THE PRAGUE BULLETIN OF MATHEMATICAL LINGUISTICS 23, 1975

On Verbal Frames in Functional Generative Description II

Jarmila Panevová

7. In the present part of our paper we want to demonstrate the feasibility of our approach on a sample of Czech verbs. As we have mentioned in Part I, § 2.1, this sample consists of a group of verbs of motion, verbs of saying, verbs of simple working activities, and verbs with the highest frequency. Let us recall that four types of complements (objects) were distinguished in our proposal, namely (i) patient or objective (Pat), (ii) addressee or dativ (Addr), (iii) origin (Orig), (iv) result or effected object (Eff).[1] Our formal treatment of verbal frames is based on the classification characterized in § 4.2, even though we are aware that some counterarguments can be raised and we have outlined some other possible solutions. However, the chief aim of our discussion was to show that the formal apparatus of functional generative description (FGD) provides for the possibility to generate various combinations of complements. The quality of the framework will not be affected even if some particular verbs are assigned a different label as for their complement type.

7.1 Verbal frames are denoted in the sequel in a way similar to that of Fillmore. More than one meaning of a given verb is distinguished only if this distinction is made necessary by a difference in verbal frames; from the lexicographical point of view, this distinction is not made in a systematic way.

Among the verbs of s a y i n g , a group of verbs with three actants (inner complements) is distinguished (Pat, Addr, Eff, not speaking about Ag), with various combinations of obligatoriness and optionality of these complements (e.g. vysvětlovat - explain, tvrdit - claim, šeptat - whisper, říkat - say, vykládat - explain).[2a] Another class of verbs of saying has only two inner complements (Pat, Addr): e.g. zakazovat - prohibit, zmínit se - mention, svěřovat se - unbosom, otázat se - ask. Only a few verbs in this group have only a single inner part-

icipant (Pat) - e.g. oslovit - address, naříkat - bemoan, vypovídat - declare. Another type of complementation can be found with the verbs hovořit - speak, mluvit - talk with the verbal frame Ag(Pat][Addr][Manner][Instr), where each of the sentence (i) Hovořil o posledních událostech - He spoke about the latest events, (ii) Hovořil se sousedem - He spoke with his neighbour, (iii) Hovořil nahlas - He spoke aloud may be regarded as complete even from the point of view of semantic representation. A special type of verbal frame was found with the verb domlouvat - reprove, where Addr is an obligatory participant and Pat an optional one.[2]

As for the verbs of simple w o r k i n g a c t i v - i t i e s , the typical inner complement here is Pat; it is obligatory with some verbs (e.g. utírat - wipe, trhat - tear, plnit - fill), in other cases it is optional (pumpovat - pump, kreslit - draw, malovat - paint, prát - wash). It is often the case that the perfective and imperfective forms differ as for the obligatoriness of Pat: while the perfective forms have Pat as an obligatory complement, the corresponding imperfective form may occur even without Pat at all (or the place of Pat is filled by some type of general patient, cf. § 4.1). As a matter of fact, the occurrence of some kind of general patient is rather frequent with this group of verbs.

The verbs of m o t i o n often require direction as their inner participant; with such verbs as jet - go, jít - go/walk, direction is one of the complements with "relative obligatoriness" (i.e. one of those included in crossed brackets); similarly with such verbs as dostat se - get to, dovést - lead, vejít - enter, přiblížit se - approach, vrátit se - return.

The group of verbs with the highest f r e q u e n c y in the frequency list can be hardly characterized by any general feature at all.

It can be easily seen that there is a certain correspondence between the type of actant and its surface realization: this concerns before all the connection between agentive (Ag) and the surface subject in active sentences.[3] However, the following examples exemplify some exceptions to this correspondence:

(1) To (Pat) se mi (Ag) líbí.- I like it.(lit.: It - to me - - likes) Ag, Pat

(2) To (Pat) se mu (Ag) podařilo.- He succeeded in that.(lit.: It - to him - succeeded) Ag, Pat (in the sentence Výborně se to podařilo - It turned out wonderfully the agentive is described as a general agent)

(3)(a) Zdály se mi (Ag) smutné sny (Eff).- I dreamed sad dreams.(lit.: Dreamt - to me - sad dreams) Ag (Pat) Eff

(b) Zdálo se mi (Ag), že jsem na moři (Eff).- I dreamt that I was on the sea.

(c) Zdálo se mi (Ag) o tatínkovi (Pat).- I dreamt about my father.

(d) Záleží jí (Ag) na tobě (Pat).- You are of importance for her.(lit.: interest - to her - upon you)

If the frames of these verbs were chosen so as to correspond directly to the surface forms of the participants in question, then the patient of such verbs would be animate and the agentive would usually be inanimate (only with the verb líbit se - like this need not be the case: Někdo se mi líbí - I like someone; lit.: someone - is liked - by me). However, since the agentive primarily is animate and the patient inanimate, and since there are paraphrases such as (1′) to (3′), we have chosen another approach to the frames in question:

(1′) Něco se mi líbí.= Mám něco rád.(I like something)

(2′) Něco se mi podařilo.= Zvládl jsem něco.(I succeeded in something)

(3′) Zdálo se mi, že ... = Snil jsem, že ... (I dreamt that ...)

We have found neither in the literature nor in the structure of Czech any convincing arguments for regarding "mi" in the above examples as distinct from other cases of Tesnière's "1st actant" and for characterizing it as an addressee, recipient etc.

On the contrary, the verb ztratit se - to be lost is assigned here a frame Ag (Něco (Ag) se ztratilo - Something got lost), because the sentences Něco jsem ztratil (I lost something) and Něco se mi ztratilo (Something got lost to me) are not paraphrases.

The following examples of shifted participants can be quoted, where some other participant is shifted to the place of Pat:

Eff → Pat: domluvit, aby (induce to), podotknout, že (point out that), stát se čím (become someone), působit jako co (function as), učit se čím (be trained as) etc.

Orig → Pat: jmenovat se po kom (be named after someone), zůstat po kom (be left after someone), tvořit se z čeho (be formed from something)

7.2 In the functional generative description, the surface realization of participants is a matter of the so-called transductive components. The questions that should be solved by these components concern first of all the following two domains:

A/ the so-called systemic ellipsis, i.e. for instance the problems of potential sentence parts (in Daneš' terminology);[4]

B/ the choice of morphemic forms for the manifestation of particular participants, connected first of all with the government of verbs.

As for the systemic ellipsis, the inner participants that are obligatory on the tectogrammatical (semantic) level and potential on the level of surface syntax (called phenogrammatical in FGD), i.e. those that can be deleted in the course of transduction of the tectogrammatical representation to the phenogrammatical one, should be marked in some way in the verbal frame (in the notation we use, such a participant is underlined in the frame formula). Such an inner participant is obligatorily present on the tectogrammatical level in the form of a concrete lexical sementeme, and its deletion may depend on the structure of the text on the surface level. One of the conditions of this deletion may be the contextual boundness of the given participant;[5] the item it identifies has already been mentioned in the preceding text (directly or indirectly) or it may be known from the situation. Similar type of deletion can be seen, perhaps, with the addressee of such verbs as rozprávět - discuss, bavit se - have a chat, hovořit - talk, if the action is connected with mutuality (i.e. each other). Such a type of deletion should be provided for by a special rule in the transductive component.

