

Univerzita Karlova v Praze
Filozofická fakulta

Ústav anglického jazyka a didaktiky

Diplomová práce

Jiřina Popelíková

**Vztahy mezi syntaktickou strukturou a aktuálním členěním větným: studie
vývojových tendencí na základě paralelního textu raněnovooanglického a
současného**

**The relations between syntactic structure and functional sentence
perspective as reflected in a parallel Early New and Modern English text: a
study of developmental tendencies**

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to prof. Libuše Dušková for the generous guidance I have continued to receive during the writing of this thesis and to doc. Jan Čermák for his kind help and advice on the choice of historical sources and bibliographic material pertaining to the study of the Early Modern period.

Prohlašuji, že jsem diplomovou práci vypracovala samostatně a že jsem uvedla všechny použité prameny a literaturu.

I declare that the following MA thesis is my own work for which I used only the sources and literature mentioned.

Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| 1. Introduction..... | 6 |
| 2. General section | 8 |
| 2.1. Introduction to Early Modern English | 8 |
| 2.2. Syntactic considerations | 9 |
| 2.2.1. Phrase, clause and sentence: On the basic nature of Early Modern English syntax | 9 |
| 2.2.2. Word order and the issue of inversion | 11 |
| 2.3. FSP considerations..... | 13 |
| 2.3.1. Functional sentence perspective and its relation to syntax: Introduction to some basic concepts and issues of FSP analysis | 13 |
| 2.3.2. The notion of givenness | 15 |
| 2.3.3. The notion of communicative dynamism | 20 |
| 2.3.4. The notion of theme/topic..... | 22 |
| 3. Research project..... | 28 |
| 3.1. Methodology | 28 |
| 3.1.1. Introduction..... | 28 |
| 3.1.2. On the choice of text: A short introduction to <i>The Consolation of Philosophy</i> | 29 |
| 3.1.3. On the analysis..... | 31 |
| 3.2. Findings and results | 34 |
| 3.2.1. The clause and the sentence..... | 34 |
| 3.2.2. Clauses with no direct clausal parallel..... | 37 |
| 3.2.3. Differences in clausal realizations of corresponding semantic content..... | 40 |
| 3.2.4. Other notes on FSP | 50 |
| 3.2.5. Between syntax and stylistics | 58 |
| 4. Conclusion | 60 |
| Bibliography | 61 |
| Sources..... | 62 |
| Czech summary..... | 63 |
| Appendix I..... | 68 |
| Appendix II..... | 75 |

Abbreviations

| | |
|--------------|---|
| <i>EModE</i> | Early Modern English |
| <i>PDE</i> | Present-day English |
| <i>S</i> | subject |
| <i>V</i> | verb |
| <i>Vcop</i> | copular verb |
| <i>Vpass</i> | verb - passive |
| <i>Od</i> | object - direct |
| <i>Oi</i> | object - indirect |
| <i>Oprep</i> | object – prepositional |
| <i>Cs</i> | subject complement |
| <i>Adv</i> | adverbial |
| <i>X</i> | an unspecified element, other than subject and verb |
| <i>V2</i> | verb-second |
| <i>CD</i> | communicative dynamism |
| <i>FSP</i> | functional sentence perspective |
| <i>S-no.</i> | sentence number |
| <i>C-no.</i> | clause number |
| \emptyset | no clausal parallel |

1. Introduction

The interplay of communicative and syntactic aspects in the historical development of the English language belongs to one of the less researched areas in diachronic linguistics. Having been only relatively recently brought to a more general attention the investigations carried in this field nevertheless seem to bring a number of interesting conclusions, raising questions about the extent to which the syntactic changes may be influenced by pragmatic parameters (Seoane, 2006: 360). This thesis tries to develop some of the points that have been made in regard to this problem by focusing on the developmental tendencies in clausal and sentential syntax between the Early Modern and Present-day English in relation to information flow.

The following chapter presents a short overview of some of the most important theoretical issues connected to the study of grammatical and pragmatic factors extant for the given period. The first part of the chapter addresses the diachronic aspects of the study, concentrating on the linguistic, as well as extralinguistic influences that have shaped the syntactic developments of the 16th and 17th centuries. Special attention is paid to the structural differences between the Early and Late Modern period on the level of individual clauses, stressing the processes of grammatical systematization in the time as proceeding in a series of wave-like preferential shifts, rather than in an unequivocal, straightforward manner.

The second part of the chapter aims at introducing the notion of functional sentence perspective as one of the crucial dimensions of communicative language description and addressing some of the key concepts and issues connected therewith. It also briefly touches upon a variety of different approaches to these issues, highlighting the main points of non-agreement between some of the streamline theories and comparing the advantages and disadvantages of each approach by presenting an overview of limitations and possibilities it offers through its particular conception of the basic FSP phenomena.

Chapter 3 presents the results of a comparative analysis performed on two parallel versions of a prosaic text, focusing on the structural disparities that may be observed between the Early Modern and Present-day editions. These structural disparities are then considered from the communicative point of view, investigating whether or not the differences in syntactic choices bear relevance to the thematic interpretation of a given syntactic unit. The aim is to determine

what possibilities and choices the syntactic system provides in indicating the information structure of a sentence what types of structural or preferential changes has the English syntactic system in this respect underwent during the last four hundred years.

2. General section

2.1. Introduction to Early Modern English

The Early Modern English period is often considered to be somewhat of a diachronic Cinderella. Having for a long time been recognized only as a substage to the Modern language development (Kastovsky, 1994: 1), it has received comparatively little attention, being overshadowed by its older siblings. The period is generally thought to span the whole course of the 16th and 17th centuries, although some researchers prefer to place the beginning of Early Modern English on the year 1476 with the introduction of the printing press in England, and the end on the date of the American revolution in 1776 (Bækken, 1998: 3).

While Old and Middle English periods can be described in terms of sweeping changes and systemic transformations, the immediately following centuries may be seen as a time of regularization, systematization and functional expansion (Rissanen, 1999: 189). Shifts in the cultural and social climate as well as the changing dimensions of everyday life have brought an increasing pressure for the gradual formation of a standard language variation that would be internally consistent, capable of providing an accurate and adequate medium for the discussion of a broad range of topics in different types of situations, and flexible enough to be able to match the intricate aesthetics of such modes of expression as could be found in classical literature (Görlach: 1991, 95). On the level of grammar, this endeavour can be manifested in the process of slow unification and regularization of morpho-syntactic patterns and in the imitation of Latin models, particularly in the increased complexity of the sentence structure.

In the first part of this chapter, I should like to summarize the most fundamental differences separating the Early Modern English syntactic system from the one with which we are familiar today, paying special attention to the issue of word order and multiple sentence complexity. The second part aims at introducing the concept of functional sentence perspective and communication flow, establishing a link between the nature of the syntactic level of a language and the ways in which the different types of information are encoded in order to enable the interlocutors to proceed in their conversation from a mutually shared common ground to the core of the actual informative contribution. In the final part, a brief overview is given of the previous research performed on an Early Modern English material,

focusing on the relations between syntactic attributes and information packaging. These findings then demarcate the background assumptions for the present study.

2.2.Syntactic considerations

2.2.1. *Phrase, clause and sentence: On the basic nature of Early Modern English syntax*

While a vast number of syntactically relevant changes have occurred in the course of the Old and Middle English, and indeed the roots of the current major syntactic structures can be traced to the years before 1500 (Pérez-Guerra, 1995: 296), the grammatical situation in the 16th and 17th centuries cannot be fully equalled with Present-day English usage. Many of the “firmly established syntactic rules” found today are still reported to be lacking (Görlach: 1991, 98), allowing for a certain amount of freedom of choice with respect to such matters as word order, patterns of negation or *do*-support (Barber, 1976: 280-283; Bækken, 1998: 4).

To a 21st century observer, a concise overview of Early Modern English syntax may at times appear as a strange symbiosis of conflicting principles, characterized by swings and tensions between unnecessary redundancies on the one hand and omissions and zealous overcondensation on the other. During its development towards a more straightforwardly systematic arrangement in the Early Modern period, English syntax has gone through the process of gradually abandoning certain constructions and practices that from today’s perspective would appear cumbersome, confusing, or simply not economic. Multiple negation was still extant in the sixteenth century, disappearing slowly around the middle of the period (Barber, 1978: 283). The majority of conjunctions can be found to combine with *that*, “a practice which was given up almost entirely, as superfluous, in the late seventeenth century.” (Görlach, 1991: 122). A special type of subject repetition, in which a particular referent was first identified by a noun-headed noun phrase, only to be immediately reinstated by means of a personal pronoun is also found. At the same time, the language of the early 16th century often lacked the clear-cut level of precision in auxiliary use and *do*-periphrases, usage of articles (Rissanen, 1999: 189), rules of inversion (Rissanen, 1999: 264-265) or subject omission (Barber, 1976: 285).

In general, the nature of the period can be subsumed under the heading of transition, characterized by greater variation and grammatical flexibility. A detailed description of the Early Modern syntactic system is given in the third volume of *The Cambridge History of the English Language* (1999) by Matti Rissanen, who deals with the syntactic changes both on the phrasal and sentential level, including the issues of word order and multiple-sentence organization. Sections devoted to grammar and syntax also form an essential part of Charles Barber's 1976 *Early Modern English* and Manfred Görlach's 1991 *Introduction to Early Modern English*, two comprehensive accounts devoted specifically to the 16th to 17th century period. The present chapter offers only a very short summary of the basic characteristics pertaining to the Early Modern syntactic system, focusing primarily on the changes underlying the developments of the linear arrangement and realization of clauses. For a more comprehensive account, the reader is referred to the relevant bibliography listed above.

The perception and spatial delimitation of sentence in the Early Modern period can be found to slightly differ from that in the Present-day English. Unlike in Late Modern English, the distinction between sentence and paragraph was often blurred in the earlier stages, resulting, at times, in sentences "excessively long" for the contemporary eye (Görlach, 1991: 126, 130). Despite this narrow line between syntactically and textually distinctive units, observations can be made on the gradual rise of non-finite and non-coordinating structures throughout the period. The influence of classical models, especially the stylistic elegance of Ciceronian Latin, had led to an increased popularity of certain types of constructions, "particularly those related to the formation of complex sentences." (Rissanen, 1999: 189)

While the distinction between relationships of subordination and coordination had not yet been fully established in the present scope (Görlach, 1991: 126), the ambivalence of some clauses in this respect was gradually starting to diminish, with the subordinate clauses transforming into a more structurally clear-cut form (Rissanen, 1999: 189). As a result, many of the subordinating conjunctions underwent the process of strengthening in terms of their semantic differentiation, making the interpretation of the clausal relationships within a sentence more precise (Görlach, 1991: 122). Following the trend set by the previous developments, the most important type of subordination still remained in the form of relative clauses, the usage of which was further supported by their parallels in Latin, and which became particularly abundant during the first decades of the 16th century. Under the influence of Latin syntax models, the relative clauses became more regularized in respect to *preposition*

+ *relative* sequences, as well as more open to combinations with absolute participles and infinitival constructions (Görlach, 1991: 125).

The rise of non-finite structures in this period is of a particular interest, both from the syntactic and textual perspective. The heightened frequency, as well as variety, of their usage, which may be observed already from the 16th century, is generally attributed to two main factors. Firstly, it is the already mentioned influence of classical Latin, in which the use of non-finite forms was immensely broad and common. The numerous, conscious attempts to imitate and transfer ancient rhetorical and stylistic patterns into contemporary prosaic works inevitably led to the popularization of infinitival and participial clauses, which began ever more often to replace their finite relative and adverbial counterparts (Görlach, 1991: 97, 120-122). The second reason for the increase in their popularity may be seen in the economy of expression that they offer. Limitations of such concision, however, lie in the heightened chance of obscurity and opacity that may ensue when too much condensation is performed in an ambiguous context. The spread of non-finite clause structures and the stylistic diversity it has brought has thus come at a price of a simultaneous lowering of explicitness (Görlach, 1991: 126-130).

2.2.2. *Word order and the issue of inversion*

The question of clausal arrangement during the early Modern English period has been only relatively recently put under in-depth investigation, as it has for long been “assumed that the main changes concerning word order at clause level took place in earlier periods.” (Pérez-Guerra, 1999: 1). While it may be certainly claimed that the SVO order spread already in the course of Middle English, and that it had, by far, become the commonest pattern in declarative sentences (Barber, 1976: 280), current studies suggest that the process of transition towards a fixed SV sequence had not been as entirely straightforward as the initial impressions might suggest (Breivik and Swan, 1994; Bækken, 1998, 2003).

In the most general terms, the word order change in English is seen as a shift from what is deemed to have been most likely a verb-second (V2) constraint language towards a system which is verb medial. The precise dating of this change appears to be, nevertheless, a matter of some dispute. A number of recent studies report a dramatic decrease of the frequency in V2 patterns between the Old and Middle English period (Bækken, 2003: 2), with the assumption

of the SVO pattern being largely stabilized in the affirmative statements by the year 1500 (Görlach, 1991: 107). The data given by Breivik & Swan (1994) in their investigation of initial adverbials, and by Bækken (1998, 2003), who has devoted a number of her academic papers to the development of Early Modern English syntax, appear to suggest that the establishment of verb-medial order was a wavelike process progressing by leaps and bounds throughout the 16th and 17th centuries, rather than coming to a fixed state around the end of the 15th. In other words, while an Early Modern declarative sentence “shows a strong tendency” towards the SVO sequence, “this tendency is not yet grammaticalized [...], at least not in the sense of exhibiting the set patterns and fixed rules which characterize Present-day English.” (Seoane, 2006: 361)

This is especially perceivable in the case of inverted subjects. In Late Modern English, a postverbal placement of the subject in non-interrogative sentences is subject to strict limitations. One of these is the presence of an initial negative or restrictive adverbial, such as *never, nor, only, rarely, seldom*, etc. (Barber, 1976: 281). At the beginning of the Early Modern period, however, the use of inversion was much less confined, showing a greater amount of variety in allowing for combinations with different kinds of initial elements, including direct objects and subject complements. A detailed account of 16th and 17th century inverted patterns is given in Bækken (1998, 2003), who studied the fluctuation of frequency rates in XSV and XVS sequences, where X refers to “one or more elements of different structural types” (2003: 196).

