

excluded collective works even though often he was their main author. This concerns first of all the book *The Meaning of the Sentence in Its Semantic and Pragmatic Aspects* (Reidel, Dordrecht, Academia, Prague, 1986); another joint publication which reflects Petr Sgall's intensive and stimulative collaboration with Barbara Hall Partee should also be mentioned in this context (Hajičová Eva, Partee Barbara and Petr Sgall: *Topic-focus Articulation, Tripartite Structures, and Semantic Content*, Kluwer, Amsterdam, 1998). However, we do hope that the volume of Sgall's selected writings demonstrates characteristic features of Petr Sgall as a researcher: the overwhelming variety of deeply rooted topics of interest, the ability to penetrate into the substance of arguments and giving a convincing counterargument, the consistence of opinions while at the same time openmindedness and openness to discussion and a willingness to accept the opponent's viewpoint if he finds good reason for it.

Eva Hajičová (Prague)

Bibliographical Note

Petr Sgall's bibliography before 1986 was compiled as a gift from his colleagues on the occasion of his 60th birthday and was made available as an internal report of the Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, Charles University; the bibliographical data from later periods were published on the occasions of his birthdays in the *Prague Bulletin of Mathematical Linguistics* (PBML) 55, 1991, 95–98; PBML 65–66, 1996, 113–122 (bibliography 1986–1996, with a short introduction "Petr Sgall Septuagenerian") and PBML 75, 2001, 87–91 (bibliography 1996–2000). A complete bibliography of Petr Sgall is appended to the volume of Sgall's selected papers (*Petr Sgall: Language in its multifarious aspects*) published by Karolinum, Prague, 2006.

CONTENT CATEGORIES IN THE PRAGUE TYPOLOGY

For Petr Sgall on the occasion of his 80th birthday

I concluded another text on the Prague typology somewhat sceptically saying that the Prague typology cannot predict the grammatical categories of Hjelmslev's content plane (the grammatical functions) of a language or the grammatical elements of Sgall's tectogrammatical level (cf. Vykypěl, 2005a; for a comparison of Hjelmslev's content plane and Sgall's tectogrammatical level, cf. Vykypěl, 2005b, 227ff.). Yet, such a conclusion was perhaps not entirely fair. In the present paper, I would like to highlight some aspects of this problem.

The question of the system of grammatical functions seems to be particularly clear in the polysynthetic type. The polysynthetic type, as a language type that is not favourable to grammatical elements, is opposed (explicitly by Popela, 1991; 1998) to the other language types that are favourable to grammatical elements. A result of this property is that the grammar and also the grammatical functions in the polysynthetic type (or, more precisely, in languages in which this type dominates) are reduced in comparison with the

other types (or with languages in which the other types dominate). However, it is important to note that this reduction seems to happen not arbitrarily, but hierarchically. Consider the following quotation from Skalička:

"Nous avons dit que le type polysynthétique s'efforce de construire le langage uniquement de sémantèmes et que toutes les fois qu'un sémantème ne peut pas être employé, le type polysynthétique préfère ne pas exprimer la catégorie en question. Mais la seconde possibilité devient plus difficile, lorsqu'il s'agit des cas. Il est facile d'omettre le nombre, car on ne court pas le risque de provoquer un malentendu. Par contre il est impossible – tout au moins dans certaines phrases – d'omettre la différence entre le nominatif et l'accusatif ou les nuances telle que « avec quelqu'un » et, « sans quelqu'un », etc." (Skalička, 1946, 399f.)

The fact that the absence of the category of number is more admissible than the absence of the category of case is to be interpreted in this way: that a language can lack grammatical elements which serve the naming act of Mathesius, i.e. have an onomatological function as, for example, number does, but cannot lack elements which serve Mathesius' act of sentence formation, i.e. have a syntactical function as, for example, case does (for Mathesius' acts see Mathesius, 1975). Transposed into Sgall's functional-generative description, this means that morphological values can be missing in the tectogrammatical level of a language, but not syntactical values. At the same time, it is significant that one can find not only empirical grounds for the lack of onomatological grammatical elements or functions (such empirical grounds were, in principle, presented by the situation in Chinese in Skalička's text I have quoted from), but one can also find a theoretical argument. Grammatical meanings or functions have (in the formulation by Skalička, 1965) three main properties: they classify lexemes, they are syntactical (i.e. they serve Mathesius' act of sentence formation) and they are abstract (i.e. they serve Mathesius' naming act). In onomatological grammatical elements, the abstract meaning prevails. However, this is contrary to the central constructional principle of the polysynthetic type: the polysynthetic type builds its grammar, and in general its system, on semantemes, it seeks to build only transparent and motivated signs, and also to avoid abstract meanings and to prefer concrete and lexical meanings (cf. also Skalička, 1955a; 1960). Again, Skalička can be quoted on this:

"Il nous faut encore rappeler un point qui parfait la caractérisation de la grammaire chinoise. Ce qui fait que cette grammaire n'est pas développée de la manière qui est celle des langues européennes : en règle habituelle, le pluriel n'est pas exprimé, les cas ne sont pas distingués des fonctions syntaxiques (le nominatif du sujet, etc.), il n'y a pas de système des temps, pas de congruence. Ce sont ces éléments que v. d. Gabelentz indique comme « moins logiques que plutôt psycho-rhétoriques ». Ils expriment l'étonnement, l'insistance, et ainsi de suite. Par exemple, *pa*, impératif, « l'accent porté sur l'impératif », *la*, « déjà », *ni*, « l'interrogation appuyée » et « l'emphase », « la fin d'une phrase appuyée ». Cela est naturel. Le caractère concret, toujours valable, de la grammaire chinoise trouve son contrepoids dans la valeur extrêmement délicate de ces particules." (Skalička, 1955b, 19f.)

Instead of abstract or grammatical elements such as tense or aspect (that, after all, can be treated as the verbal counterpart of the nominal category of number; cf. Hjelmslev, 1959, 157), there are only strongly concrete temporal, aspectual or modal adverbs in the polysynthetic type.

The general polysynthetic principle of building the grammar by means of lexical elements has thus two main consequences. One consequence that concerns only the signs or the morphematic level, but not the content plane or the tectogrammatical level, is the fact that the polysynthetic type expresses grammatical functions with *semantemes*, i.e. either with a succession of lexical morphs or with *semantemes* in grammatical functions. Another consequence relevant for the content plane or the tectogrammatical level is the absence of onomatological grammatical elements or a tendency to eliminate them.

Similar implications as to the tendency to eliminate onomatological grammatical elements on the basis of the degree of concreteness and agrammaticity, as found in the case of the polysynthetic type, can also be formulated for the others types. According to Skalička (1955a; 1960) also the agglutinative type – though not as strongly as the polysynthetic – is relatively agrammatical and produces relatively motivated signs. It is, therefore, possible to presuppose also in the agglutinative type a tendency to eliminate onomatological grammatical elements, although this tendency is presumably not as strong as in the polysynthetic type (here cf., for example, the unclear status of number and tense in dominantly agglutinative Turkish: are these categories of word-formation or of grammar?). On the other hand, the isolating type is strongly grammatical and abstract and the inflectional type is relatively grammatical and abstract; thus, it is possible to presuppose a clear presence of onomatological grammatical content elements in a language in which these types dominate.

Another example for the points at issue is offered by the category of article. According to Sgall (1992, 205) articles are predictable for languages with a dominance of the isolating type. But this seems to hold true solely for one of the basic panchronic functions (meanings) of the category of article, viz. the syntactical function of its members in functional sentence perspective. As the example of the so called definite declension of adjectives in Lithuanian and Latvian shows, the article (as a content element) can also occur in languages with a dominance of the inflectional type, viz. in its second panchronic meaning, the generic one.

It is, however, possible to doubt the existence itself of a uniform content category of article. One can argue that the article, with a dominantly syntactical function in isolating languages, simply presents one of the expressions of functional sentence perspective and therefore does not belong to the tectogrammatical level or is not a category of the content plane, but it is to be placed into the morphematic level or into the sign aspect of language usage. What, on the other hand, belongs to the tectogrammatical level or presents a content category is the functional sentence perspective. Hjelmslev (1938, 282) even claimed that the category of emphasis (which roughly corresponds to functional sentence perspective) is, along with the content category of case, the only universal (i.e. present in all languages) content category (on the content category of emphasis see Hjelmslev, 1959, 177, fn. 1). If, then, one presupposes a universal category of emphasis or of functional sentence perspective, it means that this category is contained in all language systems, however it is – as any grammatical content category – expressed in different ways: in dominantly isolating languages, for example, by means of the article in the form of a separate word, in dominantly

inflectional languages, for example, by means of word-order (on functional sentence perspective from the typological point of view see Sgall – Hajičová – Panevová, 1986, 241–244). The above mentioned second panchronic meaning of the article, the generic one that is found, for example, in the Lithuanian and Latvian definite declension of adjectives can be, on the other hand, considered not as a grammatical onomatological content element, but as a lexical onomatological content element and therefore not as part of the grammar in a narrower sense, but as a part of word-formation. Word-formation, or word-formational functions, are also expressed in different ways in different language types and the inflectional way is so called morphological conversion, i.e. formation by means of endings. This corresponds well to the dominance of the inflectional type in Lithuanian and Latvian in the case of the Lithuanian and Latvian word-formational content elements in question: the so called definite and indefinite adjectives are distinguished in these languages by different sets of adjective endings.