The choice of a morphemic manifestation of a particular participant is given by a table of verbal government. However, there are also cases where two or more surface realizations of the same participant are possible. Let us illustrate this point by some examples; our discussion will also show that it is not often clear enough whether we are encountered with two synonymous morphemic variants realizing the same participant or whether we are concerned with two different participants already on the tectogrammatical level. In the latter case, the question then arises to which type the two participants belong. It should be considered with a great care, which of the two solutions to accept; let us only state that our standpoint obviously differs from the approach of those linguists who work with "Gesamtbedeutung" (general meaning of cases)[7], which is connected - if used in a consistent way - with the rejection of synonymy between cases or between prepositional morphemes.

With verbs as pomáhat s něčím / v něčem - help in / with something, vzít se za něco / o něco - advocate a thing / stand up for something, ukazovat něco / na něco - show something / point to something, měnit na něco / v něco - change in / into something, we regard the two forms rendering Pat (or Eff) as synonymous. With the pair of the forms dative/ /k někomu (to someone) rendering Addr with the verb pravit - say , the synonymy is not so clearcut: the difference between the two forms has perhaps a stylistic character (if the role of Addr is fulfilled by a name of a collective, the form k někomu (to someone) is preferred - cf. pravil k davu, k lidu - he said to the crowds, to the people). There is a slight difference in meaning also between the forms k něčemu / o něčem (to something - about something) with the verb vyjádřit se (tell one's opinion), only the former being connected with an extraneous approach of Ag to Pat. In our opinion, however, this difference is not deep enough to assign these participants to different types.

The choice of a morphemic form often depends on some contextual criterion; e.g. with čekal pět přátel - he expected five friends; čekal příjezd hostů - he expected an arrival of guests, the form of accusative is possible only if Pat has not

a temporal meaning, whereas the form na + Acc. (for + Acc) may be used with any participant (čekal na prázdniny - he waited for the holidays; čekal na pět přátel - he waited for five friends). With the verb platit - pay, the two possible realizations of Pat are accusative or za + accusativ (for); if a modification of measure is present, the only possible form is za + Acc. (zaplatil dovolenou / za dovolenou - he payed the holidays / for the holidays; but only zaplatil za dovolenou 3000 Kčs - he payed for the holidays 3000 Kčs). With the verb žádat - ask for, there are two combinations of forms for the inner participants Pat and Addr: o + accusative (Pat), accusative (Addr) on the one hand, and accusative (Pat), od + Gen (Addr) on the other, with a difference in meaning: e.g. Addr rendered by accusative presupposes a direct communication with the person in question, etc. We propose therefore to work here with two different verbal frames or with two different lexical meanings of the verb.

7.3 The distinction between inner participants and free modifications is connected with several other theoretical questions. It was not yet possible to find any solid empirical basis for a definite solution, and we shall therefore only characterize briefly the issues involved, illustrating them by some examples and presenting some arguments that suggest a possible description of the cases under discussion.

Let us add that these questions arise necessarily in any theoretical framework for the structure of the sentence nucleus; it can be regarded as an advantage of our framework that they become more evident.

7.31 Examining the cumulation of modifications of the same type in a single sentence (see § 2.1), we have seen that such a cumulation is possible with free modifications as well as with such cases where one of the cumulated modifications fills an obligatory position in the verbal frame.[8] It should be investigated, however, which of the cumulated participants assumes the role of an inner participant (as a part of the verbal frame) and which is a free modification (and may be - according to some views - derived from a higher predicate).[9]

a temporal meaning, whereas the form na + Acc. (for + Acc) may be used with any participant (čekal na prázdniny - he waited for the holidays; čekal na pět přátel - he waited for five friends). With the verb platit - pay, the two possible realizations of Pat are accusative or za + accusativ (for); if a modification of measure is present, the only possible form is za + Acc. (zaplatil dovolenou / za dovolenou - he payed the holidays / for the holidays; but only zaplatil za dovolenou 3000 Kčs - he payed for the holidays 3000 Kčs). With the verb žádat - ask for, there are two combinations of forms for the inner participants Pat and Addr: o + accusative (Pat), accusative (Addr) on the one hand, and accusative (Pat), od + Gen (Addr) on the other, with a difference in meaning: e.g. Addr rendered by accusative presupposes a direct communication with the person in question, etc. We propose therefore to work here with two different verbal frames or with two different lexical meanings of the verb.

7.3 The distinction between inner participants and free modifications is connected with several other theoretical questions. It was not yet possible to find any solid empirical basis for a definite solution, and we shall therefore only characterize briefly the issues involved, illustrating them by some examples and presenting some arguments that suggest a possible description of the cases under discussion.

Let us add that these questions arise necessarily in any theoretical framework for the structure of the sentence nucleus; it can be regarded as an advantage of our framework that they become more evident.

7.31 Examining the cumulation of modifications of the same type in a single sentence (see § 2.1), we have seen that such a cumulation is possible with free modifications as well as with such cases where one of the cumulated modifications fills an obligatory position in the verbal frame.[8] It should be investigated, however, which of the cumulated participants assumes the role of an inner participant (as a part of the verbal frame) and which is a free modification (and may be - according to some views - derived from a higher predicate).[9]

A similar question is connected with modifications understood as participants with relative obligatoriness (denoted by crossed brackets in our notation): if several modifications co-occur in a single frame, it is necessary to determine which of them undertake the role of an inner participant and which are free (this does not concern Pat, Addr, Orig, and Eff, which always are - according to our definition - inner participants). If this question were left unsolved, such sentence as Jan šel k mamince lesem - John went to his mother through the wood would be determined as ambiguous within two meanings depending on the fact which rule would be used for which of the two participants.

For the solution of both of the above-mentioned points the same criteria should be used; therefore we shall examine them together. Let us tentatively assume that for this investigation, the position of the boundness juncture in the sentence and the type of modification is to be taken into account. However, some empirical tests, which we have also tried to use, do not work; Koktová[10] assumes that a free modification can be made into an independent clause while an inner participant cannot: e.g. Na Václavském náměstí stál muž. - On the Wenceslas Place stood a man. (Bylo to na Václavském náměstí. Stál tam muž. - It was on the Wenceslas Place. There was a man standing there.- free modification); Muž stál na Václavském náměstí - A man stood on the Wenceslas Place (the latter example cannot be reformulated in a way analogous to the former one, and therefore the author regards it as an inner participant). However, in the latter case, both possibilities should be accounted for (which involves - as will be shown below - a semantic distinction between a modification of place and of time). It should be examined whether the mentioned test is valid in case the modification in question is in the main assertion replaced by an anaphoric word. Cf. the two possibilities in V turistické chatě jsme zůstali v Tatrách. - In a touristic challet we stayed in Tatra mountains.

