Communicative dynamism and prosodic prominence in presentation sentences with initial rhematic subjects

Martin Adam — Irena Headlandová Kalischová (Brno)

ABSTRACT

Within the framework of the theory of functional sentence perspective (Firbas 1992), the distinction between presentation and quality scale sentences plays a vital role. The present paper proposes to shed light on one of the most common configurations of presentation sentences, viz. structures with initial rhematic subject (e.g. *an uninvited dwarf came*), examining the way native speakers place the intonation centre in such structures, i.e. to map the correspondence between the degrees of communicative dynamism and prosodic prominence. For the purpose of the investigation selected chapters from Tolkien's *The Hobbit* are used.

KEYWORDS

FSP, presentation, scale, intonation centre, communicative dynamism

1. INTRODUCTION

Apart from a careful selection of data and a minute and profound analysis of it, an appropriate interpretation of the text material under analysis seems to stand at the root of linguistic research of all sorts across schools, approaches and methodologies. It follows that within the theory of functional sentence perspective (henceforward referred to as FSP)[1] — in relation to its context-orientation and multifaceted character — this postulate holds true perhaps even more so. Among other aspects, it is especially the relatively blurred and at times perhaps indistinct borderline between the two dynamic semantic scales (Presentation Scale and Quality Scale) that has raised many a question in recent FSP research (i.e. Dušková, 1999, 247–272, 2015, 202–208, 256–268; Svoboda, 2005, 2006; Chamonikolasová, 2007, 2010; Adam, 2013, 157–165, 2014, 2016; Rohrauer, 2015, 148–150, 162–164; Brůhová and Malá, 2017).

The present paper proposes to discuss one of the most common configurations of presentation sentences (Pr-sentences), viz. structures with an initial rhematic subject. Since the prototypical Pr-sentences of this sort actually violate the end-focus principle (with the most prominent, rhematic element occupying the initial position), the prosodic treatment of these utterances in spoken discourse then becomes an important issue. The research objective of this paper is to examine the way native speakers place the intonation centre in such structures, i.e. to map the correspondence between the degrees of communicative dynamism and prosodic prominence.

---

1   For the full list of abbreviations used, see the List of Abbreviations at the end of the article.

2. CORPUS AND METHOD

For the purpose of the proposed discussion, the authors decided to analyse J. R. R. Tolkien's novel *The Hobbit*, specifically the written form against its spoken version (an audiobook narrated by Rob Inglis[2]). The corpus data encompasses chapters I-V of the novel, representing ca 27,800 words, which amounts to 2,268 basic distributional fields. The actual procedure comprised several stages: first, all Pr-sentences were extracted manually and further subdivided into four types, second, the recorded text was subjected to a physical perception test and the prosodic treatment of the selected utterances was assessed on an auditory basis, and finally, the correspondence between the distribution of communicative dynamism and that of prosodic prominence was determined.

Below are charts showing basic corpus statistics (the incidence of Presentation and Quality Scale sentences; see Table 1) and the statistical occurrence of individual types of Pr-sentences (Table 2) respectively. The ratio of Pr- and Q-Scale sentences (8% vs. 92%) virtually corresponds with other recent research data (Adam, 2013, 153–156, 2016; Rohrauer, 2015, 148–150; Stehlíková, 2016, 109–111, 123). Also the syntactic realization of Pr-sentences (with Type I being the most frequent and Type IV represented just marginally) is in concord with the usual make-up of fiction narrative texts examined previously (Dušková, 1998; Adam, 2013).

