ON SOME TEXTUAL ASPECTS OF FSP:
DYNAMIC SEMANTIC TRACKS IN ACTION

Martin ADAM
Masarykova univerzita, Université Masaryk, Brno

RÉSUMÉ

La théorie firbasienne de la Perspective Fonctionnelle de la Phrase (PFP) a été pour l'essentiel explorée au niveau phrastique (Firbas 1992; Svoboda 1983). Plus récemment, néanmoins, on a prêté davantage d'attention au niveau, supérieur, du texte (Firbas 1995, Adam 2009, Drápela 2011). Les recherches menées à ce niveau ont pu montrer qu'une analyse de type PFP portant sur des macro-unités telles que le paragraphe ou le chapitre étaient prometteuses en ce qu'elles peuvent révéler des traits structuraux caractérisant l'ensemble d'un texte. Cet article essaie d'éclairer d'une part l'opération qui consiste à laisser des marques sémantiques dynamiques, de l'autre leur impact sur l'interprétation dans le cadre de la PFP. Nous illustrons la méthode par un texte extrait du Nouveau Testament, où l'analyse, dans ce cadre, ne saurait être univoque. L'article cherche également à montrer qu'en général les textes manifestent des propriétés qui permettent de distribuer le dynamisme communicatif à divers degrés, sur les unités de niveau supérieur, notamment sur toutes les unités fonctionnelles qui constituent la couche rhématique du texte.

ABSTRACT

The domain of the Firbasian theory of functional sentence perspective (FSP) has been explored mostly on the sentential level (Firbas 1992; Svoboda 1983). Recently, however, attention has been paid also to the functional picture of higher hierarchical levels of text (Adam 2009, Drápela 2011; cf. Firbas 1995). Research has shown that an FSP analysis of a distributional macrofield (a paragraph, a chapter) is a promising step taken in the study of FSP and that it can reveal significant characteristic features of a whole text. The paper tries to throw light on the operation of the dynamic semantic tracks and on their interpretative function in FSP, illustrating the method on a text extracted from the New Testament where an appropriate FSP analysis would not be otherwise unequivocal. The paper also sets out to demonstrate that texts generally manifest inner qualities that are capable of distributing the degrees of communicative dynamism over higher hierarchical units, above all the functional units within the rhematic layer of the text.

1. FSP FUNDAMENTALS

The theory of functional sentence perspective (hereafter abbreviated FSP) as aptly elaborated above all by Jan Firbas seems to have vindicated its firm place in the area of functional linguistics; it has been an integral and widely recognised part of the research into the theories of information structure (for a thorough survey of the theory of FSP see esp. Firbas 1992).

For more than a decade, our current research has been dealing with the theory of FSP, adopting the research methods prolifically elaborated by Firbas and the Brno branch of the Prague School followers (among others Firbas 1986, 1992, 1995; Svoboda 1981, 1989, 2006; Dušková 1988, 1998, 2008; Chamonikolasová 2007, 2010, 2014). Following late Firbasian tradition, our research into the area of the theory of FSP has predominantly dealt with the text material of religious discourse, to be more specific of biblical texts of narrative, dialogic and poetic character. The principal focus has predominantly been on FSP at the hypersyntactic level (cf. Firbas 1995; Daneš 1974; Pípalová 2010), viz. the establishment and operation of the dynamic semantic tracks, the phenomenon of the functional macrofield, notional homogeneity (or original Firbasian 'trend of thought', cf. Firbas 1961: 94), etc. (summarised in Adam 2009).

In a nutshell, FSP explores how a piece of information is produced in the act of communication, and also how different elements are given different communicative prominence, *i.e.* are emphasised (foregrounded) or made less significant (backgrounded) to achieve the author's communicative intention. In FSP, the very moment of utterance (or perception of a sentence) is thus a phenomenon of paramount importance. As Chamonikolasová (2000: 139) aptly notes Firbas' approach is "an approach of an independent observer who studies utterances without speculating about the process in the speaker's or listener's consciousness".

Though unique and autonomous, the theory of FSP may be labelled – in its essence and thanks to its field of research – by several linguistic hallmarks. Principally, it belongs among the so-called theories of information structure / information processing that deal with the distribution of information over different communicative units (Quirk et al. 1985: 1356-1377; Chafe 1994; Halliday 1994; Sgall, Hajičová and Panevová 1986; cf. Tárnyiková 2009). As FSP looks at individual sentences from the point of view of their function in the relevant context, it manifests many features of text linguistics and definitely draws on some of its major methods. Text linguistics views texts as elements strung together in definable relationships (see *e.g.* van Dijk 1985 or de Beaugrande and Dressler 1981), dealing with the analysis of the surface structures that unify the text on the one hand and the deep semantic relations between the elements on the other.