(i) Bylo to (Stalo se to) v turistické chatě. Zůstali jsme v ní v Tatrách. - It was (It happened in) a tourist challet. We stayed in it in Tatra mountains.

(ii) V turistické chatě jsme zůstali. Bylo to v Tatrách.
(lit.: In a tourist challet we stayed. It was in Tatra mountains.)

Another criterion, that of the coordination of members included in crossed brackets points out to the fact that there are two possible relations between the members inside the brackets:

(iii) coordination is possible:
Šel do knihovny a pro chleba. - He went to the library and for bread.
Běžel se vykoupat a do lesa. - He ran to have a bath and to the forrest.
Ta se hodí do naší party a k mytí nádobí. - She is good for our squad and for washing the dishes.

(iv) coordination is not possible:
*Slouží dobře a ke grilování masa. - It serves well and for grilling the meat.
*Jede na kole a k rybníku. - He goes on a bike and to the pond.

The participants of the type (iii) apparently belong to what we called a hypercase (see § 2.1; it is therefore necessary to take into consideration the solution we propose there , namely to provide for this case by means of the distinction between a functor and a grammateme.

7.32 A solution of the above-mentioned problem is a very difficult task since it involves an interplay of several factors. For the time being,in our discussion we take into consideration only a co-occurrence of two modifications of the same type or of two modifications of types included in crossed brackets, within one sentence. This problem, left open for further investigation, is connected with (1) a distinction between a local and a temporal adverbial (in semantic representation) and with a question whether (1′) an underlying temporal specification can be realized on the surface as direction (from, to) or as manner; (2) the position of the modifications under examination with regard to the verb is further influenced by an interplay of some other factors: (2a) each of the modifications is placed on different sides of the verb, (2b) both modifications are contextually bound (op. c. in Note 5) and

stand before the verb, (2c) both modifications are ordered according to the systemic ordering and stand after the verb. As we have already mentioned, (3) the place of the boundness juncture is also relevant for the issue under discussion. Furthermore, it should be investigated (4) whether there is a distinction between cases where the contextual boundness can be determined by the situation of the discourse and those, where a previous mentioning in the text is necessary (e.g. in Yesterday it rained. there is a temporal setting, whereas in By car he went to Chicago. the car must have been mentioned in the preceding co-text; this member does not belong to a setting, but it belongs to some other part of the topic). (5) The semantic relationship between two modifications can range from strict inclusion (In New York he lived in Harlem.) through such pairs as In Italy he lived in a tent. or overlappings (In Bulgaria he lived at Black Sea.) to cases without any such links (To school he went for his daughter.); this variety has its consequences for the possibility of combinations inside a sentence, as we shall see below. (6) In connection with (1) it still remains to be examined under what conditions one of the modifications can be analyzed as derived from a coordinated or embedded underlying sentence.

We shall attempt now to divide the examples under examination into several groups (we concetrate for the time being on sentences with two modifications with a single verb with the order one before the verb, one following the verb, the boundness juncture being denoted by a slant line):

(i)(1) V Praze / bydlel na Vyšehradě. - In Prague / he lived in Vyšehrad.

(2) V Itálii / bydlel ve stanu. - In Italy / he lived in a tent.

(3) U příbuzných / zůstal na chatě. - With his relatives / he stayed in the challet.

(4) V Bulharsku / bydlel u Černého moře. - In Bulgaria he lived at the Black Sea.

(ii)(5) K příbuzným / přijel do Řevnic. - To his relatives / he came to Řevnice.

(6) Na kole / jel do Plzně. - On the bike / he went to Pilsen.

(7) Pro dceru / došla do školy. - For her daughter / she came to school.

In the group (i), the first modification is a setting (which is always contextually bound), and in all cases it is derived from a temporal embedded clause.[11] The sentences are - under certain assumptions - answers to such a question as Co se stalo? - What has happened?, Co je nového? - What's the news?[12] In these cases, the inner participant is that modification which is not contextually bound (it is underlined in the above examples).

In the group (ii), the modification at the beginning of the sentence is not a setting, but it is known from the context, i.e. it is contextually bound. The sentence (5) - under the assumption mentioned in Note 12 - is an answer to Co je s příbuznými? - What's the matter with the relatives?; similarly, the sentence (6) is an answer to the question Co jste říkal o kole? - What have you said about the bike? The "slot" for an inner participant in the verbal frame of the given verbs seems to be filled by the modification included in the question, i.e. by a contextually bound participant. The contextually non-bound modification is an additional specification, which is free: (5) K příbuzným přijel, a sice do Řevnic. - To relatives he did come, which is to Řevnice.

(iii) (8) V Praze bydlel / na Vyšehradě. - In Prague he lived / on Vyšehrad.

(9) V Itálii bydlel / ve stanu. - In Italy he lived / in a tent.

(10) U příbuzných zůstal / na chatě. - With relatives he stayed / in the challet.

(11) V Bulharsku bydlel / u Černého moře. - In Bulgaria he lived / at the Black Sea.

About this group the same can be said as about the group (i) except for the fact that the sentences (10) and (11) are ambiguous (each of the modifications can have a temporal source): as a rule these sentences are disambiguated by the context. In (11) the modification v Bulharsku - in Bulgaria is not a setting in the context as Můžeš mi říci, kde bydlel v Bulharsku? - Can you tell me where he lived in Bulgaria?, in the sentence (10) the modification u příbuzných - with relatives is not a setting in the context Ve městě nikdy nezůstává u příbuzných, vždycky jede

domů. Kdy tedy u nich zůstal? - In the town he never stays with his relatives. He always goes home. When then does he stay with them?

(iv)(12) K příbuzným přijel / do Řevnic. - To his relatives he came / to Řevnice.

(13) Na kole jel / do Plzně. - On a bike he went / to Pilsen.

(14) Pro dceru došla / do školy. - For her daughter she came / to school.

In this group, the "slot" for an inner participant is filled by a modification that is contextually bound; the newly attached modification is more free.

With a reverse order of the modifications the situation is not quite symmetric:

(v)(15) *Na Vyšehradě bydlel v Praze. - On Vyšehrad he lived in Prague.

(16) Ve stanu / bydlel v Itálii. - In a tent / he lived in Italy.

(17) Na chatě / zůstal u příbuzných. - In the challet he stayed with his relatives.

(18) U Černého moře / bydlel v Bulharsku. - At the Black Sea / he lived in Bulgaria.

