

In this article I have taken a closer look at the functions performed by hashtags on Twitter and **other** social networking sites. **I have argued that** while their search functionality continues to be important, they have been appropriated by users to perform **other** roles in the communicative process. **According to relevance theory**, inference is involved on both sides of the explicit-implicit divide, and a hearer must carry out a range of inferential work to arrive at the overall intended meaning. This will include deriving the proposition expressed, accessing any higher-level explicatures and deriving any implicatures. In Section 4, **I have discussed** examples relating to each of these levels, and **demonstrated** that tweeters **may** use information in hashtags to guide the inferential processes involved in each. **This is to be expected** on a relevance-theoretic approach to utterance interpretation in which utterances are clues to the speaker's intended meaning, and in which communication is acknowledged to take place at a risk. Throughout the **discussion I have highlighted** the relation between the use of hashtags and the style and tone of the tweets. **As discussed** in Section 2, Twitter facilitates one-to-many, asynchronous communication that is lean in terms of social cues but which remains casual, personal and informal in style. Hashtags provide a means by which tweeters can activate relevant contextual assumptions within the character limit and without the need to provide explicit background information and thus detract from the casual, informal style. In sum, hashtags **can be used** to activate **certain** contextual assumptions, thus guiding the reader's inferential processes. This bridges the gap between the tweeter's cognitive environment and the cognitive environments of a **potentially** disparate range of readers, while allowing a conversational, personal style to be maintained. **The examples discussed in this article have been chosen** to illustrate the range of inferential tasks to which hashtags **may contribute**. **Future work in this area is needed** to determine the relative **frequencies of each function, and therefore to assess to what extent the additional pragmatic role has been incorporated into tweeters' repertoires.** Furthermore, **we might consider** how the inferential function of hashtags fits into a theory of utterance interpretation **more generally**. Relevance theory recognises the existence of so-called procedural elements (Blakemore, 1987, 2002, 2007) which function as [...] (**Blakemore, 2002:89**). While procedurally encoded meaning was originally associated with **certain** functional expressions in language, such as discourse connectives and pronouns, recent **work (Wharton, 2009; Wilson, 2011) has suggested** that the **notion** of procedural meaning **might be broadened** to apply **more generally** to aspects of communication which [...] (**Wilson, 2011:20**). The pragmatic functions of hashtags **illustrated in this article seem** to fall within this **broader** definition. Developing a procedural account **might be** the next step in integrating **our understanding** of the changing nature of online tagging behaviour into a **more general** picture of utterance production and interpretation.

The arguments presented in this paper support the claim that FQs all, both, and each are partitive expressions and that, as such, they serve to shift a listener's attention locally to the universality of **some** already accessible discourse group. Although the effect on interpretation is **slight** in **most** cases, quantifier float serves a consistent and useful function on the sentence level. **In a broader sense,** the **partitive analysis characterizes** quantifier float as

highlighting information about discourse referents. **In that respect, this analysis, although focused on English FQs,** is relevant to current accounts of quantifier float in **other** languages and to the **more general** study of nominal expressions within discourse. **Work on quantifier float in languages other than English, particularly non-European languages, has also considered** the functional aspects of quantifier float. The extensive literature on Japanese quantifier float addresses topicalization, discourse prominence, and cognitive load (**Downing, 1993; Kim, 1995; Hamano, 1997**); for example, **Shimojo (2004) suggests that** the host for a Japanese FQ, **usually** the intransitive subject or transitive object, has a particular cognitive status relevant to new and focused information. Moreover, **many analyses of quantifier float in languages other than English suggest that** presenting new information defines the discourse function of an FQ and **some (Kim, 1995; Wu, 1998; Donohue, 2004; Simpson, 2004) explicitly identify** a partitive function for the FQ. Until recently, **most work on quantifier float in European languages has focused** on syntax or, in **a few** cases, semantics (**Kayne, 1975; Sportiche, 1988; Junker, 1990; Merchant, 1996; Hoeksema, 1996b; etc.**). **Some recent work, however, has begun to turn** to pragmatic and functional questions, in particular, **considering** a relation between quantifier float and information structure. **Belletti (2004, 2005) argued that** multiple constructions, including pronoun doubling and quantifier float, are linked to focus/topic positions in the VP periphery. **Elguea (in press) proposed that** information structure underlies Spanish quantifier float, floated quantifiers never being topics but **often** being focused material. **Rochman (2009) argues** for a prosodic framework for quantifier float, associated with focus structure. **I hope that the partitive analysis of English FQs presented in this paper will contribute to** the emerging discussion of functional aspects of FQ. **Although I have not characterized FQs in terms of focus, my analysis defines them** as presenting new information about a subject which is **often** the topic of the clause. **Of course,** the partitive function of quantifier float in English exemplifies just one **possibility** for introducing new information about discourse entities within the sentence. **I have proposed that other** nominal expressions in float position, including overt partitives and intensive reflexives, **can** also fulfill the **general** function of shifting attention to a re-evaluation of a subject. **In this respect,** floated expressions reflect the many ways in which nominal expressions integrate new and old information in discourse and the ways in which word order reflects this variation. Until recently, the substantial attention to anaphora in semantic and psycholinguistic studies has promoted a linear view of old and new information, exemplified in the definite/indefinite and given/new distinctions. However, **it is becoming increasingly clear** that the range of discourse functions **must be extended** beyond these binary distinctions in a more dynamic way. **As I have argued elsewhere (Reed, 2007), novel definites, split-antecedent pronouns, and overt partitives show** that complex nominal expressions combine information **often considered** either given or new. The behavior of floated expressions in English adds to that evidence.

Interjections, even primary interjections, are not [+...] (Leech et al., 1982:53). First, **many** primary interjections function in the participation and information frameworks of discourse,

rather than marking emotional involvement. Second, interjections are fully integrated into the system of everyday spoken language. Third, interjections are thoroughly lexicalized, **often** with a variety of functions: Particularly secondary interjections like boy and shit exhibit complex patterns of distribution and function (thus, boy occurs as a response token, an initial parallel marker of emotional involvement, an initial pragmatic marker signalling topic shift, in exclamative constructions, especially those exhibiting SAI, and along with the focusing phrase I tell you; while shit appears as a response token, an initial parallel marker of emotional involvement, an initial pragmatic marker signalling topic shift, an intensifier in shit no, shit yeah, and as a response marker in the information framework in no shit). They have identifiable meanings in context, **as can be seen in** agreeing responses like man is right. **We reviewed** relevant literature concerning initial position in turns, and **we found** that turn-initial position has special discourse significance for **various** reasons from a wide range of different linguistic perspectives. **Corpus data confirm** the importance of initial position in turns and **demonstrate** the frequency of interjections serving as pragmatic markers in this position as well as their functions as response tokens or back-channels. Any item in the initial position in a turn **tends to** take on pragmatic marker functions. This holds not only for traditional primary and secondary interjections like ooh and boy and their variants and extensions like goddamnation and oh bloody hell, but also for imaginative combinations like land sakes alive and heavens to Betsy. Further, any item which **routinely** appears in initial turn position **tends to** expand its range of functions, so that interjections as pragmatic markers **tend to be** multifunctional. **We saw that** these multiple functions are **often** differentiated by separate intonation contours. Interjections **often** function as parallel pragmatic markers in turn-initial position, but **we also observed** various functions for interjections beyond those of parallel markers, namely **typical** discourse marker functions of signalling contrast, elaboration, transition and so on. **We inspected** a wide range of functions for **frequent** interjections. Moreover, **a few** secondary interjections in initial turn position function as intensifiers rather than pragmatic markers in combinations like hell yeah and shit no. **We saw that** interjections as parallel pragmatic markers **frequently** appear with exclamative constructions, doubly marking the emotive force of the turn. Finally, **we inspected** the distribution and functions of the formula I tell you as an example of a phrasal unit functioning as a pragmatic marker. Interjections are too complex and multifunctional to be sensibly listed among the specific classes of pragmatic markers. The open-ended nature of the classes of primary and secondary interjections makes it impossible to list them in any case. It is more expedient to treat primary interjections as a sui generis class with various functions **generally** emanating from their status as **(certain kinds of)** interjections along with **more or less** formulaic meaning/functions, and to leave secondary interjections in their proper lexical classes, describing their functions as interjections in general pragmatic terms.

The received view of speaker meaning is that it involves recognition of a specific **kind of** speaker intention by hearers, and that utterances are processed by users accordingly. The focus in analysing speaker meaning is thus **generally** on the speaker's commitment to the truth of information (**although cf. [Wilson and Sperber, 1993](#)**), and on **(presumed)** cognitive state-processes. **The proposal in this paper** for treating speaker meaning as a deontic concept **offers an alternative view** to this in two ways. First, what a speaker is held

accountable for goes beyond the veracity of information to include other moral concerns, such as social rights, obligations, responsibilities **and the like**. Second, to be held *interactionally* accountable differs from inferring commitment. The former is tied to an understanding of speaker meaning as arising through incremental, sequentially grounded discourse processing (e.g. [Arundale, 2008](#), [Arundale, 2010](#), [Gregoromichelaki and Kempson, forthcoming](#) and [Gregoromichelaki et al., 2011](#)), while the latter is tied to a punctuated view of speaker meaning that arises at the level of utterance processing. [Weigand \(2009:30\)](#) **proposes that** a discourse-processing view of meaning as **something we** are incrementally “coming to” (termed *verständigung* in German) contrasts with an utterance-processing view of meaning as **something we** “reach” or “come to” (*verstehen*) (see also [Kecskes, 2012](#)). **Of course** the former does **not necessarily** preclude an utterance-processing view, but there remains, nevertheless, the **puzzle** of how, **if ever**, to reconcile a discourse-processing view of speaker meaning as fundamentally deontological with a punctuated, utterance-processing view of speaker meaning as hearer's inferring speaker commitment to the veracity of reflexively intended mental representations. The first **step in attempting to** do so is to recognise that these constitute different perspectives. Thus, while a deontological notion of speaker meaning **may seem** of **limited** value to those focusing on speaker meaning at the level of utterance processing (cf. [Wilson and Sperber, 2002:627](#)), participants do **evidently** orient to the deontological aspects of speaker meaning through holding speakers accountable to the moral order for such meanings in interaction. To dismiss such concerns is to ignore the very real-world consequentiality of what **we** are taken to mean. **There remains much to do, however, in furthering the proposals in this paper** about speaker meaning as deontological. **More work needs to be undertaken** to explore the ways in which accountability **can be modulated**, as well as to further develop **our understanding** of the constituents of the moral order. The extent to which speakers **can be held** accountable for meanings is **arguably** an empirical question that **will** benefit from close, systematic examination of how speaker meanings emerge in real interaction through various kinds of meaning-actions. **In this way, we may** open the field up to **potentially** productive ways of furthering **our understanding** of the concept of speaker meaning, and the **broader** concept of pragmatic meaning of which speaker meaning constitutes just one type.

Orientation to the expert/novice dynamic and movement away from this dynamic over time **can be viewed**, following [Lave and Wenger's \(1991\)](#) construct of Legitimate Peripheral Participation, as evidence of Sophie's trajectory from peripheral towards full participation in interaction. There were two main behaviors that **were interpreted as** evidence of Sophie and José's orientation to the novice/expert paradigm: corrective repair and discussion of language learning. In their discussions of language learning, José proposed for Sophie and Sophie professed to need a type of interaction that fits the description of Lave and Wenger's Legitimate Peripheral Participation. Sophie was invited to participate in expert conversation but with limited responsibility and clear indication that she would be offered support as needed. In their interactions, Sophie, as the NNS novice, had the opportunity to employ her developing communicative skills under the supervision of José, the NS expert. The goal of their activity was officially oriented to communication, but they also recognized a meta-activity of providing a less competent speaker the opportunity to participate in communicative practices with an expert who could provide a model, repair, clarification, and **other** forms of support as needed.

Sophie and José's discussion of language learning and their explicit acknowledgement of their dual goals in the interaction **may well** be a product of the unnatural setting of the conversations. Sophie and José were strangers when they engaged in their first conversation and their interactions were being video-taped. **One wonders if similar** discussions take place in spontaneous interactions between NNS learners and NSs. Regardless of whether explicit

discussion of the dynamics at play takes place, **it appears that** an implicit understanding of the special circumstances of the language learner **would be** present in **some** NS/NNS interaction, most especially if the NNS makes known his or her status as a student of the language. **One assumes**, however, that not all NS/NNS interaction **would** achieve a balance between providing the NNSs support while also respecting their competencies. On one end of the spectrum, NNSs **may be** frustrated by NSs who insist on correcting learner errors to the detriment of communication, **as was reported by** [Wilkinson \(2002\)](#). On the other end of the spectrum, NNSs **may** find themselves in encounters with NSs who are unaccustomed to dealing the NNSs or simply unsympathetic to NNSs' needs. José **appears to be** the proverbial "sympathetic interlocutor" **referred to in the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines** ([Breiner-Sanders et al., 2000](#)).

José and Sophie also displayed their orientation to the novice/expert paradigm through their **frequent** use of repair; specifically, correction. They engaged in repair processes **to varying degrees** throughout the course of the year, indicating their evolving orientation to the novice/expert paradigm. **The patterns** evidenced in their interactions **support findings** by [Norrick \(1991\)](#) and [Kurhila \(2001\)](#) showing particular patterns of correction in novice/expert interactions, but did not replicate the patterns **seen in** [Wilkinson \(2002\)](#). The pervasiveness of corrective sequences was a salient pattern in the interactions while Sophie was holding the floor, particularly towards the beginning of her stay abroad. **The present research contributes** to the previous research on correction in novice/expert interactions by introducing evidence of patterns **not noted** before, including the existence of clusters of correction and the **probable** underlying causes of said clusters. **The findings also reveal** the changes in the types of correction **seen** over the course of the year abroad, **indicating** an orientation shift away from **some** form-focused repairs, particularly form-focused option sequences, towards **almost** exclusively meaning-based repairs.

As noted at the onset, the study of contrastive pragmatics across English varieties lags far behind the contrastive study of lexis, pronunciation, and grammar. **Only a few** years ago, [Schneider and Barron \(2008:3\)](#) could **observe that** [...]The situation is **of course** changing and the present Special Issue is one **indication** of this (cf. [Schneider, 2010](#) and [Haugh and Schneider, 2012](#)).