Last but not least, as far as the principal historical trends of linguistics are concerned, FSP is naturally interconnecting both structural and functional

approaches in the Praguian sense. Combining the approaches adopted by formalists and functionalists, the theory of functional sentence perspective draws on the findings presented by the scholars of the Prague School of linguistics. The key figure in the study and elaboration of FSP, Jan Firbas, found his inspiration in the teaching of his predecessor, Vilém Mathesius whose research was apparently instigated by the pioneering investigation presented *e.g.* by Weil, Paul, Marty and Gabelentz (for references and further details see Adam 2014). Mathesius was a true pioneer in the implementation of functional analysis of sentences viewing the sentence as a dynamic phenomenon developing in the act of communication (as opposed to the traditional formal analysis that considers a sentence a static body). In his linguistically prophetic research, Mathesius noticed the language tendency of every utterance towards having a theme and a rheme, and formulated the basic principles of what was to be labelled FSP only later (Mathesius 1975: 81). According to Mathesius' studies on the word order in Czech, the theme of a sentence represents the basis of the utterance / point of departure, that is what is being talked about (and hence is retrievable from the context), while the rheme is connected with the core of the message, that is what is being said about the theme (most often something that is not known from the context of the act of communication) (ibid.).

In Firbas's view, the sentence is a field of semantic and syntactic relations that in its turn provides a distributional field of degrees of communicative dynamism (CD); Firbas defines a degree of CD as "the extent to which the element contributes towards the development of the communication" (1964: 270). The most prominent part of information is the high point of the message, *i.e.* the most dynamic element; other elements of the sentence are less dynamic (have a lower degree of CD). The degrees of CD are determined by the interplay of FSP factors involved in the distribution of degrees of CD: linear modification, context and semantic structure (Firbas 1992: 14-16). In spoken language, the interplay of these factors is joined by intonation, *i.e.* the prosodic factor. It is the continuum of the degrees of CD along with the interplay of the basic FSP factors that make FSP specific within the field of text linguistics. CD basically operates on the level of a clause; the individual thematic and non-thematic elements form then thematic and non-thematic strings (see below). In other words, the theory of FSP transcends the domain of text grammar, enriching it with the approach adopted by the study of information processing. In his summarizing monograph, Firbas (1992: 41ff) also introduced the idea of the so-called dynamic semantic scales that are implemented in sentences; they functionally reflect the distribution of CD and operate irrespective of word order. In principle, Firbas distinguishes two types of dynamic-semantic scales: the Presentation Scale (Pr-Scale), in which a context-independent element is introduced on the scene, and the Quality Scale (Q-Scale), in which a quality is ascribed to a subject (for further details see Firbas 1992).

The domain of the theory of FSP has been explored mostly on the sentential level, *i.e.* in the area of the basic distributional field created by the clause. Recently, however, attention has been paid also to the functional picture of higher hierarchical levels of text; the research has shown that an FSP analysis of a distributional macrofield (a paragraph, a chapter) is a promising step taken in the study of FSP and that it can reveal significant characteristic features of a whole text (cf. Firbas 1995, Adam 2009).

This article proposes to examine the textual level of discourse from the point of view of functional sentence perspective; it focuses above all on two FSP phenomena: (1) the horizontal and vertical relations operating within the text, and (2) the interpretative function of the dynamic semantic tracks.

2. FSP ANALYSIS OF THE CLAUSE

Since the pioneering work of Jan Firbas' research into the theory of functional sentence perspective, the interpretative analysis of the clause has been the corner stone of FSP. Indeed, it is the FSP analysis of a basic distributional field (clause) that is the starting point of the functional inter-pretation. The very Firbasian notions connected with the functional and dynamic approach towards text derive from the functional analysis of the clause; Firbas claims that the central position in FSP interpretation "is occupied by distributional fields provided by independent verbal sentences" (1992: 11-12). He views a clause as "a field of relations" (syntactic and semantic above all) that determine the distribution of communicative dynamism (CD) over individual communicative units of the clause. Units carrying a lower degree of CD form the thematic part of the clause and those carrying a higher degree of CD form – together with so called transition – the non-thematic part of the clause (Firbas 1992: 80-81).

