the reliance on intuition enables one to point to the many problematic issues still outstanding in the field of FSP studies.

The penultimate position of the rheme-accent suggests a colloquial flavour, especially with the informal word trjap'em in (216).
1.22 The actual-syntactic type of the translations is identical to that of the Russian sentences.

1.3 Summary: Linear Structure $S - V - C - C$

1.31 This linear structure is represented in the data by two actual-syntactic types of the Russian sentences, the basic one (91%) being $(S) V C C$. It has been observed that if the non-final $C$ is a direct object, then it is always context-affected. If, however, the penultimate direct object is context-unaffected, the second actual-syntactic type, viz., $(S) V C (C)$, is formed, which may be considered a colloquial variant of the first.

1.32 In the majority of sentences (86%) the linear structure of the translations remains the same, but the linear position of the two complements may be reversed for matters of idiom or cohesion. Apart from differences mainly due to the manner of symbolization, the actual-syntactic types of the translations can in each case be considered equivalent to the original sentences.

2. Linear Structure $C - S - V - C$

This linear structure was found to underlie two actual-syntactic types: $(C S) V C$ and $(C C) S (V C)$.

2.1 Actual-Syntactic Type $(C S) V C$

2.11 Here is an example:
The sentence initial complement is in each case context-affected.

2.12 The translations form two actual-syntactic types: 
\(<(S) V (C) C>\) and \<(C S) V C>\).

2.121 An example of \<(S) V (C) C>\ of the translations was (222); another example is:

(223) ētu "rrrealistic-photographic" mažnę ja by pereimenoval v "Mokrju kricu"!
I would like to retitle this "rrrealistic-photographic" daub "The wet chicken"! /191/.

In both instances the thematic function of the penultimate C is reflected by the dedynamizers: the word "last" in the former and the demonstrative pronoun in the latter. The actual-syntactic types thus remain functionally equivalent, their surface difference being merely due to the adherence to the prevalent word-order in English.

2.122 An example of \<(C S) V C>\ is:

(224) Samuju bol'šuju morkov' ona daet Gusakovoj
The biggest of the carrots she gives to Gusakova /177/.

Apart from the reason of imitating the original sentence, the somewhat unusual position for the direct object can be explained by the wish to put a certain prominence on the thematic component (cf. "prosodic intensification of the theme" in Firbas 1968:22-3).
2.2 Actual-Syntactic Type <(C) S (V C)>

(225) Eti derev'ja on sam posadil vokrug daci
He had himself planted these trees around the dacha /143/

(226) a dlja Gusakovoj vsja radost' v morkovnom nosike
but for Gusakova the whole fun is in the carrot-nose /173/.

2.21 The rhematic function of S is reflected by the rhematizer sam in the first example, and by the dynamizing influence of quantity in vsja in the second.

The non-final rheme-accent and the clash with the primary semantic means in (225) render the sentence emotive, but in the second sentence, where on account of V esse the clash with the primary semantic means is absent, the sentence has merely a colloquial flavour.

2.22 The translations form two actual-syntactic types:
<S V (C C)> and <(C) S V (C)>.

2.221 Example of <S V (C C)> is (225). Rheme-accent is again supported by a rhematizer, "himself". As in the Russian sentence, apart from the non-final rheme-accent there is also a clash with the primary semantic means, and the sentence is not devoid of certain emotiveness even in the translation.

2.222 Example of <(C) S V (C)> is (226). Here, too, rheme-accent is reflected by an expression of quantity. Similarly to 2.122, the initial position of the complement results in a slight contrastive intensification of the thematic complement.
2.3 Summary: Linear Structure C - S - V - C

2.3.1 The Russian sentences based on this linear structure form two actual-syntactic types in approximately equal distribution: three sentences form \((C \, S \, V \, C)\), and two sentences \((C \, S \, (V \, C))\). The occurrence of a thematic C in the sentence initial position gives that component some prominence within the thematic section. It may be noted that similarly to the expressive prominence in the non-thematic section, this prominence, too, goes hand-in-hand with a clash between the basic distribution of CD and the primary semantic means.

2.3.2 The linear structure of the translations usually changes to the prevalent sequence in English \(S - V - C - C\). However, there may be no change, if the initial C of the Russian sentence is felt to have some prosodic intensification.

3. Linear Structure C - C - V - S

The Russian sentences with this linear structure form two actual-syntactic types: \((C \, C \, V \, S)\) and \((C \, C \, V \, S)\).

3.1 Actual-Syntactic Type \((C \, C \, V \, S)\)

(227) V centroplan iz kabiny letčikov vyšel radist
The radio-operator emerged from the crew's cabin into the aisle

3.1.1 In this example all components may be considered context-unaffected. Apart from the sentence final position, the rheme-accent is also supported by the primary semantic means, since it is the subject that functions here as the non-thematic FRA of V esse.
3.12 The translations form two actual-syntactic types: 

<SV(C C)> and <(S) VC(C)>. 

3.121 Example of <SV(C C)> was (227). In this sentence the definite articles refer to the general knowledge of there being a "radio-operator" on the plane, as well as a "crew's cabin", and an "aisle" ("the crew's cabin" may in fact be considered context-affected, since the expression "the crew's cabin flattened like the head of a sturgeon" has occurred in the text but a few pages preceding (227)). Thus, in spite of occurring in the initial position and being accompanied by the definite article, S is nevertheless rhematic on account of being context-unaffecte and functioning as a FRA of V esse.

The non-final rHEME-accent does not clash with the primary semantic means, and, as in the original, no expressiveness is felt to be present in the translation.

3.122 The actual-syntactic type <(S) VC(C)> of the translation is represented in:

(228) Na ruke u Very Ivanovny visit sumka 
     Vera Ivanovna has a bag hanging on her arm /169/.

