

THE RELATION OF CENTRE AND PERIPHERY AS A LANGUAGE UNIVERSAL

Recent linguistic research pays much attention to the so-called language universals¹ in different domains of language. It is evident that the most important universals must be considered those which characterize natural languages in contrast to other semiotic systems, or to other systems in general. One of such properties was pointed out by S. KARCEVSKIJ and called "the asymmetric dualism of linguistic sign"²; this concept concerns the relation between the "form" (expression) and "function" (meaning, content) and belongs to the common theoretical and methodological equipment of the linguistics of Prague school.³ Besides this, in many works of this school and also elsewhere another candidate for a universal of this kind may be found, though it is not always explicitly formulated. I have in mind the fact that is often referred to as the relation of centre (central elements) and periphery (peripheral elements) of language system (some authors use other terms, cf. the article by J. NEUSTUPNÝ in the present volume). What is meant, is obviously a property concerning both the system of language and its functioning in discourse, having reference to the paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations as well, and possessing both the qualitative and quantitative aspect.⁴

In reference to systemic relations, the terms "centre" (C) and "periphery" (P) apparently concern a certain aspect of the relation between the units (of various ranks) of the language system and this system taken as a whole, or, generally, of the relation of lower rank units to those of a higher rank, or, in other words, the structure of complex systemic units.

The relation P—C may be, of course, established on various linguistic levels and on each of them it will display specific modifications. But the general essence of all its varieties may be characterized by the fact that the commonly found conception of the organization of language as a neatly patterned, symmetrical, regular, uniform system of units (of various ranks) is in principle false. It is exactly this erroneous assumption that misleads (as I pointed out some years ago⁵) many linguists, who in the course of their analytic practice find out that this conception does not empirically hold, to two extreme, equally wrong solutions: they either dismiss the

notion of the systemic character of language at all, or, on the contrary, they adjust the established linguistic data, by means of untrue simplification and violation, so as to make them more compliant with the assumed pattern of the system of language.⁶ Both solutions are obviously unscientific and one must fully agree with C. F. HOCKETT,⁷ who comments on his hypothesis stating that "5.5 There are gaps, asymmetries, or 'configurational pressures' in every phonological system, no matter when examined" with similar words: "Most systems, by virtue of a sort semi-magical logistics of maneuvering on the part of analysts, can be forced to appear neat and symmetrical. The maneuvering is always worth undertaking, not in order to force symmetry where there is lack of it, but because it is heuristically valuable — it helps to show relationships within a system that might otherwise be missed. But the asymmetries, however pushed about, remain in the system".

The situations in which our analytic practice meets the difficulty or even impossibility to determine unambiguously the place of the given item in the system, are very often connected with classing linguistic units with different categories. Mostly the difficulties lie in the assumption that each element contains all properties of the given category and that it contains them to the full extent (in other words, that the categories are clear-cut and unambiguously delimited⁸). Thus in German two opposite word-formative categories may be distinguished, viz. the derived words and the compounds. But in classing, e. g., the noun *das Schulwesen* or the adj. *kugelförmig* we are at a loss if we are to decide with which of the two categories those words should be classed. A very similar situation in English has been described in E. KRUISINGA's *A Handbook of Present-Day English* (II, 3, 1932, p. 60—61): "Although it is true that English suffixes usually have no substantial meaning, some formations have been included in the sections on derivation that show suffixes with a more or less clear meaning; these might, in fact, have been included among the compounds. Such are the formations in *-ful*, especially the adjectives *-fold*, *-ana*. Formations in *-like*, such as *childlike*, *springlike*, might be called derivatives as well as compounds". — Another example: Perhaps in all European languages there are words with the first Latin or Greek component, such as *ultra-*, *infra-*, *macro-*, *micro-*, etc.; should they be classed with prefixes, or not? (And there is no help in calling them "semi-prefixes" or "quasi-prefixes".)