Scales	Abs.	%
Pr	182	8
Q	2,086	92
Total	**2,268**	**100**

TABLE 1. Corpus statistics

Type of Pr-sentences	Abs.	%
I (existential *there*-construction)	86	47.3
II (initial rhematic subject)	74	40.7
III (fronted adverbial + subject-verb inversion)	20	10.9
IV (locative subject)	2	1.1
Total	**182**	**100.0**

TABLE 2. Types of presentation sentences

3. PRESENTATION SENTENCES

The idea of dynamic semantic scales, implemented in sentences, was introduced by Firbas (see especially 1992, 66–69); the scales functionally reflect the distribution of

---

2   The audiobook is available at http://esl-bits.net/ESL.English.Learning.Audiobooks/ The.Hobbit/indice.html

communicative dynamism (CD) and operate irrespective of word order. In principle, Firbas distinguishes two types of such scales: the Presentation Scale and the Quality Scale. In these scales, each element is ascribed one of the dynamic-semantic functions (DSFs). In contrast to a static approach towards semantic functions of sentence constituents, the dynamic-semantic functions may change in the course of an act of communication; the same element may thus perform different functions in different contexts and under different conditions (Chamonikolasová, 2010; cf. also Firbas, 1992, 66ff; Svoboda, 2005, 225).

As has been mentioned above, the present paper focuses on the sentences that implement the Presentation Scale. This scale generally includes three basic dynamic--semantic functions: proceeding in the interpretative arrangement from the least to the most dynamic element, the first position is taken by the thematic Setting of the action (Set), usually temporal and spatial items regarding when and where the action takes place. Second, the existence or appearance on the scene is typically conveyed by a verb by means of the Presentation of Phenomenon (Pr); as Firbas says, a Pr-verb expresses "existence or appearance on the scene with explicitness or sufficient implicitness" (Firbas, 1995, 65). Finally, the major, most dynamic element, the Phenomenon to be Presented (Ph), is literally ushered onto the scene. The average occurrence of Pr-sentences in texts has been determined to range from 5 to 12% of all distributional fields (Adam, 2013, 61ff, 153–156).

In previous research as well as in the data under analysis, four principal syntactic patterns have been identified and labelled as Types I-IV (see Table 2 above; for more details on these, see e.g. Adam, 2013, 59ff, 156; Dušková, 2015, 202–208). To exemplify each of the types, selected examples (1–4) excerpted from the research corpus are adduced below; the rhematic Phenomena are presented in bold and the number in square brackets indicates the item number in the corpus.

— Type I: Existential *there*-construction
   (1) *There were **lots of dragons** in the North in those days…* [18]

— Type II: Preverbal Rh-subject
   (2) *…and **a waning moon** appeared above the hills between the flying rags.* [115]

— Type III: Fronted Adverbial + S-V Inversion
   (3) *Then suddenly out of the gloom came **a sharp hiss**.* [179]

— Type IV: Locative Subject + Rh-object
   (4) *It (=the cave) had **a dry floor and some comfortable nooks**.* [182]

As proposed, the present discussion is above all preoccupied with the second most recurring subtype of Pr-Scale sentence pattern, viz. that with a rhematic subject in the initial, i.e. preverbal position. Such a configuration is perceived as the prototypical, canonical type connected with the Presentation Scale (cf. Dušková et al., 1988, 62, 531–532). In it, the initial sentence element is typically represented by a context-independent subject, which is only then followed (in concord with the requirements of

the English word order principles) by the verb expressing existence or appearance on the scene (cf. Dušková, 1999, 248–250); the sentence may also open with a scene-setting temporal or spatial thematic adverbial, the position of which is rather volatile. As a result, the end-focus principle is not applied. It should be noted, however, that sentences with a rhematic subject in a preverbal position are, as a rule, considered unmarked by native speakers of English (exceptions may be observed in connection to prosodic re-evaluating intensification; cf. Firbas, 1992, 154–156). In Czech, for that matter, the situation is reversed: the end-focus principle is most closely observed while an initial rhematic subject is untypical if not highly exceptional and can be justified only under special prosodic or other emphatic conditions (cf. Dušková, 1999, 281).