While the greatest frequency is exhibited by patterns where X is an initial adverbial, the specific requirement for its semantics to be negative or restrictive is documented to form approximately around the middle of the period, establishing itself firmly during the 17th century. Before that, inversions after adverbials are attested in free variation, regardless of the type of adverbial that precedes them (Bækken, 2003: 196-198; Barber, 1976: 282). The choice of XVS patterns appears to be the result of the interplay of various factors, including the realization of the subject, the length of the initial element and the transitivity of the predicate. According to both Bækken (2003: 197) and Rissanen (1999: 264-266), inversion was more likely to occur in cases, where (1) the subject was realized by a noun-headed noun phrase, instead of a pronoun, (2) the initial element is extremely light, (3) the verb phrase is short and complex, mostly comprising just an intransitive verb, and (4) the predicate includes one of a limited set of particular verbs, especially *have* and *say*. Similar conditions also appear to have

applied for the inversion after an initial object, the fronting of which was often done for the purpose of strengthening the textual coherence.

This fuzzy picture, suggestive of a less than settled state of the Early Modern English word order, has led Breivik & Swan (1994: 36) to the conclusion that the sentential and clausal arrangement of this period is in the “state of flux,” progressing slowly towards fixation by means of a series of shifts. This fluctuation in terms of permissibility of non-SVO word order has been one of the foci of the present research, trying to establish a link between the commencing modern syntactic rules on the one hand, and the ways of arranging different types of information inside the domain of a clause on the other.

2.3.FSP considerations

2.3.1. Functional sentence perspective and its relation to syntax: Introduction to some basic concepts and issues of FSP analysis

Within the sphere of recent and contemporary Czech linguistic domain, the issues of functional and communicative aspect of the language description have long presented one of the pivoting themes of linguistic research. Being observed already by Mathesius, the roots of the notion of FSP reach back into the mid-19th century and the name of Henri Weil, a French classical scholar, who in 1844 published a monograph entitled *De l'ordre des mots dans les langues anciennes comparées aux langues modernes (The Order of Words in the ancient languages compared with that of the modern languages)* (Firbas, 1974: 11-12). By comparing a number of typologically distinct word order systems, Weil comes to the conclusion that albeit these systems represent different patterns of formal linear arrangements, the expression of thoughts and ideas ultimately follows the same fundamental principles, regardless of the historical development the languages have undergone. In the light of these findings, he proposes drawing a terminological distinction that would capture the dichotomy between the perceived grammatical diversity on the one hand and the apparent communicative universality on the other.

He does so by establishing the concept of two types of “movement” that can be manifested in the process of any potential formation of an utterance. The first is syntactic, which is characterized by a linear, grammatically plausible progression from the beginning of a

sentence to its end; the second is the movement of ideas, reflecting the mental processes involved in the production and perception of a language material, i.e. in the process of communication. While the first may be subjected to the processes of variation and change, Weil observes, the latter tends to remain essentially constant (Firbas, 1974: 12), bridging the otherwise insurmountable abyss between typologically and chronologically distant language systems.

This “movement of mind” has become vital for the concept and study of FSP, as it touches upon one of the basic questions of linguistic research: that of the general rules of language as perceived in the process of human communication. Communication, by its definition, is a fundamentally reciprocal action involving at each moment of its duration two participating parties: that of the producer(s), who, depending on the situationally relevant medium, may be either a speaker or a writer, and that of the perceiver(s), i.e. listener/reader. It is on the mutual understanding of the contents and implications of the individual utterances and their combinations in the process of discourse that a successful outcome, be it primarily of informational or emotive value, largely depends. For that end, a selection of both “lexical and grammatical means of language” available to a given speaker is used in order to “[be] made to serve a specific purpose” he or she attempts to achieve (Firbas, 1974, 14). This orientation, or way, “in which a semantic and grammatical sentence structure is [made] to function in the act of communication” is then termed as the FSP (Firbas, 1992: 11).

The potentially vast range of choices at speakers’ disposal for conveying particular ideas to their audience is nevertheless partially subjected to the considerations of the addressees themselves. As Pérez-Guerra (1999: 16) poignantly observes, it should be borne in mind that the actual process of selecting particular language means is not merely production-oriented, but it also, first and foremost, serves as a “hearer[/reader]-oriented strategy which provides the major clues for the correct *understanding* of an utterance”¹. In order to achieve this understanding, a certain level of informational common ground must be presupposed to exist between the perceiver and the one to whom their attention is directed, a set of points which the producer can assume to be shared, and around which the core of the main idea he or she wants to convey can be built. These ideas, as of yet unfamiliar to the audience, generally tend to be delivered by means of gradual unfolding, proceeding sequentially from that which is mutually shared (Bækken, 2003: 85). This can be seen as done mainly for the purpose of

¹ italics are mine

avoiding potential misunderstandings or confusion on the part of the listener/reader, who would otherwise be unable to comprehend the message in question and thus would be rendered unable to further participate in the communication process.

The communicative strategies sketched out in the previous paragraph, which are employed for achieving a smooth information exchange, nevertheless naturally raise the question of which language elements are most suitable to serve as the anchors of shared information value, and from which the deliverance of yet unmentioned observations or unperceived relations can take place. According to Daneš (1974: 106), the literature concerned with the study of the FSP phenomena generally centres around three basic aspects relevant to this issue: (1) the distinction between the *given/known* and the *new/unknown*, (2) the notion of *theme/topic* as opposed to *rheme/comment*, and (3) the degrees of *communicative dynamism*. While the first two date back to Mathesius's writings, the last concept has been introduced by Firbas as a means of a finer, more subtle analysis of (2).

The definitions of these terms, however, are of an extensively varied, if not vague nature and great differences in their perception may be traced from author to author. Some use the notions of (1) and (2) interchangeably, others do not. Before establishing the conceptual perception relevant for the purpose of the present study, let us look at each of these terms in turn, and address some of the central FSP issues in the light of the contemporary linguistic trends and approaches.

2.3.2. *The notion of givenness*

It has been stated that in the process of discourse, the selection and arrangement of grammatical and lexical means for a specific goal that is to be attained is determined by the producer of the utterance in regard to their audience's current knowledge. In other words, the speaker/writer has to channel the communication flow so as to build up on what he or she expects the listeners to know, be aware of, or be able to deduce under the present circumstances, i.e. on the pieces of information that are "given". The criteria for distinguishing givenness, Bækken (2003: 86) duly remarks, may nevertheless, at times, be perceived as extremely fuzzy and difficult to pinpoint. In terms of FSP analysis, the notion of can be seen as comprising two defining features: that of recoverability in relation to the

context and that of gradedness in relation to the relative spatial distance between two co-referential elements within the given textual sample (Daneš, 1974: 109-110).

When identifying elements in regard to whether or not they may be labelled as contextually given, it is important to note that albeit *givenness* relies on what is known to the perceiver at the moment of the utterance, it should not be *equalled* with the concept of knowledge, as these two can function in very different ways. In his paper, *Substantiating Daneš's view of givenness as a graded phenomenon*, Firbas (1994: 119) illustrates this point by providing the following example:

[1] *Then the old gardener appeared.*

(Firbas, 1994: 119)

While the definite article may hint towards the interpretation of *the old gardener* as a person familiar both to the speaker and the hearer, the fact that the sentence functions as a vehicle for introducing this character to the scene through the predicate verb *to appear* suggests that in the current situation it conveys a piece of new information for the hearer (Firbas, 1994: 119). This view is also substantiated by Geluykens who, like Firbas, concludes that “not everything the hearer ‘knows’ can be assumed to be in his consciousness” (Geluykens, 1992: 10). The FSP being concerned with the “immediately relevant verbal and situational context” (hence “aktuální” in the Czech term “aktuální členění větné”) (Firbas, 1992: 22-24), the notion of *givenness* is tightly and inevitably connected to the possibility of being recoverable, or at least deducible, from what is available not generally, but under current conditions.

These conditions may be subsumed under what is by Firbas (1992) and Kohonen (1978) distinguished as two basic types of context. Firstly, it is the linguistic, i.e. textual context, manifested in a continuous flow of verbal communication (Firbas, 1992: 22-24). Secondly, it is the so-called pragmatic or situational context, comprising the “total contemporary world picture” of the communication participants (Kohonen, 1978: 67). This can include pieces of extralinguistic reality that are “of immediate, *ad hoc* concern”, deictic expression, personal pronouns such as *me*, *you* etc. (Firbas, 1992: 24-25). Any piece of information that is at the same time present both in the moment of expression of an utterance as well as in its immediately relevant context is then labelled as context-dependent; any other piece of

information is then seen as being context-independent (Firbas, 1994: 120; Hajičová et al., 2003, 100).

The concept of given as opposed to new elements has been further elaborated by Pérez-Guerra (1999), who establishes an intricate taxonomy of information content carried by the so-called referential, i.e. lexical, items. In his view, referentiality comprises two different dimension: (1) the relative difficulty or easiness with which the perceiver can access a given concept, and (2) the actual information content, regarded as a relative property of words and phrases in the process of discourse. The interplay of these factors is summarized below:

[2] Table 1: Dimensions of referentiality, according to Pérez-Guerra (1999: 26-28)

| dimension of referentiality | type of information | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| (1) availability | 1. available | – in consciousness, in focus |
| | 2. semi-available | – in peripheral consciousness, outside of focus |
| | 3. unavailable | – outside of consciousness, in long-term memory |
| (2) thematicity | 1. old | a. shared knowledge |
| | | b. current textual/conversational set of referents |
| | | c. assumed / marked by speaker as old |
| | 2. new | a. brand new |
| | b. unused contents | |
| | 3. contrastive | connected to a previously mentioned referent by means of semantic opposition |
| | 4. predictable | between old and new |
| 5. unused | not materialized in discourse | |

As can be seen from the table, givenness, in accordance with the definition stated above, subsumes the values of 1.1 and 2.1, while newness includes all the instances of 1.2, 1.3, 2.2 and 2.3. 2.5 while perceivable as inherently “new *in potentia*”, might nevertheless be said to fall outside the scope of the given-new dichotomy, as it is not realized in a particular piece of

discourse and thus cannot be ascribed to any of the types reserved for language items as used in the active process of communication.

The question of referentiality and retrievability has also been addressed in depth by Hajičová, Panevová and Sgall (Hajičová et al., 2003: 99-102), who place the basis of their analysis on the differentiation between contextually bound “topic” and contextually non-bound “core/focus”. The concept of context-boundness, however, Hajičová stresses, should not be merely viewed as a feature, the relevance of which is strictly limited to the scope of pragmatics only. Instead, it is to be perceived in close connection with language semantics, as an inseparable part of textual meaning capable of influencing and modifying the actual interpretation of a particular sentence in a given context. Hajičová cites an example, already pointed out by Halliday, of a notice sign board in a London underground station saying:

[3] *Dogs must be carried.*

(Hajičová et al., 2003: 100)

For a person acquainted with forms of travel in the city, the most natural interpretation of this directive would be that of “the passengers who are travelling with dogs must carry them”. In other words, the message addresses those and only those, who choose to travel with a pet. If, on the other hand, we would discard, or rather change our knowledge of situational context, we might arrive at a somewhat peculiar, and doubtless originally unintended demand that “all who wish to travel by an underground train must carry a dog with them.” The interpretation is entirely dependent on the passengers’ understanding of immediately relevant circumstances, for the sentence itself may result in two completely different implications.

One of the basic semantically distinguishing features between the topical and the focal part of a sentence concerns a bi-partite distinction of presupposition and allegation (Hajičová et al., 2003: 101-102). The terms apply to individual segments of an utterance in relation to their truth value under different polarity. While the term presupposition implies a proposition that holds true regardless of whether the sentence is positive or not, i.e. falls outside the scope of sentence negation, allegation need not necessarily convey a valid piece of information, once negated. Cf. the following two pairs of sentences in [4]². The presuppositions are printed in

² translation is mine

bold; the relevant allegations in question are underlined. Logical implications of each set of propositions are given below:

[4]

1.1 Yesterday, **Milan's daughter** was seen by George's brother at the exhibition.

1.2 Yesterday, **Milan's daughter** was not seen by George's brother at the exhibition. (She was seen by George's uncle.)

→ Milan has a daughter × George may or may not have a brother

2.1 Yesterday, **George's brother** saw Milan's daughter at the exhibition.

2.2 Yesterday, **George's brother** didn't see Milan's daughter at the exhibition. (He saw Milan's niece.)

→ George has a brother × Milan may or may not have a daughter

(Hajičová et al., 2003: 101)

Note that in each set of examples, the second utterance may be followed by an explicatory sentence relating to the nature of the focal, contextually non-bound element(s). The section containing retrievable pieces of information, on the other hand, is assumed to be existent by both the speaker and the hearer, with no regard to the consideration whether the utterance as a whole is deemed true or not.