Although different on the surface, the semantic contents of the original and the translation correspond in their degrees of CD, and the actual-syntactic types are equivalent.

The rHEME-accent on the penultimate complement is supported by the dynamizing indefinite article, while, the '-ing' form again being optional (cf. VI. 2.1213), the final C is interpreted as a thematic setting, rather than an attribute of the rhematic direct object.
3.2 Actual-Syntactic Type \(<(C \ C \ V) \ S>\)

(229) Polovodovу čto-to vozrazil komendant

The Airport Chief made some objection to Polovodov. /197/.

3.21 The interpretation of the complements as thematic is supported by the possibility of pronominalization of the first C and by the second C itself being a pronoun. \(V\) is interpreted as thematic, first, because of the adopted convention, viz., that in the presence of a non-thematic \(S\), \(V\) can be non-thematic only on the condition that it potentially has the semantic content of esse, and that there is semantic affinity between \(V\) and \(S\) (Adamec 1966:51). Second, the interpretation of \(V\) as thematic can also be explained in terms of Firbas, that \(V\) is 'presented' as context-affected, because "Polovodov's" remark:

(230) "Porjadok! Bol'še ja ne primu na bort ni odnogo čeloveka" "Hold it! I can't take a single other person on board" /197/,

which in the text immediately precedes (229), is expected to invite objections from the characters in the story, because there are many other people anxious to get on board, too.

3.22 The actual-syntactic type of the translation is \(<(S) \ V \ C \ (C)>\). This is a rare instance of non-equivalence between the actual-syntactic types of the original and the translation. From the point of view of FSP, the passive variant:

(231) An objection was voiced by the Airport Chief

would be more accurate, since it would shift the rheme-accent onto "Airport Chief", allowing the "objection" itself to be interpreted as
something expected from the context, as in the original sentence. And yet, despite the non-equivalence, one cannot assert that the translation is altogether unsuccessful. This can be accounted for by the fact that the FSP of the Russian sentence is in the first place somewhat uncertain (potentially multifunctional) and, as noted in 3.21, the interpretation of the thematic function of V was in part forced by the adopted convention. Second, although it has been suggested that V may be interpreted as thematic on account of being 'presented' as such, the actual contextual conditions do not necessarily demand a thematic 'objection' and a rhematic 'objector'. This can be tested by rearranging (229) into:

(232) komendant₁₁ čto-to₁₂ vozrazil₁₃₀ Polovodovu₁₂

in which the 'objection' is clearly rhematic, but which does not impair the link between the preceding and the succeeding contexts. In view of this consideration, the functional non-equivalence of the translation may be considered as having no adverse effect in the instance now under dis-

3.3 Summary: Linear Structure C - C - V - S

3.31 This linear structure gave rise to two actual-syntactic types: <(C C) V S> and <(C C V) S>. Owing to their poor representation, no generalizations are offered.

3.32 The actual-syntactic types of the translations are in each case rearranged so as to achieve the predominant pattern in English S - V - C - C, but, save for one exception, the resultant sentences are functionally equivalent.
4. **Linear Structure S - C - V - C**

The remaining linear structures are each represented with only one Russian sentence.

4.11 The actual-syntactic type representing the linear structure S - C - V - C is \((S) C (V C)\).

(233) "Ty [, ja znaju,] i v pis'ma ne brezguy' klast' zasušennye cvetočki"

"[I know your ways,] you don't even shrink from putting dried flowers in letters" /143/.

The rheme-accent is supported by the intensifier i. The thematic function of S is obvious, but the thematic function of the V - C group occurring at the end of the sentence must be understood as resulting from being presented as context-affected, especially in view of the fact that the person's impartiality to flowers is known from the immediately preceding context. Such an interpretation is consistent with the observation made by Adamec (1966:23) that if the non-thematic section is formed by V and two other components, the order of the components must be verb - interpolative theme - rheme-proper.

The non-final position of the rheme-accent is due to emphasis and perhaps to the colloquial flavour of direct speech.

4.12 The actual-syntactic type of the translation is \((S) V C C\). Here the intensifier occurs before the entire group V - C - C, which can thus be interpreted as a complex non-thematic unit. Rheme-accent falls on the same component as in the original, and the difference between the actual-syntactic types is only of minor importance, embracing the interpolative theme and the transitional V.
5. Linear Structure $S - C - C - V$

5.11 This linear structure is represented by $(S \, C) \, C \, V$ of the following sentence:

(234) "Berlin ot nas s toboj nikuda ne denetsja!"
"Berlin won't escape either of us!" /205/.

Strictly speaking, this sentence is multifunctional and the rheme-accent would be equally acceptable on $V$. The interpretation favoured here is the one with a non-stressed verb in the sentence final position, since this adds a colloquial flavour due to direct speech.

5.12 The actual-syntactic type of the translation is $(S) \, V \, C$.

The objective complement with a thematic function in the Russian sentence becomes rhematic in English, causing a functional non-equivalence. The difference may be accounted for by the fact that the non-thematic section of the Russian sentence consists of a set-expression, the literal translation of which does not suit the idiom of English. Nevertheless, the rheme-accent on "either" seems unwarranted, especially since it can be avoided by translating (234) as:

(234a) Berlin will not escape us

with the resulting actual-syntactic type $(S) \, V \, C$, in this way minimizing the functional difference from the original.

6. Linear Structure $V - S - C - C$

6.11 The actual-syntactic type is $<V \, S \, C \, C>$, represented by:
The only context-affected component is S, but being flanked by the non-thematic V and C, it also functions in the non-thematic section in the capacity of an interpolative theme. The structure of this actual-syntactic type is used for the narrative style (cf. note 24), which suits this passage of war-time reminiscences.

