In the present state of sentence analysis it would seem a promising venture to reconsider some of the theses of the Prague School. Vilém Mathesius's dichotomy of "formal" and "functional sentence analysis" takes on a new significance in the light of N. Chomsky's controversial notion of "underlying and surface structure".

Mathesius holds that to describe a sentence one must rigidly discriminate an underlying constituent structure, through which all relevant syntactic relations between the parts of the sentence are specified, and a kind of surface structure ("Mitteilungsstruktur"), through which certain aspects of the surface structure are determined. The latter is influenced both by the intention of the speaker and by the context. This notion seems to shed some light on the problem of word order, which has not been solved yet by the generativists.

In an interesting article K. E. Heidolph has shown that the arrangement of constituents in a German sentence can be largely derived from anaphoric relations with contextually adjoining sentences. Other phenomena like selection of article, pronoun-nominalization, accentuation as well as certain aspects of 'complex sentence formation' can be explained in the same way.

In this paper I shall attempt to describe some contextual conditions which must be regarded as relevant for an analysis of suprasegmental features. A formulation of exact rules cannot be attempted here owing to the absence of a complete grammar taking into account contextual regularities. Moreover, these rules would have to refer to the underlying structure of English sentences, a matter still much in dispute.

1 This terminology has been used by J. Firbas. Cf. the bibliography in J. Firbas's paper, 'Some Thoughts on the Function of Word Order in Old English and Modern English', Šborník práci Filologické Fakulty Brněnské University 6 (A5), 1957, pp. 72—100.
4 The following studies, while remaining within the framework of generative grammar, contain proposals deviating more or less radically from Chomsky's own version of the theory: B. C. Hall, Subject and Object in Modern English, M. I. T. Doct. Diss., Cambridge, Mass 1965; Ch. J. Fillmore,
It can be shown that an NP in a given sentence always carries the primary accent when introduced for the first time. If mentioned for the second time it can only carry a secondary accent. Thus if a sentence S1 contains an NP and is followed by S2, which has NP anaphorically related to NP, NP in S2 receives the primary accent (7), while NP in S1 is given the secondary accent (8). Furthermore, an NP mentioned for the first time, is normally preceded by the indefinite article and often appears in final position, while NP is preceded by the definite article (often realized as this) and usually has initial position. Using Vilém Mathesius' terminology, we shall call the former rhyme and the latter theme. Hence we will be able to distinguish between a thematic and a thematic accent:

(1) Bill had an apple. (2) This apple had red cheeks.

If there is no such NP in the antecedent sentence the thematic accent is automatically given to the verb. (If the verb is accompanied by particles or certain modifications then these parts carry the accent.)

(3) Bill ate the apple.

The proper name in (3) is equivalent to an NP with the definite article additionally marked with the distinctive feature [+ unique]. We may assume that every definite anaphoric NP, even if marked [+ unique], permits the contextual elimination of the head NP. In this case an anaphoric pronoun appears, which can be considered as the form of the definite anaphoric article in isolation. Cf.: (4) *He ate the apple*. (5) has only one accent, viz. the thematic one. Thus one may assume that the thematic accent as a suprasegmental feature can be eliminated together with the head NP. On the other hand the rhyme does not allow pronominalization. Neither (5) nor (6) are equivalent to (1): (5) John had something. (6) Bill had it. (6) appears acceptable only if e.g. the neutral gender is contrasted with another gender.

Sentences like (7) Bill ate the apple, and (8) Bill ate the apple can appear in the same context as (3). They do, however, imply additional contextual conditions. Cf.: (9) Bill (not Jim) ate the apple. (10) Bill ate the apple (not the pear). It has been pointed out before that sentences like (7) and (8) presuppose others which are often identical except for the constituents carrying the contrastive accent. These sentences, as it were, correct antecedent sentences paradigmatically. They are particularly often used in dialogue. We may assume that the wh-question demands equivalent contextual conditions. It differs from the answer given to it only in the NP to which the wh-marker refers. This assumption would correspond to the fact that any lexical constituent which can be made the object of a question can have the contrastive accent:


(13) What did John do with his shoes? — John polished his shoes.