In the present study I have sought to apply the **methodology** of cultural scripts, already well established in the cross-linguistic arena, to the contrastive pragmatics of "early interactions" in three Anglo Englishes. **This study has been incomplete and tentative in some respects, partly on account of difficulties with obtaining cross-dialectal data of comparable quality to that available for cross-linguistic comparisons and partly because we are attempting to characterise communication style differences at a greater level of subtlety than with comparisons across entirely different languages and cultures.**

Nevertheless **I believe that** the **methodology** of cultural scripts has a great deal to offer cross-dialectal pragmatics, both at the level of description and at the level of explanation. In particular, **I would like to draw attention to the fact that** cultural scripts provide a medium for formulating integrative interpretations and explanatory hypotheses about data of many different kinds. **The present study has drawn mainly** on personal testimonies about cultural cross-talk, sociological and cultural studies, discourse production tasks, and contrastive corpus data. Other **potential** data sources include contrastive lexical semantic analysis, micro-analysis (CA style) of recorded interactions, questionnaires and surveys of various kinds, examination of "critical incidents" of cross-cultural misunderstanding, interviews, focus groups **and the like, and others.**

As the field of variational pragmatics opens up, exploring these and other data-gathering techniques is an important priority, as is accumulating more and more empirical studies. In this environment it is important not to lose sight of the fact that data as such is not the main game. Before generalisations and explanatory hypotheses **can be formed**, data from any given source **has to be interpreted** and data from **various** different sources **has to be integrated** into **some** common framework. As this proceeds, emergent **generalisations and hypotheses begin to guide** and to focus the investigative process. Cultural scripts provide an extremely versatile, yet at the same time highly constrained, technique for interpreting and integrating data about sociolinguistic and pragmatic phenomena from many different sources, just as the larger paradigm of ethnopragmatics ([Goddard, 2006b](#)) provides an overarching alternative to the still dominant neo-Gricean pragmatics.

Above all, in cross-dialectal pragmatics, as much as in cross-linguistic pragmatics, an explanatory account can only emerge from **methodologies that allow us** to tap into insider perspectives on the speech practices in question, linking them with the values and attitudes of the people concerned.

For non-native speakers, maintaining coherence over the length of extended discourse or monologue is problematic because of the lack of collaborative feedback ([Clark, 1996](#)) and opportunities for negotiation ([Foster, 1997](#)) with the interlocutor. Miscues at the semantic and pragmatic levels **can** arise and interact with each other leading to a discourse which **is perceived** as lacking in specificity and relevance. **The research presented here has suggested that** these miscues have psycholinguistic reality; that is, when listeners perceive the discourse, the miscues have a real effect on their understanding. By manipulating the discourse, **it is possible** to bring about improvements in the coherence and clearly it is beneficial for language learners and teachers to know this. **The research has also suggested that** the **majority** of the incoherence is taken up by a **small number of** severe miscues rather than the totality of miscues. The manipulation of the most severe miscues brought about the largest gain in coherence as perceived by the native listeners. When further manipulations were made to the discourse by repairing the remaining miscues the gain in coherence was not significant. Thus a picture emerges of a **small number of** miscues having a disproportionately large effect. This picture is **perhaps** somewhat positive for language learners and teachers **in general** since **it suggests** they can focus their efforts on the more salient and substantial miscues in order to bring about improvements in coherence. Language learners do not have to aim for absolute nativelike performance in their discourse in order for improvements in coherence to

be perceived. In addition, language teachers have an **indication** as to the focus of intervention ([Bygate, 1994](#)). Specifically, intervention should be instigated on semantic and pragmatic grounds when miscues in consistency and relevance lead to a disturbance in coherence ([Bublitz and Lenk, 1999](#)). Moreover, language teaching and the study of language learning should, as [Hughes and McCarthy \(1998\)](#) **rightly point out**, incorporate a discourse approach to grammar as a solution to **certain**

problems that sentence-based approaches cannot deal with: **The present study has highlighted the need for further research to investigate** coherence and how it is affected by miscues in the discourse. **The study is limited to some extent by the small number of samples that were considered and further research will be needed in order to confirm the hypotheses.** The use of manipulation studies and the techniques **outlined here is, I would suggest**, a valid way to proceed in order **to demonstrate** that miscues at the discourse level have psycholinguistic reality. In particular, the ability to manipulate non-native discourse through the modification and addition of features is paramount since the lack of coherence is **more often than not** due to a paucity of cueing features rather than an abundance. The **relatively** easy access to non-native discourse and sophisticated computer editing tools means

that manipulation studies **of this kind** are not difficult to implement and the study of non-native discourse **can shed light** on how native discourse is constructed and perceived. **The research here also suggests** a need to return to meaning in non-native discourse. Meaning **of course** has always been central to discourse studies but in the past there has been a **tendency** to concentrate on the more formal aspects of the non-native code such as grammatical and phonological miscues. These features are **often** easier to identify and categorize and, **while I do not discount the importance of these, I feel that** the core focus for the study of non-native discourse is how it unfolds at the semantic and pragmatic levels. **I hope this paper has gone some way towards promoting this idea.**

Earlier research by the Language in the Workplace team found that identifying disagreements in face-to-face workplace interactions was **often** difficult because they are **frequently** expressed implicitly or indirectly between native speakers in New Zealand workplace settings ([Holmes and Marra, 2004](#)). **In this paper, the data** was the recorded workplace interactions of interns from Victoria University's Workplace Communication for Skilled Migrants Programme. **This data was used** to test the original continuum beyond the native speaker context, using an **approach** which distinguished individual expressions of contrasting views (disagreement) from any overarching conflict, and emphasised the norms of the group for interpreting the discourse. Thus **analysis of the disagreement took into consideration** the negotiated and shared understandings which the community has developed over time, while paying attention to many layers of contextual constraint; the norms for how to enact disagreement are understood within the negotiated norms of the Community of Practice, which themselves reflect the constraints **of broader** norms such as those of the institution or society. So, within the earlier native speaker data there was evidence of a **general** pattern of implicitness which **we have consistently found** throughout our New Zealand workplace data, and which **we have argued** reflects wider societal norms within which the teams operate ([Holmes et al., 2011b](#)). In addition to this **broader** constraint, in the case of the skilled migrant data, the joint enterprise of each of the individual Communities of Practice **appears to** be in line with their stated purpose to integrate the skilled migrant interns into their organisations on a short term basis, and to provide good workplace experiences to facilitate longer term career options. The result is that **it has been almost impossible to identify** disagreements **with any confidence**. In practice, the mentor and colleagues with whom the interns are interacting **appear not** to take up **potential** disagreements, instead reinterpreting any attempts at disagreement by the skilled migrants as a different speech act (e.g., refusal) or **more commonly** as a misunderstanding or miscommunication. The **hypothesised** 'tolerance' exhibited by the colleagues means that the migrants do not get a chance to engage in the negotiation of disagreement, nor to be involved in the (re)establishment of the community norms for disagreement. This simultaneously reduces the migrants' ability to learn to perform these important aspects of professional identity. **This finding highlights** the place of co-construction within disagreement. **The analysis made use** of a definition of disagreement **proposed by** [McCrae \(2009\)](#) which emphasised the need for two parties to establish contrasting stances, a component also inherent in sequential considerations of disagreements (e.g., [Pomerantz, 1984](#)). The lack of engagement with **potential** disagreement by the colleagues, regardless of whether this is intentional or unintentional, means the two viewpoints are never substantiated. In other words, an ostensibly supportive environment **is helping** to construct the migrants as members of the communities where the goal is to 'host' the migrants and the ongoing interaction is reinforcing outsider or partial status rather than supporting an inward trajectory. This has the unintentional **potential** to hold back integration into a longer term workplace community where disagreements **are**

seen as permissible and negotiated. **If the in-group members do not expect disagreement, does this mean that the skilled migrants don't have the opportunity to disagree? And what happens when they enter a community where contestive behaviour is integral to the linguistic repertoire?**

The last point, the relevance of the contextual environment in which disagreement episodes occur, returns **us** to the **goal** of the special issue, namely theoretical perspectives of both what constitutes disagreement (**in my case** regarding community norms) and the ways of negotiating disagreement which draw on an understanding of shared linguistic practices. **A key concern presented here**, is the co-construction of disagreements, the relevance of disagreement as an interactional achievement, and the central role played by community norms in **our** ways of enacting, interpreting and participating in disagreement in context.

In this paper, I have presented what I see as an important deficit in the **discussion and **interpretation** of Grice's Cooperative Principle. **There seems to be a tendency** to dwell too much on the term 'cooperation', rather than looking beyond the principle as enunciated, to the motivation Grice gave to the mechanism he had **identified**. **This seems to be largely** because Grice (1975) is read in isolation, rather than in the context of his other writings on the philosophy of language. **Knowledge of this material rapidly shows** that cooperation is not a concept that recurs in Grice's thought, and as such is **unlikely** to be the pivotal force in **his analysis** of the workings of language. **It is suggested that many of** the problems in **interpretation** stem from the clash between Grice's use of the term 'cooperation' with a technical meaning, and the more **general** meaning of the word. It is particularly problematic in this context because dialogue is **often (rightly or wrongly)** termed as being cooperative. The use of these two terms in the same area of linguistics has muddied the waters, and it is **perhaps** unsurprising that **some** confusions have occurred. **Generally, it seems to be that** the CP is **assumed** to take on a meaning **rather** closer to that of the **general** meaning of 'cooperation'—thus leading to what I have termed 'cooperation drift'. **In the discussion of Grice's work presented** above, **my aim has been to demonstrate** the distinction between the Gricean motivation behind the CP, and the type of 'cooperation drift' which **has been identified** in the literature. Firstly, the **argument was made** for the necessity of reading Grice's work in the philosophical context, rather than in isolation. Then, a **consideration of this context showed** a **number of** themes which recurred: logic, conventional/non-conventional and, most importantly, rationality. Grice's interests were in the system of language as an example of human rational action, and thus to be accounted for through **some variety of** logic (although, **perhaps**, not traditional formal logic). **His aim was to find** the logic of conversation which **could** account for the gap between saying and meaning, saying and implicating, conventional and non-conventional meaning. The logic that **he sought was seen as** a manifestation of rational action. To offer this as an **interpretation** of Grice is to operate at a macro-level of pragmatics: it answers one question, but asks many **others**. Rationality **may** be the driving force that **Grice identified**, but it does not account for how **we** make particular choices at the utterance level. **If rationality is about evaluation** – which is the strongest available **implication** from Grice's papers – then to model this rational action,**

we need to know what competing needs the human brain is weighing up, and how each of those needs is valued. **More current work in discourse analysis and pragmatics suggests** some **possible** answers to these competing needs: politeness, efficiency, humour, group-identification, and so forth. Grice offers **us** no answer to any of these questions, and so **we can only guess** at the type of motivations he was **hypothesising**. In conclusion, **the aim of this paper has not been to claim that** the CP is the answer to pragmatics. **It is clear** that Grice's work has major limitations; it is based on introspection rather than data, and takes no account of interpersonal factors. However, it is **part of** the foundations of the discipline of pragmatics, and as such it is **part of** what **we all** build on. Therefore **care should be taken** in its interpretation.

In this study of coordination of verbal dependents, all three binary **possibilities were considered**: coordinations of adjunct with adjunct, complement with complement, and adjunct with complement. In addition, these coordinations **were investigated** for both non-wH and WH elements, with conjunctions not limited to and. Previous analyses have never **to my knowledge** covered all of these cases. The main **findings** are that: 1. If multiple events are described by a VP, then coordination of the verbal dependents is semantically required. 2. The exclusive-or implicature accounts for the strangeness of **some** or-coordinations of verbal dependents, specifically, when the information contributed by the conjuncts **suggests** that an exclusive-or reading is not intended. When the exclusive-or **implicature is supported**, the coordinations improve. 3. Coordination with and Q-implicates either that multiple events are being referred to, or that there is **some** relationship between the conjuncts that **would not** be expressed by simply juxtaposing them. The better this **implicature is supported**, the more acceptable the coordination is. 4. In formulating interrogatives with more than one WH element, WH coordination is chosen over a multiple-wH formulation when a pair-list answer is not desired. **The analysis presented here suggests several lines for further research.** First of all, there are all the **possible** complement-complement and adjunct-complement coordinations to be constructed with verbs **not investigated here, some of which were mentioned** above. In analyzing these coordinations, there is one overarching caveat: **Attempting** to rule out **some of** these coordinations by **declaring** that a verb is ambiguous between the relevant subcategorizations **should be done** with extreme caution. **It has already turned out that some of** these coordinations are acceptable after all, in the right context. **If one accepts this truth and then says without strong independent motivation:** All the REST of these coordinations are ungrammatical because of ambiguity of the verb, then ambiguity will be to a logical theory of coordination as magic is to science: the 'we just don't know' throwing up of hands that occurs when the frontier of knowledge is reached. Moving beyond coordination of verbal adjuncts and complements, it **may be** that **the analysis detailed here can be extended** to cover coordination of nominal adjuncts and complements. For example, the contradictory information contained in green and purple forces the phrase green and purple pill **to be interpreted** as a pill of which **some** parts are green and **some** purple. This 'multiple-locations' reading **seems to** be related to the 'multiple-events' readings **discussed** for coordinations of verbal adjuncts and complements. An example of the kind of

complement-complement (or **perhaps** ad- junct-complement) coordinations that **could be investigated can be seen** in the attestation in 67. Finally, the **conventional** wisdom that words with different syntactic categories and different meanings must be ambiguous (i.e. occupy separate lexical entries) **can no longer be taken** for granted. Such a **stance opens the door** to overgeneration that was not a problem under the old **assumption**, and **calls for closer investigation** of the nature of lexical ambiguity and the semantics and pragmatics of coordination.