The requirement of retrievability in relation to the concept of linguistic context, postulated earlier, nevertheless inevitably raises another question: for how long in terms of spatial extent can an individual piece of information be perceived as retrievable? The issue has been addressed first by Svoboda (1981: 88-89), who in a study of an Old English prosaic material maintains that the retrievability span of a particular element oscillates on the range of approximately seven clauses. Following Svoboda's findings, the topic has been subsequently dealt with by Daneš and Firbas (1994), who conclude that the actual distance between an element and its contextually dependent re-expression may vary from text to text, depending on the length of intervening clauses, the characteristics of their semantic content etc. The "obliteration of retrievability", they stress out, is not to be seen as a phenomenon of an absolute, binary value, but rather as a "a gradual process," operating over "a very brief stretch of text" on scalar terms (Firbas, 1994: 121). In order for an element to remain given, it needs

to be re-expressed within this relative span, either through means of repetition, implicational reference, synonymy or other relevant forms of substitution based on close semantic relationships of mutual, non-opposing relatedness (Bækken, 1999: 299). The clearer the retrievability of an element is made, the smoother the operation of the communication as a whole becomes (Firbas, 1994: 123).

2.3.3. *The notion of communicative dynamism*

In the previous section I have addressed the issue of contextual dependence, drawing upon the notion of given as opposed to new piece of information. It has been said that the general tendency of communication seems to proceed from the common ground of mutually shared pieces of knowledge that is immediately activated in the participants' consciousness to the core of the message by the process of gradual unfolding what is present in the mind of the producer, but absent from the current operative knowledge of the perceiver. The level of contextual boundness is relative to and dependent on the immediately preceding stretch of text and on the situational variables the hearer/writer and the speaker/listener are subjected to.

For a full description of the process of communication flow, however, the mere notion of context dependence does not always prove completely adequate. While it can be claimed that utterances do indeed tend towards ending with a contextually new set of items (Biber, 1999: 896), a feature which has been labelled as the principle of end-focus (Quirk et al., 1985: 1357),³ it cannot be equally assessed that each utterance must contain a given element. Thus in a sentence

[5] *A girl broke a vase.*

(Firbas, 1966: 243)

both noun phrases have to be interpreted as conveying a new piece of information. At the same time, however, it seems evident that the contribution of the *girl* and the *vase* towards the development of the communication is not fully equivalent, for it is clearly the latter that

³ The principle of end-focus is often found to concord with another organization principle called end-weight, which states that lengthier and more complex constituents are more likely to be placed at the end of the clause, rather than in the middle or the beginning. This is often done for practical reasons, for initial lengthy passages might easily confuse the listener into losing the track of the other person's speech. As new elements usually require more explication than the old ones, the two principles usually work together (Quirk et al., 1985: 1361-1362).

would be perceived as more important (Firbas, 1966: 243). This “extent to which a linguistic element contributes towards the further development of the communication” is seen by Firbas (1992: 8-9) as a relative degree of what he terms “the communicative dynamism”.

Communicative dynamism (CD) itself is to be understood as “a quality displayed by communication in its development (unfolding) of the information to be conveyed and consisting of advancing this development” (Svoboda, 1974: 38). In some ways this theoretical concept may be seen as an extension of the given-new bipartition, but in its essence, Svoboda (1974: 40) remarks, it is unquestionably broader. Not only does it enable the researcher to operate on the levels of multiple degrees, but it is also capable of “an abstraction from and generalization of the reciprocal of contextual dependence” (Svoboda, 1974: 40). Each sentence may thus be viewed as a basic “distributional field” over which different degrees of CD are spread (Firbas, 1992: 15), the neutral, basic distribution progressing from the lowest to the highest (Firbas, 1974: 35). Within the borderlines of each of these broad distributional fields a number of smaller scale, hierarchically arranged subfields can exist, constituted on the syntactic level by individual clauses and phrases. Each of these subfields is “perspectived towards the communicative unit that carries the highest degree of CD”, thus carrying its own autonomous FSP (Firbas, 1992: 19, 75). This hierarchical levelling of syntactically defined units with respect to their particular FSP can be illustrated by an example given in [6]. The communicative units carrying the lowest degree of CD on each separate level are printed in bold; those carrying the highest are underlined:

[6]

1. sentence level: ***Paul** decided to learn foreign languages.*
2. clausal level: *to learn foreign languages*
3. phrasal level: *foreign languages*

(Firbas, 1992: 19)

The most dynamic communicative unit inside the basic distributional field is represented by the non-finite clause “*to learn foreign languages,*” which itself is perspectived towards the notional content of its direct subject realized by a noun phrase. This noun phrase consists of a head and nominal premodifier “*foreign*”, the latter of which specifies and further develops the former, thus carrying a higher degree of CD.

Although the number of potential degrees of CD within a distributional field is not limited (Firbas, 1992: 19), for the purpose of FSP analysis a line is traditionally drawn to distinguish between two or three basic levels. The utterance element carrying the lowest degree of CD is regarded as the “theme” (Th) of the sentence, while the rest of the elements are classified as “non-thematic”, comprising the so-called “focus” or “rheme” (Rh). Sometimes a distinction is made in the non-thematic part between the actual rheme and a possible number of transitional elements (Tr) which serve as a link between the two opposing ends of the CD scale (Firbas, 1992: 66-72).⁴

The factors influencing the relative degree of CD carried by communicative units in written⁵ texts are threefold. Firstly, it is the linear arrangement of the constituents, which tends to proceed from the lowest degree to the highest. Secondly, it is the textual and situational context of the utterance, which determines givenness. And thirdly, it is the semantics of the individual elements. The second and third factors may, in combination, work against the primary linear arrangement, allowing for more dynamic elements to precede the less dynamic ones and vice versa (Firbas, 1992: 10). The semantic and contextual considerations become especially important when analyzing languages with fixed word orders which are governed primarily by grammatical principles, such as Modern English (Firbas, 1992: 119). Notice that the CD analysis becomes more complex than the previously described approaches, as it works with an interplay of factors, rather than with a select single one.

2.3.4. *The notion of theme/topic*

Having briefly sketched out some of the most basic theoretical issues and concerns connected to the FSP analysis in terms of givenness, context dependence and CD, let us now turn to the concept of theme and summarize the key differences in various approaches to the *theme-rheme/topic-comment/core-focus* dichotomy. Regardless of a particular type of approach to FSP, there arises a natural need to distinguish between a certain specific point of departure, from which the communication flow unfolds, and the heart of the conveyed message. The set

⁴ Firbas (1992: 70ff.) himself in his analyses draws even a yet finer distinction, when he distinguishes between six different groups of elements, according to their relative degree of CD: theme, transition proper, transition proper oriented, transition to the exclusion of transition proper and transition proper oriented, rheme to the exclusion of rheme proper, and rheme proper. For the purpose of this thesis, however, only simple binary distinction is adopted. A detailed description of each of the six degree-based units' features can be found in Firbas (1992).

⁵ In spoken discourse a fourth crucial factor comes into play in the form of intonation. As, however, intonation in the written medium can be only supposed, not observed, it exceeds the scope of this thesis. For a detailed analysis of the FSP in spoken communication see Firbas (1992: 143-226)

of common labels coined for that purpose generally centre around the notion of “theme” or “topic”, i.e. a term which serves to identify the starting point of a sentence, anchoring it within the broader context of a given language situation. Such anchor may be described in terms of a small number of distinct, albeit intertwined and mutually supportive features. The concept of “theme” or “topic” is therefore a relatively varied terminological construct, encompassing a range of working definitions based on the primary choice of which of these characteristics are given the primary distinguishing role.

In his introduction to FSP analysis, Pérez-Guerra (1999: 17-19) recognizes two main branches of theme concepts. The first one, represented e.g. by Halliday or Quirk, bases its definition on syntactic considerations. The “theme” or “topic” must usually meet a specified set of morpho-syntactic requirements, the most conspicuous of which being the occupation of an initial position within a given structure. By topicalization is then meant the process of grammatical fronting, most of the study being dedicated to the impact of changes in linear arrangement and word order (Firbas, 1992: 126).

The second branch, on the other hand, focuses on the pragmatic implications of thematicity. These approaches, Pérez-Guerra (1999: 17-19) points out, do not delimit themes on the basis of their position, but rather on the basis of their meaning and contextual function. Within that broad field, further division can be found, the most important one separating the requirement of givenness in Bækken (1998, 2003) and context-boundedness in Hajičová, Panevová and Sgall (Hajičová et al., 2003: 99-102) from that of the lowest degree of CD in Firbas (1992).

Seoane (2006: 364) distinguishes yet another approach, within the broader range of Pérez-Guerra’s pragmatic group, and that is of a semantically based conception in which theme delimits and introduces what the remaining part of an utterance is going to be about. In this respect, it is the semantic factor of the FSP that is considered the most relevant for the analysis, linear and contextual restrictions being not necessarily brought in the focus.

A simplified overview of the three basic types of views on thematicity is given in [7]. A summary of the relevant FSP factors that are taken into consideration in describing and application of the term “theme” in each approach are given in the right-hand column. It is important to note, however, that the working definitions of 1.-3. need not be necessarily

mutually exclusive, as one particular communicative unit may, and often does, comprise more than one of the characterizing features listed below:

- [7] Table 2: Different concepts of theme/topic in English: adapted from Seoane (2006: 364) and Pérez-Guerra (1999: 17-19)

| concept of Th | Th characterized as | FSP factors |
|----------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| 1. syntax-based | the 1st propositional constituent of a clause | linearity |
| 2. pragmatics-based | given/context-bound element | context |
| | element with the lowest degree of CD | context linearity semantics |
| 3. semantics-based | constituent which states what the clause is about | semantics |

2.3.5. FSP research on Early Modern English material

If comparatively little research has been carried out on the syntactic developments in Early Modern English, an even lesser amount of studies appears to exist that have been specifically devoted to the FSP analysis of the texts dating from that period, most of them carried out as parts of the research on 16th and 17th century word order. Pérez-Guerra's *Historical English Syntax: A statistical corpus-based study on the organisation of Early Modern English sentences* (1995) is a selective treatise of the syntactic developments occurring between Late Middle English (1420-1500) and Early Modern English (1500-1710) in the light of the Present-day (1961) grammatical usage. The study is based on the Helsinki and LOB corpora, spanning a scope of more than 500 years. In his analysis, Pérez-Guerra rejects the pragmatic conception of theme as not particularly useful on the ground that it is not, in his view, sufficiently based on immediately "observable features" (Pérez-Guerra, 1999: 19). Instead, he proposes a structural definition, which delimits the theme in relation to the position of the subject and the predicator in the clause:

- [8] The theme of a declarative clause comprises either the subject when it is sentence-initial or every segment from the beginning of the clause up to either

the subject in those cases in which the subject precedes the predicator, or up to, and including, the predicator when the lexical subject follows the predicator. Thematic constituents must be either integrated in or bound to the syntactic structure of the clause; discursive material and conjunctions are not considered.

(Pérez-Guerra, 1999: 20)

Observing the theme to be syntactically defined, Pérez-Guerra draws upon Stucky's concept of permutational word order variation⁶ for introducing the concept of thematic subsystems, i.e. an interrelated set of constructions which differ in no propositional or morpho-syntactic feature from one another, but which do possess different thematic elements. Assuming that the "unmarked organization in English declarative clauses" as can be perceived in Modern English is that of SVX, any constructions of thematic subsystems which do not place a lexical subject in the clause-initial position are considered as thematically marked. These structures include *there*-constructions, clefts, extrapositions, cases of topicalization and inversion.

Comparing and mapping the changes in structural attributes and textual frequency of both the marked and unmarked constructions of each of these thematic subsystems in the given time span, Pérez-Guerra (1995: 296) reaches two important conclusions. Firstly, no significant syntactic change pertaining to or directly affecting the constructions analysed seems to have been observed: "the basic syntactic organisation of the thematic variants within each subsystem did not undergo significant alteration within the periods analysed, which corroborates the assumption that the major patterns must have developed earlier." Secondly, despite not having undergone a structural shift, significant changes seem to have occurred during the Early Modern stage in terms of consolidation of the marked variations, which was characterized both by increase of the general frequency of their usage, as well as their expansion into a wider range of different text types. This consolidation is especially observable in the later stages of the period between 1640 and 1710, affirming the initial assumption of Early Modern English as a period significant for the development of thematic variations observed in the Present-day language.

⁶ Pérez-Guerra refers to Stucky, Susan U. (1987) *Configurational Variation in English: A Study of Extraposition and Related Matters*, SRI International, 377-404. Stucky distinguishes between configurational variants (1985:378), which encompass all syntactic constructions with identical propositional content, but of different structure, and permutational variants, which are "not dependent on the morphological form of lexical items" (1985: 379) (Pérez-Guerra, 1985: 21)

A different approach to thematic analysis is taken by Bækken, who in her corpus-based 1998 study *Word order patterns in Early Modern English with special reference to the position of the subject and the finite verb* and the subsequent *Word order in 17th century in English: A study of the stabilisation of the XSV pattern* published in 2003 considers the nature of mutual relationship between the ways of encoding contextually given elements and their position in a sentence. Following upon the pragmatic notion that themes are constituted by their situationally bound content, she makes several important observations about the principles governing the choices of resultant word order patterns with respect to the thematicity of the individual clause constituents.

Similarly to the Late Modern English data, the 16th and 17th century texts show “a strong tendency for subjects to constitute given information,” (2003: 116, 198). This is corroborated by Seoane (2006: 363), who stresses the universal validity of the given-before-new principle throughout the historical development of English. Most of the thematic subjects comprise pronominal expressions, while new subjects tend to contain noun heads. The placement of subjects in relation to the position of predicates appears to be fully consistent with the principles of end-weight and end-focus, in that both contextually non-bound, new subjects and to some extent non-pronominal given subjects are more likely to appear postverbally, rather than initially. In other words, subject-verb inversion appears to still have been one of the comparatively available means of FSP organization up until and including the 17th century (Bækken 2003: 116).