The unacceptability of (15) is connected with the fact that a narrower specification (under the assumption of a single Vyšehrad, an in - a single - Prague) cannot be a setting. The example (16) also does not belong to this group because here the modification at the beginning of the sentence cannot be a setting; it is in the contextually bound part of the sentence (as in (ii)); similarly as above in (ii), a contextually bound modification is an inner participant here. The sentences (17) and (18) are from the mentioned point of view ambiguous, the disambiguation of them being usually done by context. For instance, (18) in the co-text Co dělal u Černého moře? - What did he do at the Black Sea? the modification u Černého moře is a temporal setting and the non-bound modification is an inner participant; in the co-text Co bylo s Černým mořem? - What was the matter with the Black Sea? the modification u Černého moře is an inner participant (locative).

(vi)(19) Do Řevnic / přijel k příbuzným. - To Řevnice / he came to his relatives.

(20) Do Plzně / jel na kole. - To Pilsen / he went on a bike.

(21) Do školy / došla pro dceru. - To school / she went for her daughter.

Similarly as in (16), here the first modification is not a setting and it fills the slot for an inner participant.

(vii)(22)* Na Vyšehradě bydlel / v Praze. - On Vyšehrad he lived / in Prague.

(23) Ve stanu bydlel / v Itálii. - In a tent he lived / in Italy.

(24) Na chatě zůstal / u příbuzných. - In the challet he stayed / with his relatives.

(25) U Černého moře bydlel / v Bulharsku. - At the Black Sea he lived / in Bulgaria.

If in the sentence (24) and (25) - i.e. with a contextually bound verb - the contextually bound modification is a setting, then the "slot" for an inner participant is filled by a contextually non-bound modification; if the contextually bound modification is not a setting, then it itself becomes an inner participant (and it is the non-bound modification that is assumed to have a temporal source). The sentence (23) differs in this respect from the sentence (24) and (25), since in the former only the non-bound modification may have a temporal character.

(viii)(26) Do Řevnic přijel / k příbuzným. - To Řevnice he came / to his relatives.

(27) Do Plzně jel / na kole. - To Pilsen he went / on a bike.

(28) Pro dceru došla / do školy. - For her daughter she came / to school.

The inner participant in these examples is that modification which is underlined.

It seems that this classification involves the criteria 1, 2a, 3 and 4; it will be necessary also to deal with the criterion 5 (the semantic kind of the modification), which has been left aside in our considerations. Another question consists in whether a temporal underlying structure can be assumed also with the specification of direction, means and purpose in our examples. If this is the case, then with the groups (ii) and

(vi) the conclusions will remain the same, but with the groups (iv) and (viii) we should count with ambiguity: e.g. if the sentence (26) is taken as an answer to Kam přijel, když přijížděl do Řevnic? - Where did he come when he was coming to Řevnice?, the inner participant would be that modification which is contextually non-bound; similarly with other examples - the result would thus differ from what was stated above. Presumably it is not also immaterial that the sentence (26) may be an answer to Ke komu přijel do Řevnic? - To whom did he come to Řevnice?, and the sentence (27) to Na čem jel do Plzně? - On what did he go to Pilsen?; the "case" question would probably point to the inner participant.

We have tried in the above classification to take into account several interplaying factors; this, however, does not mean that some other factors cannot be found that would be important, or that we suppose to have found a definite answer to the given issue. It will be necessary to analyze also other word order variants of the quoted examples (e.g. of (2b), (2c)), and also with more than two modifications. We think that it is important to raise the mentioned problems and to consider which of them are semantically relevant (and as such should be distinguished by means of the description) and which are not (and where one can be reconciled even with the fact that a sentence may have several derivational histories, this syntactic ambiguity having incidentally no impact on the cognitive content).

7.33 Another group of questions considered as open for further discussion and requiring a more detailed examination is connected with the so-called hypercases. We have already discussed some possibilities of combining several participants into one "hypercase" (e.g. place: in, under, beside, etc.; purpose and intention), but a more detailed analysis of the participants in question would be necessary to bring convincing arguments for an introduction of the notion of hypercase into our framework. The introduction of "polyfunctional" participants (if we understand well the description of some examples of inner participants in works mentioned in Note 1) needs not only a further empirical investigation but also a discussion of its usefulness in the given framework. Perhaps the so-called shifting of participants

(in which the level of ontological content is concerned) we have spoken about in Part I, § 5, is connected with the latter problem.

7.4 When analyzing our sample of verbs, we have arrived at 55 disjunct subsets of verbs with different verbal frames; this classification of the sample is given in Appendix 2. In Appendix 1 our analysis of the sample is illustrated by some examples. With each verb, the presence of a particular inner participant is denoted by + (obligatory) or (+) (optional) in the respective column on the left-hand side of the table; on the right-hand side, the surface realization of particular inner participants with the given Czech verbs is shown, where the symbol % in the column Ag stands for nominative in non-passive sentences, VV stands for a dependent clause; the underlined forms are Czech prepositions (connected with the abbreviation of the given morphemic case attached by +). Let us recall from our above discussion that the classification of Pat and Eff and their interrelation as applied in our formal treatment is still open for further discussion.

In the last part of our paper we present the rules by means of which any of the treated verb would be generated with any of the acceptable combination of its inner participants. The shape of the rules is based on the first version of the generative component of FGD[13], which is now experimentally tested in an extended form on the computer[14]. The generative rules have the form of context-free phrase-structure rules, in which the relation of dependency is introduced by means of functors. The inner participants are generated here in the order of their communicative importance (the so-called systemic ordering) based on a hypothesis formulated in Sgall, Hajičová and Benešová, op. cit. in Note 5, p. 67. In the surface structure, only agens is generated on the left-hand side of the verb, according to this hypothesis for Czech; other participants follow the verb in the following order: how long, where, manner, accompaniment, instrument, addressee, origin, patiens (objective), from where, which way, to where, effectum, measure (extent), condition, interest (benefit), aim (purpose) - if we include here only those complements and modifications that play a role of an inner participant in our sample. Free modifications can be generat-

ed by means of recursive rules, which are not included in the set of rules quoted below, because the positions of these modifications in the systemic ordering need not be the same as with the inner participants and hence are not yet clear enough. The output of the rules are the classes of verbs V_i ($1 \leq i \leq 55$) as contained in Appendix 2; this Appendix may then serve instead of rules containing the terminal lexical semantemes. We use here a simplified notation of the type of determination (grammateme).