Similar situations occur in determining the word (as a systemic unit). Thus in Czech there exists the form *se*, roughly corresponding to the Russian verbal morpheme *-sja*, but distinguished from it by two formal properties: it is spelled as a separate word and is "a free form", whose position in the sentence is governed by rules of word order (*se*, being an enclitic, is placed after the first word or word group of the given clause, irrespective of the

position of the verb). Should it be treated as a "free" morpheme, or as a "purely grammatical (non-lexical)" word? — On the other hand, there exist word groups that may be evaluated simultaneously either as combinations of separate words, or as single compounds (cf., e. g., *air-ship*, *motor car*; *lifeboat*, *taxi-driver*, *school inspector*, *townhouse*, *townhall*, *class-consciousness*, *looker-on*, *son-in-law*, *man-of-war*, ...; (cf. the vacillation in spelling and in the stressing of such formations).⁹ This fact was very aptly pointed out by KRUISINGA (o. c., p. 4, 8): "... there are various degrees of closeness, so that attempts strictly to divide compounds and syntactic groups would be contrary to the character of the phenomenon"; "... any decision on the question whether we have a group or a compound would be necessarily arbitrary". And one is inclined to add that exactly this relatively wide range of "undeterminable" cases is characteristic of English and bears upon its linguistic type.

From the sphere of syntax one may adduce, e. g., the relation between the grammatical object and the adverbial determiner; thus in constructions like *he looked at the door* and *they are retreating from the enemy*, our criteria for distinguishing these two basic syntactic categories fail. (V. ŠMILAUER characterizes this situation very aptly saying that a dispute about such cases is possible, but of no use.) — Further, linguists widely differ in determining the category of "copula-verbs". Some scholars delimit this category very narrowly and class with it only the verbs of the type *to be* (Russian: *byt'*, *byvat'*) and *to become* (R.: *stat'*, *stanovitsja*); according to others, there is a great variety of copula and semi-copula verbs (e. g., also verbs denoting various phases of a state or its modality). To our knowledge, one can hardly find two scholars who would fully agree in determining the range of such verbs.¹⁰ K. HORÁLEK¹¹ is evidently right when he points out the transitional character of copula-verbs; in his opinion, such verbs stand on the boundary between lexicon and grammar and, at the same time, they occupy a transitional position between syntax and morphology.

All such insoluble dilemmas and useless disputes can be clearly removed if one gives up the common notion of strict compartmentalization and simply admits an obvious idea, viz. that the organization of linguistic elements in the "system of systems" has a different nature, a different structure, than is usually assumed: the classes (and sub-classes) of elements should not be regarded as "boxes" with clear-cut boundaries but as formations with a compact core (centre) and with a gradual transition into a diffuse periphery which, again, gradually passes (infiltrates) into the peripheral domain of the next category. Thus in the above-adduced example from German, we get following series (spectra) of words, representing the transition from the centre of compounds to the centre of words derived with a suffix: (a) *Schnellzug*, *Schauplatz*, *Arbeitsstätte*, *Schulwesen*, ... *Freund-*

schaft, Schreiber; (b) schneebedeckt, wertvoll, kugelförmig, ... musterhaft, sonnig. — The system of language might thus be presented as space with an uneven density of elements, structured according to the principle "Centre — Periphery — Transition", or as masses of centres with their "fields of gravitation" (of various extent and power) which are in contact, mutually infiltrate one another and are hierarchically ordered (this conception is closely related to the presentation of the Russian verb system, as described in KARCEVSKIJ's *Système du verbe russe*, Prague 1927).

Our conception does not, of course, deny the existence of classes or categories, but at the same time it does not force us into unambiguous decisions in those cases where the decision has not been made by the language itself (to paraphrase a truthful dictum of A. MARTINET). It strives to respect the dialectical character of the structural relations and allows to account for even multilateral relations (thus the infiltration of peripheries may encompass more than two categories). It is also in accordance with some new principles of logical analysis (cf. here in J. NEUSTUPNÝ's study). — Finally, with the help of the terms C and P one can also characterize individual grammatical categories in terms of the varying degrees of their compact or, conversely, diffuse character.