In this article, I have focused on one aspect of the study of metathesis: the factors that favor and disfavor its occurrence. **As I have shown**, a unified and predictive account is viable when both universal and language-specific factors are taken into account. The universal component draws on the psychoacoustics of the sound combination at issue and the context in which it occurs, while language specificity results from the influence of a speaker/hearer's knowledge of sound patterns in the native language. **I have also argued** that two conditions are necessary for metathesis to occur: first, there must be indeterminacy in the signal, and second, the structure that **would** result from metathesis must already be attested in the system. Indeterminacy sets the stage for metathesis, and a speaker/hearer's knowledge of the sound system and its patterns of usage influence how the signal is processed and, thus, the order in which the sounds are parsed. The greater the indeterminacy, the more the speaker/ hearer must rely on native-language knowledge to infer the temporal ordering of the sounds. An important **assumption in this paper** is that metathesis has its roots in speech processing. **Support for this view comes in part from the observation that** the sequence resulting from metathesis conforms to an existing pattern in the language. Additional evidence comes from the **findings of Mielke and Hume (2001)** concerning the influence of word recognition on crosslinguistic patterns of metathesis. **The findings of that study confirm the view that** ordering reversals are dispreferred at the beginning of a word or root, and that metathesis overwhelmingly involves adjacent sounds. Both word position and proximity **have been shown** to be significant factors conditioning speech processing (**Connine et al. 1993, Cutler et al. 1985, Hall 1992, Marslen-Wilson 1989, Marslen- Wilson & Zwitserlood 1989**). **While it is hoped that this study advances our knowledge of metathesis, it nonetheless goes without saying that many issues remain to be addressed.** For example, **it is clear** that the role of experience plays a key role in predicting metathesis, given its influence on speech processing. Yet, language use involves production as well; considering **the potential** interplay of language experience and production on metathesis **may** also prove fruitful. That this is an area worth investigating is **suggested by Dell and colleagues (2000:1365)** who confirm that: each utterance of a syllable tunes the language production system to favor the production of that and **similar** syllables. The effect of this tuning endures longer than a single trial, and it accumulates with the tuning associated with other utterances. The overall effect is to adapt the production system to recent experience ... The phonology is projected preferentially from those parts of the lexicon that are most accessible, such as recently experienced sound forms. **It is thus reasonable to assume** that a less practiced articulatory routine, whether it involves

coordinating the elements of a single sound or of a sequence of sounds, is less precise and **perhaps** more difficult. The result is a bias towards more practiced articulatory routines. With respect to metathesis, **this would suggest** that low-frequency or nonoccurring sound sequences **would tend** to lose out to more practiced sequences. **I leave the implications of this topic for our understanding of metathesis open for future research.**

The proposed analysis of V-P constructions provides straightforward answers to the main questions about constituency and order that a comprehensive syntactic analysis needs to address. The alternation between V-P-DP order (turn on the lights) and V-DP-P order (turn the lights on) is attributed to the systematic **possibility** of alternative argument structures for lexemes with a single meaning, such as turn on, look up, and mess up. Either the P is projected syntactically, in which case it is realized as an intransitive P complement, or it is not projected, in which case the V-P lexeme is realized as a compound V. **In essence**, in one manifestation turn on and mess up are the left-headed counterparts of lexical compounds such as overturn and uproot; as with other left-headed compounds (such as passersby and worse-off), inflectional morphology (e.g. past-tense morphology) appears on the head. Unstressed object pronouns, which are **plausibly** another kind of inflectional morphology, are also necessarily attached to the head (messed it up). This lexical-compound **possibility** accounts for the various word-like properties of V-P lexemes, including their cohesion in the V-P-DP construction (e.g. the P cannot be modified and does not act like a complement with respect to coordination) and their participation in **standard kinds of** word-formation operations (re-, -able, and -er affixation, V-to-N conversion, and V formation from N/Adj + P combinations). The **analysis** of the V-DP-P construction has long **presented** theoretical challenges, even though, **in some sense**, the challenging facts are **quite** simple: a direct object DP and the primary object (O1) in a double-object construction must **ordinarily** precede the P and, **in general**, only these precede the P. The popular small-clause approach to the analysis of the V-DP-P construction, according to which the DP is the subject of a small clause whose predicate is the P, provides **a potentially** interesting answer to the question of why only the DP precedes the P: only a DP can be the subject of the P. However, a detailed **examination of the SC approach reveals** that it lacks independent motivation and faces serious obstacles. Most importantly, there exist clear cases of SCs built around Ps in English, which can occur as complements of Vs (e.g. all these lights on in Imagine all these lights on). The problem is that strings such as all these lights on in Turn all these lights on systematically fail to display the properties of true SCs, having to do with constituent behavior and their interaction with adverbial phrases. Analyzing the P as a separate complement of the VP, such that in phrases like turn the lights on both the lights and on are independent complements, explains why the lights on, for example, does not behave like an SC. As for the linear-order facts concerning Ps in the V-DP-P construction, it turns out that any analysis of the structure of VPs needs to recognize a constraint with the effect of ensuring that intransitive P complements, whether these are part of a V-P lexeme or not, must be aligned leftward **of most** other elements of a VP (P-LEFT). **The fact that** direct objects and O1s necessarily precede intransitive P

complements follows from ranking P-LEFT lower than the constraints ensuring that direct objects and OIs are also placed leftward in the VP. These linear-order constraints on VPs are grounded in **very general** functional and processing principles with substantial crosslinguistic motivation (Tomlin 1986, Hawkins 1994, Wasow 2002) and **apparently** must be formulated **in some way** on any analysis. Recognition of such constraints obviates the need for an SC analysis of VPs built around verbs with intransitive P complements, or, indeed, for any abstract syntactic analysis with intricate embedding or derivational complexity.

The data examined here identify an unmarked reading of clause-final PPs in read speech that is determined by syntactic and phonological factors. The syntactic phrase, that is, the PP, determines the **potential** boundary of the prosodic phrase, and the phonologically based accented-syllable count determines whether the boundary can be realized as a prosodic phrase edge. The PP **data further indicate** that other factors such as the focus domain, given/new distinctions, contrastive stress, and parallelism are exceptional phenomena that interact with the phrasing of the PP to determine whether the unmarked form is appropriate. The characterization of an unmarked phrasing enabled **us** to improve on **our** original prosodic system since **it allowed us** to implement length rules that handle constituents previously **regarded as** leftovers from **other** rules. Many problems with the initial implementation, in particular **the tendency** to place an unnaturally strong break before short clause-final PPs, were resolved. The **notion** of an unmarked phrasing also **adds to the understanding** of how prosody interacts with syntax and semantics, and how marked phrasing resulting from discourse, pragmatic, and **other considerations might be handled**. Finally, **the study provides** a handle on the notion of prosodic length and thus **suggests** additional correlations between length and phrasing. **Further work needs to be done on the significance of the secondary phrase boundary and on the status of the verb-adjacent constituents, which had been discarded for this study.** The verb-adjacent PPs **appear to** conform to the **mechanisms discussed here**, but with the factor of constituent balancing around the verb playing an additional role. A professional dramatic reading is idealized speech, intended to maximize comprehension for an unseen listener. **If a pattern of accented and unaccented syllables facilitates perception,** as Martin suggests (1972), then a dramatic reading should **aim at some rhythmic ideal, which is evidenced** in the bifurcation of the data in Table 4. **This observation raises several questions** including whether and **how this rhythmic ideal applies to the rest of the data beyond the prepositional phrase. How would the pattern found here emerge in less formal read speech like e-mail, and in the spontaneous speech of human-computer interaction?** The most basic question is **why the length/phrasing correlation exhibited in the data exists-why does the presence of a second accented syllable correlate with a pause?** The rhythmic structure **proposed by Liberman and Selkirk** offers a promising direction in considering this question.

I have explored the possibility that syllable cut, along with nuclear length, are primary properties of Orm's phonology. **The assumption** of syllable cut has the advantage of being

compatible with the full range of Ormian phonological, metrical, and orthographic phenomena. In particular, **it provides a basis** for pre-Ormian degem, an **assumption** that is key to an understanding of Orm's extension of the double graphs to nonetymological environments. Syllable cut also provides a basis for Orm's metrical distinction of light and heavy syllables. **More generally, from a diachronic perspective** syllable cut has the **potential** to serve as a cornerstone for a coherent analysis of the quantity changes of the period, and crosslinguistically it makes comprehensible the **similar** drifts in the breakdown of quantity in the various Germanic languages. The dating of the onset of the phonologization of syllable cut has been a controversial topic. **Vachek**, for example, on consideration of a variety of data, **places** the rise of syllable cut in the Middle English period between the mid-thirteenth and mid-fourteenth century (Vachek 1959). By contrast, **Vennemann (2000)** **proposes** that syllable cut is also the motivating factor behind HCL, a change that **is usually assumed** for the late Old English period. **I cannot resolve this controversy here**, but **my partial reconstruction** of Ormian phonology **confirms** the phonologization of syllable cut by early Middle English. There have also been different **perspectives** on the details of the diachronic transition from quantity to syllable cut. In the case of Upper German, for example, **Naiditsch (1997)** **sees** a diachronic transition from quantity to isochrony to syllable cut. **In Vennemann's (2000) study, he sees** a direct transition from quantity to cut with no intervening stage of isochrony. Regardless of how this played out in the other Germanic languages, **my reconstruction** of Ormian phonology **necessitates the assumption** of an interim stage in the shift from quantity to syllable cut, a stage in which nuclear length and the syllable-cut prosody coexist. **Further detailed Middle English and pan-Germanic diachronic studies are essential**. **Stockwell and Minkova (1990:201)** **discuss** the difficulty of determining the contrastive versus redundant characteristics of a reconstructed phonology. **Perhaps some would argue that** syllable cut should **be considered** only a derivative property dependent on other factors such as nuclear and consonantal length. **As far as I am concerned**, however, **one point is certain**: while none of the numerous **attempts** to understand the phonological basis of Orm's orthography has been **entirely** successful, the introduction of syllable cut provides the basis for a full understanding. This **resolution of Orm's system provides** powerful 'external' evidence for the relevance of the syllable cut prosody to the significant quantity changes pre- and postdating Orm.

The analyses outlined above define passives and impersonals by means of morphosyntactic deletion and suppression operations. Yet the basic contrast is **essentially** theory-neutral, and compatible with any approach that can distinguish the lexical transitivity of a predicate from the selection of surface arguments. Passive verb forms are detransitized, **as assumed in traditional descriptions**. Impersonal forms of personal verbs preserve lexical transitivity, but inhibit the expression of a syntactic subject. Since impersonalization merely suppresses the syntactic realization of a subject, it is **generally** insensitive to argument structure and applies equally to unaccusative and to unergative verbs. **More generally**, distinguishing passive and impersonal constructions has a number of descriptive and theoretical consequences. On the descriptive side, this distinction **contributes** to a more accurate account of the construction

inventory of various languages and language families, including Balto-Finnic, Balto-Slavic and Celtic, **as argued above**. On the theoretical side, reclassifying subjectless forms of unaccusative verbs as impersonals rehabilitates the RG **claim** that '[n]o impersonal Passive clause in any language **can be based** on an unaccusative predicate' (**Perlmutter & Postal 1984a: 107**). Restoring one of **the few plausible** morphosyntactic universals is **perhaps** worthwhile in itself. Additionally, this insight **can be incorporated**, or reincorporated, into **most** syntactic approaches at no cost. Passives of unaccusatives are fully expendable in every account that allows them, since they are merely accommodated by generalized passive rules or constraints. The recognition of passives of unaccusatives in LFG, for example, does not reflect any deep formal or empirical principle, but is solely a consequence of formulating the passive rule so that it targets the most prominent semantic role of a predicator (**Bresnan 2001: 307**), rather than the subject function (**Bresnan 1982b: 9**). Returning to the **traditional view of** the passive as a subject-sensitive process is also compatible with a wide range of accounts, including the categorial analyses of **Bach (1980) and Keenan (1985)**, which map predicates onto predicates, and transformational approaches, such as **Baker et al. (1989)**. **There is an even broader consensus that** a detransitivizing morphological process plays a key instigating role in passive alternations; the main disagreements concern the syntactic reflexes of this process. Finally, a **morpholexical treatment of verbal diathesis also suggests the outline of a strategy** for consolidating a **number of** different approaches. Recasting RG analyses in morphological terms not only reconciles a relational perspective with **traditional views of** voice alternations, but also allows key insights of RG accounts to be integrated into constraint-based models. **Arguably** the central differences between RG accounts and those developed in GPSG, LFG or HPSG derive from the RG **claim** that relational strata are syntactic representations. However, there is no **compelling** reason **to assume** that strata - or entire relational networks, for that matter - are syntactic, rather than lexical. Strata provide an **almost** 'pure' expression of lexical valence, with **practically** no representation of any aspect of morphological form, constituent order or hierarchical structure. **A morphological interpretation of strata accounts** for the abstractness of RG analyses, since properties like order and arrangement are not represented in argument structures. The lack of a morphological component within RG also follows **if RG is reinterpreted in toto as a theory of morpholexical alternations**.

We started with a puzzle concerning the lexemic status of a class of derived nouns. **Do we regard bol'noj/bol'naja and ucascijsja/ucascajasja as forms of a single lexeme each or as two separate lexemes? If they are separate lexemes, how is it that they share all of their properties except for gender and how is it that the gender alternation is so regular? If they are forms of a single lexeme, how do we record the fact that a noun can be inflected for gender, when normally the gender of Russian nouns is an inherent property, not a fact of inflection? It is clear that** the converted nouns have the semantic representation of a noun and not an adjective. However, **I have argued that** the conversion process preserves that part of the morpholexical signature that defines the word as formally an adjective. Because adjectives inflect for gender, this means that there is a set of forms available from the

paradigm which **can be taken** over to signal gender differentiation. This allows the converted nouns to behave in the same way as adjectival pronominals such as drugoj 'other' or **indeed** like 3rd person pronouns. Moreover, the same **perspective** applies to adjectival surnames. **To the extent that we can say that** 3rd person pronouns belong to a single lexeme, **we can therefore regard** gender-inflecting converted nouns and surnames as forms of a single lexeme. Russian is not unique in this, **of course**. **Other** Indo-European languages present **essentially** the same picture. Standard German provides one particularly interesting twist. A German adjective takes different inflectional paradigms depending on the type of determiner it cooccurs with, e.g. ein gut-er Mann 'a good man', but der gut-e Mann 'the good man' (**Hammer 197 1: 48f.**). Deadjectival noun formation is very regular and such converted nouns exhibit the same morphosyntactic peculiarity when they appear in phrases (**Hammer 1971: 54f.**): ein Angestellter 'an employee (male)', eine Angestellte 'an employee (female)', der/die Angestellte 'the employee (male/female)'. There are **certain** deviations from the **expected** declension **in some cases** but the point is that a salient morphosyntactic property of adjectival agreement is preserved even under noun conversion. **It would be interesting to investigate what other adjectival properties are preserved under conversion in other languages.** **We may ask** whether the converted nouns and their kin are 'real' nouns (or indeed 'real' adjectives). **However, this is not, to my mind, a fruitful or interesting question.** These words have properties of both nouns and adjectives therefore **and one might wish to think of** them as 'mixed categories'. However, they differ in important ways from transpositions such as participles, relational adjectives or deverbal nominals. That type of transposition preserves the semantics but changes the morphosyntactic features (including lexical category). The converted nouns change their syntactic category and their semantics but preserve their morphological (inflectional) category. **It would be interesting to look for other cases where morphology is preserved under syntactic/semantic derivation in this way.** **An obvious case in point would be** the 'descriptive nouns' found in **many** American languages, such as Navajo, in which a noun is formed from a phrase which retains a **variety of** finite verb inflections (see **Spencer 2000: 317 for discussion**). **The fact that** lexical categories turn out to be 'mixed' in **at least** two distinct ways **illustrates** the extent to which the concept of 'lexical category' is a derived **notion**. **In the present case** it is a function of **at least** the morpholexical signature and the argument structure of the lexeme. These are the real primitives of lexical categorization and they **can be combined** in ways that give categories which are distinct from the canonical verb, noun or adjective. **But there is no need to be surprised or worried by this provided we have the right primitives and the right combinatorial theory for them.** Nonetheless, the deadjectival **nouns discussed here raise** important questions about the nature of lexical categories and the notion of the lexeme, and any complete theory of lexical structure and lexical relatedness will have to take full account of them.