In a direct opposition to the subjects, initial elements other than subject and verb, show a completely reverse functional tendency, in that the majority of preposed constituents are contextually new. While given initial constituents seem to primarily function as means of textual cohesion, new elements appear to gain structural emphasis from their placement. Their initial position can thus be interpreted as a “focusing device”, endowing the element with a greater amount of informational importance (Bækken 2003: 117).⁷ The XSV order appears to show the greatest amount of consistence in terms of information flow, typically proceeding

⁷ This phenomenon may be likened to the observed high emphatic effect of the marked placement of rhemes in current Czech described by Mathesius (1947: 340) and Firbas (1992: 120), which is given by the non-observance of the governing word order principle of FSP linearity compliance (Firbas, 1974: 13). In the course of Modern English, however, the marked character does not primarily stem from the non-observance of the basic distribution of communicative dynamism; instead, the resulting emotive emphasis is a result of the deviation from the requirements of the grammatical principle, which delimits an element its sentence position on the basis of its syntactic function (Firbas, 1992: 120).

from a new initial element to given, usually pronominal, subject. The same level of generalization appears to be rather more difficult to make for the inverted patterns, as the frequency of particular combinations proves to fluctuate for different initial elements; structures complying to the basic distribution of communicative dynamism nevertheless appear to be common, as it allows for the post-verbal placement of new subjects (Bækken 2003: 118).

3. Research project

3.1. Methodology

3.1.1. *Introduction*

The previous chapter has presented some of the key approaches to the problems of sentence ordering and information flow with respect to the changing nature of language, and in particular to the grammatical shifts that have been observed to occur within the last half-millennium. It has been said that the 16th and 17th centuries belong to one of the less researched areas in the history of the English language, especially, but by no means exclusively, in the domain of thematicity considerations and (con)textual analysis. The present research does not strive to convey a comprehensive description of the relationship between the syntactic and communicative strategies in the mid-Early Modern English period; instead, it tries to map the key differences between the Early and Late Modern clausal syntax, with attention paid to the limitations it imposes on the observance of the FSP linearity principle and the possibilities it offers for reconciling that principle with the grammaticalized word order. In comparison with the studies of Bækken and Pérez-Guerra, introduced earlier, the following analysis differs in two basic respects: (1) choice of the language material, and (2) selection of the pursued FSP theory.

Both of the previous investigations were relying on a one-dimensional, i.e. single-factor, approach to thematicity, based either on the initial position of an element within a clause or sentence, or on the issue of contextual givenness. For the purpose of the present research, thematicity is perceived in the Firbasian sense as a result of an interplay between the clauses' contextual position, linear arrangement and semantic content, resulting in the individual communicative units being assigned different degrees of CD on different syntactic levels; the thematic element being the one the degree of which is the lowest. The analysis was simplified in the sense that only binary division was observed, differentiating between theme and non-theme. Instead of a detailed description of each distributional field, the primary focus is placed on the role of the grammatical principle of word order in determining the position of the thematic elements.

Also unlike the research conducted by Bækken and Pérez-Guerra, the present study is based on a comparison of two parallel editions of a single text, rather than on corpus material. While the textual approach necessarily inhibits any stylistic or demographic analysis, and faces the imminent danger of falling prey to the temptation of overgeneralization as a result of overestimating the role of the authors' own idiolects, the confrontational perspective it offers possesses the advantage of direct comparison of matching propositional content and syntactic structures as they appear in the actual discourse. The stress is thus placed on the observation and evaluation of specific differences ensuing under corresponding contextual circumstances.

3.1.2. *On the choice of text: A short introduction to The Consolation of Philosophy*

Albeit the number of preserved literary material dating from the 16th and 17th centuries is much higher than that from any other of the earlier periods, the choice of a text suitable for a parallel Early-Late Modern syntactic analysis is very limited. Due to the similarities in grammar and lexis the texts of this period share with Present-day English usage, it is relatively difficult to find a piece of prose that would exist for both stages of the historical development of the language. It was therefore decided that the source material should not be selected from an original piece of Early Modern prose, but from a period translation of an earlier literary work. To that end, the 6th century philosophical essay *Consolatio Philosophiae*, or *The Consolation of Philosophy*, was considered one of the most ideal choices.

Written by an eminent classical scholar, Anicius Manlius Severinus Boethius, *The Consolation* belongs to one of the most popular and by far the most frequently translated books of the early Christian philosophy (Anderson, 1964: 15-16; Walsh, 2008: xxxi). The history of *consolatio* as a formally distinctive genre dates back to approximately the third century BCE, some of the most famous works having been written by such literary and political figures as Cicero or Seneca (Walsh, 2008: xxx). Boethius' composition, however, boasts several idiosyncrasies.

The Consolation was written during Boethius' imprisonment in Ticenum as a collection of five books, each addressing a different set of metaphysical problems. The form of the treatise is fashioned as an interaction between a prisoner, i.e. Boethius himself, who awaiting his execution laments his cruel lot, and the personification of Philosophy, who acts as his teacher and guide in the matters of Fortune, Fate, Providence and, ultimately, God. The dialogue form

is considered to have been directly influenced by classical literary models, especially the works of Plato, but unlike his predecessors, Boethius opted for a prosimetric form, a combination of prose and verse passages typical for traditional Menippean satire (Walsh, 2008: xxxviii). This, in a sense eclectic, approach characterizes one of the important features of *The Consolation*: that it was intended not for a limited circle of contemporary philosophers, but for a larger audience with general taste for classical literature (Walsh, 2008: xxxviii).

The initial spread of its popularity is credited to Alcuin of York, who established it in the contemporary academia as part of the mediaeval educational curriculum, and inspired the composition of several theological commentaries (Anderson, 1963: 8; Walsh, 2008: xliii-xliv). The book itself soon came to be regarded not only as an inspirational essayistic text, but also, in the broader sense, as a “compendium of classical thought,” preserving elements of ancient philosophical tradition in medieval Europe (Anderson, 1963: 7). Despite its post-classical Latin, which did not suit the tastes of many Renaissance critics, *The Consolation* nevertheless remained in high regard in Britain, especially during the 17th and 18th century, when it became customary to treat Boethius as one of the authors every educated person should be familiar with (Walsh, 2008: xlviii-xlvix).

The popularity of the text inspired many vernacular translations, the oldest known example of which reaching back to the late 9th century and the court of Alfred the Great. Despite being better described as a paraphrase, rather than a fully fledged translation, Alfred’s unique attempt had remained an isolated phenomenon for almost five hundred years. In the late Middle Ages and during the Renaissance, *The Consolation* was translated by numerous literary and political figures, including Chaucer (around 1380), John Walton (1410), and Queen Elizabeth I. (Anderson, 1963: 15; Walsh, 2008: xlvi-xlviii).

The two translations used for the purpose of this project stand separated by the gap of 390 years. The first one (Text A) comes from the pen of an anonymous literate, identified only by the letters I. T. Dedicated to the Countess Dowager of Dorset and published in London by John Windet in 1609, this version is generally regarded as one of the finest translations produced in the 17th century (Anderson, 1963: 15-16).⁸ The 1963 edition from which the text for this analysis was taken includes some items of revised punctuation, mostly in the form of the reduction of commas, but keeps most of the period spelling conventions, with the

⁸ The high esteem in which the translation has been hold can be also perceived in the translation’s reproduction appearing as late as the mid-20th century, including Latin-English bilingual editions (see bibliography).

exceptions of a small number of words, in which the original spelling might be potentially confusing or ambiguous for the modern reader. The Late Modern, 20th century text it parallels (Text B) is a translation by Professor P. G. Welsh, originally published in the Oxford World's Classics edition in 1999. Both these translations adhere to the original prosimetric form, each of the individual chapters/sections being either introduced or summarized by a short verse, depending on which of the five books they belong to. The material excerpted for this analysis encompasses 50 sentences from the beginning sections I-III of the fifth, and final, book of the Early Modern version, which has been selected as the referential basis for the comparison, and a corresponding section covering the identical amount of content in the later one. As the metre may unduly restrict both the grammatical and lexical choices of the language, exercising an influence over the syntactic structures, as well as the FSP, all the metrical passages were excluded.

3.1.3. *On the analysis*

Having selected the source material for the analysis, each piece of the text was then divided into separate clauses. These have been individually numbered in accordance with the following pattern:

- (1) Clauses in Text A have been marked successively from 1 to 222, regardless of a finite or non-finite realization of each particular clause.
- (2) Clauses with corresponding propositional content in Text B have been appointed an identical number as their semantic counterparts in Text A.
- (3) Clauses in Text B which either do not have a corresponding clausal realization in Text A or contain a completely new piece of information, absent from the Early Modern version, have been marked by the number of their closest preceding, or, when sentence-initial, their closest following clause and distinguished by being assigned an additional ordering numeral, such as 6.2, 19.3, etc. These additional numbers are, once again, assigned successively, according to the linear progression of the text.
- (4) Parts of one clause, intersected by the presence of another clause are marked by letters, e.g. 161.1.a, 194.b etc.
- (5) Sentences in Text A have been individually marked from 1 to 50.

- (6) Sentences in Text B have been marked by the corresponding number of their Early Modern counterparts. In cases where the content of one sentence in Text A corresponds to more sentences in Text B, these sentences are assigned the same number as the sentence in Text A and subsequently marked by a capital letter, e.g. 5A, 7B etc. In the reverse case when one sentence in Text B corresponds to more sentences in Text A, the sentence in Text B is marked by the conjoint numbers of the sentences in A, followed by a slash and a number of which particular corresponding sentence in Text A it relates to, e.g. 29-30/29, 31-32/32B etc.

For the purposes of comparison, each clause is referred to in terms of its reference number, i.e. a “code” of the clause consisting of a letter (A or B), indicating the version of the text it appears in, and the actual number of the clause assigned to it according to the key listed in (1) - (4).

Once numbered, the individual clauses have then been ordered in a matching table, with the earlier translation being placed on the left hand side and the later on the right. Each clause was then analyzed for:

[9]

1. its realization, i.e. finite, non-finite, or verbless
2. its syntactic type, i.e. nominal content, nominal relative, adjectival relative, and adverbial
3. its syntactic function, i.e. main vs. dependent: subject, object, adverbial, etc.
4. its position within the sentence (this concerns mainly the cases of mismatch in linear arrangement between Text A and Text B)
5. its FSP

Morphological differences were not considered. For easier orientation in the material, thematic elements in each clause have been marked by bold, non-thematic elements have been left plain. Note, however, that the core of the FSP considerations only encompasses the distributional fields of clauses, not that of individual phrases. When appropriate, distributional

fields of the whole sentences are touched upon in relation to the changes in sequences of matching clauses between the two texts, as mentioned in (4).

Following this multi-level analysis, any structural non-correspondences between the clauses in Text A and B with a matching semantic content have been noted down and counted. In the parallel table, any mismatches in points (1) to (3) are summarized, mostly in the line directly under the clause in question. Where appropriate, a short explanatory paragraph is added, focusing on the reasons for these differences or their practical implications. When a sequence of clauses with similar or related non-corresponding features can be found, the explanation is usually included under the last one.

On the basis of the theoretical preliminaries concerning the nature of Early Modern syntax introduced in the previous chapter, several types of differences were expected to be found between Text A and B. One of the most basic mismatches was assumed to be marked in the length and number of sentences, with the later version comprising shorter and more numerous examples. Given the fact that in both cases the original language from which the translation were produced was Latin, it was also suspected that the Early Modern version might include a considerable number of structures, the usage of which had been influenced and inspired by Latin texts, especially in relation to the means of sentence condensation. Cases of inversion and non-observance of the basic SVO order in declarative sentences were expected to occur more frequently and in more varied environment in Text A. The measure of adherence to the basic distribution of CD was thought to be closely similar, albeit the anticipated level of relative freedom in word order was suspected to occasionally enable the linearity to change more easily to accommodate the theme - non-theme sequence.

The following sections present a concise overview of the most important syntactic differences that have been observed in the two texts, with special relation to changes in the FSP or its means, wherever relevant. Examples are given in each section of clauses pertaining to the issue in question; the full text of both versions is included in the Appendix. Also enclosed is the original comparative table with short commentary sections, as described above.

3.2. Findings and results

3.2.1. *The clause and the sentence*

After the initial identification and numbering of the individual clauses, the disproportions between the two texts appear to corroborate the observations of the Early Modern sentences being longer and thus less numerous than the sentences found in the Present-day version of the same text. Cf. the following:

[10] Table 3: Total number of sentential and clausal units in Texts A and B

| | | <u>Text A:</u> <u>EModE</u> | <u>Text B :</u> <u>PDE</u> |
|-----------|--------------|--|---|
| sentences | Total | 50 | 55 [+10 %] |
| clauses | finite | 199 (89.6 %) | 215 (93.5 %) |
| | non-finite | 21 (9.5 %) | 15 (6.5 %) |
| | verbless | 2 (0.9 %) | 0 (0 %) |
| | Total | 222 | 230 [+3.6 %] |

As can be seen from the table, the difference in the number of sentences between the two texts reaches 10 %. While, given the small scale of the sample, the figures in this case cannot be viewed as fully conclusive they nevertheless do point towards the conclusion of the Late Modern sentences being shorter and less informationally packed than those of the Early Modern period. This overall tendency nevertheless should not be viewed as absolute in the sense that it would exclude the possibility of lengthier sequences appearing in the newer version where the older one opts for shorter, separate structures. Thus while sentences number 5, 6, 18, 35, 41, 45, are unquestionably longer in the earlier text, it is in Text B where the correspondingly separate 27 & 28, 29 & 30, 31 & 32, and 49 & 50 are amalgamated in one-sentence units.

Slightly contrary to the assumption of the sentences being universally shorter also goes the fact that the later version is higher in the number of individual clauses. This disproportion appears to hint at the existence of systematic differences both on the level of nominalization and in lexical choices (see 3.2.6 for more details) between the two texts, resulting in the later relying on a greater number of clauses to deliver the same propositional content. Rather than just in terms of length, it might therefore be more precise to claim that in this particular case, the Early Modern sentences tend to comprise a larger number of semantically relevant elements than the Late Modern ones, thus managing to convey more information within one unit.