6.12 The actual-syntactic type of the translation is <V C C>—a functional equivalent of the original.

7. Summary: Sentences Consisting of S, V, C, C

7.1 Of the 24 possible permutations in sentences consisting of S, V, C, C, only six linear structures are represented by the Russian sentences in the data. The basic linear structure is S - V - C - C, accounting for 67% of all the sentences, then follows C - S - V - C with 15%, and C - C - V - S with 9%, while the remaining linear structures S - C - V - C, S - C - C - V, and V - S - C - C are merely occasional with but a single sentence representing each.

The basic linear structure for this group underlies the actual-syntactic type <(S) V C C> which accounts for 63% of the sentences and thus may also be considered the basic actual-syntactic type. It has the occasional narrative style variant <V S C C>.

The second group of actual-syntactic types (18%) contains a non-thematic V and C. In half of the sentences the actual-syntactic type is the unmarked variant <(C S) V C>. This is closely followed by the colloquial variant <(S) V C (C)>, and occasionally by the emphatic variant...
<(S C) C V>.

In the third group (9%) S is the only non-thematic component. It is interesting to note that, as with the sentences consisting of S, V, and C, the best represented actual-syntactic type here is an expressive variant, viz., <(C) S (V C)>, rather than the neutral one <(C C V) S>.

Group four (6%) has a non-thematic V and S and is represented by only the unmarked variant <(C C) V S>.

Finally, group five is represented by merely one example, in which a non-thematic C functions in an expressive actual-syntactic type <(S) C (V C)>.

7.2 In all but two sentences the linear structure of the translations is S - V - C - C, which, compared with the original sentences is 94% vs. 67%. In the exceptions, the sentence initial complements, contrary to expectations, do not denote merely a setting, but are objective complements, in one case (2.122) being even a direct object. The reasons for such a deviation from the general pattern seem to be, first, to give the complement some prominence within the thematic section, and second, to imitate the linear structure of the Russian sentence.

7.3 There is an important question left unanswered in this study: is there any correlation between the type of complement (e.g., Co accusative vs. Co instrumental vs. Cpl vs. Cdi, etc.), its linear position within the sentence, and its FSP function in the actual-syntactic type? The data in the present study does not permit reliable generalizations, and the question remains open for further study.
Owing to the differences in the FSP roles performed by certain classes of adverbials, it would seem useful to differentiate between the temporal and local settings, which operate as primary semantic means, on the one hand, and the remaining adverbials, whose degree of CD is determined, context permitting, by word-order, on the other.

There are only 14 sentences that contain adverbials of cause, purpose, condition, etc.—obviously an insufficient representation for making generalizations, and a description of this class of adverbials would necessitate a specialized, rather than the general data extraction, as carried out in the present study. Temporal adumbrations are somewhat better represented with 21 sentences containing them, but their FSP nature is felt to have much affinity with the 'quantitative and qualitative characteristics of the verb' (Q), and they, too, deserve a more exhaustive treatment than can be offered in this limited study.

Consequently, a description of only the 'situational adverbs', i.e., of the temporal and local settings, is offered here. The two are dealt with under separate headings for the reasons: first, to compare the local setting (L) with local specifications (Cpl, Cdi); second, to compare between the 'settings' themselves, i.e., between L and T.

1. Temporal Setting (T)

In the Russian sentences of the data, four positions can be isolated for T: 1) sentence initial, 2) second, 3) penultimate, 4) final.
1.1 T in Sentence Initial Position

1.1.1 In most cases an initial T occurs alongside a thematic S in the actual-syntactic type \<(T S) V C\>:

(236) Odnaždy Andrej Polikarpovič vošel v komnatu ženy
One day Andrei Polikarpovich came into his wife's room /157/
or in its expressive variant \<(T S) C V\>:

(237) "Sejčas by ja v ljuboj sisteme stala rabotat!"
"Now I'd take work in any network" /127/;

or in \<(T S) V\>:

(238) posle pobedy my vstretimsja
after the war we would meet /207/.

In addition to S, the thematic section may also contain a complement placed in the final position, as in \<(T S) V (C)\>:

(239) odnaždy vy daše prsnulis' mne
once I even dreamed about you /147/;

or a V, as in \<(T S V) C\>:

(240) Teper' on byl lišen i ětogo
Now he was deprived even of this /155/
or its expressive variant \<(T) C (S V)\>:

(241) Sejčas-to mne i samoj ěto predstavljaetsja ... nu naivnym
now it all seems to me rather ... naive /207/;

or finally, both V and C, in addition to S, as in \<(T S V C) L\>:
Then he began to feel discomfort at every step /153/.

in which the thematic function of the V-C group is inferred from the immediately preceding context:

Andrei Polikarpovich felt that in the general system of order which was dear to his heart some breach has been made /153/.

When S is not thematic, it is always found at the end of the sentence in the function of rheme-proper, while T either provides the only theme of the sentence, i.e., <(T) V S>:

or occurs alongside a thematic C, i.e., <(T C) V S>:

sometimes joined also by V, i.e., <(T C V) S>:

1.12 In the majority of cases (86%), the position of T in the translations remains the same. In the rest of the sentences, it is changed to the sentence final position:

she had married in 1952 /117/.
With the exception of a single case, the change of the position for T seems unmotivated—in fact, not only in the 14% in which the change has occurred, but in at least a vast majority of the other cases such a change would also be acceptable. The only exception is:

(248) Bol'she Efimova ne prixodila
Yefimova didn't come again /131/,

in which the retention of the initial position for "again" would alter its meaning of "after that".