Last but not least, the said conception appears to be important and useful in explaining the dynamics of language development (this can be seen from VACHEK's studies in historical phonology or from DOKULIL's establishment of the dynamic tendencies in the verbal system of Contemporary Czech).¹² As a universal of language development may also rank the fact that peripheral phenomena are less stable than those belonging to the centre (which may result either in the total disappearance of the peripheral elements or in some modification enabling them to be shifted on to the centre); this, of course, concerns not only the language system taken as a whole but also its sub-systems (and categories). One is also faced with the question to what extent such organization of the system is suitable and acceptable for the functioning of language, further, whether the development of language is governed by the tendency, however non-consistent, for a complete elimination of peripheral phenomena (and thus for a complete balance, "symmetry" of the system) or whether one can rather ascertain some optimum degree of non-balance — a degree which may differ for different languages —, or, possibly, some limits of such non-balance, the overstepping of which might appear unacceptable, for fear of excessive vagueness resulting from such overstepping. On the other hand, it might be assumed that language tends to preserve the non-balance within certain limits (which should be established for each language) but never eliminates it altogether, because the state of non-balance clearly has some advantages: It preserves language from becoming too stiff, or, more exactly, the non-

balanced state of the language system is a natural and necessary consequence of the non-static character of language (which again is a basic universal of language, as seen by the Prague linguists;¹³ some analogy with the phenomena of redundancy of language may be noted in passing here).

As relatively most elaborate the relation between C and P appears to be on the phonological level. In J. VACHEK's conception¹⁴, in which some systematic analysis of the problems has been presented, two criteria are mentioned as relevant for the above-said relation (see Chapter One of his treatise quoted here above): as peripheral he classes a phoneme which is not fully integrated or which has a low functional yield (i. e., is not fully utilized in the system). In our opinion it might be profitable to consider also the criterion of the utilization in utterance contexts, i. e., in principle, the frequency of occurrence of the given language unit. Thus, the relation of C—P on the phonological level could be gauged by three parameters, the first of which, i. e. the degree of integration, would combine qualitative and quantitative aspects (we believe, like Vachek, that it is not only the number of oppositions that is the decisive factor but rather their kind), while the other two are of quantitative nature. (Needless to say, the concept of 'integration' will have to be specifically interpreted on other language levels.)

As no less important factors we regard the hierarchy and interplay of different criteria (i. e., of different qualities). This applies also to language levels higher than the phonological. Thus, e. g., the 'irregular' European verb forms of the type *esse*, which are very little integrated in the morphological paradigmatic patterns of their languages, do not appear to be peripheral if viewed from the standpoint of their functional load both in the system (cf. their utilization as copulas, as auxiliaries in compound verb forms) and in concrete utterances: this may account for their relative power of resistance and for their stability in the diachronic aspect. Some tendency aiming at a higher degree of integration, however, can be found in languages — see, e. g., the rise of the Czech dialectal form of 1. sg. *(j)su* 'I am', the colloquial form of 2. sg. *(j)seš* (replacing *jsi*) and the complete victory of the 3. sg. *je* over the original form *jest*. Or, to take another example, undeclinable Common Czech adjectives like *fajn*, *prima*, *bašta*, *žůžo*, *lážo*, *čupr*, ... (all meaning 'O. K.' with strong emotional colouring) are, viewed morphologically, non-integrated, and thus peripheral. They are not numerous, and thus count as peripheral also from the standpoint of their functional load. But their frequency certainly does not stamp them as peripheral (especially some of them and in some functional styles). — It is thus clear that there exists a problem of the degree to which these three criteria of peripheral character can be simply added together if a global classification is to be obtained. One thing, however, is certain, viz. that "language itself" does effect such complex, global evaluation of each of its items: this is clearly seen both in the diachronic aspect (see the instability of peripheral elements) and in the synchronic aspect, viewed, of course, not statically but dynamically — this has been noted here above in the instance of the Czech verb of the type *esse*, and it can also be demonstrated in the case of undeclinable adjectives: Aside of the primary, non-declined forms, there arise, quite spontaneously, the inflected, secondary doublets of the type *fajnový*, *primový*, *lážový*, which is clear evidence of the peripheral nature of the primary forms. (On this point, cf. VACHEK's paper in the present volume.) — Similarly, the Czech indeclinable nouns of the type *parte* 'funeral announcement', *finále* 'the final match', *skóre* 'score' reveal, at least in the Instrumental case, the inflected doublets ending in *-em*.