1. Pred → $\begin{cases} NP_o\ R_a\ VP_o \\ \Delta_i\ R_a\ VP_o \\ NP_o\ R_a\ V_{35} \\ V_{17} \\ V_{35} \\ VP_o^{ba} \end{cases}$ i = general actor 1, general actor 2, general actor 3

2. $VP_o^{ba} \rightarrow V_{19}\ R'_p\ NP_o$

3. $VP_o \rightarrow$

$V_a\ R'_d\ NP_o$ – aim	a = 12,15,16,22,29,131
$V_7\ R'_d\ NP_o$ – interest	1 = 28,38,39,42,45,46,48, 50,103,133,138,139,140, 143,144,145,146,148, 149,152,334,338,339
$V_{10}\ R'_d\ NP_o$ – extent	
$V_n\ R'_{eff}\ NP_o$	
$V_m\ R'_d\ NP_o$ – to where	m = 4,12,14,15,16,21,22, 123,126,153,155
$V_k\ R'_d\ NP_o$ – which way	k = 9,14,15,16,123,147
V_8	i = 1,9,13,19,20,21,22,24, 25,27,30,33,36,37,38, 39,40,41,44,46,48,52, 241,248,302,313,332, 336,337,429,454,551, 355
$V_{126}\ R'_d\ NP_o$ – from where	
$V_i\ R'_p\ NP_o$	
$V_h\ R'_{orig}\ NP_o$	
$V_f\ R'_{addr}\ NP_o$	
$V_c\ R'_d\ NP_o$ – instrument	
$V_{15}\ R'_d\ NP_o$ – accompaniment	h = 3,41,48,49
$V_e\ R'_d\ NP_o$ – manner	f = 13,32,36,37
$V_d\ R'_d\ NP_o$ – where	c = 13,16
$V_{11}\ R'_d\ NP_o$ – how long	e = 5,13,14,15,16,24
V_p	d = 6,14,20
	p = 18,25,36,39,41,48,49, 52,338,339,429

4. $V_x \rightarrow$	$V_{x-100}\ R'_p\ NP_o$	x = 102,103,123,126,131, 133,138,139,140,143, 144,145,146,147,148, 149,152,153,155
5. $V_y \rightarrow$	$V_y\ R'_p\ NP_o$	y = 10,28,29,32,34,42,45, 50,338,339
6. $V_z \rightarrow$	$V_z\ R'_{orig}\ NP_o$	z = 3,30,40,42,46,48,49, 50,52
7. $V_w \rightarrow$	$V_{w-200}\ R'_{orig}\ NP_o$	w = 241,248
8. $V_v \rightarrow$	$V_v\ R'_{addr}\ NP_o$	v = 27,28,33,50
9. $V_q \rightarrow$	$V_{q-300}\ R'_{addr}\ NP_o$	q = 302,313,332,334,336, 337,338,339,355
10. $V_u \rightarrow$	$V_{u-400}\ R'_d\ NP_o$ - manner	u = 429,454
11. $V_{551} \rightarrow$	$V_{51}\ R'_d\ NP_o$ - where	

Note. A and R´ with subscripts are conceived of as functors with two arguments, written to the left and to the right of the functor; for the sake of simplicity, the necessary parentheses are omitted here.

From a symbol for predication (Pred) the first rule generates the left inner participant connected with the governing verb phrase (VP_o) by the functor R_a; the left participant (agens) is either an NP_o (a noun phrase, or an embedded predication) or it is general (we distinguish here three possible meanings of a general agens[15]). V_{17} is such a class of verbs which are "agentless" and do not have any other participant; V_{35} is such a class of verbs that are either agentless, or have an agens but do not have any other participant. The symbol VP_o^{ba} denotes verb phrases containing an agentless verb that is connected with some other participant, too; among the verbs analyzed here only the class V_{19} belongs there. By an application of further rules, the verb phrase VP_o is rewritten either directly as some class of verbs V_i and is modified by some

inner participant (in the order from the most right-hand side member in the systemic ordering), or is not modified, but only rewritten as V_i, or is not rewritten as V_i ($1 \leq i \leq 55$) directly but by means of another non-terminal symbol V_k ($k > 100$), which indicates that in some further rules some other inner participant(s) will be added. Let us recall here, that in case the verb has in its frame e.g. (Pat)(which way) and the "slot" for an inner participant is filled by the modification of the type Pat, then the modification "which way" has a character of a free modification; similarly if with a verb of the frame (which way / where / to where / how) the slot for an inner participant is filled e.g. by the modification of the type where, then the modifications to where, how and which way are free modifications. The rules, however, provide for a possibility of any of the participants in such frames to be an inner participant with other modifications being free.

1 When the theoretical background of various approaches to the sentence nucleus (verbal frames) are compared, at least two streams may be traced. One of them, initiated in our country by E. Pauliny (Štruktúra slovenského slovesa - The Structure of Slovak Verb, Bratislava, 1943), shows certain similarities with what has been recently stated about the role of noun phrases as participants of verbs by R. S. Jackendoff (Semantic Interpretation in Generative Grammar, Cambridge, Mass., 1972, p. 34), who bases his account of these relationships on the stimulating analysis by J. Gruber (Functions of the Lexicon in Formal Descriptive Grammars, mimeo, 1967). A single NP may have according to Pauliny, Gruber and Jackendoff more than one semantic function (see Pauliny's formulations about a goal merging with agent, e.g. brat ide - brother goes; similarly Jackendoff treats the English verb roll in a way as a reflexive verb). A hint in a similar direction can be also found with Daneš (Vědecká synchronní mluvnice spisovné češtiny - A Scientific Synchronic Grammar of Standard Czech, Komise pro studium gramatické stavby při Mezinárodním komitétu slavistů, Praha 1974, p. 11) - at least with some participants, e.g. To okno rozbil vítr - That window was broken by wind - vítr is said to have a dual role Ag/Element. To the second stream, represented by Fillmore, Tesnière, Apresjan, Helbig and others, each of the individual NP's occurring with a given verb is assigned just one participant label.

1a The present contribution is based on an analysis of Czech verbs; the English equivalents, of course, do not always agree in their syntactic and semantic properties with the quoted Czech examples.

2 The meaning of verbs of saying are analyzed by F. Daneš (Verba dicendi a výpovědní funkce - Verbs of saying and utterance function, Studia Slavica Pragensia, 1973, 115 - 124) from the point of view of the "case slots" in their semantic formulae (according to Daneš, these are always speaker, addressee and the information; with different

verbs there are different relations among these three elements). Cf. also other Daneš' studies on the structure of verbal meanings (Pokus o strukturní analýzu slovesných významů - An Attempt at a Structural Analysis of Verbal Meanings, Slovo a slovesnost 32, 1971, 193 - 207; K struktuře slovesných významů - On the Structure of Verbal Meanings, Jazykovedné štúdie 12, 1974, 142 - 152).

3. This does not mean that our description of complement is determined by its surface form only. We can say only that if there is no deeper reason to introduce a new unit of meaning, we base the classification on the given surface form.

4. F. Daneš, Větné členy obligatorní, potenciální a fakultativní - Obligatory, Potential and Optional Sentence Parts, Miscellanea Linguistica, Ostrava 1971, pp. 131 - 138; Vědecká synchronní mluvnice spisovné češtiny - A Scientific Synchronic Grammar of Standard Czech, Komise pro studium gramatické stavby, Praha, 1974, p. 8.

5. For the notion of contextual boundness, see P. Sgall, E. Hajičová, and E. Benešová, Topic, Focus, and Generative Semantics, Kronberg im Taunus, 1973.