1.2 T in Second Position

1.21 In one case T functions as an interpolative theme in the actual-syntactic type used mainly for the narrative style, viz., <V T C S>:

(249) obernulis' togda vokrug našego krasavca-goroda hitlerovskie vojska
Hitler's army then had its coils around our beautiful city /191/.

In the remaining cases, T, again, always functions in the theme; in addition, it is always preceded by a thematic S, as in <S T V>:

(250) on teper' tulpel
he had now grown stupid /161/

or in <(S T) V C>:

(251) Ona nedavno priexala iz derevni
She's recently arrived from the country /129/.

When the sentence contains also a thematic C, the latter is invariably placed at the end, e.g., <(S T) V (C)>:
"Naša promyšlennost' teper' izgotovljaet motornye" or in <(S T V C) A (C)>:

"Nas institut v samom načale vojny évakuirovalsja v Pjatigorsk iz osaždennogo Leningrada"

"At the very beginning of the war our institute was evacuated to Pyatigorsk from Leningrad under siege" /125/

("institute in Leningrad" is known from the context); or in <(S T V C) A (C)>:

Ja by togda prostila Andreju Polovodovu ljubuju grubost' I would have forgiven Andrei Polovodov any coarseness at that moment /207/.

1.22 In the translations, the position of T remains the same in 64%, although if an auxiliary verb is present, T is invariably placed between the auxiliary and the notional verb:

Efimova vsegda byla nastojčiva i trebovatel'na Yefimova had always been pertinacious and exacting /119/.

The position of such temporal adverbs as occurring in the above sentence is practically fixed (cf. Dvořáková 1964:131), but the same cannot be said for many other cases, e.g., (250)-(252).

When a change in position occurs, it seems to be connected with T being expressed by a prepositional phrase:

Čislo ėto včera prošlo The date had expired the day before /115/.

In such cases, T is usually placed sentence finally, but the initial position is also possible and in fact is probably preferred when the end of the sentence already contains elements with adverbial nuances, as in (253).
1.3 T in Penultimate Position

1.3.1 In the penultimate position, T was found to function either as an interpolative theme, viz., <(S) V C T C>:

(257) Ja byla u vas nedelju tomu nazad po voprosu ustrojstva na rabotu
I came here a week ago about getting a job /113/,

or simply as one of the thematic components, viz., <(S C T) V>:

(258) Takoe resenie otborovyj komissii menja sначала удивило
This decision of the Selection Committee at first surprised me /190/.

1.3.2 The translations show no difference in the place of T, but poor representation in data does not allow generalizations.

1.4 T in Final Position

1.4.1 Only two sentences are present in the data, and both have T as rheme-proper. The actual-syntactic type of one example is <(S V) T>:

(259) ja doušivalas' posle vojny
I completed my education after the war /126/,

and the other, <(S V) C T>:

(260) on proizošel i ne v našej sisteme i mnogo let nazad
this had occurred in another network and many years before /130/.

Here C and T are not to be taken as forming a complex non-thematic section (only V has this property), but simply as two concatenated rhemes-proper.

1.4.2 Once again, the translations show no difference in either the sentence position for T, or the functional equivalence of the
actual-syntactic types; moreover, here also the representation is inadequate for drawing any conclusions.

1.5 Summary: Temporal Setting (T)

1.51 In 92% of the Russian sentences T was found to be thematic. In the remaining cases its function is distributed equally between the interpolative theme and rheme-proper. As an interpolative theme T may occur either in the second or in the penultimate position, but when functioning as rheme-proper T is always final.

The usual place for a thematic T is the sentence initial position (77%). It is also well represented in the second position, but only on a single occasion in the penultimate position.

T is seldom (6%) the only thematic component in the sentence. Most frequently (56%) it is accompanied by a thematic S. Other components may also occur with T as the second thematic component, but again, more often such combinations are accompanied by S as the third thematic component.

1.52 The actual-syntactic types of the translations are always functionally equivalent with the originals. In sentences corresponding to the originals with a penultimate or final T, the linear structure remains the same, which is also true for most of the other cases (85%). If a change in the linear structure occurs, it always involves shifting T into the final position, with a tendency to occur more frequently when T occupies the second position in the original. The transposition of T in the translations can usually be accounted for by idiomatic requirements.
2. Local Setting (L)

In the Russian sentences of the data, L occurs in three positions: 1) sentence initial, 2) penultimate, 3) sentence final.

2.1 L in Sentence Initial Position

2.1.1 In the present data the sentence initial L functions only as a theme. It was found to be occurring in the following actual-syntactic types: <(L S) V C>, as in:

(261) Vpered' pustye' upiraetsja v nabereznuyu Moskvy-reki
Ahead the waste ground ends in the embankment of the Moscow River /167/,
in <(L S) V>:

(262) A tut na pustyre sneg bely
But here on the waste ground the snow is white /167/,
in <(L V) S>:

(263) Mezdu derev'yami peredvigalos' droza'scee bledno-zeretoe pjatno sveta
Between the trees there was moving about a quivering, pale-yellow spot of light /159/,
and in <(L C) V S>:

(264) Sprava na wysokom beregu skvoz' prozra'chnuyu tuman zybilis' ogni goroda
To the right on the high bank the lights of the town trembled through the transparent mist /149/.

A conspicuous feature is that the initial L does not occur with a thematic V or another thematic D.
2.12 In the translations, the sentence position of $L$ tends to remain the same (70%), but a change may occur owing to various idiosyncrasies of English, e.g.:

(265) [v svjazi s tem, čto] na linii peregorali transformatory [as a result of] the transformers burning out along the line /115/,
in which the choice of a different mode of expression disfavours the initial position for $L$; or in:

(266) V Veselom štaty ukomplektovany
The vacancies in Vesyoloye have been filled /129/,
in which the change in position transforms what is $L$ in the Russian sentence into an attribute, thus forming a tighter syntactic unit; or in:

(267) K svoemu udivleniju, v priemnoi on uvidel Efimovu
To his surprise he found Yefimova in the waiting-room /135/,
in which the change avoids a possible ambiguity, viz., interpreting "in the waiting room" as an attribute of the word "astonishment".