The difficulty of assessing, in a complex way, the systemic position of the elements of some language system is connected with another aspect of the problem. The concepts of C and P are mutually correlative, i. e. the peripheral can only be estimated with regard to something central, and *vice versa*. Moreover, there does not exist any clear line separating C and P, but a continuous transitional zone. While there certainly exist phenomena situated "in the very centre" or "in the obvious periphery", one cannot overlook the existence of items which can only be denoted as "more central" (or, respectively, "more peripheral") than others. In short, the central and the peripheral character are qualities revealed by different items of the language system in different degrees (and in view of the fact that the transitions appear to be continuous it would hardly make sense to establish any exactly defined degrees of peripheral character). A statement like this will certainly scare those linguists who have been convinced that degrees and transitions are unknown to languages, that 'everything is either this or that' (to quote a fitting statement of M. Joos.)¹⁵ But, as is well known, even N. CHOMSKY takes for granted the existence of various "levels (degrees) of grammaticality" (see his *Syntactic Structures*, pp. 15, 36, Note 2, p. 42, Note 7) and thus admits the existence of gradual transition or rather, in the given instance, the absence of clear-cut limits of the language system itself.¹⁶ — Such statements do not, of course, contradict the well-known dictum of F. DE SAUSSURE, viz. "dans la langue il n'y a que de différences". They only reveal the fact that a deeper and more refined and specific analysis of language units and their mutual relations appears to be inevitable.

It might be objected, of course, that the concepts C and P, as outlined above, are not defined in exact terms but rather in an intuitive and symbolic manner. It is also obvious that with the lack of unequivocal criteria, enabling the researcher to arrive at clear yes-or-no decisions (necessitated by mathematical methods), one could hardly be able to exactly ascertain quantitatively the functional load of central and peripheral phenomena or their frequency of occurrence. One should thus try to arrive at a more exact formula in rendering the continuous transition found between C₁, P₁, P₂, C₂, or, to put the thing differently, to interpret the vagueness existing here in a non-vague manner.

Clearly, our intuition judgements of some language facts being closer to the centre and of others being more or less remote from it are based on some objective features of the examined phenomena. In other words, classificational criteria like "a derived noun", "a compound adjective", "a motivated word", etc., must be subjected to a more detailed analysis, penetrating more deeply; that is to say, we must refine our classification. This procedure will reveal that classificational criteria (i. e. the qualities of classified phenomena) are not simple, further unanalysable, but complex,¹⁷ being made up of sets of some features, sets which are, of course, structured and subject to a hierarchy (an instance of such structuration is exactly the breakdown of the facts of the given category into C and P).

The thing can be demonstrated on two examples, one taken from Czech and one from English. Let us first consider four Czech words: *holubník*

(dove-cot), *rybník* (fish-pond), *kurník* (hen-house) and *ratejna* (a big room — pejoratively). Tentatively one can say that these four words constitute a series whose members become increasingly more and more distant from the centre containing derived words, and acquire the status of more and more non-motivated expressions. In a detailed analysis one finds that the word *rybník*, though clearly derived from the basis *ryba* 'fish', is found to be less central than *holubník* (derived, in its turn, from *holub* 'pigeon') for the reason that it also denotes such receptacles of water in which no fishes can be found, despite the fact that the two word-formative elements can be distinguished in it with absolute certainty. The word *kurník*, again, is classed as non-central because its basic morpheme *kur-* ('hen') is rather difficult to identify as it is not found in the common word-stock, to which the derived term *kurník* clearly does belong. Finally, the word *ratejna* occupies a place on the very periphery of derived words and can almost be regarded as non-motivated, in view of the fact that its only identifiable morpheme is the suffix *-na*, while the part of the word preceding it cannot be identified with the basic morpheme of any Present Day Czech expression. Thus the quality of "derivedness" appears to be complex; if we keep, for simplicity's sake, to our above examples, we find that it includes the following set of features: (1) the analyzability of the word into its morphemic elements, (2) the possibility of identifying these elements with some others existing in the language, and (3) the conformity of the lexical meaning of the derived word with its 'etymological' (word-formative) meaning. The smaller is the number of these features in a given word, the more distant it is from the centre. It should be noted that the order of the features has a hierarchic sense: feature (2) is conditioned by feature (1), but not *vice versa*, and the same is true of the mutual relation of (2) and (3). Further it should be added that in the case of *kurník* the feature (2) can be analysed more profoundly and, accordingly, more different degrees of identifiability can be distinguished (here on the basis of differentiation within the word-stock, determined by criteria of stylistic order, by order of frequency of occurrence, etc.); a similar possibility of differentiation could also be established with regard to feature (3). Thus it can be said that the hierarchy of the set of classificatory criteria reveals a number of strata, and that the features are, to a degree, heterogeneous.