If the semantic extension of -ung derivatives is accepted as an instance of polysemy, this implies that the derivatives are a **rare** counter-example to the accepted direction of semantic

change. The **implications of the findings** for this aspect of historical linguistics do not **seem to** be grave, however. The multiple senses of the -ung derivatives are a consequence of these derivatives' ability to denote more than one semantic function. **Potentially at least, it seems that** the suffix **could be used** to **primarily** form derivatives with any of the four concrete functions should a context require such a word. That this does not happen in practice is simply a matter of routine - and blocking - and does **not necessarily** prohibit the **potential** primary formation of derivatives with concrete senses. Only **if this were wholly prohibited, and if a primary abstract sense were a necessary first step (which is nonetheless the situation in the usage data studied)**, would the data seriously contradict the direction of semantic change. A further **implication** of a polysémie analysis is its acceptance that the nouns involved must be lexically listed. **It has been claimed** in generative linguistics that productively formed derivatives - such as the German -ung nouns are not lexically listed (**Aronoff 1976: 45; Zucchi 1993: 3**). The principle is that the productively formed derivatives only come into existence when created by rule and must be created again when needed again (**Anshen & Aronoff 1988 : 646**). Since a word must be lexically listed before it can assume additional senses, such a **view implies that** derivatives formed by productive means cannot become polysemous. In German, however, the attachment of -ung to a verb stem to form an action noun is highly productive. Overall, rather than occurring where suffixes have lost their coherence or productivity, **as argued by Aronoff (1976: 45)**, the polysemy **observed here seems to** occur when an affix is so productive and coherent that it **can be comfortably used** to denote more than one function or sense without confusion (despite the **potential** ambiguity out of context). **The claim that** productively formed derivatives are not listed in the lexicon thus does not tally with the **data studied here**. Indeed, **Haspelmath (2002: 44)** states that frequently used transparent derivatives **can** be lexically listed: **the phenomenon described here offers further evidence in support of this**. Finally, **the findings of this paper can be applied** to another, **similar** phenomenon in which a derived noun with a non-concrete sense comes to acquire concrete senses. In German, the deadjectival nouns formed with the suffix -heit (and its allomorphs -keit and -igkeit) **primarily** denote a quality. When a secondary sense with a personal referent is acquired, as in Persönlichkeit 'personality [quality]' + 'personality [person]', the word has moved backwards along the entire length of the semantic change continuum **shown** in (18) above. **Similarly**, Süßigkeit denotes in its primary (and earliest) sense the quality 'sweetness' and has acquired the concrete sense 'sweet (i.e. confectionery)'. In both these cases, the secondary sense is established and idiosyncratic (beyond denoting a concrete referent with the characteristics of the base adjective). Again, therefore, a polysémie analysis is preferable.

This report began with the observation that both family tree models and wave models are needed to account for the history and relatedness of language families. Family tree models are generated by the transmission of changes internal to the system of the speech community, while the wave model reflects the effects of diffusion through language contact. **I then considered** the **general consensus** of a strong constraint against the diffusion of language

structure in language contact. **My main thrust here** is to advance an explanation for this difference by attributing internal developments to generational learning, the incrementation of change in an unbroken sequence of parent-to-child transmission, and assigning the **major** effects of diffusion to the results of extragenerational learning. **If this is the case, it follows that** the results of language contact will be slower, less regular, and less governed by structural constraints than the internal changes that are the **major** mechanism of linguistic diversification in the family tree model. The difference will still be a matter of degree, since **recent studies of language change across the lifespan have shown** that adults do participate in ongoing change, though more sporadically and at a **much** lower rate than children. When language forms are transmitted by contact of single adults or individual families, less regular transmission **can be expected**. **The cases studied here suggest** the basic reason why structural borrowing is **rare**: the adults who are the borrowing agents do not faithfully reproduce the structural patterns of the system they are borrowing from. **The main body of the article applies this thinking** to the study of dialect diffusion, focusing on two cases **found** in the data of the Atlas of North American English. There is evidence that the complex short-0 tensing system of New York City has diffused outward to four different areas. The resulting systems **resemble** that of New York City in its superficial outline - the phonetic conditioning of tensing by the following segment - but differ from the original model in the absence of grammatical condition- ing, the open-syllable constraint, and specific lexical exceptions. The Northern Cities Shift developed simultaneously in all areas of the Inland North. The chain-shifting mechanism operates with a high degree of consistency, linking the movements of six vowels in an overall rotation. But the transmission of the system along the St. Louis corridor produces a more irregular result, **indicating that** the individual sound changes are diffusing individually rather than as a system. **To pursue these issues further, it would be helpful to know more about the limitations on children's ability to learn new dialects and on adults' inability to learn them. Our knowledge** of the diffusion of mergers is particularly inadequate, both for adults and children. **It has been indicated above that** children of nonlocal but native speakers of English can acquire native competence in a second dialect except for grammatically conditioned, lexical distributions (**Payne 1976, 1980**). **It was also suggested that** children of nonnative speakers are not so limited. This differentiation **may not** exist for the acquisition of chain shifts, given the uniformity of the Northern Cities Shift across **a large section of** the United States. **This issue may be resolved** by replications of the Payne, Oyama, and Kerswill studies in a city of the Inland North. Further studies of such communities **may add to our** appreciation of the large-scale consequences of changes in linguistic competence across the lifespan.

The view that emerges from considering alternative meanings in competition is one in which **most (perhaps all)** of the meaning that **might be thought** to attach firmly to a linguistic item is the one component **I have discussed** in least detail: semantic representation. **Perhaps all** that competent speakers of a language must 'know' about a word is the **rather** formal semantic properties that enable it to be combined with other words systematically to yield truth conditions for sentences in which it occurs. And these are not full and determinate truth

conditions but truth conditions relative to the referential value assigned to the word, which **may** vary without a distinctively linguistic change. In a formal linguistic system, the basic meaningful units do not have content assigned to them but only semantic types and the combinatorial principles related to these. The semantic type assigned to dog **might** specify that relative to a domain of discourse the word denotes a subset of that domain - the set of dogs in the domain. Equivalently, **one could think** of dog as denoting a function from the domain into the two values, true and false: the function **would** yield the value true for each individual in the set of dogs in the domain and false for each individual in the complement of the dog-set. A formal language **might** further use meaning postulates to constrain **possible interpretations** of its basic content items, but even such constraints cannot determine content. For example, **we might** require that nothing **can** be both a cat and a dog and that both cats and dogs are individuals in the domain of discourse. Such abstract characterizations, however, do not get **us** very far toward a concept of cat or of dog. Referential content, **I conclude**, is **basically** loaded into lexical items through social practices of language use. Speakers must enter into those practices in order to endow the **essentially** empty word forms they encounter with referential content. And conceptual baggage **even more obviously** gets attached - **sometimes** detached - through the social processes of using words to do various things: to collaborate with others on plans, to recount to one another experiences or feelings, to work with others on enhancing understanding of the world **we** share. When groping for linguistic resources to accomplish various **goals**, **we** reach for forms that **seem to have already been relatively** successful at doing **something similar**. Importantly, **we** select words from among others that contrast with them, a crucial point that **my** emphasis on words **may** obscure. Speakers and hearers alike expect **some** shifts in reference and in conceptual baggage: **we** do not require these content-laden and highly significant components of lexical significance to stay completely fixed. And **of course we** speak and interpret not word by word but in the context of ongoing discourse, during which words **can get endowed** with reference and conceptual baggage as they are deployed in syntactic relations to other words and in sentences that follow up on other sentences in a developing discourse. It is the **relative** emptiness of words - their strikingly formal character - that, **I hypothesize**, is responsible for their great functional value. **I repeat a slogan I have used before:** words matter so much precisely because so little matter is firmly attached to them.

In order to preserve strict cyclicity, **Chomsky (2001) proposes** adopting a process of pair-Merge distinct from the standard set-Merge **generally** available in constructing complex linguistic expressions. This pair-Merge is to apply only to adjuncts, **thus leading us to question how**, at the point in a derivation before two elements are merged, NS **might** know that an adjunction structure is required. In this squib, **I have rejected mechanisms** based on selection or semantics in favor of an empirically and theoretically motivated one based on adjuncts containing a functional shell parallel in nature to that of clauses and nominals. The head of this structure, called Mod, signals to NS that pair-Merge must occur, precisely where **Chomsky (2001) specifies** that it must, and nowhere else. It furthermore effects the semantic

correlate of pair-Merge, predicate composition/intersection, that **Chomsky claims** is required by considerations of the conceptual-intentional (C-I) interface, and it does so in a nonprimitive manner by making use of the independently required semantic mechanism of function composition. The need for what Mod provides is not in question: **as Chomsky (2001:18) states**,[...] **The device proposed here** is the functional head Mod, which yields predicate composition without distinguishing it semantically from composition in **other** domains. The existence of Mod is not motivated solely to satisfy this need of the C-I interface. **Indeed, it is not even motivated primarily to answer the basic question of this squib.** Instead, it is motivated for the independent empirical and theoretical reasons **outlined** in the previous section. **In adapting the Mod hypothesis to present purposes**, we unify the answer to empirical questions concerning the identity of morphemes in **various** unrelated languages with the **theoretical desire** to maintain strict cyclicity while accounting for antireconstruction effects. Either result **could be achieved** independently of the other, but the unified **proposal developed here** is simpler, and given its source in the requirements of interface conditions, it is more in line with the **Strong Minimalist Theory**. Furthermore, **this approach to determining pair-Merge opens the door** to the **possibility** of explaining the **apparently** strict relationship between adjunct types and particular syntactic heads, **noted in McConnell-Ginet 1982, Bowers 1993, Cinque 1999, and elsewhere**. **In discussing adverbs, adjuncts par excellence, Cinque (1999:106) succinctly states that** [...] There remains a clear need to explain this systematic correspondence between adverbs (or **more generally** modifiers) and particular syntactic heads. The **proposal made here seems** eminently suited to this task, **if it can be shown that** the correspondence is due to a relationship between the heads of the two pair-merged elements, *ot* and *P* in *(ao, f)*. That is, the relationship **might** be between Mod, the head of the functional structure involved in an adverb/modifier, and, **say**, the clausal functional head *I*, in a structure like *({Mod, Adv}, I)*. **Substantiating such a hypothesis, of course, will require much future research.**

What **I have tried to do here is develop a general theory** of constituency and constituency diagnostics, with the **goal** of explaining why different tests work the way they do and why they **often** produce contrasting or even conflicting results. **Although many theories have dealt with some of the contrasts between different structural diagnostics, I know of no** general predictive theory of what these contrasts are and why they exist. The critical ingredient of the **theory proposed here** is the **claim that** syntactic structures are built up incrementally by the grammar, in a strictly left-to-right order. The effect of this for constituency is that there are strings that are constituents at some point during a syntactic derivation, but are not constituents at later stages of the derivation. This, in turn, restricts the range of constituents that a **given structural test can see**: only strings that are constituents **at the point when the test applies can be seen by that test**. On the basis of differences in which derivational stages individual syntactic processes can see, **we can explain a substantial** amount of the variation among constituency diagnostics. **The list in (113) summarizes the main results explained** by the Incrementality Hypothesis **here**. (113) a. Coordination is a

more liberal diagnostic of constituency than other processes (section 4.1). b. Verb + preposition sequences can be coordinated but resist pseudogapping (section 4.1). c. VP-ellipsis bleeds scope/binding possibilities; VP-fronting does not (sections 4.2 and 4.3). d. Comparative ellipsis both does and does not bleed scope/binding possibilities, depending on word order (section 4.3). e. Conjuncts in noncoordinate RNR **may** undergo movement, **provided that all movement precedes addition of shared material** (section 4.4). f. C-command tests do not give rise to constituency conflicts (section 4.5). g. Argument stranding is disallowed in VP-fronting and VP-ellipsis, but not in comparative ellipsis and RNR (section 4.6). As a result, not only can **we** explain constituency conflicts without recourse to flexible constituency—thereby retaining the **assumption** of a single structure for any given sentence—we can also explain where **we expect to observe** constituency conflicts and where **we do not expect to find** them. Furthermore, **we** can do this without assuming any principled difference between tests, in contrast **to other** accounts of constituency conflicts. In an incremental derivation, the differences between constituency tests simply follow from the differences in when the tests apply. Finally, **it should not be forgotten that** incremental left-to-right structure building is a mechanism that is already extremely well motivated from studies of language production and comprehension (e.g., Marslen-Wilson 1975, Frazier 1978, Levelt 1989, Tanenhaus et al. 1995, Ferreira 1996). An incremental left-to-right structure-building mechanism is therefore a necessary component of the language faculty, independent of the grammatical considerations raised here. **It should also be noted that** the nonincrementality of **standard** models of grammar provided one of the primary **arguments** for separation of grammatical and processing systems in the 1960s and 1970s (see Fodor, Bever, and Garrett 1974, Levelt 1974). **If the current proposal is correct**, then this particular **argument** for separation of grammar and processing systems disappears. From the perspective of a general theory of the language faculty, therefore, the innovation of left-to-right structure building is **not really** an innovation at all; it is **something that we already know** to be available. All that is novel here is the claim that this property of syntax does **rather** more explanatory work **than is generally assumed**.