However, owing to the operation of the primary semantic means, $L$ remains thematic regardless of its sentence position, and the actual-syntactic types can be considered equivalent in all respects.

2.2 $L$ in Penultimate Position

2.21 In the Russian sentences a penultimate $L$ was found to function only as an interpolative theme, viz., $<(S) V L C>$:

(268) my stirali tam bel'e
we washed the linen there /209/,
in which the position of L seems to be determined merely by rhythm, rather
than by its semi-rhematic function, as can be inferred from note 20.

2.22 The translation places its L after the S - V - C structure,
which is the usual practice for the pronominal words like "there" (unless
a thematic prominence is required, in which case they could be placed
sentence initially).

2.3 L in Final Position

2.31 A sentence final L occurs in the actual-syntactic type
<(T S V C) L> in the sentence already shown as (242) (repeated here for
convenience):

Potom on stal чувствовать неудобства на каждом шагу
Then he began to feel discomfort at every step 153/.

In this sentence all components, except for L, are contextually dependent,
and, aided by the basically rhematic position in which it occurs, L is
easily interpreted as the rheme-proper.

2.32 In the translations, the position of L remains unchanged.

2.4 Summary: Local Setting (L)

2.41 With only one exception, in which L is rhematic and in
the sentence final position, L functions as theme or as a context-given
interpolative theme. In the Russian sentences a thematic L is usually
(77%) in the sentence initial position, but may also occur in the penulti-
mate (or second) position for what seems to be rhythmic considerations or
when the initial position is used to impart (in co-operation with a
contrastive conjunction) some prominence on another thematic component.

2.42 In the translations, the occurrence of a thematic L in the initial position is less frequent (54%), but in each case the change from the initial position seems to be motivated by reasons other than free variation, e.g., to avoid ambiguity or an unwarranted thematic prominence.

3. Comparison of L with Cpl and Cdi

L is typically a thematic component, occurring in this function in 84%. Cpl, on the other hand, has no clear tendency to function either as a thematic (43%), or a rhematic (53%) component, while the tendency for Cdi is opposite to that for L, since it occurs as rheme-proper in 70%.

A thematic L was found to occur only in the sentence initial position. Thematic Cpl and Cdi may also occur in this position, especially in the general-verificative actual-syntactic types, e.g., \(<(\text{Cpl}) V (S)'>\), or when S functions as a non-thematic FRA of V esse, e.g., \(<(\text{Cdi}) V S'>\)-- but on the whole it is more usual for even thematic Cpl or Cdi to occur in the sentence final position.

Rhematic L and Cdi were found to occur only in the sentence final position. Cpl, too, is usually in the sentence final position (70%), but in an expressive general-informative variant the optimum position seems to be the penultimate, e.g., \(<(S) \text{Cpl} V>\) (expressive variants with L and Cdi were not found in the data).

The above comparisons seem to offer sufficient justification for formal differentiation between the various semantic contents of what was once treated under just the one term as the 'adverbial of place'.
4. Comparison of L with T

A thematic T is most frequently initial, but may also be in second position in the capacity of the 'secondary theme', when the 'primary theme' is S, usually with a slight prosodic intensification. Like L, a rhematic T is always in the sentence final position.

It is obvious that there is a great deal more similarity between L and T than between L and Cpl, Cdi. Nevertheless, the differentiation between temporal and local settings, which are treated in Adamec under the single symbol 'D', seems justified, since although T is similar to L in occurring predominantly in the sentence initial position, L seems to be dissimilar to T in that its occurrence in the capacity of the 'secondary theme' has not been observed in the data.
Notes that summarize prevalent linear structures and actual-syntactic types conclude each major sub-section of the present study. On the whole, the notes are in agreement with observations made by Adamec (1966). As in Adamec, this study, too, lacks depth, especially when it comes to dealing with sentence components other than S, V, C, while Q and certain sentence adverbials have been altogether by-passed, since it was felt that treating them with a view of making generalizations would extend the study beyond its material limitations. Although it might have been considered more profitable to have made a deeper study of one of the many issues that lack exhaustiveness in Adamec, e.g., the FSP functions of P, I, Pa, A, Q, D, nevertheless, the aim for a broad coverage taken in the present study can be justified, especially if the contrastive aspect of the analysis is taken into consideration. In the first place it was important to demonstrate the sheer feasibility of a contrastive FSP analysis by applying a method adapted in part from Firbas and in part from Adamec. The broadness of scope provides numerous opportunities to account for certain interpretations of FSP, without which the analysis might have seemed arbitrary—a criticism often levelled at the student of FSP. Moreover, the partial overlap with Adamec reveals a number of general problems which might have to be solved before a deeper study of some specific problem can be tackled in Russian, let alone in a contrastive FSP analysis.

In conclusion, the present study summarizes some of the problems felt to be of particular interest, and offers comments on the probable
outcome of their future investigations.

A differentiation between the degrees to which a sentence component is contextually dependent may add rigour to the notion that whether or not a component can be inferred from the context, it may be 'presented' as contextually dependent or independent. An attempt is made in this study to differentiate between components that can be pronominalized within a given context, referring to them as 'given', and those whose pronominalization within the given context would be unacceptable, despite their being considered inferrable from the context--this type of contextual dependence being referred to as 'known' (cf. pp. 55-56). It could be that a 'given' component can be 'presented as contextually independent' only in the verificative ('second instance') sentences, especially in the presence of 'new' or even 'known' components within the same sentence.