To pass on to the English example (see above, p. 11), it may be said that the English compounds are characterized by at least four features: (1) stress, (2) spelling, (3) morphology, and (4) meaning. Applying these criteria¹⁸ to the word *blackboard* we find that it belongs to the centre of the category; the feature (4) is missing in *townhouse*, while (2) is missing in *townhall*; in *taxi-driver*, its compound character is signalled by (1) and, to some extent, by (2) (the feature (2) has obviously two degrees). The term *motor car* is wholly peri-

pheral, being distinguished from the preceding examples only by its stress. Here, too, the features are ordered hierarchically: even though the word-group *old maid* is characterized by the feature (4), it is not usually classed with compounds, obviously because of the weak position of (4) in the hierarchy of classificatory features. On the other hand, the types *son-in-law*, *looker-on* are often treated as semi-compounds, apparently in view of the way they form their plurals: they are lacking the feature (3) which thus must be considered a relatively "strong" feature.

It might be asked what makes us formulate such complex criteria, and exactly these and no others. The answer is that such formulations are prompted by the reality of language. It appears that both in the synchronous functioning of language and in the dynamics of its development it is exactly the groups of language units characterized by a certain set (complex) of features that play an important part. These groups act as centres of gravitation around which are grouped, at various distances, units which have some features common with these. To overlook this fact would make it impossible to assess the actual nature of the language system and of its functioning, and it would also contradict the speakers' linguistic intuition. Should the analysis and classification be effected according to individual, simple criteria, it would result in scattered *débris* which would fail to give a true picture of the reality of language in its hierarchic and systemic relations, and would not do justice to the functioning of language.

The relation of C and P can also be met with in analyzing the facts of sequential order, i. e., the discourse: any delimitation and segmentation of utterances is faced with difficulties due to our inability to draw, in many instances, unequivocal limits between two utterance units, and it is faced with this trouble on different levels of analysis.

On the phonic level the difficulty emerges, e. g., when delimiting the syllables: while the number of syllables of a certain utterance segment is established without any troubles (being equal to the number of syllabic peaks), the limits separating contiguous syllables are often difficult to establish. The literature discussing the problems of the syllable¹⁹ has often dealt with this point and the authors have attempted to formulate a number of various criteria by which the limits could be safely drawn. For Czech, the problem was tackled by H. KUČERA (op. cit., pp. 81—4). He uses distributional criteria and only in those instances in which they fail he takes recourse to statistics: he then prefers that type of segmentation which results in the most frequent types of word-initials or word-finals (both expressed in general terms C[onsonant] and V[owel]). Thus the Czech word *ona* 'she' can be divided syllabically either as V.CV or as VC.V; the first possibility is preferred because it represents $9 + 214 (= 223)$ various concrete sound com-

binations, while the other possibility is backed only by $198 + 6 (= 204)$ such combinations. Kučera's decision is, besides, in conformity with the intuition, manifested in reading words by syllables, in singing, etc.; though Kučera himself admits this factor (as well as others, such as that of the morphemic structure) he does not accept it as a working criterion.

In their time, J. D. O'CONNOR and J. P. L. TRIM²⁰ voiced the opinion that intuitive judgements concerning syllabic frontiers are, in reality, based on statistic relations; these judgements are supposed to have taken shape thanks to the experience obtained in using the language for years. We do not suppose, however, that O'Connor's and Trim's opinion can hold good — the very instance quoted from Kučera's book appears to point to the contrary, as the statistical ratio 233 : 204 does not appear to speak very clearly, while the intuitive judgement, rejecting *on-a* in favour of *o-na*, is absolutely unequivocal. The same conclusion is obtained in comparing another set of instances of theoretically possible syllabic divisions, instanced by Kučera, viz *če-ský* (182), *čes-ký* (412), *česk-ý* (102): the last of the three possibilities, opposed to the first and second, is intuitively dismissed as impossible; the first two possibilities, again, are intuitively evaluated as equally feasible, despite the statistical data: their equal feasibility may be due to the Czech tendency favouring the open syllables and, conversely, to the operation of the morphemic analysis. In our opinion, intuitive judgements rest in all factors that are concerned here, including the statistical factor. The statistical viewpoint, however, should be considered for all other factors, not for some only, as in the practice of Kučera's who disregards important structural facts of different language levels. In addition to this, attention must be paid to the hierarchy obviously existing among the said factors.