6. The Czech sentence Účastníci se dobře bavili - The participants enjoyed talking /with each other or with somebody/ is ambiguous. On its first reading, the Addr (which is an optional participant with this verb) is absent; on the second, the Addr (corresponding roughly to "with each other") is deleted in the course of transduction from the tectogrammatical to the phenogrammatical level.

7. We suppose that convincing arguments against an unconditional application of the theory of general meaning have been presented by C. E. Bazell, Syntactic Relations and Linguistic Theory, CFS 8, 1949, pp. 5 - 20 and J. Kuryłowicz, Le problème du classment des cas, BPTJ 9, 1949, pp. 20 - 43. In spite of this, it is still sometimes assumed that all meanings of a case or of some other morpheme can be fully described only by representing them as being derivable from a single meaning, cf. e.g. recently P. Novák, K věcné platnosti pádů, jejich tzv. celostnímu (obecnému) významu a lo-

kalismu - On the Objective Function of Cases, their so-called General Meaning and Localism, Slovo a slovesnost 35, 1974, pp. 88 - 95; his case function F_2 stands evidently most closely to our understanding of cases (simple or prepositional); his F_3, if we understand well his reasoning, concerns our "hypercases" (it is not, however, clear here, what is to be understood under "the common objective background" -"společné věcné pozadí"); the distinction between F_1 and F_5 is connected with a fairly different domain of problems, which - similarly as the function F_4 (connected with a hitherto unclarified notion of "semantization") - can be perhaps discussed in a more concrete way just on the basis of an explicit account of the function F_2.

8. Even though e.g. Fillmore works with a principle according to which any case occurs only once per sentence. Cf. below § 7.31.

9. Cf. R. Bartsch, Adverbialsemantik, Frankfurt a/M., 1972.

10. E. Kaňková, Určení okolnostní a intenční (manuscript).

11. In J. Panevová, Inner Participants and Free Adverbials (prepared for PSML 6) we have mentioned that for some surface local specification we presuppose an underlying structure with a temporal character (for this question cf. also R. Steinitz, Adverbial syntax, Studia Grammatica X, Berlin, 1969, and F. Miko, The Generative Structure of the Slovak Sentence, The Hague-Paris, Bratislava, 1973, esp. p. 98). We have analyzed some examples without claiming to have reached a clear specification of the conditions under which the local specifications have an underlying semantic temporal source. We have tried to show that the examples as (1) are very typical for this situation: v Praze - in Prague plays here a role of a temporal setting.

12. The conditions permitting the use of the sentence (2) as an answer to this question include that among the foregrounded elements of the shared knowledge there is somebody who had returned from Italy, in sentence (3) the family relations are foregrounded, etc. Thus the question test is used here

in connection with conditions of this kind (a part of the topic being given not by the question itself, but by the situational background common to the question and to the answer); cf. op. cit. in Note 3, pp. 50 and 60.

13. Cf. P. Sgall, Generativní popis jazyka a česká deklinace - Generative Description of Language and Czech Declension, Prague, 1967, pp. 99 - 102; slightly modified in P. Sgall, L. Nebeský, A. Goralčíková, and E. Hajičová, A Functional Approach to Syntax, New York, 1969, pp. 95 - 98.

14. Cf. A. Říha, S. Machová, Computer Testing of a Generative Grammar, paper presented at 1973 Int. Conference on Computational Linguistics, Pisa.

15. J. Panevová, Věty s všeobecným konatelem - Sentences with General Actor, Studia Slavica Pragensia, Praha 1973, pp. 133 - 144.

Continue →

Appendix 1

	Ag	Pat	Addr	Orig	Eff	Det
bavit se	+	(+)	(+)	-	-	-
dokazovat	+	(+)	(+)	-	+	-
doporučovat	+	+	(+)	-	-	-
mluvit	+	(+)	(+)	-	-	(how)
oslovit	+	+	-	-	-	-
připomenout	+	(+)	(+)	-	+	-
svěřovat se	+	(+)	+	-	-	-
vyptávat se	+	+	(+)	-	-	-
balit	+	+	-	-	(+)	-
česat	+	+	-	+)	(+)	-
čistit	+	+	-	-	-	-
házet	(+)	+	-	-	-	to where
kreslit-impf	+	(+)	-	-	-	-
kreslit-perf	+	+	-	-	-	-
$lít_1$	+	+	-	.+)	-	-
$lít_2$(pršet)	-	-	-	-	-	-
mlít-impf	+	(+)	-	(+)	(+)	-
mlít-pšrf	+	+	-	(+)	(+)	-
sázet	+	+	-	-	-	-
tavět	+	(+)	-	(+)	(+)	-
dojít	+	-	-	-	-	to where, aim
jet	+	-	-	-	-	to where, instr. which way, aim
odejít	+	-	-	-	-	from where
přibližovat se	+	-	-	-	-	to where

Continue

Appendix

Verbal frame	Ag	Pat	Addr	Orig	Eff
Ag(Pat)(Addr)	%	ø+Loc	g+Instr		
Ag(Pat)(Addr)Eff	%	o+Loc	Dat		Acc,VV
Ag Pat(Addr)	%	VV,Acc	Dat		
Ag(Pat|Addr|how|instr)	%	o+Loc	s+Instr		
Ag Pat	%	Acc			
Ag(Pat)(Addr)Eff	%	ɔ+Loc	Dat		VV,Acc
Ag(Pat)Addr	%	s+Instr	Dat		
Ag Pat(Addr)	%	na+Acc	Acc		
Ag Pat(Eff)	%	Acc			v+Acc, do+Gen
Ag Pat(Orig)(Eff)	%	Acc		z+Gen	v+Acc
Ag Pat	%	Acc			
(Ag)Pat to where	%	Acc, Instr			
Ag(Pat)	%	Acc			
Ag Pat	%	Acc			
Ag Pat(Orig)	%	Acc		z+Gen	
--					
Ag(Pat(Eff)(Orig))	%	Acc		z+Gen	na+Acc
Ag Pat(Orig)(Eff)	%	Acc		z+Gen	na+Acc
Ag Pat	%	Acc			
Ag(Pat(Eff))(Orig)	%	Acc		z+Gen	v+Acc
Ag(to where|aim)	%				
Ag(to where|instr|which way|aim)	%				
Ag from where	%				
Ag to where	%				

Appendix 2

Verbal Frames

1 Ag Pat

Jirka hledá práci.