Can the possessive pronoun be considered an additional semantic means? A preliminary investigation carried out in this study adds no evidence in support of such an assumption, but a more exhaustive study may reveal some correlation between the predisposition of the possessive pronoun to function in the theme and the features of inalienability and redundancy (cf. IV. 5-7).

The comparison of Russian and English sentences and the transposition tests offered in this study reveal a heterogeneity of the FSP element referred to by Adamec as 'interpolative theme' (vnutrijadernaja osnova). It could be that this may be abandoned in favour of Firbas's treatment of such elements as unambiguously thematic or non-thematic. Moreover, this would entail reconsidering Adamec's notion of the composition of the 'complex rhyme' (kompleksnoe jadro), perhaps also allowing for the occurrence of a non-thematic V alongside a rhematic A (cf. V. 1.5).
The objective complement, too, may need further differentiation, since it seems that the direct object has inherently a higher degree of CD than other objects (cf. VII. 1.21). It would also be worthwhile to examine the status of what GSRLJa (1970) refers to as ob"ektnye determinants, e.g., у + Gen. in Russian, which in this study are believed to have an ambivalent nature with respect to FSP (cf. VI. 2.11). It could be that whereas the direct object is at the top of the hierarchy of the primary semantic means performed by FRA in general, 'ob"ektnye determinants' will be found to constitute the lowest level of the hierarchy within FRA's.

As demonstrated by Adamec, the concept of 'zero theme' is useful to deal with certain types of Russian sentences. It is evident from the present analysis that this concept could be fruitfully employed even in English (cf. V. 2.12).

Bearing in mind that the linear-dynamic structures S - V - C and C - V - S are "even more neutral than the ones with stressed V in the sentence final position", it would be interesting to investigate whether the parallel linear-dynamic structure S - V - P/I is also devoid of expressiveness due to an actual-syntactic type with a non-final rheme-proper (cf. V. 1.21). A related problem is the type of 'clash' that occurs in the expressive actual-syntactic type variants. For example, which primary semantic means are involved, if at all, in the 'clash' that results in merely a colloquial flavour, rather than emotiveness proper? also, is there a relationship between the clash of primary semantic means with the basic distribution of CD on the one hand and prosodic intensification in the theme on the other? (cf. VII. 2.31).

To conclude this schematic summary of the most interesting
problems discovered in the course of the analysis carried out in the present study, one could also mention that at least for a contrastive Russian-English analysis, a distinction between the various types of adverbial complements (Cd), as well as between the various types of sentence adverbials (D) could be revealing (cf. VIII. 3-4).

This study will have more than achieved its purpose, if, by its exploratory attempt at a contrastive FSP analysis of Russian and English, it has helped to prepare ground for more fruitful studies in future.
NOTES

1"Есть, правда, случаи, особенно в научном стиле, где синтаксическая функция существительных сигнализируется прежде всего порядком слов. Сюда относятся случаи типа . . . "Бытие определяет сознание. Однако таких случаев, во-первых, довольно мало, а во-вторых, потенциально они всегда двусмысленны." (Adamec 1966:16.) ".. в синтаксической функции в русском языке порядок слов использован сравнительно мало, причем обычно он функционирует не один, а наряду с другими факторами, иначе говоря, один только порядок слов, даже в содействии с местом фразового ударения, обычно не в состоянии определить синтаксическую функцию того или иного члена совершенно однозначно." (Adamec 1966:17-18.)

2"Порядок слов в предложении связан с его коммуникативным заданием."

3Unless specified otherwise, all examples are to be read in their neutral form, i.e., unmarked prosodically for contrast or expressiveness and without special contextual presuppositions.

4"Во многих других языках, например, в английском или французском, в такой конституции нужно пользоваться пассивом." (Adamec 1966:84.) (The term конституция embraces both the verbal context and the extra-linguistic situation--cf. pp. 22-23.)

5"В реальной языковой коммуникации в человеческом обществе не существуют и не встречаются контекстно несвязанные высказывания." (Pala 1966:82,83.)

6This, to my knowledge, unpublished article contains the most comprehensive summary of the semantic FSP means. Page references are to the proof copy, kindly supplied by its author.

7Adamec's (1966:58) term, who refers to it as обстоятельственное дополнение (Cd). He notes: "Местная характеристика [i.e., a situational adverb of place] является обстоятельственным дополнением и способна входить в состав комплексного ядра [on which see further in this study] . . . , если она стоит при глаголах с широким значением 'нахождения' или при глаголах, в которых такое значение потенциально содержится: [например] 'Дед Гришка 10 сидел 20 у окна 30 . . . .' " (numerical values are mine).
This reference was kindly pointed out to me by Dr T.M.S. Priestly (Univ. of Alberta).

It is tempting to simplify it further as RHEMACCENT, but in this study I shall refrain from radical terminological innovations—see also note 19.

Cf.: "... актуальное членение того или иного предложения примерно дано конкретной конституацией ... т.е. факторами, которые стоят вне самого предложения. Однако одновременно актуальное членение предопределяется ... лексико-семантической структурой самого предложения, синтаксическим, лексическим характером компонентов и степенью их индивидуализованности, т.е. факторами, стоящими внутри самого предложения." (Adamec 1966:34-40.)

Cf. a work on contextual analysis by Kravčuk (1968).


Cf.: "... при анализе конкретных предложений мы можем, с большей или меньшей вероятностью, устанавливать тип их актуального членения, даже не зная конституции, другими словами, мы способны устанавливать актуальное членение предложений, вырванных из контекста, только на основании их линейно-динамического оформления [i.e., word-order and sentence stress] и лексико-синтаксической структуры со степенями индивидуализованности компонентов [i.e., the semantic structure of the sentence]. Таким образом, на основании этих данных (рассматриваемых в полной комплексности) мы можем с большей или меньшей вероятностью секундарно восстанавливать его конституцию и коммуникативное задание." (Adamec 1968:40.)