The assumption that only lexical items can carry the contrastive accent seems to be invalidated by the following sentence: (14) John did see the girl. However, the sentence makes sense only if complemented, e.g. in the following way: (15) a) John did not see the girl. b) John did see the girl. A change of speaker is also involved. Therefore this type is very common in dialogue. The contrasting of a) with b) can be interpreted as a contextual explication of emphasis, which can refer to the assertive morpheme of the verb.

Either kind of special accentuation, contrastive as well as emphatic, often superimposes the contextually conditioned regularities of thematization and rhematization. Consequently, Heidolph in his article has explained contrastive and emphatic statements as synonymous repetitions of antecedent sentences. Every primary accent on a second-mention NP seems indeed to be interpreted as a contrast.

As to intonation, the accents, whose position are contextually determined, mark the points where changes in pitch relevant to the interpretation take place. If it is true that there are only two relevant 'Tonschichten' then they are likely to be determined by the two prominent points within a sentence, viz. rhyme and theme. The thematic accent corresponds to a prosodic rising intonation, while the rhematic accent is given the secondary accent (8), which according to Isaenko and Schädlich announces a falling intonation at the end of the sentence. Without this falling intonation a sentence remains a fragment. This observation is supported by the fact that an NP with thematization never appears in isolation. This kind of fragmentary sentence differs clearly from the acceptable type of grammatical ellipsis. If sentences with only one relevant 'Tonbruch' are possible, then they must have the post-ictic falling: (9), which often appears at the end of a sentence, but in any case constitutes the final cadence of a question. A falling 'Tonbruch' can be easily isolated in the case of an ellipsis. In an answer to a wh-ques-

---

5 Cf. K. R. Heidolph, op. cit.
6 Cf. K. R. Heidolph, op. cit.
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tion the NP to which the wh-marker refers appears in isolation with the falling 'Tonbruch': (15) Who ate an apple?
The boy (ate an apple).

Finally a short remark on selective (= restrictive) and descriptive (=modifying) clauses. In a descriptive relative clause there are usually two rhemes, one of which is the head constituent while the other lies within the descriptive modifying clause. If the modifying clause is not reduced it is preceded by an optional pause:

(16) I'll take the first train (//) which stops at the main station.

This observation might lead us to the assumption that every sentence can have only one rhematized constituent unless there is a sentence pause between the two clauses in question. Here we might have an additional criterion for defining more clearly the descriptive relative clause whose embedding is less complete than that of the restrictive clause. Very often a change in strategy is noticeable in spoken texts. The integration of the following clause is carried through only half way:

(17) I'll take the first train. Which stops at the main station. This is hardly possible with the selective type, which is closely integrated. Here the matrix NP does not carry a rhematic accent: it is closely connected with the selective clause, which carries the rhematic accent. Pauses in this case have to be interpreted in all likelihood as hesitation phenomena.

DISCUSSION

Wade:

Vielleicht könnte man den Begriff der Wiederholung in einigen Fällen durch die zusätzliche Unterscheidung von semantischen Unter- und Oberklassen etwas schärfer fassen. Z. B.

you'll find all sorts of cars: big vehicles, small vehicles, an old Ford, a new Chrysler, anything you like.

Die Oberklasse (vehicle) bleibt unbetont, die Unterkasse (Ford bzw. Chrysler) wird betont.

Firbas:

With regard to the problem of the relation between repetition and thematization raised by Dr. Wode in the discussion, I should like to emphasize the necessity of elaborating the criterion of what may be termed the narrow scene, i.e. in fact that of the very purpose of the communication. (I have touched upon this problem in Non-Thematic Subjects in Contemporary English, Travaux Linguistiques de Prague 2, Prague 1966, p. 246).

11 B. Drubig, Kontextuelle Beziehungen zwischen Sätzen im Englischen (Kiel, 1967), M. A. Thesis (mimeographed). I feel deeply obliged to the author for many valuable ideas offered in his thesis and in long discussions. Helpful suggestions were also given to me by my Lektor and informant Roger L. Snook, M. A.