Since the sentence is a field of relations, it is necessary to define what is meant by a basic distributional field. Firbas (1992: 15-17) agrees with Svoboda (1989: 88) that "a sentence, a clause, a semi-clause and even a nominal phrase serve as distributional fields of CD in the act of commu-nication, and their syntactic constituents (*e.g.* subject, predicative verb, etc.) serve as communicative units". Through the interplay of the three FSP factors, it is then possible to identify the degrees of CD carried by the communicative units: according to the gradual rise of CD, it is theme proper (ThPr) – diatheme (DTh) – transition proper (TrPr) – transition (Tr) – rheme (Rh) – rheme proper (RhPr) (here presented in the so-called interpretative arrangement, *i.e.* according to the gradual rise in CD irrespective of the positions they occupy within the sentence (Firbas 1986: 47)

3. FSP ANALYSIS OF A MACROFIELD

As has been mentioned above, the principles adopted in the FSP analysis of a clause are applicable also to higher hierarchical levels of text, such as

paragraphs or chapters. The dynamic relations appear not to be restricted to the level of individual clauses but to exceed them, to operate on the supra-sentential, macro-structure level of a communicative macrofield (for details see Adam 2004: 17-18). Looking at an integral piece of text, we may iden-tify two types of vertical relations that are chained into the two following sequences: co-referential strings and dynamic-semantic tracks.

To illustrate the phenomena operating in the suprasentential dimension, an extract from *the New Testament* of *the Bible* will be now used (see below). Biblical texts have repeatedly proven to be a rich and suitable source of discourse analysis studies (most notably Firbas 1992 and 1995, Svoboda 1983, Adam 2004 and 2006). Especially the later studies published by Firbas dealt with a number of *Old* and *New Testament* texts. Firbas made it clear in his works that such text material represents a set of written discourse (of narrative, dialogic and poetic types) manifesting numerous remarkable lan-guage phenomena: both generally linguistic and text-specific. By means of illustration, let us now discuss an example of an FSP analysis where both types of chains are indicated. First, the text under analysis (discussed in detail in Adam 2006) will be presented in full, so that the reader may see the piece of writing in context. It is an extract taken form the New Testament, namely a passage from *the Gospel according to Luke*, chapter 2, verses 4-9 (Kohlenberger 1997: 387):

> [4]So Joseph also went up from the town of Nazareth in Galilee to Judea, to Bethlehem the town of David, because he belonged to the house and line of David. [5]He went there to register with Mary, who was pledged to be married to him and was expecting a child. [6]While they were there, the time came for the baby to be born, [7]and she gave birth to her firstborn, a son. She wrapped him in cloths and placed him in a manger, because there was no room for them in the inn. [8]And there were shepherds living out in the fields nearby, keeping watch over their flocks at night. [9]An angel of the Lord appeared to them, and the glory of the Lord shone around them, and they were terrified.

In Table 1 below, for the sake of illustration, the selected referential strings of 'Joseph', the 'baby Jesus' and the 'shepherds' respectively are presented in CAPITALS, whereas the dynamic-semantic track created in the rheme-proper layer is indicated by the use of *italics* (both these categories will be discussed separately below).

Martin ADAM

Verse	Clause	TrPr (conj)	ThPr	DTh	TrPr/Tr	Rh/RhPr	RhPr	Scale
2:4	4	So1		also4 from the town of Nazareth in Galilee5	went3	*to Bethlehem6*	*JOSEPH2*	Pr
5	5		there3	HE1	went to register2	*with MARY, who…4*		Q
	5a		TO HIM4	who1	was pledged2	*to be married3*		Q
	5b	and1	^		was expecting 2	*a child3*		Q
6	6			While they were there1	came3		*the time for the BABY to be born2*	Pr
7	7	and1		she2	gave birth3	*TO HER FIRST-BORN, A SON4*		Q
	8		She1	**him3**	wrapped2	*in cloths4*		Q
	9	and1	^ **him3**		placed1	*in a manger4 because there was no room for them in the inn5*		Q
8	10	And1	there2	out in the fields5	were3		*SHEPHERDS keeping watch over their flocks at night4*	Pr
9	11			**to them3**	appeared2		*An angel of the Lord1*	Pr
	12	and1	AROUND THEM4		shon3		*the glory of the Lord2*	Pr
	13	and1	THEY2		were3	*terrified4*		Q

Table 1. – FSP analysis of Lk 2:4-9

3.1. Co-referential strings

It is of crucial importance to distinguish between the co-referential strings on the one hand and the dynamic-semantic strings on the other. The co-referential strings are chains of individual communicative units with the

same referent; the string usually starts in the rhematic sphere and, moving across the transition, it finally establishes itself in the thematic layer (Firbas 1992: 27-29). In the thematic sphere, if the notion remains context-dependent, the process may continue within a number of distributional fields. In Table 1 above, one can easily follow the vertical run of three co-referential strings: those of 'Joseph', 'Mary', the 'baby Jesus' and the 'shepherds'. These strings may be presented in a simplified way as follows (Table 2):