I have shown that a variety of phenomena fall **rather** naturally into place **if transitivity is treated as a substantive syntactic category**, one of the core functional categories at the heart of the computational system underlying human linguistic competence. **In essence, earlier theories attempted** to reduce transitivity to a relation between assignment of structural Case and θ -role assignment. **My investigations suggest that this approach needs to be fundamentally revised**. Obviously, both the Agree relation and θ -relations play crucial roles in the operation of the system of transitivity, **but the evidence shows that** transitivity, **like other functional categories that have been proposed**, has **some** irreducible content that cannot be **completely** explicated in terms of other mechanisms of the computational system. Transitivity is **similar** to predication **in this respect**. **As I have argued elsewhere**, predication is also a substantive syntactic category—**perhaps** the central syntactic category of natural language—whose role in the computational system cannot be reduced to other more basic categories or mechanisms. This does not mean, incidentally, that both predication and

transitivity **might not** be ultimately analyzable in terms of more basic substantive features, but such refinements **would not** affect the basic point that these categories are substantive rather than purely formal **in nature**. **If this conclusion is correct, it is worth thinking** for a moment about the nature of these categories. Both predication and transitivity are **essentially** relational. Predication is a relation (of a particularly fundamental kind) between two syntactic objects. Nothing precludes these two objects from being related to one another in other ways that are determined by other subsystems of grammar, but the relation itself is not reducible to the operations of these other systems. **Similarly**, transitivity brings two syntactic objects that **may be** related to one another in entirely different ways into a **certain** specified relation that is not decomposable into these other relations. Transitivity is different from predication in that it is not obligatory: not all sentences display transitivity, whereas all sentences display predication. Transitivity permits another syntactic element besides the subject to be brought into a relation with a predicate, but it is a subsidiary relation, hence is **not always** manifested in syntactic structure. Nevertheless, it is **frequently** there, even when not directly visible. **As my analysis of passivization and related phenomena shows**, transitivity is **often** demonstrably present even if the terms of the relation are not phonetically, or even syntactically, visible. **These observations suggest that perhaps** the entire linguistic system consists ultimately of a system of relations of various kinds between classes of lexical items. **Some of** these relations are purely formal, others are substantive, but all are ultimately relational **in nature**. **One of the major** theoretical challenges that faces linguistic theory at the present moment is to begin to make more precise exactly what it means to say that the fundamental categories in terms of which linguistic competence is organized are **essentially** relational **in nature**. **This study represents a step in that direction.**

The results of my study can be summarized as follows: First, adult native Italian speakers find that for all verb classes **some** novel items sound better than others. This contradicts a **number of** previous **findings that claim** that regular morphological processes are uniformly applicable to all novel words. Second, ratings of novel words are **significantly** correlated with numerical environment reliability values based on the minimal generalization model of morphological learning. **The fact that human ratings correlate well with neighborhood reliability values indicates that** speakers have knowledge about environments and reliabilities for all inflectional classes, including the regular class. **Because the ratings in this study are of novel words and not of existing ones, one must conclude that** speakers are **somehow** able to generalize their knowledge about the distribution of classes in the existing lexicon. **The model outlined** in § 2 represents this knowledge as a large set of symbolic rules, at all levels of generality. **There appear to** be two features that **contribute** to the success of **this model** in capturing the Italian **data**, as well as **Prasada and Pinker's English data**: First, it calculates reliabilities of morphological processes within particular phonological environments, expressed as the structural description format of symbolic rules, rather than focusing on lexical neighborhoods. In §4.4, **it was argued** that predictions based on phonological environments found an effect for English, where a lexical neighborhoods

approach failed to find one. Second, **this model** retains information about reliabilities in many specific environments, rather than simply keeping the single most general rule to derive regulars. **The current findings have implications** for symbolic and nonsymbolic approaches to morphology. For advocates of exemplar-based and analogical approaches, the challenge **is to find some** definition of similarity and lexical neighborhoods that can capture the item-by-item differences that **are observed** for novel regulars, both in the Italian **data** and in **Prasada and Pinker's English data**. For symbolic grammar-based approaches, the challenge is to determine where local generalizations about regular morphological processes reside in the linguistic system. **Under the model I have employed here**, they **are simply listed** alongside the **more** general rules, in a single, probabilistic grammar that includes both regular and irregular processes. **Under a more traditional model, with a limited number of very general rules**, knowledge about subgeneralizations **may be viewed as** 'workbench material', created during the grammatical acquisition stage and retained in **some form** in the adult system. **This view would be** incomplete, however, without three additional mechanisms: (1) a procedure that **can identify** the 'real' rules from amidst many more effective local variants of the rules on the workbench, (2) an explicit theory of how and where workbench knowledge is represented, and (3) an explanation of why **some** tasks encourage speakers to use workbench knowledge instead of the rules of their grammar. **But no matter what model is used to derive productive inflections**, **the results presented here show that it must be more than** simply a single, context-free rule.

The aim of the paper was to describe and analyze the operation of back-formation in neologisms over the last three decades. **Analysis of the sample** of 68 of the latest back-formations **has indicated** that **some of** the long-lasting **tendencies** continue even in this most dynamic period, e.g. the prevalence of verbs created by back-formation from action nouns, gradual decrease of adjectives back-formed from nouns, the disappearance of inflectional back-formations or the production of stylistically neutral items rather than marked ones. On the other hand, **some of the results prove** that the new layer of vocabulary is characterized by **certain** features which correspond to its “young age”, namely the diversity of structures. Compared to the overall **tendency** of back-formation in the total period (since 1900) to produce an increasing proportion of compounds, the most recent **sample of items attested** in dictionaries contains more non-compounds and a higher number of monomorphemic words. On the other hand, compounds are **fairly numerous** within the category of back-formed verbs itself and in addition, **the research has revealed** a higher number of compound back-formations in lively informal communication on the Internet which have **not been officially attested** yet. Also, the creation of nouns from adjectives (Type IV) **seems to be fairly** active, at the moment more active than forming verbs from agent/instrument nouns (Type I). Prefixal back-formations (Type VII) **appear to be** still comparatively productive too, even **if** they are **generally regarded as** a marginal type. **As far as stylistic value is concerned, it is worth mentioning that we can observe** a growing quantity of terms or other expressions related to the areas of IT and business at the moment. These features, in contrast to the long-established ones, **can be seen as evidence of** the continual movement in the language and the slow, gradual establishment of new words in the lexicon. **The research** among neologisms as **possible** source words for further back-formations has generated yet another **sample** of 25 back-formed items – those which **were suggested as** potential and subsequently confirmed as existing (but not entered in dictionaries yet) in Internet communication. After the addition of these newest ones and the attested back-formations from the last three decades, **the investigation** covered 93 back-formation-neologisms in all. In the total of back-formations collected for the period since 1900 until the present (733 items), **this latest sample** represents 13%. **However, this number is only relative since not all possible sources have been examined.** The **approximate number of** back-formations formed at this period **will be known only after a sufficient lapse of time when another retrospective study is made.** More importantly, **the fact that** new back-formations of various types continue to be created in informal communication and **are still being recorded** in dictionaries is **evidence** that this process of word formation is indeed productive and has **potential** for the future.

The analysis of the occurrences of ten English proverbs in the BNC and their ten Czech counterparts in the SYN2000 **has shown** that only a **limited number of** them, ranging from 26.0% in English to 53.8% in Czech, **can be regarded** as constituting speech acts by themselves. **This fact does not seem to have been significantly influenced by the fact that** between 44.3% and 33.7% of occurrences in English and Czech respectively are non-canonical in form (the proverb is a lexical or grammatical variant of the canonical form, has an elliptical form or is reduced to one of its “signature” parts). While the representation of constative, directive and commissive proverbs in the English and the Czech **sample** is **more or less** the same (3 constative, 6–7 directive, 1–2 commissive proverbs), when used in context as speech acts (87 and 155 instances out of 334 and 288 respectively), the

representation of each type of force in the occurrences of the English and the Czech proverbs **shows** differences: more constative uses among the English proverbs, more directive uses among the Czech ones. This is due to the overall 28 representation of individual proverbs and to numerical differences in speech act and non-speech act use. **The initial assumption that** the characteristic (canonical) form of the proverb which signals its presence in the text (**in addition to other features**) **can be considered** the proverb's IFID (with each proverb having a specific kind of force attached to it conventionally and permanently), though undoubtedly true, **has to be modified** in the sense that even the canonical form of a proverb is not a guarantee of speech act use (just as performative verbs **may not be used** performatively). For example, in the sentence It is said that 'Still waters run deep', the proverb is a clausal subject, and although both the framing main sentence and the proverb alone are constatives, the illocutionary force of the whole sentence (with the proverb as an object) is that of assertion, while the force of the proverb (**if used on its own**) is that of explanation. Conversely, **it is possible to find** instances of reduced or modified proverbs in text whose default illocutionary force is preserved ("Every cloud, as they say"). **The inevitable conclusion is that** the preservation of the conventional default illocution of proverbs in context depends less on the canonical form than on the observation of the felicity conditions which, in turn, depends on the circumstances wherein the proverb is used. In particular, the use of a proverb in dialogue or direct speech is **more likely** to involve its speech act use, while reported indirect speech and/or syntactic subordination are less favourable to such use, and metalinguistic use precludes it. All in all, proverbs **are perhaps best conceived of as** speech act idioms with default illocutionary force potential whose form (**or at least some prominent parts of it**) serves as an IFID. However, **this potential can be realized** only when the felicity conditions of the respective speech act are met. **As the study has shown**, this happens in text, especially written text, far **less frequently than perhaps assumed**. Also, **the findings of the study suggest that** the same proverbs (i.e., proverbs which are translation equivalents), occurring in comparable English and Czech corpora, are **in some respects** used differently in these two languages. In sum, the simple equation proverb-default illocutionary force **must indeed be qualified** by the proviso of felicity conditions fulfilment and by the understanding that there are many ways in which proverbs are used in text and **some of** them are not compatible with the proverb's conventional force (i.e. the proverb is not used as a proverb). In addition to drawing attention to the different uses of proverbs in texts **the study highlights** the importance of the felicity conditions in proverbs and **the fact that** these conditions **have not been described** so far. Their description **may prove rather** difficult for there **may** be conditions common to all proverbs and conditions specific only to **some**. **However, this is a task for another study.**

Even though body parts, especially those which are unique, **are usually associated** with nongeneric definite reference and thus with the use of the definite article or possessives, there are **several** cases in which a body part appears with the indefinite article. Since arm is not a unique body part, having more possible referents, the determination of this body part with the indefinite article is the least involved. **Most often**, the use of the indefinite article with arm is connected with functional sentence perspective in that these constructions conform to the **usual** configuration of a given theme (**usually** a subject) and a new element in the rheme (an arm). In addition, **the use of the indefinite article may suggest that** the possessive relationship between a subject and the body part does not hold and introduces a possessor other than the subject. Finally, the indefinite article **is also used** in situations where there are more subjects and a class of objects, viz a number of arms, is involved. Head and nose, on the other hand, are unique body parts and since they are polysemous, the use of the

indefinite article with these two body parts is **largely** connected with the respective meaning. The first distinction to be made depends on whether a head/a nose retains its basic meaning or is used with a modified (yet related) meaning, or whether the body part is used as a part of a fixed, idiomatic expression. When the body part retains its basic meaning, viz. a part of the body, a further division is made according to the syntactic function of the body part and its relation to the subject. Moreover,]s expressing other types of reference (i.e. generic or nongeneric indefinite non-specific) **need to be taken into account**. As in the case of an arm, the indefinite article plus head/nose is connected with functional sentence perspective, introducing a new element, a rheme, into the information structure. Both head and nose refer to the body part proper **in a majority of the examples**; however, their use with a modified (yet related) meaning is also **quite common**. In cases where head/nose refers to the body part, the indefinite article **almost** exclusively expresses nongeneric indefinite specific reference and there is **usually** possessive relationship between the subject and the body part in question (in these cases the body part appears in the syntactic function of object). In addition, a head **is also frequently found** in the syntactic function of subject and there are four examples in which the indefinite article expresses either generic reference or nongeneric indefinite non-specific reference. Thus, the use of the indefinite article with unique body parts **is shown to depend** not only on functional sentence perspective, but also, and even more importantly, on the meaning of the body part in question, and on the semantics of the indefinite article and of the sentence as a whole. In the style of fiction, an additional factor **has been found** in style-specific uses.

I have proposed an approach to early child communication **that I consider** useful for linguistically oriented analysis. **The approach concentrates** on **broadly** defined meanings, and **attempts to see** them in a complex way in terms of both the means of expression and the meanings. **The approach** respects the communicative function of language and the specificity of the early stages of development, including the situatedness of early child production, **the fact that** both the child's forms and their meanings can (and do) differ from the target ("adult") usage, and that language acquisition is a process. **I focused** on linguistic **interpretation** of the child's production within the context of interaction between the child and the carer. **I did not attempt to draw conclusions about the child's comprehension, about what the child really "had in his mind", or what the underlying and more general psychological principles behind the studied data might be.** **These problems would need to be analysed using other methods and approaches.** **I have illustrated the approach** by a case **study** of (widely delimited) negation in one Czech-speaking child during his one-word period (from **approximately** 12 to 18 or 19 months of age); **I focused** on the child's active production. **The proposed approach allows observation** of a wider repertoire of means of expressing negation used by the child. **It also enables** the grounding of the analysis of the linguistic means of expression in a broader context (i.e. mainly the context of **other**, nonverbal means of expressing the same meaning, and the context of the corresponding communicative intentions expressed by the child), and **it shows that** the main linguistic means of expression (ne, ne ne, neń) exhibited an interesting distribution of meanings and functions **quite** different from the target, and that they **seemed to form a certain** system (a gestalt) during the **period under analysis**. **A more detailed analysis of the data may show more clearly some other tendencies**: e.g. the shift from nonverbal to verbal means of expressing negation; the shift from less conventional gestures to more conventional ones; and **some** preferences for expressing **certain** communicative functions by **certain** means of

expression. **After the child starts to produce more complex utterances and starts to inflect words, a more syntactically oriented analysis would be possible.**

The paper aimed to illustrate the powerful role of a sequential analysis in obtaining an in-depth insight into the discursive process of decision-making in meetings. Specifically, **the focus was directed onto the investigation** of three discursive practices – Explanations, Accounts, and Formulations – **observed** in the utterances **of some** speakers as combining recurrently with the effect of creating and maintaining extended turns. Being able to draw on the unique individual properties of these practices, and to chain them effectively, increased the opportunities for the speakers either to influence or to drive the decision-making process. **This has been demonstrated** through examples of authentic data: The Green Button and ITUG01 single-case analysis. Importantly for the **analysis**, the exquisite characteristics of Explanations, Accounts, and Formulations lay in their appearing entirely unprepossessing and **commonplace**, rather than in their being extraordinary. **The research confirmed** that the practices were continually present in the meetings data – to the point where **many** speakers were demonstrating unconscious competence in their use. That is to say the individuals' use of the practices had become second nature to them. These speakers exploited the properties of the practices more successfully than did others, and **some** were also more skilful in combining their overall impact on the talk at hand. The practices formed part of their 'competency portfolio' assisting them to perform their respective professional roles. Exploration of the combined effect of Explanations, Accounts, and Formulations in the extended turns of meetings' talk is, **to the best of my knowledge**, novel to the **research reported**. **Somewhat** heuristic were also the tools of interactional matrices and the visual deconstruction of the extended turns into their individual practices. Although **primarily** facilitative of the textual analysis of the transcripts and of the actual discursive practices occurring, these tools advanced the application of CA by developing an insight into the fluidity and dynamics of the decision-making process in meetings. **The analysis enabled** the processing of a **relatively large** volume of transcripts, as well as the examination of the sequential nature of the practices as these were employed in talk. **It achieved this** by targeting extended turns, as opposed to taking the **traditionally** narrow focus on conversational data. At the macro-level, the **examination of the meetings' talk highlighted** the reduction in the use of discursive practices across a series of institutional meetings as the participants attempted to behave professionally and to remain relevant to the agenda point at hand. Further, **the analysis indicated** the interconnection between the three discursive practices and decision-making. The micro-**analysis subsequently identified** a set of distinctive patterns in which the practices occurred in the extended Combination turns; the impact of the patterns and the complementary role of Explanations, Accounts, and Formulations within these **were explored**. The practical application of the **findings may therefore be assumed as being essentially** twofold. One strand leads back to the environment of business organisations where, in the spirit of "partnership research", the **findings may** be contested, re-visited, and further honed in the context of authentic business interactions. Such an initiative **will help** to raise the profile and significance of talk as constituting an integral part of organisational models and **perhaps be deserving of greater consideration in this context in the future.** Collaboration with partnership organisations **will** also nurture what **may** later become the second, the applied, use of the CA insights **obtained**: to interpret and describe the communicative behaviours

associated with the act of decision-making in such a way that the research **findings may inform** communication teaching and training.