It appears that decisions such as those made by Kučera are arbitrary, inasmuch as they lack the necessary systemic motivation. It may be possible, and for purposes of practical application sometimes even necessary, to resort to simplified, unequivocal solutions. But it would be a great, and even dangerous, mistake to suppose that such simplified solutions do justice to the complex reality of language, reality reflected in the linguistic intuition and behaviour of the members of the given language community, both in the synchronistic and in the diachronistic aspects of the facts. If, as is correctly stated also by Kučera, in some instances the native speaker hesitates between two alternative solutions, one obviously has to do with a case of vagueness. Such a case we can, or at least try to, account for by ascertaining all the factors in the play and their mutual relations (clearly, to do so is not easy), but we cannot, and do not want to, eliminate it. It constitutes a fact of language and MARTINET is undoubtedly right in urging that a linguist should not decide in those cases which have been left undecided by language itself. One must simply admit that between two contiguous syllable peaks

there exists a transitional zone (HOCKETT's "interlude"), consisting of the peripheries of both syllables, with frequent overlapping of these peripheries. This ascertainment does justice to the situation in language more adequately than an artificial, arbitrary solution of the problem would be able to do.

The existence of the relation of C and P on the phonetic level is also widely known: mutual overlapping of the peripheries of two contiguous sounds is expressly mentioned, e. g., by M. ROMPORTL²¹ as a characteristic and essential fact (see also his paper in the present volume).

On the morphemic level, too, the relation of contiguous morphemes may sometimes be in full conformity with what has been said here about C and P. This is especially the case when morphemes are found to overlap: in such instances the right-hand side of the first morpheme and the left-hand side of the second morpheme have an element in common which, so to speak, functions *apo koinou* (as a rule, one and the same phoneme is evaluated as belonging to both contiguous morphemes). In other words, here again no boundary between the two morphemes can be drawn, such as would be identical with a boundary lying between two contiguous phonemes (the written language escapes such situations, at least in part, by preserving the optical make-up of both morphemes, v. ModE *im-mortal* as opposed to /i'mɔ:tl/). There is a tendency in the language aimed at the elimination of this vagueness by effecting a morphematic restructuring of such a word (more exactly, by effecting a change in the phonological structure of one of the morphemes or of both). Thus in the type /i'mɔ:tl/, /i'moubail/, /imə'tiəriəl/, /i'li:gəl/, /ili'džitimit/, /i'libərəl/, /i'regju:lə/ new morphemic evaluations arise of the type '/i/ + the basic morpheme'; the instrument of such re-evaluation is the so-called associative analysis, identifying the basic morpheme with its *vis-à-vis* in concrete expressions.²²

The relation of C and P in the domain of discourse is finally met with also on the level of the so-called functional sentence perspective, i. e. in the analysis of the utterance into the theme (topic) and rheme (comment). Already in 1939, V. MATHESIUS²³ pointed out that the theme (the starting point of the utterance) may consist of more elements. In that case "as centre of the theme functions the element that is more topical, and the other elements become concomitant... Also the rheme very often (and perhaps regularly) contains, apart from the centre, also concomitant elements which lead to that centre and join it with the theme... The theme and the rheme, if they consist of a greater number of words, are often mutually interwoven in various ways" (o. c., pp. 173—174). Also J. FIRBAS, whose writings systematically develop Mathesius's theory, in his detailed analysis consistently distinguishes not only the thematic and rhematic, but also the transitional elements of utterances (see, e. g., *SPFFB* A4, 1956, p. 94f., and Firbas' paper in the present volume), and the distinction proves to be very fruitful.

It can even be asserted that the conception of the functional perspective of utterances necessitates the assumption of transitional elements, as rigorous dichotomy of theme and rheme proves to be unpracticable in any more profound concrete analysis of utterances in any language.