JOSEPH (RhPr)	MARY (RhPr)	BABY (RhPr)	SHEPHERDS (RhPr)
↓	↓	↓	↓
HE (DTh)	SHE (DTh)	HER FIRSTBORN, A SON (Rh)	TO THEM (DTh)
↓	↓	↓	↓
TO HIM (ThPr)	SHE (ThPr)	HIM (DTh)	AROUND THEM (ThPr)
		↓	↓
		HIM (ThPr)	THEY (ThPr)

Table 2. – Co-referential strings of Lk 2:4-9

Firbas defines the co-referential strings as "linguistic elements naming or indicating the same extralinguistic phenomenon, in other words having the same referent" (1992: 32). In the flow of communication "co-referentiality links elements together, producing co-referential strings" (Firbas 1992: 63). In a sense (being 'in praesentia' relations that operate thanks to an activation of paradigmatic equivalences), the co-referential strings – in contrast with the syntagmatic quality of the FSP analysis of the clause – may partially be understood to run in the text in vertical direction, forming thus a field of paradigmatic relations.

3.2. Dynamic-semantic tracks

The other type of vertical chains – the dynamic-semantic tracks – is not based on such inter-layer relations as the co-referential strings are, but on the links established within one of the tracks exclusively. The existence and function of the dynamic-semantic tracks was first described by Firbas in relation to the concept of notional homogeneity of the RhPr layer (Firbas 1992: 77 and 1995: 64-66). The tracks are formed by all the thematic, transitional and rhematic elements of the text respectively. In other words, the rhematic track of a text, for example, may be described as a complete set of all the rhematic elements found in the given passage. Let us add that since the rhematic sphere is the most dynamic section of every piece of text (Rh-elements carry the highest degrees of CD), it is usually the rhematic track

that is central to the functional analysis of a text. Also the thematic and even transitional tracks are, however, capable of chaining into separate dynamic-semantic tracks.

Going back to Table 1, we can identify, for example, the following rhematic track constituted by all the rhematic elements:

> **RhPr:** Joseph → to Bethlehem → with Mary → to be married → a child → the time for the baby to be born → to her firstborn, a son → in cloths → in a manger → because there was no room for them in the inn → shepherds keeping watch over their flocks at night → An angel of the Lord → the glory of the Lord

Table 3. – The rhematic track of the text analysed

At this point let us comment on the semantic character of the rhematic track: a mere outline of its prominent members 'tells the story' and contains the information necessary for the reader to follow the narration. Thanks to this notional homogeneity, the dynamic-semantic strings are capable of summarising and communicating the main points of the message conveyed (for details see Adam 2003: 48-50). The enumeration of the rhematic elements neatly shows the semantic structure of the text and, at the same time, corroborates the significance and prominence of the rhematic layer. To be more specific, the scene of the text under discussion is gradually entered by four selected participants: Joseph, the baby, shepherds, and an angel – *i.e.* the elements that enter the course of communication for the first time and so carry the highest degree of CD. These RhPr notions are accompanied and semantically developed by the elements occupying the Rh layer (the third column from the right in Table 1).

3.3. Syntagmatic and paradigmatic relations within FSP

At this point, let us recall that the functional analysis of the basic distributional field created by the clause is a horizontal phenomenon characterised by syntagmatic relations between individual elements, whereas the FSP picture of a distributional macrofield formed by higher levels of text operates on the vertical axis and is characterised by two sets of paradigmatic relations (co-referential strings and dynamic-semantic tracks). Such a two-direction system of relations operating within the discourse logically corresponds with Ferdinand de Saussure's concept of the structure of the language system (de Saussure 1993). The most important kind of relationship, according to de Saussure, is a syntagmatic relation, *i.e.* a linear (or horizontal) one (de Saussure 1993: 170-172); this concept obviously reflects what has been said above in regards to the dichotomy of the horizontal – vertical relations in FSP analysis: in the interpretation, the syntagmatic relations are primary. Furthermore, de Saussure claims that individual syntagms acquire their value only because they stand in opposition to all elements before or after them.

Similarly enough, the degrees of CD are distributed over individual units according to the degree to which they contribute to the development of communication; in this sense, the syntagmatic relations are in concordance with one of the central factors in FSP, linear modification. In the act of communication, the meanings of individual elements continually move closer to the high point of the message to finally fulfil the communicative purpose of the author (Firbas 1992: 105).