The search for sentences in which word order alone **can be relied** on to override all other FSP factors as a theme/rheme indicator **has proved to be** difficult: they are extremely **rare** and rather elusive, since they **cannot be easily identified** in electronic corpora by regular search tools. Their scarcity also makes them difficult to process quantitatively. **Additionally, it is fair to say that even the structures described in this paper could theoretically be found in contexts where their FSP interpretation was different from that suggested above, for example, if they were used as cases of second instance (Firbas, 1992, 111).** The strength of the weak factor is therefore **limited**; linearity only overrides the other FSP factors in a narrow range of syntactic constructions, which **tend to be rare. Yet, a few relatively safe assumptions can be made.** Such sentences are **almost** certainly more **common** in written than in spoken language. In written language the choice of unusual word order substitutes for prosodic marking of the rheme, whereas in spoken language the rheme is sufficiently signalled by the placement of the intonation nucleus, even when it contradicts the non-prosodic indicators. In other words, linearity **can** override the other two non-prosodic factors (context and semantics), but it **is difficult to imagine** it overriding prosody. Unusual word order in prepared spoken language (public speeches, etc.) **may be used** to create a special stylistic effect (rhythm, parallelism, etc.), whereas in unprepared spontaneous talk **it would most likely be interpreted as** an imperfection resulting from processing-time constraints. The effect of linear indication of FSP grows with the degree to which a particular linear arrangement of clause constituents is unusual. Subject that-clauses **can be used to show that** while the **common** case of extraposition has **negligible** effect as an FSP indicator, the **much rarer** initial position **virtually** always renders the that-clause thematic, and the extremely **rare** subject that-clause postposition **must be interpreted** as a signal of rhematicity. Even in written language, unusual word order is **most likely** a polyfunctional device; its FSP indicating function cannot be strictly separated from **other**, particularly stylistic, effects. Instances of predication fronting are a good example of this. **Last but not least, it has to be borne in mind that the leading role of word order as an FSP factor as described in this paper must be understood strictly from the interpretation point of view, in terms of the occasional capacity of word order to be a sufficient, albeit not the only, signal of the thematic or rhematic status of a constituent.** The FSP of a given sentence is always a product of an interplay of all of the factors, and word order can only operate within the framework set by this interplay. The choice of unusual word order is therefore not the cause, but merely an important symptom of a particular FSP.

The present analysis has illustrated that single spatial adverbials of all semantic classes **tend to** perform the DSF of Specification, placed **mostly** in end position in this function. When performing the DSF of Setting, which concerns only adverbials referring to position and direction, they are placed either in initial or end position, the latter position being predominant. The preference to perform the DSF of Specification applies only to two semantic classes of single temporal adverbials, **notably** those of position and duration, placed invariably in end position in this function. The medially placed temporal adverbials, referring to position, relationship and frequency, perform the DSF of transition, for the last-mentioned semantic class it being the most **typical** function. On the contrary, for temporal adverbials of relationship, the most **typical** DSF is that of Setting, placed **in the majority of cases** in initial position when performing this function. As for multiple spatial adverbials occurring in

clusters, **my results indicate a tendency** to perform the same function, most **frequently** that of Specification. As for multiple temporal adverbials, being **almost as frequent** in continuous as in discontinuous sequences, they **tend to** perform the same function when occurring in clusters, whereas in combinations, the most **typical** case is one temporal adverbial placed initially with the function of Setting and one placed finally with the function of Specification. As for DSFs performed by heterosemantic sequences of adverbials, **based on the above investigation it can be concluded that** clusters with S—>T word order placed in end position **tend to** perform the DFS of Specification, if not both, then **at least** one of them. As for combinations with T—>S word order, there is a great variety of possibilities with regard to the DSFs such co-occurring adverbials can perform in the act of communication, the most **typical** case being an initially placed temporal adverbial with the function of Setting and a finally placed spatial adverbial with the function of Specification. **The present inquiry has shown that** subordinate temporal clauses—in spite of **being found** in all positions within the structure of their superordinate clause—**tend to** be placed in end position, **notably** when performing the DSF of Specification. When placed in initial position, they serve as a Setting, although **they have been found** in this function also in the other clause positions. As for subordinate spatial clauses, they **have been found** only in end position, invariably performing the DSF of Specification. **The analysis of conversational texts with regard to FSP has proved that** the dynamic semantic functions performed by spatial and temporal adverbials in the further development of communication depend on the interplay of all the four FSP factors.

This paper has shown that monosemantic **approach seems to** be adequate when dealing with the modal verb can, **viewed as** having a core invariant meaning (potentiality). The occurrences **interpreted as** ability, possibility, or permission **can be seen as** a modification of the underlying core sense in the appropriate contextual conditions. **The root possibility reading of can proved** to be the most frequent one and **can be generally considered** more neutral (unmarked) than permission or ability; it **often** applies only because there is no clear indication of restriction or of inherent properties of the subject and the action **is merely viewed as theoretically possible**. By contrast, since may **can be employed** to express epistemic and root possibility, **it can be characterized as** polysemous. Nevertheless, the two **seemingly** distinct senses co-occur **almost** exclusively in formal settings, where it **may sometimes** be problematic to distinguish between them; cautious statements (epistemic possibility) and presenting information as a fact (root possibility) **tend to** merge in scientific discourse. **The analysis has revealed that** syntactic correlations are **rather** weak and **may** prove ineffective in distinguishing subtle differences in the meaning conveyed. Particularly with may, the syntactic criteria **listed in the literature** on modality focus **largely** on differentiating epistemic possibility from root permission, but do not relate adequately to the differences between the two possibility senses. **The context provided the necessary clues for the final disambiguation of many instances, but sometimes it was difficult to establish the point at which one interpretation was no longer possible. It has been confirmed that** the domain of root possibility is dominated by can, whereas that of epistemic possibility by may, **which implies that** there are many distributions in which the two modal verbs cannot compete. Even though they both can convey root possibility, in **nearly** half of the cases (43%) root possibility can and may are in complementary distribution, i.e. may is marked for formality and is **unlikely** to substitute for can in less formal contexts. Can **appears to be** unmarked in that it is not restricted regarding stylistic variation and **normally** occurs in various

settings, formal as well as informal. Root possibility can and may overlap merely in affirmative sentences and their interchangeability is **largely** restricted to formal settings (ADMIN and ACAD POSSIBILITY READINGS OF CAN AND MAY 103 in this study), where they **tend to be employed** as stylistic variants, and **seem to be partly** conditioned by specific syntactic co-occurrence patterns. Yet the extent of semantic overlap between root possibility can and may in formal settings is remarkable, they are interchangeable in 94% of occurrences in ADMIN and ACAD. Root may **usually** conveys possibility due to enabling external conditions, whereas with can the fulfilment of the action **may sometimes** depend on a mixture of external factors and inherent properties of the subject.

This study investigated the use, distribution and functions of cognitive verbs in political interviews. More specifically, the focus was on the most frequent verbs in the **corpus**, namely think, mean, and believe occurring the first-person singular and first-person plural present tense. These verbs function parenthetically, which means that they are functionally and structurally flexible and independent of the complement clause and they are not followed by the complementizer that. Parenthetically-used cognitive verbs in political interviews **may** either intensify or attenuate the illocutionary force of the utterance, depending on the linguistic and situational context, on the syntactic position and prosody. If used initially with phonological prominence, they function as boosters, if used medially or finally without phonological prominence, they **tend to** hedge the proposition. When determining pragmatic functions of these parentheticals, prosody alone **may not necessarily** reveal them. Both the situational and linguistic context is relevant. Lexical items **may** be unstressed because of their position or because being repeated in the discourse, **not necessarily** because of their function. They **may** be stressed not because of their importance or contribution to the propositional meaning, but because of the rhythmic structure of the sentence. The examined cognitive verbs express subjectivity, **which indicates that** politicians focus on self-presentation and expressing their attitudes and opinions as correct ones, they also invite the recipients to adopt the politician's perspective. **In this way**, cognitive verbs **may be regarded** as markers of intersubjectivity. I think is the prototypical representative of cognitive verbs and accordingly the most frequent **in my corpus**. Compared to the incidence of I think, the distribution of I mean and I believe is **not that** high. The reason is that the other two parentheticals have a more determinate semantic meaning than I think. Also, they have not undergone the process of grammaticalization and pragmaticalization as I think has. I think, therefore, does not express cognition only but rather speaker attitude to the proposition. It also has interactional function. The distribution of I mean is more restricted compared to that of I think. It is due to its more precise semantic meaning. **According to Fetzer**, I mean is present **primarily**, it [...]or make an explanation or correction of a statement (2014: 68). I believe is also a cognitive verb with **rather** specific and more determinate semantic meaning. Thus, its frequency of occurrence in the **corpus** is low compared to I think and I mean. When using I believe the speaker **feels** sure of the truth of the information conveyed. **It is considered as** the most straight-forward and the least grammaticalized [construction] of the three cognitive verbs examined because of its determinate meaning (**Fetzer 2014: 68**). Other cognitive verbs appearing in the interviews, assume, suppose, and guess, are low in frequency because their use is constrained to more formal contexts, or, in case of guess to informal language. **Another aim of this paper was to examine** co-occurrence of cognitive verbs with discourse markers. I think collocates with a **number of** discourse markers, e.g. and, but, so, well, yes, and no. As the configuration and I think occurs **frequently** in political discourse, **Fetzer**

(2014: 79–80) assigns it the status of [...] (Fetzer 2008: 251). Other collocations of I think with discourse markers do not occur so frequently, therefore, they cannot be assigned the status of a salient discourse pattern. The cluster and I believe is also frequent in political discourse, so it has also been ascribed the status of a salient discourse pattern. It indicates that [...] (Fetzer 2014: 81). The collocation of I mean with the discourse marker and is very low (a mere three occurrences in the corpus), which again derives from its restricted semantics.

The paper investigated the use of metaphor in newspaper articles on natural catastrophes with the focus on social and cognitive functions that metaphor performs. The analysis revealed that the newspaper representation of the 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami and 2005 Hurricane Katrina is predominantly metaphorical, drawing upon three major metaphor themes: the depiction of the natural phenomena as animate beings, monsters and war. The metaphor theme of animation is realized by lexical means ascribing to the hurricane and the tsunami a human body, sounds made by animals, and negative emotions. Animation is also established in the transitivity pattern of sentences referring to the tsunami and the hurricane, in which the natural phenomena occupy the role of an agent, implying that they act of their own volition. Hyperbolic and emotionally colored lexis are used to portray the natural phenomena as enormous, frightening and violent monsters, and the war theme tends to be expressed in explicit similes and references to the tsunami and the hurricane as attacking, fighting and punishing people. The consistent employment of metaphorical language results in the naturalized construction of the natural phenomena as furious and heartless monsters. Metaphor leads to the categorization of the events drawing upon frames that people are familiar with. It articulates a coherent, feasible world-view, which helps people to comprehend and make sense of natural catastrophes. It thus serves as a tool of conceptualization employed to get a better understanding of reality. Yet, the categorization process produces a black-and-white and a good-versus bad portrayal of natural catastrophes. It leads to a simplification of complex issues, hiding the causes of the events and hindering constructive action. Moreover, metaphor appeals to readers' emotions, which prevents rational problem-solving of the situation and makes people take the constructed picture of the natural phenomena for granted. By intensifying fear in people, newspapers call forth the need to be protected by those in power, resulting in the reinforcement of unequal power relations. Demonization of natural phenomena hides the failure of the key notion of Western Enlightenment ideology – the superiority of science and technology which corresponds to an anthropocentric world-view seeing mankind as dominating nature. Nevertheless, the bipolarization of the world into innocent people and violent nature maintains the sharp divide between nature and culture characteristic of Enlightenment ideology. It also contributes to the establishment of a symbolic community among people, knitting them together through the evocation of feelings of belonging and solidarity. Demonizing metaphor themes serve to justify human failure, hide politico-economic and social conditions and thus work as an effective ideological tool. To conclude, the paper reveals on the analysis of concrete linguistic material that metaphor simultaneously performs several cognitive and social functions, which are all intertwined with each other. This multi-functionality makes metaphor a unique and very effective discursive tool to be employed in newspapers.