"Линейно-динамическая структура представляет собой обобщение целого ряда конкретных предложений с одинаковым составом синтаксических членов, с одинаковым порядком слов и местом фразового ударения." (Adamec 1966:48.)
16"... всякий синтаксический член, относящийся непосредственно к глаголу и вытекающий из его валентности, связанный с глаголом отношением грамматического управления и семантической предикции." (Adamec 1966:6.)

17"К т. н. объектным дополнениям (Co) мы отнесли синтаксические члены, связанные с глаголом отношением т. н. сильного управления, семантически обозначающие объект действия (без каких бы то ни было адверbialных оттенков) ... ." (Adamec 1966:6.)

18"К т. н. обстоятельственным дополнениям (Cd) мы отнесли синтаксические члены, связанные с глаголом отношением т. н. слабого управления со смешанной, предметно-обстоятельственной семантикой, ... ." (Adamec 1966:6.)

19 For the 'non-thematic section' it is tempting to use the transliteration of the original Ə/Haa (cf. Firbas 1957:94n9), viz., 'rhema' (or simply 'rem', which would in addition correspond to the term used in the Russian linguistic literature, e.g., GSRLJa). Its adjective would then be 'rhemic' (or 'remeric'), differentiating it from Firbas's 'rhematic'; and prosto or kompleksnoe jadro and intrajadernaja osnova could conveniently be referred to as 'simple' or 'complex rhema' and 'intraghematic theme'. Once again, however, the danger of terminological conglomeration becomes acute, and (as with the potential term 'rhemacent', cf. note 9) I shall leave such innovations to authorities higher than that of this study.

20"Несмотря на то, что интракадерная основа имеет, с определенной точки зрения, именно характер основы, она, с другой стороны, бесспорно включается в состав комплексного ядра и является его составной частью." (Adamec 1966:23.)

21The notional part of the verb may be either thematic, as in (90), or non-thematic, as in (93), but except for the second instance sentences, TME remains transitional. This will not be shown as a separate numerical value in subsequent examples.

22"Это явление ... характерно как для разговорного языка народного (диалектного), так и разговорного стиля литературного языка ... ." (Adamec 1966:43.)

23"Типичным для разговорного языка, далее, мы считаем ... добавочное присоединение какого-то не очень важного в смысловом отношении компонента." (Adamec 1966:44.)
"Такие предложения придают речи характер эпического, фольклорно окрашенного повествования... Широко они представлены, например, у Шолохова... Другие авторы используют такое словорасположение в меньшей степени, чаще всего в разных описаниях природы и ситуации." (Adamec 1966: 46-47.)

"Данная линейно-динамическая структура [т.е. S - V - C] в русском языке употребляется чаще, чем соответствующая ей структура S - C - V. Стилистически она вполне нейтральна, можно даже сказать, что она нейтральнее, чем структура с ударяемым глаголом в конце... Часто всего... фигурирует глагол, обозначающий отношение между субъектом и объектом или влияние субъекта на объект (в сфере психической, эмоциональной и т.п.)." (Adamec 1966:70.)

26 The study would run to prohibitive length if the context affecting a given example were supplied each time. Instead, page number of the text is given in oblique brackets.

27 This remark may have to be modified in view of observations made further in the study. While it is true that in English a non-final rheme-accent is not an automatic signal for expressiveness, it still may be that some expressiveness is present if in addition to a non-final rheme-accent, there is also a clash between the basic distribution of CD (or for the present purpose, simply the rheme-proper) and the primary semantic means.

28 This group includes also a few informative sentences, i.e., <(S) V (C)>. To avoid atomization in the grouping of data, this study classifies both the informative and verificative counterparts under the one actual-syntactic type that represents the majority of cases. A similar treatment for certain actual-syntactic types has precedence in Adamec (e.g., 1966:67).
APPENDIX 1. TERMINOLOGICAL ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

A

Attribute

C (Cd, Co)

Complement (Co - objective; Cd - adverbial, Cpl - of place, Cdi - of direction)

CD

Communicative dynamism

D

Adverbial (Dc - of cause, Dpu - of purpose, etc.)

FRA

First rank (semantic) amplificator (e.g., goal of action)

FSP

Functional sentence perspective

I

Infinitive

L

Local setting

P

Predicative noun/adjective/adverb

Pa

Predicative attribute

Q

Quantitative and qualitative characteristics of the verb

S

Subject

T

Temporal setting

Tad

Adumbration of T

TME

Time and modal exponent

V

Verb in finite form

V esse

Verb of existence or appearance

V non-esse

Verb other than of existence or appearance

\x

X bears rheme-accent

\x

X bears a marked stress

< >

Actual-syntactic type, i.e., representation of FSP structure

<(X) Y>

X is thematic

< '>

Actual-syntactic type with 'verificative' ('second instance') function

/ /  

Page number of the text used as data
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APPENDIX 2. TABLE OF ACTUAL-SYNTACTIC TYPES

Legend:

(i) Russian sentences
(ii) Frequency of occurrence of (i)
(iii) English sentences (shown only if actual-syntactic type is formally different from Russian)
(iv) Frequency of occurrence of (iii)
+ Semantic-syntactic relations reorganized