George looks for a job.

bát se$_2$
cítit
cítit se$_2$
čekat
dělat$_2$
dosáhnout$_1$
držet se
držet$_1$
hledat
hledět$_1$
hrát$_1$
líbit se
milovat
myslit$_1$
najít/nalézat
nechat$_3$
objevit
obrátit
opustit
patřit$_1$
počítat$_1$-perf.
počítat$_2$
počkat
podařit se
položit
potřebovat
pozorovat
přát$_2$
stačit$_2$
stačit$_3$
stačit$_4$
stát$_2$
trvat$_2$
učit se$_1$
umět
uvést$_1$
vidět-impf. Δ_{abil}
věřit$_2$
vzít$_2$
vzít se$_2$
vzpomenout
začínat
záležet$_2$
zapomenout$_1$
zastavit$_1$
plnit
věšet-impf. $\rightsquigarrow_{us}$, Δ_{disp}
prát-perf.
překrývat Δ_{disp}
řezat Δ_{disp}, Δ_{abil}
sázet Δ_{disp}
strkat
sušit Δ_{disp}
sypat Δ_{disp}, Δ_{us}
točit Δ_{disp}
třást Δ_{disp}

přestat
pustit se$_1$
působit$_2$ Δ_{abil}, Δ_{disp}
rozhodnout se$_1$
rozhodnout
rozumět
sloužit$_2$
snažit se
oblékat Δ_{disp}, Δ_{abil}
otvírat Δ_{disp}, Δ_{abil}
záležet$_1$
znamenat
znát se$_1$
znát se$_2$
ztratit
zůstat$_2$
naříkat
otisknout
posoudit
vyjádřit se
zanotovat

třepat Δ_{disp}
utírat Δ_{disp}, Δ_{abil}
zapalovat Δ_{disp}, Δ_{abil}
zavírat Δ_{disp}, Δ_{abil}
vést$_2$
líbit-impf. Δ_{disp}, Δ_{us}
čepovat-impf. Δ_{disp}
čistit-impf. Δ_{disp}, Δ_{abil}
drhnout$_1$ Δ_{disp}, Δ_{abil}
klepat$_1$ Δ_{disp}
kreslit-perf.
malovat-perf.
měřit-perf.
mýt Δ_{disp}, Δ_{abil}
natírat Δ_{disp}, Δ_{abil}
bít Δ_{disp}
oslovit
podtrhnout
provolávat
vyzpovídat

2 <u>Ag Pat Addr</u>

Pan Smith představil svou ženu svému příteli.
Mr. Smith introduced his wife to his friend.

brát$_1$
dávat$_1$
dovolit
pomáhat
přát$_1$

představit
vzít$_1$
rozmluvit
vymluvit
podat

3 <u>Ag Pat (Orig) Eff</u>

Maminka předělala panáčka(z Kašpárka) na čerta.
Mother reshaped a puppet (from a Punch) into a devil.

dělat$_4$

4 Ag to where

Henry přijel domů.
Henry came home.

dosáhnout$_2$
hledět$_2$
obrátit se
patřit$_2$
postavit se
pustit se$_2$
ukazovat$_2$
vydávat se
dostat se
přiblížit se
přicházet
přijet
přijít
vejít
vrátit se

5 Ag how

Otec vypadal dobře.
Father looked well.

cítit se$_1$
mít se
uvést se
vypadat

6 Ag where

Marie žila v Praze.
Mary lived in Prague.

objevit se
zůstat$_3$
žít$_2$

7 Ag favour

Komise se rozhodla pro pana S.
The committee decided in favour of Mr. S.

rozhodnout se$_2$

8 Ag from where

Náš host odešel z domu.
Our guest left home.

odejít
vyjít$_1$

9 Ag (Pat|which way)

Oddíl vojáků prošel (les|lesem).
The troop of soldiers passed (the wood|through the wood).

projít

10 Ag (Pat) measure

Auto (ho) stálo 50000 Kčs.
The car cost (him) 50000 Cz. crowns.

stát$_3$

11 Ag how long

Schůze trvala dvě hodiny.
The meeting lasted two hours.

trvat$_1$

12 Ag (to where|purpose)

Jana dojde (do samoobsluhy|pro mléko).
Joan will go (to the self-service|for milk).

dojít

13 Ag(Pat|Addr|how|instr)

Řečník mluvil (o události|k posluchačům|hlasitě|cizím jazykem).
The speaker spoke (about the event|to the audience|loudly|in a foreign language).

mluvit
hovořit

14 Ag (which way|where|to where|how)

Chlapec chodil (po pěšince|v lese|k rybníku|pomalu).
The boy walked (along the path|in the woods|to the pond|slowly)

chodit

15 Ag (to where|which way|how|accompaniment|purpose)

Matka šla (do vesnice|lesem|pomalu|s dcerou|pro mléko).

My mother went (to the village|through the wood|slowly|with her daughter|for milk).

jít

16 Ag (to where|instr|how|which way|purpose)

Řidič jel (do města|nákladním vozem|pomalu|po hlavní silnici|pro písek).

The driver went (to the town|by a truck|slowly|on the main road|for sand).

jet

17 Ø

Leje.

It pours.

připozdívat se
lít$_2$

18 Ag

Chlapec spí.

The boy sleeps.

dít se
držet$_2$
hrát$_2$
ležet
mlčet
padat
padnout
sedět
spát
stačit$_1$
stát
vzít se$_1$
zastavit$_2$
zmizet
znít
ztratit se
ozvat se
běžet
sednout si
vstát
vyjít$_2$
klepat$_2$

19 (Ag) Pat

Trhlo (to) mnou.
I was shocked (by it).

trhat$_2$ házet $\triangle_{abil}$
hýbat táhnout $\triangle_{disp}$

20 Ag (Pat|where)

Jirka se učí(anglicky|v jazykovém ústavu).
George learns (English|at a linguistic institute).

dělat$_3$
působit$_3$
učit se$_2$

21 Ag (Pat|to where)

Žáci se dívají(na obraz|pod stůl).
The pupils look (at the picture|undr the table).

dívat se
podívat se

22 Ag (Pat|to where|purpose)

Ten kabát se hodí (Jirkovi|do souboru|na svatbu).
The jacket is good (for George|to the ensemble|for his wedding).

hodit se

23 Ag Pat (to where|which way)

Matka vede dítě (do školy|parkem).
Mother guides her child (to school|through the park).

vést$_1$

24 Ag (Pat|how)

Jmenuje se (Jack|po dědečkovi).

He is called (Jack|after his grandfather).

jmenovat se

25 Ag (Pat)

Děti se smály (hercům).

The children laughed (at the actors).

počítat$_1$-impf Δ_{disp}, Δ_{abil}
pracovat
smát se
stát se$_1$
stát se$_2$
stát se$_3$
tvořit se
zůstat$_1$
žít$_1$

kopat Δ_{disp}
kreslit-impf Δ_{disp}, Δ_{abil}
malovat-impf Δ_{disp}, Δ_{abil}
měřit-impf Δ_{disp}, Δ_{abil}, Δ_{us}
prát-impf Δ_{disp}, Δ_{abil}, Δ_{us}
pumpovat Δ_{disp}, Δ_{abil}
táhnout Δ_{disp}
bát se$_1$

26 Ag Pat (from where|to where)

Bral věci (ze stolu|do komory).