The other type of Saussurean relationships that functions in the language system is labelled 'associative'. From the point of view of de Saussure's dichotomy, the associative relation "unifies individual notions into a virtual mnemonic chain", in other words, it creates associations of meaning among other members of the system (la *langue*) that are not a part of the syntagmatic unit (de Saussure 1993: 171). In this way, the associative relations correspond with the paradigmatic relations described in the theory of FSP; both are non-linear and associate notions in dynamic chains that – if arranged in a logical sequence – carry meaning. Let us now summarise the results deriving from the discussion above in Table 4 below:

DISTRIBUTIONAL FIELD	FSP LEVEL	TYPE OF RELATIONS	AXIS OF DIRECTION
basic field	clause / co-referential strings	syntagmatic	horizontal
macrofield	co-referential strings	paradigmatic (associative)	vertical
	dynamic-semantic tracks		
	text	paradigmatic-syntagmatic	horizontal-vertical

Table 4. – Multi-dimensional relations within FSP

3.4. FSP structure at the macrofield level

As mentioned above, the research into FSP has proved that the theory works at different levels of text units, whether lower or higher (for further details on the hierarchy of units in FSP, see Svoboda 1989 and Firbas 1992: 16ff). The following discussion applies an analogous approach to the material of a functional macrofield, *i.e.* within larger units of text. The idea is in harmony with Firbas' conclusions in terms of the function of the thematic and rhematic layers in a text. He showed that the dynamic-semantic tracks run through individual distributional fields and convey meaning not only in the clauses proper, but create a string of a higher level, which is across the layers (Firbas 1995).

The dynamic flow of communication may be traced literally throughout all basic distributional fields, going in the vertical direction. It seems that particular sections of the text have similar qualities, as the elements within clauses do; the structure of the text resembles the theme-rheme structure in a sentence. This – once hypothetical – phenomenon was traced within a limited stretch of narrative passages of the Gospel according to St. Luke (Adam 2004). In it, I showed that the passage under examination contained inner dynamism that is capable of distributing the degrees of communicative dynamism over higher hierarchical units; the paper was focused on functional units within the rheme proper layer, in which the most dynamic development of communication takes place. Below is the summative chart of the text in question:

EXPOSITION		COLLISION	CRISIS	PERIPETEIA	CATASTROPHE
(DTh)	DTh	Tr	RhPr	RhPr	RhPr
(Roman empire)	a census Augustus Joseph Mary	an angel shepherds good news	a Saviour a baby Christ the Lord	sign baby in a manger	heavenly host praising God

Table 5. – The functional structure of the sample narrative

To sum up, it is not merely the clause that may be analysed within the theory of functional sentence perspective – the same principles of FSP may be readily applied also to the higher level of text, *i.e.* distributional macro-fields (such as paragraph or chapter). The main concern has been the difference between the co-referential strings and the dynamic-semantic tracks. It follows that the above-mentioned horizontal – vertical relations are transparently traceable within FSP analysis; the multi-dimensional characteristics has been discussed also with regards to the dichotomy concepts offered by de Saussure.

4. THE FUNCTIONAL PRESSURE OF THE LAYER

In addition to the three basic factors operating in functional sentence perspective – context, semantics and linear modification – there are two more (auxiliary) ways of interpretation: first it is the comparison with other translations (*e.g.* in Czech, the factor of linear modification asserts itself more powerfully than it does in English), and, secondly, it is the functional pressure of notional homogeneity developing in the rheme proper layer (the clause is perspectived towards the newly-appearing participants of the communication). Section 4 of the present paper should throw some light on this interpretative function of the rhematic layer, illustrating the method on a text where an appropriate FSP analysis would not be otherwise unequivocal. It will demonstrate the essential function of the thematic and the rhematic

tracks of the text, treating them from the point of view of their notional homogeneity. As has been exemplified several times (see *e.g.* Adam 2000: 47-48), all dynamic-semantic tracks manifest a certain degree of semantic unity – following a track, one can observe different elements taken out of different distributional fields; most of them belong to one semantic field, though.

The interpretative function of the pressure constituted by the thematic and the rhematic layers will be illustrated by means of analysis of an extract from the New Testament again. The passage is taken from the First Epistle to Corinthians, namely 1Cor 15:24-28 as offered by the *New King James Version* (NKJV) of the Bible, *i.e.* one of the most widely-used translations (Adam 2000: 57-62; 2009). First, the text to be analysed will be presented in full (Kohlenberger 1997):

> [24]Then comes the end, when He delivers the kingdom to God the Father, when He puts an end to all rule and all authority and power. [25]For He must reign till He has put all enemies under His feet. [26]The last enemy that will be destroyed is death. [27]For 'He has put all things under His feet.' But when He says 'all things are put under Him,' it is evident that He who put all things under Him is excepted. [28]Now when all the things are made subject to Him, then the Son Himself will also be subject to Him who put all things under Him, that God may be all in all.