Should we turn our attention to the clauses themselves, we may find a relatively high number of direct syntactic parallels. Table 4 shows that more than 60 % of the clauses in each of the two texts have been found to mutually correspond in terms of the finiteness of their predicates, their syntactic type, and in the function they perform. The remaining 40 % comprise various types of clausal mismatches, which might be grouped into two large categories: (1) clauses with no direct clausal parallel in the other text, and (2) clauses the parallel of which differs in one or more of the basic syntactic features stated above. A proportional summary of the relevant data, showing the total number of occurrences of each correspondence type is given in [11]:

[11] Table 4: Different types of clauses according to their level of mutual correspondence

| | | <u>Text A:</u> <u>EModE</u> | <u>Text B:</u> <u>PDE</u> |
|---|--------------|--|--|
| clauses corresponding in their syntactic type, function and realization to the parallel clauses in the other text | Total | 140 | 140 |
| clauses unparalleled in the other text | finite | 15 (71.4 %) | 35 (89.7 %) |
| | non-finite | 6 (28.6 %) | 4 (10.3 %) |
| | verbless | 0 (0 %) | 0 (0 %) |
| | Total | 21 | 39 |
| clauses differing in their syntactic type, function or realization from the corresponding clauses in the other text | finite | 34 (66.7 %) | 40 (78.4 %) |
| | non-finite | 15 (29.4 %) | 11 (21.6 %) |
| | verbless | 2 (3.9 %) | 0 (0 %) |
| | Total | 51 | 51 |

One of the most conspicuous and universal disparities that may be seen at a first glance is a higher preference of the Early Modern translation for employing non-finite clauses, thus reaching a greater level of economy. The other most apparent disproportion concerns the number of clauses in lack of a corresponding clausal unit in the other textual variant, which reaches almost twice as high a figure in the Present-day translation than it does for the 17th century variant.

3.2.2. *Clauses with no direct clausal parallel*

By comparing the propositional and syntactic characteristics of the unparalleled constructions, we may conclude that the presence of an extra clause, absent from the other text, can be observed to arise from three basic reasons:

- 1) The other text employs a significantly different structure for the nearest superordinate clause or for the sentence as a whole, including disparities in colligation and valency patterns of the predicate verb.
- 2) The clause possesses a semantic parallel, which is nevertheless expressed by non-clausal means. These include nominalizations, differences in lexical choices and cases of predicate coordination.
- 3) The clause shows no kind of semantic parallel, neither clausal nor non-clausal. This relatively rare type occurs in cases where a greater level of explication is felt to be needed, usually of things deducible from the nearest preceding context.

The first group is very difficult to characterize in terms of any general tendencies, as the clauses falling under this heading are extremely varied and no significantly prevailing patterns appear to emerge. Exceptionally, the presence of an extra clause may be due to diachronic changes, as in the case of A-5; this however appears to be only a very isolated case. The only relatively common denominative which may be observed in these clauses is the tendency of Text B to choose formulations, where possible, that would deliver a higher level of explicitness, as can be seen in the examples B-126.2 or B-186.2 (the relevant clauses are underlined):

[12]

1.1 *Having sayd thus she began to turne her speech to certaine other questions when I interrupted her, saying: [...].*

(A-5)

1.2 *Following upon these verses, she was diverting the course of her words to discuss and explain certain other matters, when I remarked [...].*

(B-1 to B-4)

2.1 *Wherefore they which have reason, have freedom to will and nill. But yet I make this not equal in all.*

(A-123 to A-126.1)

2.2 *Hence creatures which themselves possess reason also posses the freedom to will or not to will, but my view is that this freedom does not exist equally in all.*

(B-126.2)

3.1 *As though our question were which of them is the other's cause, the foreknowledge of the necessitie of things to come, or the necessitie of things to come of foreknowledge?*

(A-186.1-190)

3.2 *The assumption here is that we are toiling over the problem of which is the cause of which: is foreknowledge the cause of the necessity of future events, or is the necessity of future events the cause of Providence?*

(B-186.2)

Contrary to the first group clause types, the second group comprises a very strong set of regularly repeating parallels between a phrasal or nominal expression in Text A on the one hand and an adjectival relative clause in Text B on the other. This set includes a whole third of the total number of extra clauses in B and is in almost 40 % constituted by cases in which the parallel Text A employs is a possessive pronoun in the role of a premodifier. Cf. the examples below:

[13]

1.1 *'I make haste,' quoth shee, 'to performe my promise and to shew thee the way by which thou mayest returne to thy countrey.*

(A-15 to A-17.1)

1.2 *To this she responded: 'I am in a hurry to fulfil the promise which I owe you, and to reveal the route by which you are to be restored to your homeland.*

(B-17.2)

2.1 *And these questions, though they be very profitable, yet they are somewhat from our purpose.*

(A-19.1 to A-20.1)

2.2 *These matters which you raise are admittedly useful to grasp, but they do divert us for a little while from the path which we have set ourselves.*

(B-20.2)

3.1 *'My Aristotle,' quoth shee, 'in his bookes of nature declared this point briefly and truely.'*

(A-63.1 to A-64)

3.2 *'My Aristotle,' she replied, 'in his Physics has offered a succinct account of it which approximates to the truth.*

(B-63.2)

The adjectival relative clauses in Text B seem to perform two important functions. Firstly, they necessarily contain a higher level of specificity and explicitness, managing to store a greater amount of information than which can be conveyed by the possessive. Secondly, they play a vital role in the clause's FSP, as they generally render the modifying element more dynamic, stressing its rhematicity on the sentential level. It is important to note that in the last set of examples, the presence of the adjectival relative B-63.2 is conditioned by the preceding clause placing a thematic element *it* at the end, while the earlier text ends its parallel with a rheme; this disproportion, however, is smoothed out in the distributional field of the sentence, where the final communicative units are always rhematic.

The third group of clauses that has been described in the beginning of this chapter is entirely typical for the newer translation. Some of these clauses appear to serve as a special type of *aides memoire*, reminding the reader of some of the previous context, others appear to be included in order to clarify some of the more difficult passages. A special, though minor, subtype of these clauses features expressions of interaction, engaging the other interlocutor, and thus implicitly the reader, in the dialogue. As a whole, the group comprises a mixture of elements, including a discourse marker (B-147.1), style disjunct (B-48.2) and other various odd clauses included for explanatory or explicatory purposes (B-48.3, B-161.2):

[14]

1. *'What is it?' she asked. Mind you, I can guess what is worrying you.*
(B-147.1)

2. *It is a true saying, never challenged by any of the ancients, that nothing comes forth from nothing – though this foundation, so to speak, which they laid for all explanations of nature, they applied not to the creative originator, but to the matter subject to it.*
(B-48.2, B-48.3)

3. *What can by its nature deploy reason, possesses the judgement by which to discern each and every thing, and thus unaided distinguishes what must be avoided from what is desirable.*
(B-116.1)

4. *So if God has prior knowledge from eternity not only of men's actions but also of their plans and wishes, there will be no freedom of will; for the only action and any sort of intention which can possibly exist in the future will be foreknown by divine Providence, which cannot be misled.*
(B-161.2)

3.2.3. Differences in clausal realizations of corresponding semantic content

3.2.3.1. Main vs. dependent clause

When comparing the overall structure of the sentences, we may notice that Text B occasionally tends to employ a main clause where Text A would resort to subordination. At times this may result from differences in segmentation, but in other cases it appears to be just a question of general preference for coordinated structures. Most frequently the newer translation seems to favour the usage of main clauses when the older version opts for clausal adverbials or adjectival relatives, although other types of combinations can also be found. It may be rightly observed that, especially in the cases of propositional concordance between adverbial and main clauses, the avoidance of subordinate structure is likely to impoverish the sentence of some of the relational explicitness it would otherwise carry. Consider the following examples:

[15]

1.1 *And these questions, though they be very profitable, yet they are somewhat from our purpose, and it is to be feared, lest being wearied with digressions, beest not able to finish thy direct journey.*

(A-19.1)

1.2 *These matters which you raise are admittedly useful to grasp, but they do divert us for a little while from the path which we have set ourselves.*

(B-19.1)

2.1 *'There is no feare of that,' quoth I, for it will be a great ease to me to understand those things in which I take great delight, and withal when thy disputation is fenced in on every side, there can bee no doubt made of any thing thou shalt inferre.*

(A-26)

2.2 *'You must not have the slightest fear of that,' I said. It will be as good as a rest for me to identify the problems closest to my heart.*

(B-26)

3.1 *These are therefore the causes of this fortunate accident, which proceedeth from the meeting and concourse of causes, and not from the intention of the doer.*

(A-85.1)

3.2 *So this is the explanation of that casual acquisition of his. It resulted not from any intention of the man who was digging, but from causes which met and fused with each other.*

(B-85.1)

In the first set of clauses, the concessive structure of A-19.1 is mirrored in the parallel text by the use of an adjunct *admittedly*; such a kind of substitute is however not to be found in B-26. A similar example may be found in A/B-85.1, where once again the differences in segmentation resulted in a main clause being paralleled by an adjectival relative in the role of a postmodifier. While this case differs from the previous one in that we may clearly perceive two opposing tendencies of linear progression in these clauses, the FSP does not seem to have been of any structural relevance in forming this decision. Judging from the rest of the

available data, it thus appears that the reason for the older text containing a slightly higher number of dependent clauses, lies in the attempt to provide a more explicit indication of the logical implications, resulting from the relationship between the semantic content of two clausal units, and the desire to form closer propositional ties between them.

3.2.3.2. Finite vs. non-finite realization

It has been suggested in section 3.2.1 that the proportions between finite and non-finite realization of clauses are not equally distributed. Let us now therefore have a closer look at particular differences that have been perceived in both texts. The following table includes the numbers of cases, in which the corresponding clauses differ in respect to finiteness:

[16] Table 5: Non-correspondences in finite – non-finite realizations

| <u>Text A:</u> <u>EModE</u> | <u>Text B :</u> <u>PDE</u> | <u>number of cases</u> |
|--|---|-------------------------------|
| non-finite | finite | 10 |
| finite | non-finite | 7 |
| verbless | finite | 2 |

When looking at the slightly less frequent correspondence of finite (A) ~ non-finite (B), it may be seen that with only two exceptions these concern the cases of postmodifying clauses of the adjectival relative type in text A being paralleled by non-finite postmodifiers in B, e.g.:

[17]

1.1 *Wherefore wee may define chance thus: that it is an unexpected event of concurring causes in those things which are done to some end and purpose.*

(A-96)

1.2 *Thus we can define chance as the unexpected outcome of a conjunction of causes in actions carried out for some purpose.*

(B-96)

2.1 *For that which naturally hath the use of reason hath also judgement, by which he can discern of every thing by it selfe, wherefore he putteth a difference betwixt those things which are to bee avoided and those which are to bee desired.*

(A-115)

2.2 *What can by its nature deploy reason, possesses the judgement by which to discern each and every thing, and thus unaided distinguishes what must be avoided from what is desirable.*

(B-115)

3.1 *For it is not necessarie that those things should happen which are foreseene but it is necessarie that those things should be foreseene that are to come.*

(A-182)

3.2 *Their argument is that things foreseen do not therefore happen by necessity, but that things which will happen are necessarily foreseen.*

(B-181.2)

The motivation for the use of non-finite structures appears to be rooted in the attempt to achieve more condensed structures in clauses where the presence or absence of the notional subject, or rather its substitute, is not especially relevant in terms of informational load of the clause. Another reason, albeit perhaps more disputable, could be seen in the need for greater stylistic variety, for, as has been pointed out in 3.2.2, Text B contains a relatively high number of extra adjectival relative constructions, which are not present in the older translation. This might be also possibly corroborated by the fact that no similarly prevalent type of typological correspondence between the two texts appears to apply for the opposite situation, i.e. the non-finite (A) ~ finite (B) parallel. The examples may differ in realization only (A/B-136), arise as results of extraposed structures (A/B-105), or be illustrative of any other typological non-concordance, without a particular preference for a set kind of correspondence:

[18]

1.1 *For having cast their eyes from the light of the soveraigne truth to inferior obscurities, forthwith they are blinded with the cloud of ignorance, molested with hurtfull affections, by yielding and consenting to which, they increase the bondage, which they layd upon themselves, and are after a certaine manner captives by their own freedome.*

(A-136)

1.2 *The furthest degree of slavery is reached when they devote themselves to vices, and abrogate the possession of reason which is theirs; for once they lower their eyes from the light of the highest truth down to the world of darkness below, they are then shrouded in a cloud of ignorance, and become confused by destructive emotions.*

(B-136)

2.1 *'I observe it,' quoth I, 'and acknowledge it to bee as thou sayest.*

(A-105)

2.2 *'I take heed of your words,' I said, 'and I agree that it is as you say.*

(B-105)

3.1 *But their greatest bondage is, when giving themselves to vices, they loose the possession of their owne reason.*

(A-134.1)

3.2 *The furthest degree of slavery is reached when they devote themselves to vices, and abrogate the possession of reason which is theirs; [...].*

(B-134.1)

As can be seen from the examples, the primary motivation for the choice of (non-)finiteness appears to be that of concision, although a certain level of direct influence from the original Latin text might also be expected. In neither of the parallel patterns, i.e. finite (A) ~ non-finite (B) and finite (A) ~ finite (B), can it be plausibly sought in terms of CD, for no significant change in FSP is involved. The only two solitary cases, which differ in their basic linearity or seem to attribute a different degree of CD to the individual communicative units, can be found in A/B-13 and A/B-22, yet once again in neither of those, does there seem to be any indication of the FSP being directly influenced by the type of realization of its clause, but

rather by the deliberate choice of the translator (A/B-22) or by the structure of the sentence as a whole (A/B-13); cf.:⁹

[19]

1.1 *For I desire to know, whether thou thinkest chance to be anything at all,
& what it is.'*

(A-13)

2.2 *So the question that I pose is whether you think that there is such a
thing as chance, and what you think it is.'*

(B-13)

1.1 *And these questions, though they be very profitable, yet they are
somewhat from our purpose, and it is to be feared, lest being wearied
with digressions, thou beest not able to finish thy direct journey.'*

(A-22)

1.2 *My fear is that these digressions will weary you, and that you will not
be equal to complete the road lying straight ahead.'*

(B-22)

3.2.3.3. Other structural differences of syntactic type and function

The last major type of structural disparities between the parallel texts concerns those cases, in which the clauses do follow the same type of realization yet differ in their syntactic type and/or function. Albeit these comprise a total number of 22 construction pairs, their characteristics are often so varied that they escape any possibility for broader generalizations. Two repeated patterns, nevertheless, appear to emerge.