By way of conclusion it may thus be said, summarizingly, that the correlative concepts of C and P, as well as the continuous transition joining the two, can be profitably applied in analyzing both the systemic and the sequential relations in language discourses, both in synchronic and in diachronic aspect. The relation of C—P seems to rank as a universal feature of language: it is only in the light of this relation that terms like "vagueness", "complexity", "uncertainty" and the like, can acquire some systemic significance.

Notes

¹ Cf. especially the collective volume *Universals of Language* (ed. by J. H. GREENBERG), Cambridge, Mass., 1963.

² S. KARCEVSKIJ, Du dualisme asymétrique du signe linguistique, *TCLP* 1, 1929, pp. 33—38; reprinted in *PSRL*, pp. 81—87.

³ See, e. g., V. SKALIČKA, Asymetrický dualismus jazykových jednotek [The Asymmetric Dualism of Language Units], *NŘ* 19, 1935, pp. 296—303 (Skalička's conception of asymmetry, however, is broader and less distinct). — P. SGALL—L. NEBESKÝ, Vztah formy a funkce v jazyce [The Relation of Form and Function in Language], *SaS* 23, 1962, pp. 174—189.

⁴ Sometimes the relation of C and P is also considered in relation to language levels. Thus A. W. DE GROOT, Structural Linguistics and Phonetic Law, *Archives Néerlandaises de phonétique expérimentale* 17, 1941, p. 85 f., formulated the following law: "A peripheral element may modify or neutralize, as far as form and function is concerned, a central element, but not *vice versa*". Here, however, C and P are obviously taken in a meaning different from ours; one should rather speak, in our opinion, of lower and higher levels, in the sense that the higher levels (which according to de Groot are "less central") may modify the lower levels. Cf. our own statement in our monograph *Intonace a věta ve spisovné češtině* [Intonation and Sentence in Standard Czech] (Praha 1957), p. 35: "... both in a sentence and in a non-sentence utterance, melody plays a decisive part because it may modify or even neutralize the lexical and syntactic structure of the sentence in some direction (but not *vice versa*); similarly, a lexical element may be modified or neutralized by syntactical means (or by melody)."

⁵ In a contribution to the discussion at the First International Symposium "Zeichen und System der Sprache", held at Erfurt in 1959 (cf. a short summary of the contribution in the 2nd volume of the proceedings of the Symposium, published in Berlin 1962, p. 62). See also J. VACHEK's monograph quoted here below, Note 14, Chapter I, and his paper in the present volume.

⁶ Some scholars come thus to very curious conclusions, such as G. L. TRAGER and B. BLOCH who prop up the position of [h] in the ModE phonemic pattern by their

assumption that it also exists in post-vocalic positions but is implemented there by the long quantity of the preceding vowel. (On this point, see VACHEK's monograph quoted below, Note 14, Chapter II.)

⁷ C. F. HOCKETT, *The Problem of Universals in Language*, in the collective volume quoted here above, Note 1, pp. 1—22; for the quoted passage see p. 20.

⁸ See also a concise, pioneering paper by J. NEUSTUPNÝ, *The Asymmetry of Phonological Oppositions*, operating with the term "vagueness", published in *The Bulletin of the Phonetic Society of Japan (Onsei gakkai kaiho)*, 106, 1961, p. 1—6 and also his paper in the present volume.

⁹ Cf. an apt statement by L. BLOOMFIELD: "... many forms lie on the border-line between bound forms and words, or between words and phrases" (*Language*, New York 1933, p. 181).

¹⁰ Cf. an interesting survey in R. ZIMEK's monograph *Problematika spony v ruštině v porovnání s češtinou* [On the Problem of the Copula in Contemporary Russian as compared to Czech], Praha 1963.

¹¹ Cf. K. HORÁLEK, *K teorii pojmenování* [Some Notes on the Theory of Naming], *Lexikografický sborník* (Bratislava 1953, pp. 9—24); SAME, *K metodice morfologických výkladů* [Remarks on Methods in Morphology], *SaS* 17, 1956, pp. 1—6. — Cf. also following statement by M. A. K. HALLIDAY, A. MCINTOSH, P. STREVS (The Linguistic Science and Language Teaching): "But not all items are either fully grammatical, or fully lexical; there is a scale between these extremes and some items fall more towards one polarity than the others" (p. 196).