When reading the text, the reader may have problems with proper understanding of the message. These difficulties result from a great number of personal and possessive pronouns of the same type – *e.g.* 'He' (seven times), 'Him' (four times) or 'His' (twice). These pronouns denote either God the Father or the Son, *i.e.* Jesus Christ, which unfortunately reduces transparency of the message. The passage deals with the biblical concept of the end of the world, the second coming of the Lord Jesus, and the overall submission of all things under God. As the relationship among the people, the Lord Jesus and God the Father is quite a complex concept here, it is really necessary to know exactly which pronoun denotes the Father, and which the Son. Unfortunately, the NKJV translators did not manage to communicate the message in a clear, unequivocal way; the passage is rather vague in meaning, and the reader loses the thread of the text easily. To illustrate this infelicitous approach, an FSP analysis of the extract as offered in the NKJV translation will be presented; in Table 6 below, both the thematic and the rhematic elements denoting God the Father and the Son are presented in bold print.

The analysis shows that the treatment of the two main participants of the narration is not ideal. The frequent use of pronouns makes the text somewhat ambiguous and it is difficult indeed to follow the narrator's communicative purpose.

Verse	Clause	TrPr (conj)	ThPr	DTh	TrPr/Tr	Rh/RhPr	RhPr	Scale
15:24	1			Then1	comes2		the end3	Pr
	1a	when 1		**He2** the kingdom4	delivers3	**to God the Father5**		Q
	1b	when 1		**He2**	puts an end3	to all rule and all authority and power4		Q
25	2	For1	**He2**		must reign3	till...4		Q
	2a	till1	**He1**		has put2	all enemies3 under **His** feet4		Q
26	3			The last enemy that will be destroyed1	is2	death3		Q
27	4	For1	**He2**		has put3	all things4 under **His** feet5		Q
	5	But1	it3	when he says 'all things are put under **Him**'2	is evident4	that **He** who put all things under **Him** is excepted5		Q
28	6		**the Son Himself4**	Now1 when all things are made subject to **Him2** then3	will be5	subject to **Him** who put all things under **Him**, that God may be all in all6		Q

Table 6. – FSP Analysis of 1 Corinthians 15:24-28 – NKJV

Below is a simplified outline of the thematic (ThPr/DTh) and the rhematic (RhPr) strings as offered by the NKJV translation:

> **ThPr/DTh: He** (1a) → **He** (1b) → **He** (2) → **He** (2a) → **He** (4) → under **Him** (5) → the Son **Himself** (6) / **Him** (6)

> **RhPr:** God the Father (1a) → under **His** feet (2a) → under **His** feet (4) → **He** (5) / under **Him** (5) → to **Him** (6) / under **Him** (6)

Building on what has been said at the beginning of the paper about the interpretative function of the dynamic-semantic tracks let us suggest a possible solution of the problem. Turning our attention to the thematic and the rhematic layers respectively we find that it is feasible to trace the dynamic-semantic tracks constituted throughout the layers. Let us presuppose that in each of the two layers the tendency towards semantic homogeneity is strong enough to assert itself producing a more-or-less homogeneous semantic string. With this provision, it becomes much easier to decipher the "identity" of the persons denoted by all the pronouns used in the text. Under the circumstances, it is obvious that while the thematic layer conveys predominantly the notions of the Lord Jesus (the Son) – as clearly derived from clause (24), the rhematic layer implements almost exclusively the elements denoting God the Father – cf. clause (1a) again. Looking at the two semantic strings (Th –the Son; Rh – God the Father), the message of the text becomes clearer. As mentioned earlier, the passage concerns the end of the world, and explains the interrelations between the Lord Jesus and God the Father in this respect. All things will be put under Christ's feet, including his enemies and death. All this is done by God – he will put all the things under Christ. However, when the end comes, also Christ will be subject to God the Father. In other words, all things lead to the Creator – God.

This interpretation has been provided exclusively on the basis of the thematic and the rhematic layers; it is however in full harmony with what the Christian theology teaches (see *e.g.* Boice 1986: 462). The pressure of the layer is able to form an unambiguous dynamic-semantic string: instead of a confusing enumeration of pronouns we can follow a clear argument, supported by its local arrangement. The reader does not usually analyse the text in this way, though; the narration should be therefore treated differently. With the help of the layers we managed to "reconstruct" the author's intention, though this should be done preferably by the translator. Otherwise the message cannot be transmitted to the reader properly.

Let us now corroborate what has been said by presenting a translation that mediates the message of the text in a clear, but at the same time, sensitive way (see Table 7). It is taken from another translation of the Bible, the *New Life Study Testament* (NLST); its translators show that it is possible to treat the translation in regard to its purpose, which can be supported by the pressure of the dynamic-semantic tracks.