The analysis of the non-verbal elements of university websites has supported Kress and van Leeuwen's view of visual images as independent messages carrying their own ideational, interpersonal and textual meanings rather than relying **fully** on the verbal text as its illustration or specification (Kress and van Leeuwen 2006). Independent but related within the frame of the website layout, the visual image meanings come into a simple or complex interplay with the texts, and loosely or closely integrated, they co-create the multimodal discourse colony representing and promoting an institution. **The fact that** the amount of visual images (photographs, pictures, videos) decreases the more the viewer delves into the depth of the hypertext **suggests that** non-verbal modes **are perceived and used** as important attention-getting devices and effective promotional tools. The **considerable differences between the frequencies of occurrence and the roles played by non-verbal elements in the British and American websites on the one hand, and in the Czech website on the other hand, suggest that – generally speaking –** the genre of institutional website presentations **could still be seen as** emerging, having reached different levels of evolution in different cultures. It is, **of course**, not only the value of multimodality that serves **here** as an indicator of the development of the genre: **in the corpus surveyed**, the developing use of nonverbal items corresponds with developmental changes in the content and form of the verbal texts (for an analysis of university website texts and their cross-cultural comparison see Tomášková 2011b). **The current findings** contrasting the British/American and Czech university presentations **suggest that** the distinctions are related to the social and cultural contexts, and thus confirm that genres as such are culture-based and culturespecific, and that they originate, develop and decline in accordance with the resources, needs and expectations of the society in which they live. For **many** years in the Czech environment, the historically long-term substantial excess of demand over supply with regard to the numbers of students applying and admitted, steady financial support from the state and the **perceived** self-evidence of the impact of universities on society absolved educational institutions from the necessity to present and promote themselves to the general public on a daily basis. Whereas **Fairclough commented** on the promotionalization of British university discourse in the early 1990s (1992), in Czech society this phenomenon has only recently come to the fore. **This is obviously a trend that** provokes evaluative remarks of a different kind. **Even though such evaluation is beyond the scope and the aims of this study, it may be noted that –** besides the **possibly** negative aspects of burdening universities with a self-presentational and promotional agenda –this development also makes universities focus their attention on the students and their needs, and on the importance of open communication and social responsibility. **Discussing possible approaches to multimodal analysis and genre analysis in general, Bateman (2008) also stresses that** analysts should not ignore the **potential** of the technology behind it, which may either enhance multimodal creativity or **significantly** limit it. The state of Internet technology, and the course it takes in the future, will inevitably inspire and shape the generic set on the web. The transformation of the Charles University website in 2013 was a step away from the static, non-interactive, notice-board-like Web 1.0 to the realm of the communicative, receiver-oriented Web 2.0, whilst the 2014 upgrade of Harvard University website **may augur** the gradual approach of the interrelated, dynamic virtual world **expected** in Web 3.0. Narrative images in photographs at the 2013 Harvard website have been **largely** replaced with audio-visual interviews with students (current as well as alumni), teachers and staff, **many of** which abandon the model of **a rather** static interview with a seated interviewee and instead present a documentary introducing the student's and/or university life, with the interviewee present as a voiceover. **The trend thus seems to** head for the construction of a multifarious

multimodal image of the university world within institutional discourse with the verbal message co-created by a polyphony of voices.

The conclusions to be drawn from the foregoing discussion concern both nonmodified and modified noun phrases. The higher representation of the former in fiction **appears to be at least partly** due to **a relatively** high frequency of occurrence of proper names, whose modification is greatly restricted **in general. In the academic sample** this category is marginal. On the other hand the higher representation of modified noun phrases in the latter **sample appears to be at least partly** connected with the structure of technical terms, which are **frequently** two-word formations, with the modifier specifying the meaning of the head noun or designating a subcategory of the concept denoted by the head noun. Another feature of stylistic relevance **was noted** in the semantics of the premodifiers. **While in the academic sample** these modifiers, including not only adjectives, but also premodifying participles and gerunds, express classificatory meaning and **often** function as components of technical terms, in fiction they convey descriptive or evaluative meaning, and non-finite forms are **rarer** in this function. Both quantitative and qualitative differences reflecting the subject matter of the texts **were further noted** in the case of the possessive case and apposition. While the possessive case, in connection with the **relatively frequent** occurrence of proper names, **appears to** characterize fiction, apposition, especially of the enumerative/exemplificatory type, reflects the expository nature of the examined academic text. **Minor** differences connected with the subject matter **were also found** in the case of relative clauses. The syntactic functions of the relativizers differed in a **marked** prevalence of the subject function **in the academic sample**, whereas the fiction **sample displayed** great predominance of personal antecedents of the subject relativizers. In academic prose there was only one instance of this kind, **a large majority of** the antecedents of subject relativizers being inanimate. As regards the degree of complexity in the modification structure, no **major** differences, either quantitative or qualitative, **were noted** in the two texts. This is ascribable to the formal, rather than informal tenor of the narrative, and **may be classed** as a feature of the author's style. **Similarly**, the high representation of apposition and the particular types **in the academic sample may** be due to the particular field of study from which the text is drawn. Nevertheless, **some of** the points **that have been made, notably** the role of proper names, the distribution and semantics of premodifiers, **and possibly some others, may be afforded more general** stylistic relevance.

The discussion has shown that the degree of the explicitness of verbal meaning reflects the degree of the explicitness of pragmatic inferencing. Although English constructions employ primary self-agentive locomotion verbs, the meaning of the entire construction is given by a **more or less** firmly established pragmatic pattern (or by a set of pragmatic patterns), **regularly** associated with a given construction. In other words, the decoding of the meaning of the English construction is heavily dependent on situational frames. In the Czech equivalents of the constructions in question, by contrast, the meanings of verbs are, on the whole, **much more** explicit with regard to the meaning of the construction as used in a given situation. The high degree of dependence of the meaning of the English construction on the overall situational frame **can quite clearly be explained** by the high

degree of the generality of the verb's meaning. By contrast, Czech self-agentive locomotion verbs do not gain in the generality of their reference (the reason **apparently** lies in the lack of a structural counterpart for the English SA construction), which is a prerequisite for the expression of a variety of pragmatic meanings with which English SA constructions are endowed. A final point. **The discussion also raises the question, not considered here, but in need of further research**, of the relationship between the degree of pragmatic explicitness and the compositionality of constituting the construction's meaning. This problem is linked to the question of what constructional meaning actually is. **Generally speaking**, constructional meaning cannot be restricted to the meaning of the verb and the specific structuration in terms of thematic roles (in the case of SA constructions, the causee, in spite of assuming a subordinate position, represents a second energy source, i.e. retains an agentive role). **Certainly, it cannot be denied that** constructions are endowed with their own meaning; following **Goldberg (1995)**, the meaning of SA constructions **may be specified as, roughly**, the causer causes a causee to move. **Very often**, however, the association of verbal meaning and what is called "constructional meaning" does not capture the meaning of SA constructions in their complexity. **The paper has shown that** what also comes into play is pragmatic inferencing, i.e. the anchorage of the caused motion event in a specific situational frame.

Taking into consideration what has been said in the last paragraph of the preceding section, it could be argued that so much that is relevant and related to the topic of politeness is not given direct attention within the scope of the present paper. This is obviously true, but in my view, to provide a complete examination of such a complex and multivalent phenomenon would be impossible anyway. Despite all of these acknowledged deficiencies, I hope that my research has shed light on several (albeit limited) aspects of doctor–patient interaction with respect to the **politeness principle**. The findings indicate that both dialogue participants (the doctor and the patient) employ positive politeness mechanisms **quite frequently**, throughout the medical interview, and of all selected types. The quantitative analysis, supplemented with qualitative interpretation, shows that the most productive category of positive politeness is 'claiming common ground' and the phase which witnesses the most frequent utilization of these strategies is the treatment phase. In addition, **it can be stated that** to address the positive face wants of their patients, doctors initiate a series of varied positively polite strategies, enabling them to convey, among **other** things, social closeness, empathy and understanding to their clients. The positive talk of patients also takes a range of diverse forms. Patients **often** manifest friendliness, tease their doctors, joke, laugh, and initiate social talk. Individual strategies are combined, and **contribute to** a trustful and sharing atmosphere between the doctor and the patient. At the same time, however, **it needs to be remarked that** both interactants initiate face-threatening acts, though patients do so only **rarely**. On the other hand, they also use a **variety of** techniques and mitigating devices employed in order to save 'face'. In addition, both participants orient themselves towards conversation and politeness maxims, **usually** following the maxim of quality, **from time to time** flouting the remaining conversation maxim, and parallelly adhering to politeness maxims for salutary purposes. Importantly, the section of diagnosis, compared to the final part of the consultation, is **much more** formal, with the participants **rather** reserved and keeping their distance. **Clearly**, the medical consultation is a dynamic discourse type **which defies absolute and exhaustive conclusions**. **It is especially for this reason that I do not rely exclusively on my own findings, but often refer to other sources**. On the other hand, **I believe I have brought**

enough evidence to support the standpoint that recent social changes have modified the traditional model of the doctor–patient relationship and prepared ground for reduction of hierarchies and redefinition of roles in favour of the patient.

In conclusion, **at the moment** the state's integration policies **seem to** outweigh language minority rights protection, and **this approach** is also reflected in governmental language policy. The first key **goal** is the integration of the acknowledged national minorities, such as the Armenians or Azeris, into Georgia. They should be enabled, by developing communication skills in Georgian, to participate in political life actively, to become educated in the Georgian language at Georgian universities, and to find employment in Georgia. All this **should be achieved** by strengthening Georgian language education. However, when promoting these **goals**, the Georgian government **does not seem to** realize that the loyalty or integration of national or unacknowledged national minorities are **often** also a matter of maintaining their identity. Therefore in addition to supporting their integration by means of integrating the Georgian language into the curricula within general education, **often** leading to their assimilation rather than integration, **some** disintegrating elements **might be best appeased** by allowing them to maintain their own cultures and learn (in) their respective national languages. The Kists **seem to** be very aware of the integrating role of the Georgian language, but they also aim to enhance their Kist Chechen language skills, a goal which is not currently supported by the government. The second key **goal** is the integration of Georgian young people and other citizens into the Western English-speaking community, finding a better alternative for the state's model than the Russian one. It is European soft power that is attractive for the Westernoriented Georgian politicians, involving Europe's prosperous society and the peaceful relations among the EU member states. The introduction of the English language into Georgian society **often** symbolizes a better future for the people from poverty-stricken regions, such as Pankisi, while in other parts of the country, such as Signaghi in Kakheti or the capital Tbilisi, it is a matter of earning considerable income. People of any ages running small businesses offering services for tourists, such as guest houses, restaurants, cafes or shops, often prefer and are proud to speak in English to tourists, rather than Russian, as their customer base has been changing in recent times. If future governments manage to persevere this direction of policy, a new generation of Georgian citizens will grow up communicating in English fluently, which will make them part of the European and Western community, thus bringing **certain** benefits with it.

This paper discusses the nature of antonymy in English, concentrating on its perception by native and non-native speakers. For both native and non-native speakers, there is a scale running from prototypical examples of antonyms (canonical antonyms) to loosely related antonymic pairs. Canonical antonyms are defined as pairs of words with opposite meaning related by convention as well as by semantics (**Paradis, Willners, Löhndorf, and Murphy**). These pairings of **general** meaning co-occur **frequently** in English texts and they **are supposed to be** learnt together (**Paradis, Willners, and Jones**). Comparison of antonym canonicity perception by native and non-native speakers is based on the **data** acquired from elicitation experiments with 50 native speakers of English and 50 advanced learners with Slovak as their mother tongue. The advanced learners **were asked to participate** because it had previously **been shown that** their mental lexicon is very **similar** to the

mental lexicon of native speakers (**Singleton; Zareva; Wolter**). The participants **were asked to give** the best antonyms of the proposed adjectives. To make the data as accurately comparable as possible, the same set of words and the same conditions for filling the questionnaire **were used** for the non-native speakers as in the elicitation experiment with native speakers **designed by Paradis, Willners, and Jones**. **In compliance with the hypothesis, the results of the elicitation experiment with nonnative speakers indicate that** the nature of antonymy in English is the same whether the speakers are native or non-native. There is a continuum from very strongly related antonymic pairs eliciting only one antonym to weakly related words of opposable meaning both in ENS and ENNS. Differences between native and non-native speakers in preferences for particular words as the best antonyms of the given items **may** emerge due to non-native speakers' **limited** vocabulary, fewer links between the items in the non-native speakers' mental lexicon, or non-native speakers' restricted awareness of all possible contexts where the **proposed items can be used**. The above-mentioned differences are apparent in the group of less strongly related antonyms. The set of all antonyms **proposed** for the individual items differs **partially in the vast majority of cases**. All the tested items can be divided into three categories: the words that elicited more antonyms in ENS than in ENNS (47 %), the words that elicited more antonyms in ENNS than in ENS (over 34 %), and the test words that elicited the same number of antonyms in ENS and ENNS (**less than 29 %**). However, the **lists of antonyms suggested** for the individual test items from the latter group are **not fully** identical, regardless of the cases of canonical antonyms. **These observations may indicate that** although native speakers are aware of a wider range of contexts where the given antonymic pairs can occur, convention plays a more important role in their perception of antonymy than in non-native speakers'. Furthermore, the number of omitted responses in ENNS is 6.617 times higher than in ENS. The difference between the proportions of omitted responses in ENS and ENNS is natural, as the mental lexicon of learners is **usually limited** in comparison to that of native speakers. However, the behaviour of antonyms is the same in ENS and ENNS – the test words with omitted responses constitute less strongly related antonymic couplings than the words with all 50 responses. None of the strongly related pairs include a word with omitted responses. Therefore **it seems that** canonical antonym members are well-established words from the core vocabulary of English with **general** meaning. **All in all, the research presented in this paper indicates that** canonical antonyms do exist in the mental lexicon of non-native speakers. Moreover, the set of canonical antonyms is very **similar** for both native and non-native speakers with an advanced level of English. **This conclusion makes room for further investigation of the indicators of antonym canonicity in English and of the nature of the lexical-semantic relation of antonymy in general.**

This study has aimed to reveal distinct types of discrepancy occurring between the Czech text and the hand gestures in the film *American Beauty* (1999). **The first aim was to determine** individual communicative units co-occurring with the gestures in the English and Czech versions. The **results of these analyses were then contrasted**. **The contrastive analysis revealed that** out of 129 gestures, 29 were performed alongside different sentence constituents (communicative units) in the Czech text than in the original. Nevertheless, out of the 29 gestures which involved a change in function, only 15 distorted the delivered message **to some extent**, accounting for 11.6% of the total number of **analyzed gestures**. The remaining 14 gestures with discrepancy in FSP function were mainly those indicating the speaker's relationship to the referent, i.e. expressing and supporting particular intentions. **In general**, such gestures are semantically related to the entire utterance. As **they are performed** rhythmically, they **can** occur on any communicative unit which does not carry a lower

relative degree of CD and is thus not suitable for emphasis. The functions of these gestures in the communication between the audience and the film have been preserved. Different types of discrepancy between the Czech text and the hand gestures affecting the functions of the gestures **have been identified and classified** into semantic discrepancy, discrepancy in emphasis and rhythmic discrepancy. Not surprisingly, semantic discrepancy occurred mainly with gestures related to the speaker's referent. Discrepancy in emphasis occurred mainly with gestures indicating the speaker's relationship to the referent. Rhythmic discrepancy occurred with any types of speech-related gesture. All three types of discrepancy **seemed to be caused by the fact that** the actors working in the Czech dubbing had not observed the visual aspect of the film when speaking. Despite causing awkwardness by means of distorting the function of the gesture in relation to speech, the **discrepancies mentioned** above did not prevent the audience from receiving the delivered message. They only weakened it, limiting it or **some of** its aspects to one channel – i.e. the verbal one. **The above observations point to the conclusion that** the verbal and nonverbal aspects of the film make different contributions to the message of the film delivered towards the audience. While the hand gestures only **support** the message, contributing to better communication, it is the verbal aspect that is crucial to whether the audience receive the message or not.