¹² See M. DOKULIL, *Vývojové tendence časování v současné spisovné češtině* [Trends in the Development of Conjugation in Present Day Standard Czech], in: *O češtině pro Čechy* [Czech for the Czechs], Praha 1960, pp. 210—239.

¹³ Cf. also J. VACHEK, *The Place of [ɔ] in the Phonic Pattern of Southern British English*, *Linguistics*, No 14, 1965, p. 52—59. — It is worth noting that some recent sociological theories arrive at conclusions resembling our present view. Thus P. L. VAN DEN BERGHE in his article *Dialectic and Functionalism: Toward a Theoretical Synthesis*, *American Sociological Review* 28, 1963, pp. 695—705, discusses a model of the dynamic balance of social systems and states that the continuance of any system presupposes retaining certain minimum of integratedness; further, the author asks what is the empirical range of the changes of integration, i.e., how close a system may approach full balance and, on the contrary, what extent of non-balance it may tolerate.

¹⁴ J. VACHEK, *On Peripheral Phonemes of Modern English*, *BSE* 4, 1964, pp. 7—110. In the "classical" Prague terminology these terms did not stand out; VACHEK's *Dictionnaire de linguistique de l'École de Prague* (Utrecht—Anvers 1960) does not include them.

¹⁵ M. JOOS, *Linguistic Prospects in the United States*, in: *Trends in European and American Linguistics 1930—1960* (Utrecht—Anvers 1961), pp. 11—20, esp. p. 19; also, R. WELLS, *Is a Structural Treatment of Meaning Possible? Reports for the Eighth International Congress of Linguists*, Oslo 1957, pp. 197—209. — For an approach analogous to ours, see D. L. BOLINGER, *Generality, Gradience, and the All-or-None*, 's-Gravenhage 1961.

¹⁶ It is interesting to note that CHOMSKY's book also knows the concepts of the "centre" and "asymmetry" (also used by SKALIČKA — see here above, Note 2 — and HOCKETT): Cf. what he says on the kernel sentences and on transformations on p. 81 and in Note 6 to the same page ("In determining which of the related forms is more central, we are thus following the reasoning outlined by Bloomfield for morphology...").

— As for a gradual transition between the linguistic structure proper and the paralinguistic, see D. CRYSTAL and R. QUIRK, *Systems of Prosodic and Paralinguistic Features in English*, The Hague, 1964. The authors state explicitly (p. 12): "We are using the expressions 'prosodic' and 'paralinguistic' to denote a scale which has at its 'most prosodic' end systems of features (e.g., intonation contours) which can fairly easily be integrated with other aspects of linguistic structure, while at the 'most paralinguistic' end there are features most obviously remote from possibility of integration with the linguistic system proper... Since, therefore, both expressions have this 'more or less' character, there is no question of a sharp division between the two..."

¹⁷ On this point see also the above-quoted papers by J. NEUSTUPNÝ.

¹⁸ J. NEUSTUPNÝ has rightly pointed out that what we regard as a criterion for the purpose of our analytical practice constitutes a differential feature if viewed from the standpoint of language structure the qualities of which are to be described.

¹⁹ The survey of most important literature is given by H. KUČERA, *The Phonology of Czech*, The Hague 1961, p. 72. — The problem of the syllable was also dealt with in a number of communications read before the Fifth International Congress of Phonetic Sciences held in Münster i. W. in 1964 (see the Proceedings of that Congress).

²⁰ J. D. O'CONNOR—J. L. M. TRIM, Vowel, Consonant, and Syllable — A Phonological Definition, *Word* 9, 1953, pp. 103—122.

²¹ M. ROMPORTL, *Zvukový rozbor ruštiny* [The Acoustic Analysis of Russian], *AUC Philologica — Monographia III*, Praha 1962; see, e. g., his formulation on pp. 147—8.

²² Some part is obviously played here, too, by the way in which in practice words are divided into syllables, and possibly also, to some extent, by stress. The resulting /i-/ is, of course, an allomorph of /in-/ , /im-/ , etc.

²³ See V. MATHESIUS' paper "O tzv. aktuálním členění větém" [On the so-called Functional Sentence Perspective], *SaS* 5, 1939, pp. 171—174.