Verse	Clause	TrPr (conj)	ThPr	DTh	TrPr/Tr	Rh/RhPr	RhPr	Scale
15:24	1			Next1 at the end of the world2 **Christ3** **His** holy nation5	will give over4	to **God the Father5**		Q
	2		**Christ1**		will have destroyed2	every nation and power3		Q
25	3		**Christ1**		must be2	king3 until...4		Q
	3a	until1	He2		has destroyed3	all those who hate **Him** and work against **Him4**		Q
26	4			The last thing that will be destroyed1	is2	death3		Q
27	5			The Holy Writings1	say2	**God** has put all things under Christ's feet except **Himself3**		Q
28	6		**He2**	When **Christ** is over all things1 **himself3**	will put4	under **God**, who put all things under Christ5		Q

Table 7. – FSP Analysis of 1 Corinthians 15:24-28 – NLST version

Below is the simplified outline of the thematic and the rhematic tracks as offered by the NLST translation; it is apparent that in this text the pressure of the semantically homogeneous layers produces an unequivocal interpretation:

> **ThPr/DTh: Christ** (1) / **His** holy nation (1) → **Christ** (2) → **Christ** (3) → **He** (3a) → **He** (6) → **Christ** (7) / **Himself** (7)

> **RhPr: God the Father** (1) → **Him** (3a) / **Him** (3a) → God (5) / **Himself** (5) → under **God** (6)

As the analysis shows, the interpretation of the NLST extract is actually identical with the interpretation offered by NKJV in the preceding section. Both the interpretations take into consideration the semantic homogeneity of the thematic and the rhematic tracks, and are capable of presenting the narrator's communicative purpose in an unambiguous way. To be more

specific, the thematic layer is occupied predominantly by the elements referring to the notion of the Son Jesus Christ, while the rhematic layer implements primarily the notions of God the Father. Generally speaking, the thematic and the rhematic layers function in harmony with the semantic content of the text and reflect the distribution of communicative dynamism over the distributional fields (on the key role of semantic homogeneity as an FSP factor see also Drápela 2012).

5. CONCLUSIONS

To conclude, the present article has focused on the horizontal and vertical relations operating within the FSP macrofield as opposed to lower levels of text (the clause). As has been illustrated above, if we understand the FSP analysis of a clause as a horizontal process (the degrees of CD are distributed over individual communicative units in the syntactical sense), the dynamic-semantic tracks may be, in turn, viewed as a vertical phenomenon; they run through all the distributional fields "downwards". Following a track (for instance a rheme proper track), we get a vertical "cut" through all the text, creating a line of successive members of the RhPr track. It is then possible to make use of simplified outlines of all the members of the respective dynamic-semantic track. When both directions – horizontal and vertical – are applied, the functional picture of the text becomes more plastic and distinct. Such an approach apparently enriches the set of methodological tools available – the essential principles adopted in the theory of FSP are also applicable to higher levels of text, *i.e.* distributional macrofields. It seems that functional implementation of the vertical axis (to broaden the FSP analyses) is worth investigating and that the multi-dimensional approach to FSP opens new vistas to further research within text and corpus analysis.

It has also been shown that the functional pressure of the layers may corroborate (or violate) a hypothetical interpretation and thus "tip the scales" in dubious cases, distinguishing which direction a clause is perspectived. Over the years of the research into the domain of functional sentence perspective it has become clear that an appropriate FSP analysis is directly dependent on the precise interpretation of the distribution of the degrees of communicative dynamism. As has been shown, especially the RhPr (but also ThPr) tracks are functional in deciding which dynamic semantic scale the particular clause implements (Pr- or Q-scale); the analysis of 1Cor 15:24-28 (and many others, see *e.g.* Firbas 1995 or Adam 2003) has demonstrated the interpretative function of the Th- and the Rh-layers in connection with the semantic homogeneity. In other words, the structure of the thematic and the rhematic layers as such may serve a powerful interpretative tool in FSP analysis.

Whether such an application of FSP principles at the textual level may be adopted on a larger scale is still to be explored. Nevertheless, the above interpretation seems to suggest that the functional approach is not confined to the boundaries of clauses, but exceeds it into the domain of paragraphs and chapters.

REFERENCES

ADAM M. (2000). *Some Problems Concerning the Thematic and the Rhematic Layers in the Text*. Brno: Masaryk University.

ADAM M. (2003). *Religious text: the thematic and the rhematic layers within a distributional macrofield*. Brno: Masaryk University.

ADAM M. (2004). FSP analysis of a distributional macrofield. *Brno Studies in English* 30: 13-19.

ADAM M. (2006). The Horizontal – Vertical Dichotomy in FSP. *Brno Studies in English* 32: 13-21.

ADAM M. (2009). *Functional macrofield perspective (A Religious discourse analysis based on FSP)*. Brno: Masaryk University.

ADAM M. (2014). The Dramatic Arc of the Theory of FSP: A Tentative Diachronic Excursion. In: Drápela, M. (ed.), *Freedom in Linguistics: To the Memory of Aleš Svoboda.* Opava / Kolín: Albis Giorgio Cadorini. Forthcoming.