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter V. S, V</th>
<th>(i)</th>
<th>(ii)</th>
<th>(iii)</th>
<th>(iv)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. S - V</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.1 &lt;(S) V&gt;</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.2 &lt;(S) V (P/I)'&gt;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.3 &lt;(S V) A&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.4 &lt;S (V)&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. V - S</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.1 &lt;V S&gt;</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.2 &lt;V (S)&gt;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.3 &lt;(V) S&gt;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. C - C - C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.1 &lt;(V Co) S&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.2 &lt;V Co1 S&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.3 &lt;V Co (S)&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. V - S - C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.1 &lt;(V S) Cpl&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.2 &lt;V (S Co)&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(i)</th>
<th>(ii)</th>
<th>(iii)</th>
<th>(iv)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S - V - C</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>&lt;(S) V C&gt;</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>&lt;(S) V C&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>variety with Co</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>&lt;(S) V C&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>variety with CdI</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>&lt;(S) V C&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>variety with Cpl</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>&lt;(S) V C&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.2</td>
<td>&lt;(S) V (C)'&gt;</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>&lt;(S) V C&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>variety with Co</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>&lt;(S) V C&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>variety with CdI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;(S) V C&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>variety with Cpl</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;(S) V C&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.3</td>
<td>&lt;S (V C)&gt;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt;(S) V C&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>variety with Co</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt;(it) V S (Rel)&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>variety with Cpl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.4</td>
<td>&lt;S V) Co&gt;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C - V - S</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>&lt;(C) V S&gt;</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>variety with Cpl</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>&lt;(C) V S&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>variety with Co</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>&lt;(C) V S&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>variety with CdI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;(C) V S&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.2</td>
<td>&lt;(Co V) S&gt;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt;+&lt;(S) V C&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;(C) V S&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;+&lt;(S) V C&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;(there) V S (C)'&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;+&lt;(S) V C&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>&lt;(C) V (S)' &gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;+&lt;(S) V C&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>variety with Co</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;+&lt;(S) V C)'&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>variety with Cpl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;+&lt;(S) V C)'&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.3</td>
<td>&lt;(S) C V&gt;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>&lt;+&lt;(S) V C)'&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>variety with Co</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt;+&lt;(S) V C)'&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>variety with Cpl</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt;+&lt;(S) V C)'&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.2</td>
<td>&lt;(S Cpl) V'&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;+&lt;(S) V C&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.3</td>
<td>&lt;(S Co P) V'&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;+&lt;(S) V C)'&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S - C - V</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>&lt;(S) C V&gt;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>&lt;(S) V C&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>variety with Co</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt;(S) V C&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>variety with Cpl</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt;(S) V C&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.2</td>
<td>&lt;(S Cpl) V'&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;+&lt;(S) V C)'&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.3</td>
<td>&lt;(S Co P) V'&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;+&lt;(S) V C)'&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C - S - V</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>&lt;(Co S) V&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;(S) V C)'&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;(Co S V) P/A&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;+&lt;(S) V C)'&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;+&lt;(S) V C)'&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;+&lt;(S) V C)'&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.3</td>
<td>&lt;(Co) S V&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;+&lt;(S) V C)'&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.4</td>
<td>&lt;(Co) S (V)&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;+&lt;(S) V C)'&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V - C - S</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>&lt;(V Co) S&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;+&lt;(S) V C)'&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;(V Co S) P/A&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;+&lt;(S) V C)'&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;+&lt;(S) V C)'&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;+&lt;(S) V C)'&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.3</td>
<td>&lt;(Co) S V&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;+&lt;(S) V C)'&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.4</td>
<td>&lt;(Co) S (V)&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;+&lt;(S) V C)'&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V - S - C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>&lt;(V S) Cpl&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;+&lt;(S) V C)'&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;(V S Co)&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;+&lt;(S) V C)'&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(i)</td>
<td>(ii)</td>
<td>(iii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chapter VII.</td>
<td>S, V, C, C</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>S - V - C - C</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.1</td>
<td>&lt;(S) V C C&gt;</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>&lt;(S) V (C) C&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.2</td>
<td>&lt;(S) V C (C)&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;(S) V C C&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;(S) V C (C) &gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>C - S - V - C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.1</td>
<td>&lt;(C S) V C&gt;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt;(S) V (C) C&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.2</td>
<td>&lt;(C) S (V C)&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;S V (C C)&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;(C) S V (C)&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>C - C - V - S</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.1</td>
<td>&lt;(C C) V S&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;S V (C C)&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.2</td>
<td>&lt;(C C V) S&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;(S) V C (C)&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>S - C - V - C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.1</td>
<td>&lt;(S) C (V C)&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;(S) V C C&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>S - C - C - V</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;(S) V Co&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.1</td>
<td>&lt;(S Co) Cd V&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>V - S - C - C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.1</td>
<td>&lt;V S C C&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(i)</td>
<td>(ii)</td>
<td>(iii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. D</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. T</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.1 Initial T</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>&lt;(S) V C (T)&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>&lt;(S) V (T)&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;(S) V (T)&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;(T S) V C&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;(T S) V&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;(T S) C V&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;(T S) V (C)&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;(T S V) C&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;(T) C (S V)&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;(T S V C) L&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;(T) V S&gt;</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;(T C) V S&gt;</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;(T C V) S&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.2 T in Second Position</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(S T V)&gt;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt;(S) V (T)&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;(S T) V C&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;(S T) V (C)&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;(S T) V C (C)&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;(T S V C (C)&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;(S T V C) A (C)&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;(S V C) A (C T)&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;V T C S&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.3 Penultimate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;(S) V C T C&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;(S C T) V&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.4 Final</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;(S V T) V&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;(S V) C T&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. L</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.1 Initial</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;(L S) V C&gt;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt;(S) V C (L)&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;(L S) V&gt;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt;(S L/A) V&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;(L) V S&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;(S) V (L)&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;(L C) V S&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.2 Penultimate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;(S) V L C&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;(S) V C (L)&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.3 Final</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;(T S V C) L&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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