First, it is the adjectival relative (A) ~ nominal relative (B) type. The usage of nominal relative clauses is especially conspicuous in this context, since they appear in none of the clauses of Text A that fall under the heading of this section. Most frequently, they appear in the roles of a direct (B-117) or prepositional object (B-118) in places where the older version opts for a postmodifier, although one case of the nominal relative performing the role of the subject has also been identified (B-157):

⁹ For a more detailed analysis of A/B-13 see 3.2.4.1.

[20]

1.1 *For that which naturally hath the use of reason hath also judgement, by which he can discern of every thing by it selfe, wherefore he putteth a difference betwixt those things which are to bee avoided and those which are to bee desired.*

(A-117, A-118)

1.2 *What can by its nature deploy reason, by which to discern each and every thing, and thus unaided distinguishes what must be avoided from what is desirable.*

(B-117, B-118)

2.1 *For if God beholdeth all things and cannot be deceived, that must of necessity follow, which his providence foreseeeth to be to come.*

(A-157)

2.2 *If God foresees all things and cannot be in any way mistaken, then what Providence has foreseen will happen must inevitably come to pass.*

(B-157)

The second conspicuous feature, though less directly tied to any specific type of typological correspondence is the number of extraposed subjects and cleft structures, which in Text A serve to parallel various kinds of sentence constituents found in B, namely subject complements (A/B-181, 184) and adverbials (A/B-217, 219.1):

[21]

1.1 *For it is not necessarie that those things should happen which are foreseene but it is necessarie that those things should be foreseene that are to come.*

(A-181, 184)

1.2 *Their argument is that things foreseen do not therefore happen by necessity, but that things which will happen are necessarily foreseen.*

(B-181, 184)

2.1 *For although they be foreseene because they shall be and they doe not come to passe because they are foreseene: notwithstanding it is necessary that things to come be foreseene, or that things foreseen doe fall out; [...].*

(A-217, 219.1)

2.2 *Clearly the argument about Providence and the future is similar; for even if things are foreseen because they are about to happen, and they do not in fact happen because they are foreseen, nevertheless necessity lies either in that future events are foreseen by God, or that things foreseen happen because they are foreseen.*

(B-217, 219.1)

Note that while in the second pair of clauses the FSP seems largely unaffected, in case of the first pair the extraposition achieves the end placement of clausal modifiers, thus rendering them an unmarked rhematic position. Text B, on the other hand, places the focus on the adverbial and predicate combinations. This case being isolated it is hardly possible to generalize; a discussion on a similar disparity of focus, however, is carried in 3.2.4.1.

3.2.3.4. *The non-observance of SVO*

It has been pointed out earlier in sections 2.2.2 and 2.3.5 that the question of an accurate assessment of permissible word order patterns in declarative clauses throughout the course of the Early Modern period is connected to the issue of evaluating the fluctuating tendencies in the permissibility and usage of what might possibly be seen as the vestigial remains of the V2, as opposed to the preference of the future SVO standard. Since the original translation of I. T. dates back to 1609, it was suspected that several traces of inversion or other non-SVO patterns might be found in the text, possibly due to end-weight or FSP motivations. A similar investigation has been made into the Late Modern parallel in order to see whether or not the translator still chooses to employ linear deviations for the accommodation of the basic distribution of CD when necessary. The results are presented below:

[22] Table 6: Deviations from SVO pattern in declarative clauses without initial negative adverbial

| <u>word order</u> | | <u>Text A:</u> <u>EModE</u> | <u>Text B:</u> <u>PDE</u> |
|-------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| OSV | FSP motivated | 0 | 3 |
| | FSP unmotivated | 0 | 0 |
| (O)VS | FSP motivated | 1 | 0 |
| | FSP unmotivated | 11 | 0 |
| | Total | 11 | 3 |

As can be seen from the table, linear arrangements alternative to the standard modern word order are relatively rare in both samples. The only types of patterns found in the two texts that do not comply with the basic SVO arrangement are those involving object preposition and subject-verb inversion. Several important observations need, however, be made in respect to this data.

Firstly, it can be seen that each of the patterns is exclusive in the sense that it appears only in one of the texts, but not both. Secondly, while the changes to the basic word order in Text B are made in order to reconcile the linear progression with the FSP principle, this motivation is almost entirely absent from the inversions in Text A. The only case, in which inversion appears to be employed in order to achieve the basic distribution of CD, can be found in A-46. While both the noun and the prepositional phrase comprise entirely non-thematic elements, *nothing* in this sense is to be viewed as more important to the development of communication than the preceding adverbial, constituting a rheme proper:

[23]

1.1 *For it is a true sentence that of nothing commeth nothing, which none of the ancients denied, though they held not that principle of the efficient cause but of the material subject that is of the nature of all formes.*

(A-46)

1.2 *It is a true saying, never challenged by any of the ancients, that nothing comes forth from nothing – though this foundation, so to speak, which they laid for all explanations of nature, they applied not to the creative originator, but to the matter subject to it.*

(B-46)

Should we look at the specific examples of the remaining eleven inversions, we can see that they share very specific common features: (1) they all pertain to an identical predicate verb *quoth*, (2) this predicate is followed by a thematic subject expressed by means of a personal pronoun, (3) the clause in which they appear is always preceded by another clause of the same sentence, and (4) this preceding clause features direct speech. When another *verbum dicendi* is chosen and the direct speech follows, or another subordinate clause delivering the proposition indirectly is attached, no inversion is induced. Cf. the word order in the following sentences:

[24]

1. *'I observe it,' quoth I, 'and acknowledge it to bee as thou sayest.*

(A-103)

2. *Having sayd thus she began to turne her speech to certaine other questions when I interrupted her, saying: 'Thy exhortation is very good and well beseeming thy authority.*

(A-4)

3. *Then I complained, that I was now in a greater confusion, & more doubtful difficultie than before.*

(A-143.1)

It appears that inversion in the English of I. T. is closely connected to specific lexical choices, in this case, the strong colligation of the verb *quoth*. In none of the cases is the VS order FSP motivated; on the contrary, the linear arrangement in these clauses goes against the basic distribution of CD. The position of the reporting clause as always following at least a part of direct speech nevertheless raises the question of whether the inversion may not be interpreted in relation to the whole sentence as a pattern complying to the older V2 principle by following

the sequence of Od (clausal) – V – S. With respect to clause-initial adverbials, however, the text appears to be considerably progressive, complying almost fully with the modern rules of negative/restrictive as opposed to positive/open semantics of the initial elements; the only exception to this being the solitary case of A-46 mentioned above.

Unlike the cases of inversion, the sentence-initial placement of an object in Text A appears to be a strategy (1) employed primarily for the purpose of accommodation to FSP linearity principle in that it succeeds in shifting a thematic element towards the beginning of the sentence, and (2) used as a means of textual cohesion. The connective role is especially perceivable in B-16, where the object refers directly to the preceding piece of discourse. On the sentential level, the newly acquired initial position also helps the object, if weighty, to unclutter the postverbal sequence by making way for the rhematic elements:

[25]

1. *But that statement which you made a moment ago, that Providence is an issue which interlocks with a number of others, I find true from my own experience.*

(B-7.a)

2. *To this she responded: ‘I am in a hurry to fulfil the promise which I owe you, and to reveal the route by which you are to be restored to your homeland.*

(B-16)

3. *It is a true saying, never challenged by any of the ancients, that nothing comes forth from nothing – though this foundation, so to speak, which they laid for all explanations of nature, they applied not to the creative originator, but to the matter subject to it.*

(B-148.1.a)

3.2.4. Other notes on FSP

In the previous sections, the focus has been placed on the key differences between clauses based on the core structural disparities of function, type and realization. Some syntactically

and communicatively relevant differences between the source texts are nevertheless to be found outside this scope and this section is aimed at briefly presenting the most important ones of these. The first part begins with the issue of existential *there* clauses and their parallels, the second tackles the differences in FSP emerging as a result of an alternative linear arrangement within a sentence.

3.2.4.1. Existential clauses

A very interesting point of difference between the two texts which has not yet been addressed concerns the structure and FSP linearity of existential clauses. In Present-day English the special function of delivering the proposition of existence or the process of introducing a new element to the scene are generally connected with *there* constructions. The most basic pattern of an existential *there* clause includes the grammatical subject *there* followed by a verb, most usually *be* or some other kind of verb with low semantic value, and a noun phrase expressing a particular thing or person, whose existence is asserted. Naturally, the same propositional content can also be carried out by other means, such as a simple SVX sentence, where V = *exist*. The choice of which type of construction should be used may depend on a number of textual and pragmatic factors, some of which are addressed here.

Together the texts contain a total number of 18 cases of *there* constructions, 11 in Text A and 7 in Text B. It is interesting to note that this time the disproportion is largely not due to clausal omissions, as mentioned in 3.2.2, but to alternative ways of translation, where a non-*there* construction is used instead. Precise figures pertaining to each parallel type are listed below:

[26] Table 7: Existential constructions – *there* clauses and their parallels

| <u>Text A:</u> <u>EModE</u> | <u>Text B:</u> <u>PDE</u> | <u>FSP relevant</u> | <u>number of cases</u> |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|
| <i>there</i> | ∅ | - | 1 |
| ∅ | <i>there</i> | - | 1 |
| <i>there</i> | <i>there</i> | - | 4 |
| <i>there</i> | other | yes | 6 |
| | | no | 1 |
| other | <i>there</i> | yes | 1 |
| | | no | 1 |

Even though at times the change may not bear any special FSP relevance (cf. A/B-24), most usually a perceivable shift in focus is involved, as can be seen in the examples below:

[27]

1.1 *'There is no feare of that,' quoth I, 'for it will be a great ease to me to understand those things in which I take great delight.*

(A-24)

1.2 *'You must not have the slightest fear of that,' I said. 'It will be as good as a rest for me to identify the problems closest to my heart.*

(B-24)

2.1 *For if things can be drawn to any other course than was foreknowne, there will not be any firm knowledge of that which is to come, but rather an uncertaine opinion, which in my opinion were impious to believe of God.*

(A-166.1)

2.2 *If such actions and aspirations can be forcibly diverted in some direction other than was foreseen, certain foreknowledge of the future will no longer exist, but instead there will be vacillating opinion; and I regard it as sacrilege to believe this of God.*

(B-166.1)

Despite the structural differences, in the first set of cases the focus in A and B remains unchanged. In the second pair of clauses, however, the focus placed on the postverbal noun as a result of the use of *there* construction in Text A shifts towards the predicate in Text B, rendering the verb phrase a higher degree of CD than the subject. While the differences in A/B-166.1 may be seen as attributable to the fact that the former contains a clausal postmodifier, causing the whole noun phrase to comply in its position to the principle of end-weight, comparison with other existential clauses suggests that this does appear to be a more general trend, not dependent on the heaviness of the notional subject. Compare e.g. the sentences in [28]:

[28]

1.1 *'I will,' quoth shee, 'doe as thou wouldest have me,' and withal beganne in this manner: 'If any shall define chance to be an event produced by a confused motion, and without connexion of causes, I affirm that there is no such thing, and that chance is only an empty voyce without any recall signification.*

(A-41)

1.2 *Then she said: 'I shall indulge your wish.' At once she began like this: 'If one were to define chance as the outcome of a random movement which interlocks with no causes, I should maintain that it does not exist at all, that it is a wholly empty term denoting nothing substantial; for since God confines all things within due order, what place can be left for random processes?*

(B-41)

2.1 *But if any thing proceedeth from no causes, that will seeme to have come from nothing, which if it cannot bee, neither is it possible there should be any such chance, as is defined a little before.'*

(A-55)

2.2 *Now if something should emerge uncaused, it will be seen to have arisen from nothing; and if this cannot happen, chance in the sense in which we defined it cannot exist either.'*

(B-54)

3.1 *Wherefore there is necessitie in both in the one of the sitting, and in the other of truth.*

(A-204.1)

3.2 *In each of the two formulations some necessity is present: in the one that it is true, and in the other that he is seated.*

(B-204.1)

The overall tendency, should we try to generalize, seems to be for Text B to place more stress on the propositional content delivered by the predicate, rather than to concentrate on the type of information introduced into the context by the notional subject. Perhaps as strangely contradictory to this tendency, especially when taking into account the usage of the modifier *such* in A-41 or A-55, stands this one inversed case of A/B-13:

[29]

1. *For I desire to know, whether thou thinkest chance to be anything at all, & what it is.*

(A-13)

2. *So the question that I pose is whether you think that there is such a thing as chance, and what you think it is.*

(B-13)

In both A/B-13 clauses *chance* presents a contextually non-dependent, new element. The aim of the speaker is to ascertain this term's plausibility, i.e. whether or not it might be said to actually exist. Yet while the question points towards the confirmation or denial of this existence, the highest degree of CD is still carried by the subject. The newer translation succeeds in managing to place the unit of *chance* in the unmarked rhematic position by using the *there* construction, yet the older version avoids this structure, opting instead for a standard SVCopCs structure. The reason for this decision is not entirely clear. Suggested solution might be seen to lie in the fact that the newer text appears to generally take more care in rheme end-clausal placement (cf. adjectival relative clauses vs. nominalizations in 3.2.2 and the preposition of objects vs. inversion in 3.2.3.4). If this proposition is correct, it would go against the overgeneralization of the view that, during the course of the history of English, less rigid word order rules necessarily equal greater level of accommodation to the FSP

linearity principles. Before proceeding to a conclusion on this matter, however, let us yet first look at the issue of linear arrangement within a sentence as a whole.