With the example of the article we come, however, to another, more general problem, viz. the question of what level of language the "traditional" grammatical categories are to be placed into. Like the category of article, temporal adverbs, for example, can also present a relatively uniform category on the morphematic level, but they can correspond to different content categories or elements of the tectogrammatical level: some can be considered as lexical content elements, some, on the other hand, as onomatological grammatical content elements. Obviously one needs here, above all, a clear criterion for distinguishing between lexical and grammatical content elements. Such a criterion has not yet been satisfactorily formulated (the most recent intensive grammaticalization research does not offer any such criterion, as it is, for one thing, more diachronically and non-structurally oriented and, for another thing, is oriented to signs as wholes, not to content elements).

It is clear, nonetheless, that the only thing the Prague typology can more or less predict in the content plane (in the tectogrammatical level) are simply categories, but not members of the categories. This also corresponds to the fact that only categories, but not their structuration can be predicted in the expression plane (in the phonological level): the phonological implications Skalička makes for his typology relate merely to such phenomena as the proportions between the category of consonants and that of vowels, the question of the combinations of consonants or the presence of categories of prosodemes, but not to the "phonological themes" (cf. Skalička, 1967; 1979, 238–244, 307–311).

Thus, the Prague typology appears as an explicative description of the interplay or interaction between the expression plane and the content plane, or the phonological and the tectogrammatical level, of language mediated by the sign aspect of language usage or the morphonological and the morphematic level of language. The structure of the expression and the content plane, or the phonological and the tectogrammatical level, can be only partly, but – as it seems – nevertheless still included into this description.

Bohumil Vykypěl (Brno)

References

- HJELMSLEV, L.: Etudes sur la notion de parenté linguistique. Première étude: Relations de parenté des langues créoles. *Revue des études indo-européennes* 1, 1938, 271–286.
- HJELMSLEV, L.: *Essais linguistiques*. Copenhagen, Nordisk Sprog- og Kulturforlag. (Travaux du Cercle linguistique de Copenhagen, 12, 1959.)
- MATHESIUŠ, V.: *A Functional Analysis of Present Day English on a General Linguistic Basis*. Ed. by Josef Vachek. The Hague – Paris, Mouton, 1975 (Janua linguarum, Series Practica, 208.) & Prague, Academia.
- POPELA, J.: Prospects of V. Skalička's Linguistic Typology. In: Bohumil Palek & Přemysl Janota, eds., *Proceedings of LP'90*. Prague, Karolinum, 1991, 237–243. (Acta Universitatis Carolinae, Philologica, 1992, 3–4.)
- POPELA, J.: Ein Beitrag zur allgemeinen Sprachtypologie und zur Typologie des Deutschen. *Germanistica Pragensia* 13, 1998, 75–91. (Acta Universitatis Carolinae, Philologica 5, 1996.)
- SGALL, P.: Valenz und Typologie. *Zeitschrift für Phonetik, Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung* 45, 1992, 200–206.
- SGALL, P. – HAJČOVÁ, E. – PANEVOVÁ, J.: *The Meaning of the Sentence in its Semantic and Pragmatic Aspects*. Dordrecht, Reidel & Praha, Academia, 1986.
- SKALIČKA, V.: Sur la typologie de la langue chinoise parlée. *Archiv orientální* 15, 1946, 386–412.
- SKALIČKA, V.: O konkrétnosti a abstraktnosti při tvoření slov. *Universitas Carolina, Philologica* 1, 1955a, 75–84.
- SKALIČKA, V.: Sur les langues polysynthétiques. *Archiv orientální* 23, 1955b, 10–28.
- SKALIČKA, V.: Agrammatismus und Grammatismus. *Slavica Pragensia* 2, 1960, 3–6. (Acta Universitatis Carolinae, Philologica 2, 1960.)
- SKALIČKA, V.: Über die Bedeutung der grammatischen Elemente. *Slavica Pragensia* 7, 1965, 9–11. (Acta Universitatis Carolinae, Philologica 1, 1965.)
- SKALIČKA, V.: Die phonologische Typologie. In: *Phonetica Pragensia*. Ed. by Milan Romportl & Vladimír Skalička. Praha, Universita Karlova, 1967, 73–78. (Acta Universitatis Carolinae, Philologica 6, 1967.)
- SKALIČKA, V.: *Typologische Studien*. Ed. by Peter Hartmann. Braunschweig – Wiesbaden: Vieweg. (Schriften zur Linguistik 11, 1979.)
- VYKYPĚL, B.: Der Sinn der Sprachtypologie. *Sborník prací filosofické fakulty brněnské university A* 53, 2005a, 5–15.
- VYKYPĚL, B.: *Glossematikstudien. Unzeitgemäße Betrachtungen zu Louis Hjelmslevs Sprachtheorie*. Hamburg, Verlag, Dr. Kovač, 2005b.