This article presents a brief outline of the developments of English in sentential and clausal syntax between the Early and Late Modern period and the impact these developments have had on the information structure of higher syntactic units. **The aim was to identify the tendencies** in the usage of various syntactic means for the **indication** of the functional sentence perspective and to assess the extent to which these means are employed in the language during different chronological stages. In accordance with the initial expectations, the Early Modern text **has been found to tend** towards a lower level of segmentation in terms of sentential units, expressing a corresponding semantic content in a lower **number of** sentences than the Present-day version. At the same time, this **tendency** is counterbalanced by higher concision and increased economy of expression. **This is mainly achieved by frequent** usage of non-finite forms and nominalizations in places where the parallel Late Modern text resorts to finite realizations. Especially noticeable is this disproportion in the usage of adjectival relative clauses in the newer version, which **are often employed** as a means of rendering a particular communicative unit more dynamic, stressing its sentential rhematicity. This is in line with a **more general observation** of the 20th century text inclining both towards a greater level of explicitness and specificity, and its disposition to employ constructions which achieve the accommodation of rhematic elements towards the end of a clause or sentence. A very perceivable manifestation of this **tendency can also be observed** in the focalization of predicates, a **trend virtually** absent from the Early Modern version. Interestingly, the Early Modern text does not resort to **some other** types of constructions used in the later version in order to make clauses comply with the basic distribution of communicative dynamism. Inversions motivated by the principles of end-weight or end-focus are **rare**; they are **mostly** governed either by grammatical rules identical to those of Present-day English, or connected with lexical elements, viz. the regular inversion of pronominal subjects combined with quoth predicates, **perceived as** vestigial of the earlier stages of the language. Also absent from the earlier version are the elements of closer interaction employed in the Late Modern dialogues in order to achieve the impression of a more authentic, engaging discussion. **It should be stressed, however, that due to the limits of the methodology used in this**

research the findings here presented are necessarily tentative, as they are bound to the limitations of the authors' own idiolects and cannot thus be taken as representative of the language of the whole historical period.

In this paper I dealt with two types of sandhi, vocalic and consonantal, in Sanskrit in comparison with Prakrits. The junction of two vowels of **similar** quality causes contraction of vowels (into one long vowel) in Sanskrit as well as in Prakrits (when the second word begins with an open syllable in Prakrits) where in addition one vowel, either final or initial, **can** be subject to deletion (if the second word begins with a closed syllable), and the same situation is characteristic for the junction of two different vowels in Prakrits. After the elision of the final vowel, there the remaining vowel **may be lengthened**. There in sandhi any initial vowel **could** even fall away, and these sandhi forms were **occasionally generalized**. Moreover, Aśokan Prakrit and Pāli admit all kinds of hiatus which **can be bridged** either by a glide or by special sandhi consonants. The results of the junction of two vowels of different quality in Sanskrit can be diphthongization, phonological variation, elision of the initial vowel and **sometimes** hiatus. **In the case of** the junction of two consonants as well as the junction of a consonant and a vowel in Sanskrit, **typical** is assimilation of voicing or of the place of articulation, whereas in Prakrits all final consonants, except nasals, were lost, thus just simple or nasalized vowels can stand finally in Prakrits. Thus, only the final -f **may** undergo sandhi changes within the sentence. Furthermore, the external sandhi in Prakrits does not apply to all the words of a sentence but only to those which are syntactically closely connected. **It is evident that** in Prakrits the basic (pause) form of the word is **typical** not only for the end of sentences, verses or hemistiches, but also for the internal frame of these formations as is also evidenced by the situation in Old Iranian and in Middle (and New) languages. **For the most part** it is **possible** to derive their forms from pause form of Old-Aryan words, though. Yet **we must be aware** the MIA sandhi rules are only an imitation of the Sanskrit sandhi rules and not their organic continuation. Sociolinguistically, it is the same as Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit. North-Indic Buddhists wrote their texts in this language **supposedly** based on Central Indic dialect that was not identified or may be a mixture of different Central Indic dialects. Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit was substantially affected by Sanskrit since the beginning of this tradition and the **tendency** for sanskritization was always deepened. Thus, Prakrit forms stand side by side with Sanskrit forms. **According to Edgerton (2004)**, this language has never been spoken and it has been used as a sacred language only.

The paper started from the observation that gen.sg=nom.pl raises non-trivial challenges for theories of syncretism. **I then went on to show** how syncretism is treated in Nanosyntax, and **showed that** when **we attempt** to account for this syncretism in a purely mechanical way, a recursion problem arises. **I took this result at face value, and proposed that** plurals in the languages with the syncretism and elsewhere are bi-nominal recursive structures. **The solution** to the recursion problem is thus simple: **we** get effects of recursion because there in fact is a real recursion. Later on, **I have shown** that the recursion problem arises quite independently in Bayso, and **the same solution has been applied**. The beneficial consequences of the **solution have been explored in the paper**. First, the **solution allows us** to account for the syncretism in a theory which is restrictive **in the sense that** it preserves the contiguity restriction on syncretism (non-contiguous syncretisms cannot be

represented in such a theory). Second, **I argued that** the gen.sg=nom.pl syncretism is only one out of **many possible** manifestations of a bi-nominal structure. First, **the proposal directly accounts** for languages where nom.pl is morphologically based on gen.sg (North Saami, Estonian). Second, the bi-nominal structure is **obvious** in languages where plurals are formed using a morpheme homophonous to a noun 'group' (Mauritian Creole). Third, **building on the observation that** Mauritian Creole pronouns lack the 'group' morpheme, an explanation is provided for **the fact that** gen.sg=nom.pl fails to arise for pronouns (Skolt Saami and elsewhere). Fourth, **the fact that** the homophony **often** disappears on demonstrative determiners is accounted for by the **proposal that** demonstratives **may** agree with the 'group' noun. Finally, **the proposal allows us to understand apparently** 'crazy' agreement systems where each plural (i.e., multiple reference) form belongs to an agreement class of its own. **If correct, the account allows us** to draw **some general conclusions** concerning contiguity. In particular, **it seems that** evaluating the correctness of the **hypothesis** relies on a pre-established arrangement of grammatical space. **Traditional** conceptions of this space **may** be too simplistic: singular and plural **may not be** parallel columns. Instead, **I have argued that** the structure of plural is more complicated **than standardly believed**, with the consequence that the representation of gen.sg forms a direct input for nom.pl. Last but not least, **if it is correct that** pronouns **may** lack the noun GROUP, then the grammatical space against **which contiguity is evaluated may** be different for nouns and pronouns. That is because for pronouns, gen.sg does not enter the formation of nom.pl.

First, **let me share an observation** concerning the functional comparison of FSP and de Saussure's teaching. **As has become clear**, the vertical-horizontal concepts of study adopted in the theory of functional sentence perspective are in its function identical with the corresponding dichotomy introduced by **de Saussure's theory**. This **may** raise a legitimate **question: why is that? How is it that the structuralist principles are, in an analogical way, reflected in Firbas's functional approach? In my opinion**, both the theories are well-founded on the very nature of language. They both study the same material, i.e. the living language used as a tool of communication. Only with this provision, the two theories **may** draw **similar** conclusions. In the same way as **de Saussure looks** at the meaning of an individual lexeme or a whole sentence both from the syntagmatic and associative point of view, the researchers in the field of FSP **may** analogically explore a text both from the horizontal and vertical angle. **Generally speaking**, in the study of language, both the axes are functional. By way of conclusion, **I will summarize** the benefits derived from a two-dimensional approach to the FSP study of text. When both the directions – horizontal and vertical – are applied, the functional picture of the text becomes more plastic and distinct. Such a **study apparently enriches** the set of methodological tools available. For instance, **in Adam (2003) I presented a research** based on the FSP analysis and **interpretation applied** to the whole macrofield. This **approach** brought several results; having finished **my research, I was able to define** a paragraph (a chapter) as a communicative distributional macrofield, which follows the same structural principles as their lower communicative counterparts (a clause, a noun phrase) (Adam 2003: 164). In the FSP analysis of one of the narrative extracts from the Gospel according St. Luke, **I tried to interpret** separate sections of the whole passage analogically to the **usual** interpretation of a clause. I succeeded in tracing the Th – Tr – Rh structure in the chapter. Furthermore, the holistic **approach revealed** that such an **analysis** depicts the characteristic features of the text, such as gradation, coherence or semantic unity (**Adam 2003: 61–66; 164**). **It**

seems that functional implementation of the vertical axis (to broaden the FSP analyses) is worth investigating and that the two-dimensional approach to FSP opens new vistas **to further research within text and corpus analysis study.**

English normative **grammars deal** with finite/non-finite clauses in **considerable** detail. With reference to the choice between finite/non-finite clauses **they carefully consider** selection restriction issues imposed by lexical factors, the division of communicative dynamism in a sentence, differences in meaning between finite/ non-finite structures **and other points**. When both finite and non-finite structures **can be used** interchangeably, the English normative tradition does not generally indicate priority of usage. Both types of clauses simply co-exist in the norm of the language. **In comprehensive grammar reference books (Quirk et al. and Huddleston et al.)** the comments comparing finite/non-finite structures are **rather rare**. Since the third comprehensive grammar reference book – **Biber et al.** – **in some cases** contrasts finite clauses as a whole with individual types of non-finite clauses expressing the same function, finite clauses **seem to** prevail more than they actually do. In less comprehensive grammar books **we can find** remarks evaluating non-finite structures as neater, more handy, more economical, but no straightforward comments speaking in favour of finite or non-finite clauses. The diachronic research into academic English and newspaper language revealed that current users of the language **seem to** employ non-finite forms **more frequently** now than a hundred years ago. **When we compared** portions of 100 sentences of texts from these two periods and the modern texts contained fewer subordinate clauses than the old texts, then, consistently, **the findings showed that** finite clauses decreased more than non-finite clauses. When, on the other hand, the modern texts contained more subordinate clauses than the old texts, finite clauses increased less than non-finite clauses. **This fact was interpreted as a tendency** towards a non-finite mode of expression in written English. **This tendency** becomes apparent only when the perspective is diachronic. Since the grammar reference books **usually** deal with the language from a synchronic perspective, they do not provide comments referring to **tendencies** in usage over time. **From a synchronic perspective it is certainly true** that finite subordinate clauses are still used more than non-finite clauses. **If further research proves that the above-mentioned claims are valid, the findings would have some important pedagogical implications. The findings of the research may also trigger further questions. If finite/non-finite forms can be used interchangeably and current users of English use non-finite forms in writing more now than a hundred years ago, then how do writers make decisions in favour of non-finite forms? Are their decisions intentional or incidental? Are the writers aware of them?** By using non-finite forms **we achieve certain** syntactic economy because **we avoid** repeating what is clear from the surrounding context. In current academic English and newspaper language there is certainly **a trend** towards greater brevity. Unlike the writers of 100 years ago, modern writers are **often** given instructions on the maximum length of their articles. Using non-finite forms instead of finite ones **certainly contributes** to syntactic compression of texts, **usually** making them shorter, but also, as mentioned above, **significantly** less explicit. **These are only some of the issues that could be investigated by further research.**

The above paragraphs look at less common features associated with free direct and direct forms of representation in the discourse of newspaper reports, namely embedding, DT and hypothetical (F)DD. Though **they must be considered** marginal on account of their function and low frequency of occurrence, when they **are not viewed** in isolation and/or **are interpreted** in connection with the role of reported language in newspaper reports, clear patterns arise. The presence of free direct and direct reported language in newspaper reporting **contributes** to a multiplicity of voices and perspectives. In cases of embedding, reported speakers **may** themselves bring the voices of others into the discourse. **The analysis has shown that** DD (586) and FDD (263) appear **in a large majority of cases** non-embedded. This is related to **the fact that** the reported element in (F)DD can be of different length and complexity **sometimes** a string of sentences in a single instance of direct quote. Also, since the reported element in (F)DD retains its own deictic centre, the embedding of such forms also involves a deictic switch from the host to the embedded category, increasing the complexity of the report as a whole. Moreover, if (F)DD is to serve the function of credibility and reliability, quoting the source without further mediation **may** be desirable. Embedded (F)DD is **much less numerous** and the frequency decreases with the increase in the level of embedding: 31 instances of DD and 7 of FDD **were found** at level 1, whereas only 5 instances of DD **were found** at level 2. Also, DT (9 cases) appears only embedded. Apart from the complexity in form, the low frequency of embedded (F)DD also correlates with the functions the **examples examined** perform within their host forms. Though anecdotal, personal narratives or stretches of argumentative discourse **may** have their due place in newspaper reports, they are not central or essential to it. The feeling of immediacy, personal involvement and vividness is achieved by e.g. embedded direct quotes imitating dialogic spoken discourse (examples 1, 2 and 3) or embedded direct thought (examples 10 and 11). Embedded (F)DD **may** function within the evaluative and comment-like component of the newspaper report. **It is relied upon** to communicate one's opinions and argue for one's values or desirable state of affairs (hypothetical quotes in examples 3 and 7). The ideas expressed in embedded (F)DD are either identified with (example 11) or refused and corrected (example 6). The embedded quotes **can be also used** for the sake of argumentation (examples 6, 7 and 11). In these cases the importance of faithful reproduction **may** recede into the background and the only relevant factor is the retention of the deictic centre evocative of the reported situation and reported speaker's perspective. **In other cases**, form **may be foregrounded**, as in example 5. Embedded hypothetical (F)DD (9 cases) **can be attributed to** non-specific individuals and employed for the functions described above. Non-embedded hypothetical (F)DD (19 cases) **is attributed mostly** to specific elite individuals, whose presence in combination with a direct quote makes a report more valuable. Such quotes refer either to a future speech event (example 8) or **less frequently** to a piece of fictional discourse (example 9). To conclude, though the **structures discussed** above are grammatically, deictically and semantically/pragmatically more complex, their advantage is that they bring into the discourse of newspaper reports forms and/or functions of (F)DD as well as the sources of attribution that **would otherwise be much less likely** to occur. **Though more data are needed to ascertain the functions of the phenomena addressed**, there **seems to be** a manifest **tendency** in their co-occurrence, reflecting both the nature of the phenomena and the type of text they appear in.