3.2.4.2. Differences in clausal ordering within a sentence

Despite this analysis placing its focus on the clause as the primary distributional field, a few brief observations should be made on the differences in linearity and FSP of the sentence as a whole. The two texts observe a very similar order of the individual clauses, changes in clausal arrangement being relatively rare. Two cases of such disparity can be found in sentences introducing direct speech:

[30]

1

| <u>Text A: EModE</u> | | <u>Text B : PDE</u> | |
|----------------------|---|---------------------|--|
| 15 | <i>'I make haste.'</i> | 16 | <i>To this she responded:</i> |
| 16 | <i>quoth shee,</i> | 15 | <i>'I am in a hurry</i> |
| 17.1 | <i>'to performe my promise and to shew thee the way</i> | 17.1.a | <i>to fulfil the promise</i> |
| 17.2 | ∅ | 17.2 | <i>which I owe you,</i> |
| | | 17.1.b | <i>and to reveal the route</i> |
| 18 | <i>by which thou mayest returne to thy countrey.</i> | 18 | <i>by which you are to be restored to your homeland.</i> |

2

| <u>Text A: EModE</u> | | <u>Text B : PDE</u> | |
|----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 32.a | <i>'I will,'</i> | 33 | <i>Then she said:</i> |
| 33 | <i>quoth shee,</i> | 32 | <i>'I shall indulge your wish.'</i> |
| 32.b | <i>'doe</i> | | |
| 34 | <i>as thou wouldest</i> | 34 | ∅ |
| 35 | <i>have me,'</i> | 35 | ∅ |

Following Bækken's findings, it might be argued that the preverbal position of a part of the direct speech could suggest this to be a case of positional focalization stemming from the markedness of the initial placement of the object. An alternative explanation may be sought in

predicate verb in the main clauses. A note has been made in the 3.2.3.4 of the behaviour of *quoth* predicates in that they always follow at least a part of the proposition they introduce. A possible view of these sentences as instances of a V2 vestige seems plausible in the light of the reversed arrangement of clauses 15-16 and 32-33 in Text B, especially so since the reversed order renders the sentence more cohesive, as well as compliant to the basic distribution of CD.

The remaining three cases of major differences in sentential linearity are somewhat more difficult to explain. The reversed clause order of B-93 and B-92 result partly from a the type of syntactic structure found in their superordinates, but partly because of a desire to place the main sentential focus on a different element: in Text A it is the hidden chest of gold, in Text B it is the place in which the hypothetical person started to dig:

[31]

| <u>Text A: EModE</u> | | <u>Text B : PDE</u> | |
|----------------------|---|---------------------|------------------------------------|
| 86.a | <i>For neither he</i> | 86.a | <i>Neither the person</i> |
| 87 | <i>that hid the golde,</i> | 87 | <i>who buried the gold,</i> |
| 86.b | <i>not hee</i> | 86.b | <i>nor the one</i> |
| 88 | <i>that tilled his ground,</i> | 88 | <i>who dug the field,</i> |
| 86.c | <i>had any intention</i> | 86.c | <i>intended the money</i> |
| 89 | <i>that the money should be found,</i> | 89 | <i>to be found,</i> |
| 90 | <i>but as I said,</i> | 90 | <i>but as I have explained,</i> |
| 91.1 | <i>it followed and concurred,</i> | 91.1.a | <i>the place</i> |
| 91.2 | ∅ | 93 | <i><u>where one buried it</u></i> |
| | | 91.1.b | <i>happened</i> |
| 92 | <i>that this man should dig up that</i> | 91.2 | <i>to coincide with</i> |
| 93 | <i><u>which the other hidde.</u></i> | 92 | <i><u>where the other dug.</u></i> |

A similar case of a focal shift as that which was found in some of the existential clauses seems to appear in B-156 as opposed to A-158 and B-157. In a like manner, the older text chooses to rhematize the clause which develops the noun phrase performing the role of the

subject (i.e. *that* in A-156) while the newer version chooses to end the sentence with a verb phrase (cf. the table below):

[32]

| <u>Text A: EModE</u> | | <u>Text B : PDE</u> | |
|----------------------|--|---------------------|--|
| 155 | <i>For if God beholdeth all things and cannot be deceived,</i> | 155 | <i>If God foresees all things and cannot be in any way mistaken,</i> |
| 156 | <i><u>that must of necessity follow,</u></i> | 157 | <i><u>then what Providence has foreseen</u></i> |
| 157 | <i><u>which his providence foreseeth</u></i> | 158 | <i>will happen</i> |
| 158 | <i>to be to come.</i> | 156 | <i><u>must inevitably come to pass.</u></i> |

The third occurrence of a dramatic linearity change concerns the sentence number 9. From what might be observed, the inversion of B-46 and B-47 appears to be in accordance with the basic distribution of CD; the older version, on the other hand, chooses the seemingly less appealing word order in order to be able to smoothen the transition between A-47 and A-48.1 by placing those clauses next to each other which share a common referent *the ancients / they*. The final element of the sentence in Text A appears to be the postmodifier clause for the reason that it naturally follows and develops the head noun of *subject*. The most important piece of new information carried by the clause, however, is to be found in the explication of the contrastive relationship between the objects. The newer translation appears to try to counter-balance this disproportion by introducing the heart of the propositional content carried by B-49 earlier, thus achieving a shorter, less heavy postmodifying sequence, which in the final position is somewhat less distractive:

[33]

| <u>Text A: EModE</u> | | <u>Text B : PDE</u> | |
|-----------------------------|---|----------------------------|---|
| 45 | <i>For it is a true sentence</i> | 45 | <i>It is a true saying,</i> |
| 46 | <i><u>that of nothing commeth</u></i> <i><u>nothing.</u></i> | 47 | <i><u>never challenged by any of</u></i> <i><u>the ancients.</u></i> |
| 47 | <i><u>which none of the ancients</u></i> <i><u>denied.</u></i> | 46 | <i><u>that nothing comes forth</u></i> <i><u>from nothing</u></i> |
| 48.1 | <i>though they held not that</i> <i>principle of the efficient cause</i> <i>but of the material subject</i> | 48.1.a | <i>though this foundation,</i> |
| 48.2 | ∅ | 48.2 | <i>so to speak,</i> |
| 48.3 | ∅ | 49 | <i><u>which they laid for all</u></i> <i><u>explanations of nature,</u></i> |
| | | 48.1.b | <i>they applied not to the</i> <i>creative originator, but to</i> <i>the matter</i> |
| 49 | <i><u>that is of the nature of all</u></i> <i><u>formes.</u></i> | 48.3 | <i><u>subject to it.</u></i> |

3.2.5. *Between syntax and stylistics*

In section 3.2.2., it has been remarked that some of the clauses exclusive to the newer translation function as interactive elements, engaging the reader in the conversation and applying features more characteristic of a spoken discourse (the stylistic disjunct *so to speak* in B-48.2, the discourse marker *mind you* in B-147.1). The greater interactivity of the contemporary version can also be perceived as manifested by other syntactic means:

[34]

1.1 *For if any man sitteth the opinion which thinketh so must needes be true, and again on the other side, if the opinion that one sitteth be true hee must needest sitte.*

(A-198.1)

1.2 *Take the case of a person who is seated. The belief which hazards that he is seated must necessarily be true; and conversely, if the belief that a certain person is seated is true, then he must be seated.*

(B-198.1)

2.1 *This is thought to have fallen thus out by fortune, but it is not of nothing, for it hath peculiar causes, whose unexpected and not foreseene concurrence seemeth to have brought forth a chance.*

(A-75)

2.2 *For example, when a man is digging the ground to cultivate his field, and he finds a quantity of gold buried there, people believe that this has happened by accident, but it does not come to pass out of nothing, for it has its own causes, and the conjunction of these unforeseen and unexpected causes seems to have produced a chance happening.*

(B-75)

In B-198.1, the imperative mood conveys a direct appeal to the listener, triggering a deeper feeling of the addressee involvement. Also unlike the Early Modern translation, the Present-day version contains explicit references to general human agent *people/they* (B-75, B-178, B-181.2). In this sense, it might be claimed that the later text draws more closely on the stylistic anticipations of a spoken language, trying to imitate some of the features characteristic for a real life dialogue in order to deliver a more appealing, engaging argument.

4. Conclusion

This paper has attempted to describe the developments in sentential and clausal syntax between the Early and Late Modern period and the impact these developments have had on the information structure of higher syntactic units. The aim was to try and identify the tendencies in the usage of various syntactic means for the indication of the functional sentence perspective and to assess the extent to which these means are employed in the language in different chronological stages. In accordance with the initial expectations, the Early Modern text has been found to tend towards a lower level of segmentation in terms of sentential units, expressing a corresponding semantic content in a lower number of sentences than the Present-day version does. At the same time, this tendency is counterbalanced by higher concision and increased economy of expression. This is mainly achieved by a frequent usage of non-finite forms and nominalizations in places where the parallel text resorts to finite realizations. Especially noticeable is this disproportion in the newer version's usage of adjectival relative clauses, which are often employed as means of rendering a particular communicative unit more dynamic, stressing its sentential rhematicity. This is in line with a more general observation of the 20th century text inclining both towards a greater level of explicitness and specificity, and a disposition to more readily employ constructions, which achieve the accommodation of rhematic elements towards the end of a clause or sentence. A very perceivable manifestation of this tendency can be also observed in the focalization of predicates, a trend virtually absent from the Early Modern version. Interestingly, the Early Modern text does not resort even to some other types of constructions used in the later version in order to make clauses comply with the basic distribution of CD, such as object preposition. Inversions motivated by the principles of end-weight or end-focus are rare, mostly they are governed either by grammatical rules identical to those of Present-day English, or by strong lexical determinations. These are connected to the regular inversion of pronominal subjects combined with *quoth* predicates, perceived as vestigial of the earlier stages of the language. Also absent from the earlier version are the elements of closer interaction employed in the Late Modern dialogues in order to achieve the impression of a more authentic, engaging discussion.

Bibliography

- Barber, Charles (1976) *Early Modern English*, London: André Deutsch.
- Bækken, Bjørg (1998) *Word order patterns in Early Modern English with special reference to the position of the subject and the finite verb*, Studia Anglistica Norvegica 9, Oslo: Novus Press.
- Bækken, Bjørg (2003) *Word order in 17th century in English: A study of the stabilisation of the XSV pattern*, Studia Anglistica Norvegica 12, Oslo: Novus Press.
- Biber, Douglas et al. (1999) *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*, Harlow: Longman.
- Breivik, Leiv Egil and Swan, Toril (1994) 'Initial adverbials and word order in English with special reference to the Early Modern English period', in Dieter Kastovsky (ed.) *Studies in Early Modern English*, Topics in English linguistics 13, Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 11-44.
- Daneš, František (1974) 'Functional sentence perspective and the organization of the text', in František Daneš (ed.) *Papers on Functional sentence Perspective*, Praha: Academia, 106-128.
- Dušková, Libuše (1999) *Studies in the English Language Part I, II*, Praha: Karolinum.
- Firbas, Jan (1966) 'Non-thematic subjects in contemporary English', *Travaux linguistique de Prague* 2, 239-256.
- Firbas, Jan (1974) 'Some aspects of the Czechoslovak approach to problems of functional sentence perspective', in František Daneš (ed.) *Papers on Functional sentence Perspective*, Praha: Academia, 11-37.
- Firbas, Jan (1992) *Functional Sentence Perspective in Written and Spoken Communication*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Firbas, Jan (1994) 'Substantiating Daneš's view of givenness as a graded phenomenon', in Světlá Čmejrková and František Štícha (eds.), *The Syntax of Sentence and Text*, Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins, 119-129.
- Geluykens, Ronald (1992) *From discourse process to grammatical construction. On Left-dislocation in English*, Studies in Discourse and Grammar, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Görlach, Manfred (1991) *Introduction to Early Modern English*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hajičová, Eva et al. (2003) *Úvod do teoretické a počítačové lingvistiky: I. svazek – Teoretická lingvistika*, Praha: Karolinum.

- Kastovsky, Dieter (ed.) (1994) *Studies in Early Modern English*, Topics in English linguistics 13, Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kohonen, Viljo (1978) *On the Development of English Word Order in Religious Prose around 1000 and 1200 A.D. A Quantitative Study of Word Order in Context*, Meddelanden från Stiftelsens för Åbo Akademi Forskningsinstitut, Nr 38, Åbo: Publications of the Research Institute of the Åbo Akademi Foundation.
- Mathesius, Vilém (1974) *Čeština a obecný jazykozpyt*, Praha: Melantrich.
- Pérez-Guerra, Javier (1999) *Historical English Syntax: A statistical corpus-based study on the organisation of Early Modern English sentences*, Newcastle: LINCOM Europa.
- Quirk, Randolph et al. (1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*, London; New York: Longman.
- Rissanen, Matti (1999) 'Syntax', in Roger Lass (ed.), *The Cambridge History of the English Language 3: 1476-1776*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Seoane, Elena (2006) 'Information Structure and word Order Change: The Passive as an Information-rearranging Strategy in the History of English', in Ans van Kemenade and Bettelou Los (eds.), *The Handbook of the History of English*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 360-392.
- Svoboda, Aleš (1974) 'On two communicative dynamisms', in František Daneš (ed.) *Papers on Functional sentence Perspective*, Praha: Academia, 38-42.
- Svoboda, Aleš (1981) 'Two chapters on scene', in *Brno Studies in English 14*. 81-92.