4. INTONATION: A FACTOR IN FSP INTERPLAY

In the framework of the theory of FSP, the sentence is viewed as "a field of semantic and syntactic relations that in its turn provides a distributional field of degrees of communicative dynamism (CD)" (Firbas, 1992, 7–8); individual sentence elements then serve as communicative units with different degrees of CD. The degrees of CD are determined by the interplay of FSP factors involved in the distribution of degrees of CD. The FSP factors (formative forces) are (i) linear modification, (ii) context, and (iii) semantics. In spoken language, their interplay is logically joined by a fourth factor — (iv) intonation (Firbas, 1985, 1992, 14–16).

In harmony with the principal research question, the present discussion tackles the difference between the distribution of degrees of communicative dynamism (triggered by non-prosodic FSP factors) on the one hand and the degrees of prosodic prominence (PP) on the other. Intonation can confirm or modify the interplay of the other three (non-prosodic) factors and it is also capable of disambiguating possible cases of interpretative potentiality triggered by syntactic-semantic structures (cf. Headlandová Kalischová, 2010a, 45–47); thus, intonation may even change the overall distribution of CD within a communicative field.

Major phonological studies maintain that there is a connection between the nucleus placement and the information load of individual lexical units in that the nucleus mostly occurs on words carrying new information (see e.g. O'Connor and Arnold, 1973, 5; Cruttenden, 1986, 94; or Roach, 1994, 176). In his key monograph, Firbas (1992) examined the relation between the operation of non-prosodic FSP factors (linear modification, context and semantics) and the features affecting degrees of PP. Even though the relationship of the two concepts is extremely close, one cannot say that their coincidence is absolute. Basically, there are three types of relationship between the distributions of CD and PP (Firbas, 1992, 148–172):

(I) PERFECT CORRESPONDENCE
In perfect correspondence between CD and PP, the intonation exactly reflects the information structure as determined by the non-prosodic factors; in other words, the nuclear stress falls on the rhematic element. In example (5) below, the expression *a flame* is the carrier of the most dynamic piece of information (in bold) and, at the

same time, it carries the nuclear stress (underlined), i.e. it becomes the intonation centre (IC) of the utterance. The example is supplemented with the FSP functions and basic tonetic marks inserted.

(5) *Suddenly in the wood beyond The Water **a flame** leapt up.* [101]
        ' Th   \Rh   ∘Tr

(II) NON-REEVALUATING INTENSIFICATION

The following example demonstrates that this kind of intensification does not affect the basic relation between the theme and the rheme although it increases the amount of CD assigned to one of the units (Headlandová Kalischová, 2010a, 46). The non-prosodic FSP analysis is accompanied by the last line showing the prosodic intensification of the thematic subject *You*. The reason for this intensification can most likely be put down to emotive colouring; consequently the degree of CD of this unit (communicatively the least dynamic) is increased to that of a diatheme (DTh).

(6) [...and so I told him the truth. —]
    <u>You</u> must be **joking**!
    Th   Tr   Rh
    \DTh   ∘Tr   \Rh

(III) RE-EVALUATING INTENSIFICATION

Sometimes, on the other hand, the intensification produces a stronger deviation from the perfect correspondence between the distribution of the degrees of CD and PP. The point is that intonation can re-evaluate the information structure (i.e. affect the theme-rheme articulation) and in that way play down the non-prosodic factors. In the example sentence (7), the element *That* represents the only nucleus and thus the most prominent prosodic item (the intonation centre) in the distributional field; it is re-evaluated from an originally thematic unit into a rhematic one (Headlandová Kalischová, 2010b, 89). As a result of this re-evaluating prosodic intensification, the sentence is emotionally marked. Such markedness may be regarded as an irretrievable piece of information that enables the otherwise dynamically weak element to become the rheme of the sentence.

(7) *That's **good**!*   →   ***That's** good!*
    Th Tr Rh   \/ Rh Tr ∘DTh

5. ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

The overall results based on the analyses of all four types of Pr-sentences and the distributions of communicative dynamism vs. prosodic prominence within them were very positive, as may be seen in Table 3. The first column indicates the type of Pr-sentences, column 2 shows the absolute number of identified examples of each type, columns 3–4 refer to cases displaying perfect correspondence between the distribution

of CD and that of PP, while columns 5–6 relate to the number of cases with discrepancies between the CD and PP distributions.