He took the things away (from the table|to the chamber).

brát$_3$

27 Ag Pat (Addr)

Dívka prosí o pomoc (všechny přítomné).

The girl asks for help (all the present people).

hrát si$_2$
nechat$_4$
platit Δ_{disp}
prosit
provést$_1$
působit$_1$
říkat$_2$

ptát se
přiznat
vypůjčovat se
zdůvodnit
zvolat
(vy)líčit
doporučit

ukázat$_1$ Δ_{disp}
vrátit
vydávat
žádat
otázat se
promluvit

rozkázat
přikázat
nést
házet$_1$
poslat$_1$
sypat

28 Ag (Pat) (Addr) Eff

Jirka vylíčil (o své cestě) (svým rodičům) všechny podrobnosti.

George described(about his journey) (to his parents) all the details.

vylíčit
vyslovit
vysvětlit
říkat$_1$
dokázat
hlásit
namítat
napovídat
naznačovat
vypovídat$_2$

odříkávat
opakovat
pravit
připomenout
sdělovat
tvrdit
vyložit-perf
pronášet
doříkat

29 Ag (Pat) (purpose/how)

Ten přístroj slouží(všem učitelům) (dobře/k tomuto účelu).

That instrument serves (all the teachers) (well/to this purpose).

sloužit$_1$

30 Ag Pat (Orig)

Dělal třísky (ze dřeva).

He made kindlings (from wood).

hrát$_2$
činit$_1$
dělat$_1$
dostat

připravit$_1$
učinit$_1$
lít$_1$
vařit-perf

chtít	péci-perf
mít	tvořit-perf
přijmout	kupovat

31 Ag Pat purpose

Připravili nemocného k operaci.
They prepared the patient for an operation.

připravit$_2$

32 Ag (Pat) Addr

Otec ti věří,(že přijdeš).
Father believes you (that you will come).

věřit$_1$	svěřovat se
rozprávět	domlouvat

33 Ag Pat (Addr) (Eff)

Na mou otázku (mi) odpověděl, (že u toho nebyl).
He answered (me) my question (that he was not present there).

změnit	odvětit
měnit$_1$	odpovídat

34 Ag (Pat) Addr Eff

Honza namluvil (o té věci) svým kamarádům hodně nesmyslů
Jack told his friends (about that matter) much nonsense.

namlouvat

35 (Ag)

(Stroj) drhne.
(The machine) hitches.

drhnout$_2$

Křičel (zlé výhrůžky) (na děti).

He cried (bad threats) (at the children).

učit
bavit se
křičet
řvát
mumlat

37 Ag (Pat|Addr)

Volal (na mne|že se zastaví).

He called (at me|that he will come to see me).

hrát si$_1$
volat

38 Ag (Pat|Addr|Eff)

Napsal (nám|o povodni|dlouhý dopis).

He wrote (us|about the flood|a long letter).

napsat-perf

39 Ag (Pat) (Addr) (Eff)

Babička četla(pověst)(dětem) (o založení města).

Grandmpther read (to the children) (a story) (about the foundation of the town).

číst-imperf Δ_{abil}, Δ_{disp}
kázat Δ_{abil}, Δ_{disp}
povídat Δ_{abil}, Δ_{disp}
předčítat Δ_{abil}, Δ_{disp}
vykládat-impf Δ_{abil}
vyprávět Δ_{abil}, Δ_{disp}
zpívat
prozpěvovat
rozhovořit se

40 Ag Pat (Orig) (Eff)

Děti umlely křídu(z toho kusu)(na prášek).

The children ground the chalk (from that piece) (into powder).

měnit$_2$
postavit$_1$
míchat Δ_{disp}, Δ_{abil}
mlít-perf

česat Δ_{disp}, Δ_{abil}
krájet Δ_{disp}, Δ_{abil}
lámat
lepit Δ_{disp}, Δ_{abil}

plést-perf
postavit$_1$-perf
vázat Δ_{disp}, Δ_{abil}
trhat$_1$ Δ_{disp}

41 Ag (Pat) (Orig)

Pekla (koláč) (z mouky).
She baked (a cake) (from flour).

růst$_1$
péci-impf

vařit-impf
tvořit-impf

42 Ag (Pat) (Orig) Eff

Jana pochopila (o té věci) (ode mne) celou pravdu.
Joan understood (about that matter) (from me) the whole truth.

chápat Δ_{abil}
poslouchat Δ_{disp}
pochopit

43 Ag Pat Eff

Jmenovali Pavla tajemníkem.
They appointed Paul a secretary.

činit$_2$
jmenovat
nechat$_2$

považovat
zdát se$_2$

44 Ag Pat (Eff)

Balila všechny dárky(do úhledných balíčků).
She wrapped all presents (into neat packets)

balit Δ_{disp}
brousit Δ_{abil}, Δ_{disp}

45 Ag (Pat) Eff

Myslím si (o tom) následující věc.
I think (about it) the following thing.

zjistit si
poznat
představit si

zdát se$_1$
znát
dotknout

46 Ag (Pat|Eff) (Orig)

Vím(od tebe)(pravdu|co se stalo).
I know(from you)(the truth|what has happened).

vědět

47 Ag Pat which way

Provedli návštěvníky všemi sály.
They showed the visitors round all rooms.

provést$_2$

48 Ag (Pat) (Orig) (Eff)

Pekla(z toho těsta)(koláč)(na škvarek).
She baked (from that dough) (a cake) (into a scrap).

slyšet Δ_{abil}
péci-impf
vařit-impf Δ_{disp}, Δ_{abil}, Δ_{us}

49 Ag (Pat (Eff)) (Orig)

Děti postavily(kostky (do pyramidy)) (ze stavebnice).
The children built (the cubes (into a pyramid)) (from the building set).

plést-impf
stavět$_1$-impf Δ_{disp}

50 Ag (Pat) (Addr) (Orig) Eff

Jan zjistil(o této přednášce)(svému profesorovi) (od posluchačů), jaká je její úroveň.
John found out (about this lecture) (for his professor) (from the students), which is its quality.

zjistit

51 Ag Pat where

Zapomněl knihu na stole.

He left his book on the table.

nechat$_1$
zapomenout$_2$

52 Ag (Pat (Eff) (Orig))

Mleli (kávu (na jemný prášek) (ze zrnek)).

They ground (the coffee (into a fine powder) (from the grains)).

hrabat Δ_{disp}
mlít-impf Δ_{disp}, Δ_{abil}
sekat
plést-perf
stavět-perf

53 Ag Pat to where

Upustil knihu na stůl.

He dropped the book on the table.

stavět$_2$
postavit$_2$
pustit
uvést$_2$
poslat$_2$
dovést
hodit
klást
dávat$_2$

54 Ag Pat how

Matka to myslí dobře.

Mother means it well.

myslit$_2$

55 Ag Pat (Addr/to where)

Přinesl květiny (pro maminku/domů).

He brought flowers (for my mother/home).