Sources

- Anicius Manlius Severinus Boethius and Peter G. Walsh (trans. and ed.) (2008), *The Consolation of Philosophy*, Oxford World's Classics, Oxford: Oxford Paperbacks.
- Anicius Manlius Severinus Boethius and William Anderson, (ed.) (1963) *The Consolation of Philosophy. In the translation of I.T. Edited and Introduced by William Anderson*, Centaur Classics, Arundel: Centaur Press.
- Edward Kennard Rand and Hugh Fraser Stewart (1918) *The theological tractates with an English translation by H. F. Stewart and E. K. Rand. The consolation of philosophy, with the English translation of "I. T." (1609), rev. by H. F. Stewart*. London: Heinemann

Czech summary

1. Úvod

Úvod této práce obsahuje stručný nástin problematiky pragmaticko-syntaktického výzkumu zaměřeného na historický vývoj anglického jazyka a poskytuje zevrubný přehled probíraných témat. Zdůrazňuje, že analýza vztahů mezi komunikativní a větotvornou složkou řeči patří v diachronní lingvistice k relativně novým oblastem zkoumání a že přestože současné studie vztahující se k tomuto tématu přináší mnoho zajímavých poznatků v otázce vzájemného vlivu pragmatických a gramatických aspektů a roli, kterou sehrávají v procesu jazykové změny, řada otázek zůstává stále otevřena. Práce se chce proto zaměřit na sledování a popis vývojových tendencí mezi větnou syntaxí a funkční větnou perspektivou v od raně moderního období po současný jazyk.

2. Teoretická část

Druhá kapitola předkládá základní teoretická východiska prezentovaného výzkumu a shrnuje nejdůležitější poznatky na poli syntaktického vývoje v průběhu 16. a 17. století. Sekce 2.1 obsahuje krátké uvedení do problematiky rané angličtiny jako takové, sekce 2.2 předkládá přehled nejvýraznějších rozdílů v oblasti větné syntaxe odlišujících tuto fázi jazykového vývoje od angličtiny současné. 16. a 17. století je chápáno jako doba ustalování gramatického systému, charakterizovaná přechodem ke striktnějšímu pojetí jazykových pravidel a postupnému ústupu řady alternativních syntaktických variant, kdy některé z původně volně aplikovatelných prvků přejímají specifické gramatické funkce.

Pod vlivem klasických, zejména latinských textů, začíná angličtina v tomto období přebírat některé stylistické konvence, které tak umožňují a podporují šíření určitých specifických syntaktických struktur. Tato popularizace se týká zejména nefinitních klauzí, které se stávají oblíbenými mimo jiné i pro svoji ekonomičnost a jednoduchou eleganci. Vnímání rozdílů mezi textovými a syntaktickými jednotkami není v 16. a 17. století ještě plně vytvořeno, proto se hranice mezi odstavcem a souvětím mohou stírat. Během této doby však dochází ke zřetelné diferenciaci vět závislých, čímž mnohé spojky nabývají konkrétnějšího významu i funkce.

V tomto historickém období též dochází ke stabilizaci současné podoby anglického slovosledu díky postupnému upevňování pravidel pro používání inverze podmětu a přísudku.

V pozdně moderní angličtině se inverze v oznamovacích větách objevuje pouze po příslovečných určeních se záporným nebo restriktivním významem, mezi léty 1500-1700 však bylo její využití volnější a záleželo na celé řadě faktorů, včetně způsobu realizace podmětu a charakteru slovesné fráze.

Sekce 2.3 se zabývá pojmem aktuálního členění větného a jeho vztahu k lineárnímu řazení větných participantů. Koncepce aktuálního členění sahá do poloviny 19. století a jménu Henriho Weila, který se zabýval srovnáváním informační struktury vět ve starověkých a moderních jazycích. Z výsledků jeho bádání vyplývají určité podobnosti v organizaci jazykové výpovědi bez ohledu na odlišnost slovosledných pravidel. Tento koncept podobnosti výpovědní struktury byl dále rozpracován pražskou lingvistickou školou, která Firbasovými ústy definuje aktuální členění jako způsob působení sémantické a gramatické struktury věty v aktu komunikace.

Výzkum na poli aktuálního členění je obvykle soustředěn na analýzu jazykového projevu z pohledu tří základních pojmových pilířů, a to tematičnosti, kontextové zapojenosti a výpovědní dynamičnosti. Kontextovou zapojeností se míní charakter určitého větného prvku ve vztahu k momentální situační a textové znalosti posluchače. Jinými slovy, prvky kontextově zapojené jsou takové, které jsou posluchači známé z předchozího hovoru či z okolního prostředí, prvky kontextově nezapojené jsou pro posluchače nové. Výpovědní dynamičnost je s konceptem kontextové zapojenosti úzce spjatá, nikoli však totožná. Na rozdíl od kontextové zapojenosti, která je hodnotou striktně binární, výpovědní dynamičnost je záležitostí stupňovitou. Čím daný prvek více přispívá k rozvoji komunikace, tedy čím je pro posluchače informativnější, tím je dynamičtější. Prvky kontextově zapojené bývají proto méně dynamické než prvky nezapojené – to nicméně však neznamená, že všechny nezapojené prvky nesou stejný stupeň výpovědní dynamičnosti. Tento stupeň je zároveň dán i jejich sémantikou a pozicí uvnitř větného celku: prvky s nižším stupněm bývají řazeny na počátku, ty s vyšším na konci. Základním distribučním polem výpovědní dynamičnosti je chápána věta či souvětí, na kterou je nahlíženo jako na soubor distribučních polí menších, tj. polí jednotlivých klauzí a, následně, frází. Jedna komunikativní jednotka tak může nést různé stupně výpovědní dynamičnosti, podle toho, v rámci jakého pole je posuzována.

Pojem tématu je na rozdíl od předchozích dvou konceptů nejméně ustálený a zahrnuje obrovskou škálu charakteristik a definic. Práce zmiňuje dva, respektive tři základní druhy

teoretického pojetí kritéria tematičnosti. Prvním je kritérium syntaktické, které definuje téma na základě jeho počáteční pozice ve větě. Druhým je kritérium sémantické, kdy tématem je to, o čem věta vypovídá. Posledním je kritérium pragmatické, které aplikují přístupy založené na zkoumání jak kontextové zapojenosti, tak stupňů výpovědní dynamičnosti. Pro účely této práce byl zvolen přístup poslední, založený na rozeznávání dvou základních úrovní výpovědní dynamičnosti, a sice tématu a rématu. Důvodem pro toto rozhodnutí byla celistvost tohoto pohledu, který jako jediný aplikuje ve svém zkoumání složku významovou, slovoslednou i kontextovou.

Sekce 2.4 pak krátce představuje tři studie zabývající se komunikativní a slovoslednou složkou raněnovooanglické syntaxe. První je Javier Pérez-Guerrova *Historical English Syntax: A statistical corpus-based study on the organisation of Early Modern English sentences* vydaná v roce 1999, která zkoumá frekvence významově obdobných syntaktických struktur v období od pozdně střední po současnou angličtinu. Pérez-Guerra vychází ze syntaktického pojetí tématu, jako počáteční složky věty, která je strukturně vymezena vůči podmětu a přísudku. Závěry jeho studie poukazují především na nárůst frekvence a konsolidaci konstrukcí vykazujících extrapozici, inverzi, topicalizaci, anebo zahrnujících existenční *there*. Druhé dvě studie, *Word order patterns in Early Modern English with special reference to the position of the subject and the finite verb* (1998) a *Word order in 17th century in English: A study of the stabilisation of the XSV pattern* (2003), jsou dílem Bjørg Bækken, která mimo jiné zkoumá vztah mezi kontextovou zapojeností prvků a slovosledem. Z jejích zjištění vyplývá, že kontextově zapojené podměty bývají nejčastěji postaveny na počátek věty, zatímco preponované jmenné složky přísudku, adverbia a přímé předměty bývají dosazeny do počáteční pozice z důvodů kontrastních, pro zdůraznění jejich větší informační důležitosti

3. Praktická část

Třetí kapitola přináší výsledky vlastního výzkumu, založeného na srovnávací analýze dvou překladů původního latinského textu Boethiovy *Filosofie utěšitelky*. První z těchto překladových verzí byla publikována v roce 1609 a pochází z pera anonymního učenice známého pouze pod iniciálami I. T., druhá, poprvé vydaná roku 1999, je dílem profesora humanitních studií P.G. Walshe. Z raněnovooanglického textu bylo vybráno padesát souvětí, k nimž byly vyčleněny obsahové paralely textu moderního. Oba texty byly poté porovnány na úrovni jednotlivých klauzí, u nichž byl zkoumán způsob realizace, druh, syntaktická role a

výpovědní dynamičnost jejich vlastních prvků. Rozdíly mezi oběma textovými variantami byly zaznamenávány do komparativní tabulky, jejíž původní verze je k nahlédnutí v příloze.

První z výrazných odlišností, které jsou patrné již při zběžném pohledu, je nepoměr mezi počty vět a souvětí v jednotlivých verzích, kde raněnovooanglický text obsahuje 222 klauzí na 50 souvětí, zatímco v textu současném je souvětí 55 a klauzí 230. Rozdíly mezi samotnými klauzemi jsou rozčleněny do dvou základních typů: ty, které vznikají na základě absence větného protikladu klauze v textu druhém a strukturální odlišnosti větné realizace odpovídajícího významového obsahu.

Klauze bez odpovídající větné paralely mohou být nejčastěji buď důsledkem odlišné struktury nadřazené věty či celého souvětí nebo mohou vznikat díky preferenci druhého textu vyjadřovat tentýž obsah prostředky nevětnými. Velmi silnou typologickou skupinu v tomto ohledu tvoří v novodobé verzi vztažné věty adjektivní, které častokrát svým významem odpovídají součástí frázových struktur v textu raněnovooanglickém. Tím je dosaženo nejen vyšší explicitnosti daného obsahu, ale i zvýšení jeho výpovědní dynamičnosti díky větné postpozici. Třetím důvodem pro výskyt samostatných neparalelních struktur je tendence moderního překladu explikovat některé z kontextových detailů nebo užívat diskurzivních prostředků, které starší verze nevyužívá.

Strukturální odlišnosti větné realizace odpovídajícího významového obsahu mohou spočívat v různých morfo-syntaktických oblastech. Prvním znatelným rysem novějšího textu je častější využívání finitních a koordinačních struktur v místech, kde starší překlad volí klauze nefinitní nebo subordináční. Nefinitní konstrukce jsou využívány primárně z důvodu stručnosti. Charakteristické jsou pro moderní verzi také paralely starších vztažných vět adjektivních ve větami vztažnými nominálními. Starší text naopak výrazněji využívá extraponovaných vět podmětných a konstrukcí s anticipačním *it*.

Zajímavé poznatky přináší srovnání slovosledu, kdy bylo zjištěno, že zatímco současný překlad využívá odchylek od standardního slovosledného vzorce ve formě preponovaného předmětu k indikaci informační struktury a k textové kohezi, raněnovooanglická verze s jedinou výjimkou vykazuje inverzi v lexikálně omezených kontextech, kdy je přímo navázána na použití predikátu *quoth* po krátké úvodní části přímé řeči. Toto je možné

interpretovat jako možný přežitek starších slovosledných pravidel, či, na základě výzkumů Bækken, jako prostředek fokalizace.

Zvláštní rozdíl mezi oběma texty spočívá v užívání existenciálních struktur. Starší text jednoznačně preferuje konstrukce s existenciálním *there* i v případech, kdy je vlastním rématem věty sloveso. Novější překlad, naproti tomu, využívá v takových případech obyčejné sekvence podmětu a predikátu *exist / be present*. Tato tendence moderní angličtiny k dosazování rematického prvku ke konci výpovědního celku je patrná i v některých případech odlišného řazení klauzí v rámci jednotlivých souvětí.

Unikátní je v současném překladu též občasné užívání přímého apelu, stylového disjunktiva či explicitní vyjádření všeobecného lidského konatele. Tyto stylistické prostředky jsou patrně uplatňovány za účelem vyšší realističnosti, jejich cílem je vzbudit dojem autentického dialogu.

4. Závěr

Závěr práce jsou shrnuje nejdůležitější poznatky získané srovnávací analýzou obou textů. V souladu s původními očekáváními výzkum potvrzuje tendenci raně moderní angličtiny vyjadřovat stejný významový obsah menším počtem více kondenzovaných souvětí než angličtina současná. Tato kondenzace se projevuje především v častějším užívání nefinitních struktur a nominalizací. Překlad 20. století naproti tomu využívá více konstrukcí finitních: jedním z nejvýraznějších rozdílů v této oblasti je frekvence užití vztažných vět adjektivních, které jsou využívány jednak pro svou vyšší explicitnost a specifickou, jednak z důvodů aktuálněčlenských. Díky své postpozici propůjčují vyjádřenému modifikátoru vyšší stupeň výpovědní dynamičnosti, čímž podtrhují jeho rematicnost. Moderní text se rovněž snáze a častěji podřizuje základnímu rozložení výpovědní dynamičnosti co se týče koncového umístění rematického predikátu i preverbálnímu předsunutí tematického předmětu. Inverze v raněnovooanglické verzi naopak složí jako prostředek aktuálního členění jen výjimečně, v drtivé většině případů je motivována buď nastupujícími gramatickými pravidly, shodnými s angličtinou dnešní, anebo determinována lexikálně, zbytkovou tradicí postpozice pronominálního podmětu po slovesu *quoth*.