BEAUGRANDE R. de, DRESSLER W.U. (1981). *Introduction to text linguistics*. London: Longman.

BOICE J.M. (1986). *Foundation of the Christian Faith*. Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity Press.

CHAFE W.L. (1994). *Discourse, Consciousness, and Time*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

CHAMONIKOLASOVÁ J. (2000). Retrievability and Activation Cost. In: *6th Conference of British, American and Canadian Studies (Proceedings)*. Prešov: Prešovská univerzita. 134-145.

CHAMONIKOLASOVÁ J. (2007). *Intonation in English and Czech dialogues*. Brno: Masaryk University.

CHAMONIKOLASOVÁ J. (2010). Communicative Perspectives in the Theory of FSP. *Linguistica Pragensia* 20/2, 86-93.

CHAMONIKOLASOVÁ J. (2014). *On different approaches to the information structure of language*. Vienna: Peter Lang. Forthcoming.

DANEŠ F. (1974) Functional Sentence Perspective and the Organization of the Text. In: Daneš, F. (ed.), *Papers on Functional Sentence Perspective*. Prague: Academia. 106-128.

DIJK T.A. van (1985). *Handbook of discourse analysis*. London: Academic Press.

DRÁPELA M. (2012). On the suggestive semantic clue in functional sentence perspective. *Écho des études romanes* 8/1, 43-49. České Budějovice: Université de Bohême du Sud.

DUŠKOVÁ L. *et al.* (1988). *Mluvnice současné angličtiny na pozadí češtiny* [*Grammar of Present-day English on the background of Czech*]. Praha: Karolinum.

DUŠKOVÁ L. (1998). Syntactic forms of the presentation and their differentiation. *Linguistica Pragensia* 8/1, 36-43.

DUŠKOVÁ L. (2008). Vztahy mezi sémantikou a aktuálním členěním z pohledu anglistických členů Pražského lingvistického kroužku. [The relations between semantics and functional sentence perspective as seen by Anglicist members of the Prague Linguistic Circle]. *Slovo a slovesnost* 69 (1-2), 67-77.

FIRBAS J. (1961). On the communicative value of the modern English finite verb. *Brno Studies in English* 3, 79-104.

FIRBAS J. (1964). On defining the theme in functional sentence analysis. *Travaux Linguistiques de Prague* 1, 267-280. Prague: Charles University.

FIRBAS J. (1986). On the dynamics of written communication in the light of the theory of functional sentence perspective. In: Cooper, Ch. R.; Greenbaum, S. (eds), *Studying Writing: Linguistic Approaches*. Beverly Hills: Sage, 40-71.

FIRBAS J. (1992). *Functional sentence perspective in written and spoken communication*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

FIRBAS J. (1995). On the thematic and the rhematic layers of a text. In: Wårwik, B., Tanskanen, S.-K., and Hiltunen, R. (eds), *Organization in Discourse: Anglicana Turkuensia* 14. Turku: University of Turku, 59-72.

HALLIDAY M.A.K. (1994). *Functional Grammar*. 2nd ed. The Hague: Mouton.

HALLIDAY M.A.K., HASAN R. (1989). *Language, context and text: aspects of language in a social-semiotic perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

KOHLENBERGER J.R. (ed.) (1997). *The Contemporary Parallel New Testament*. New York: Oxford University Press.

MATHESIUS V. (1975). *A Functional Analysis of Present Day English on a General Linguistic Basis*. Praha: Academia (edited by J. Vachek, translated by L. Dušková).

PÍPALOVÁ R. (2008). *Thematic organization of paragraphs and higher text units*. Prague: Charles University.

QUIRK R. *et al.* (1985). *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.

SAUSSURE F. de (1993). *Course in General Linguistics*. Bally & Sechehaye 1915 (eds). New York: Pergamon Press.

SGALL P., HAJIČOVÁ E., PANEVOVÁ J. (1986). *The meaning of the sentence in its semantic and pragmatic aspects*. Reidel: Dordrecht.

SVOBODA A. (1981). *Diatheme*. Brno: Masaryk University.

SVOBODA A. (1983). Thematic elements. *Brno Studies in English* 15, 49-85.

SVOBODA A. (1989). *Kapitoly z funkční syntaxe* [*Chapters from functional syntax*]. Praha: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství.

SVOBODA A. (2006). Firbasovy sémantické škály a komunikační strategie. [Firbasian semantic scales and communicative strategies]. In: Hubáček, J. *et al.* (eds), *Pocta Evě Mrhačové*. Ostrava: University of Ostrava, 215-227.

TÁRNYIKOVÁ J. (2009). *From text to texture: an introduction to processing strategies*. 4th ed. Olomouc: Palacký University.