Type	Abs.	Perf. corresp. CD & PP		Discrepancy CD vs. PP	
		№ of occur.	%	№ of occur.	%
I	86	76	88	10	12
II	74	65	88	9	12
III	20	18	90	2	10
IV	2	2	100	0	0

TABLE 3. Distribution of CD vs. PP in Types I–IV

All four types show very consistent results, which is rather remarkable given the difference in the absolute numbers of their occurrences. A brief commentary on the findings for individual types follows, with Type II being dealt with separately in section 5.2.

5.1 TYPES I, III, IV

Type I with the existential *there*-construction comes up most frequently, and individual examples range from short utterances to rather extensive ones, cf. examples (8) and (9):

(8) *There was **a purse** in it…* [32]
(9) *Just before tea-time there came **a tremendous ring** on the front-door bell…* [14]

It has to be noted, though, that in 41% of cases the IC is placed on a final element, which is in line with the general end-weight principle and therefore represents a default prosodic treatment, such as in example (10):

(10) *There was **a fine toothsome smell**.* [30]

A recurring deviation from the expected IC placement in this type is found in cases where the general tendency in structures with a finally placed verb would suggest that "a final verb is usually deaccented, and the nucleus goes on a preceding noun" (Wells, 2011, 170). In our corpus, however, it is sometimes the verb that becomes the IC bearer, cf. sentence (11a) as opposed to what was expected (sentence (11b)).

(11a) *…where there were no people LEFT.* [24]
(11b) *…where there were **no people** left.* [24]

A possible explanation may be found in the so-called "reading stereotype" (Bolinger, 1986, 77); a phenomenon related to the fact that the end position is perceived (and preferred) as the most powerful and climatic for the nucleus placement, which can be particularly noticed when people read out loud. As Bolinger points out, "readers, including actors who mentally read their lines, often put the accent in the supposedly

most effective place regardless of the sense." (ibid.) Considering the amount of text the narrator of *The Hobbit* had to record, it is more than probable that occasionally there could be a slip of this kind.

Type III (fronted adverbials followed with subject-verb inversion) demonstrates an even higher concordance rate between the analysed rhematic elements and assessed IC bearers than Type I (90% vs. 88%). However, it must be stated that in most of the utterances (78%) the rhematic element occupies the very last position (examples (12) and (13)), which is likely to have had a share in the appropriate IC placement.

(12) *And here is* **our little Bilbo <u>Baggins</u>**... [164]
(13) *... pop! went* **a nasty smelly <u>sack</u>** *over his head...* [170]

Example (14) below shows one of the discrepancies identified between the distributions of communicative dynamism and prosodic prominence. The focalizer *too* is one of the list of function words which tend to attract nuclear stress (see e.g. Wells, 2011, 148), all the more so when it is placed finally, as is the case here. Cruttenden terms this phenomenon "lexical focusing", i.e. certain words have "a fixed relationship with nucleus placement" (1986, 73).

(14) *...and out of it comes the dragon TOO...* [163]

The FSP analysis of the distribution of communicative dynamism over the sentence elements would assign the highest degree of CD to the communicative unit *the dragon.*

Type IV, i.e. structures containing a locative subject, is evidenced by just two utterances, both showing perfect correspondence between the elements which are prosodically and communicatively the weightiest (see example (4) in section 3 and example (15) below).

(15) *It (=the hobbit hole) had* **a perfectly round door like a <u>porthole</u>**... [181]

5.2 TYPE II
Type II with an initial rhematic subject, the principal area under our examination, proportionally represents the second largest part of the corpus (40.7%), and as is the case with the other types, it also shows a very high percentage (88%) of perfectly corresponding distributions of CD and PP. The analysed material provides a great range of utterances pertaining to this type of Pr-sentences in terms of their length as well as the position of the IC bearer within the communicative field.

Even though the average length of these utterances (6.5 words) seems to tally rather closely with the general estimates of the length of tone units/intonation groups/intonational phrases (see e.g. Cruttenden, 1986, 72; Chamonikolasová, 2007, 73; or Gimson, 1994, 286) as well as that of basic distributional fields as viewed by FSP, the actual numbers of words in individual utterances vary from two to as many as twenty in one case. The following examples (16) and (17) may help to illustrate the extreme range.

(16) ***Whistles*** *blew...* [71]
(17) ***Boulders***, *too, at times came galloping down the mountain-sides...* [133]

In terms of intonation centre placement, the IC bearers occupy either an initial[3] position (65%) or they are placed medially (35%), see examples (18) and (19).

(18) ***A big jug of coffee*** *had just been set in the hearth ...* [94]
(19) *Suddenly in the wood beyond The Water* ***a flame*** *leapt up...* [101]

To digress slightly at this point, let us remark that an interesting occurrence applicable to all the Pr-sentences in the corpus has been observed: if the sentence contains one of the words *Gandalf, sun* or *moon,* identified as rheme proper, then this word becomes the IC bearer in the spoken version with unfailing regularity (see examples (20) and (21)).

(20) *Now* ***Gandalf*** *led the way.* [125]
(21) *...and* ***a waning moon*** *appeared above the hills between the flying rags.* [114]

Whether this observation may be ascribed to peculiarities of the auctorial style (narrative techniques, a particular way of description or even fondness of a character) or perhaps genre constraints (such as reiterative appearance of some phenomena — *Gandalf*, *moon* or *sun* in Tolkien's narrative), it does recur with identical periodicity and FSP interpretation throughout the text. In any case, it appears that various other texts also manifest analogous features; recently, for instance, research data examining fantasy fiction have revealed similar recurrences concerning the appearance/disappearance of RhPr elements such as *cave*, *wind*, *moon*, *sun*, *rainbow*, *cloud*, etc. (see Adam, 2013, 69, 120–121, 134). The presentation verbs operating in these sentences almost prototypically originate from the semantic category of verbs denoting natural or even supernatural phenomena that are typically unaffected by people, such as weather or the transcendental, and so, to a certain degree, show semantic affinity with the phenomena construed as rhematic subjects.

As shown in Table 3 above, there are nine instances (12%) where the analyses of the spoken and written texts reveal differences in the identification of the bearers of the greatest prosodic prominence and the carriers of the highest degree of communicative dynamism (see examples (22)-(24) in section 6). The common denominator for all nine utterances in their spoken versions is a rightward shift of the intonation centre, i.e. the narrator placed the IC on a different element than expected and this new IC is located closer to or at the very end of the utterance.

The first possible explanation at hand was that the reason could be the length of the post-IC prosodic shade, i.e. the number of units in the communicative field coming after the IC bearer. According to Firbas, elements placed after the intonation centre find themselves in the "shade", which makes their prosodic prominence lower

---

3   Please note that the initial position does not apply to the very first word only but refers to the first sentence element.

(1992, 152); phonologically speaking, in certain instances it is not the final nucleus but the preceding one that counts as the most prominent prosodic feature (Cruttenden, 1986, 84; Gimson, 1994, 242). It seemed only natural that a speaker would find it rather difficult to maintain a somewhat subdued prosody on a larger stretch of text coming after the main peak and therefore might add extra emphasis to the final words; yet this theory had to be dismissed as unfounded. The corpus yielded evidence contrary to this presupposition, showing clearly that there was a high percentage among the utterances with corresponding CD and PP distributions where the post-IC prosodic shade stretched over as many as five words and more (see Table 4 below). Comparatively extensive parts of communicative fields following the IC bearers can also be found in examples (17), (18) and (21) above, each of which displays perfect correspondence between CD and PP.

Length of post-IC prosodic shade	%
1–2 words	41
3–5 words	38
6–12 words	21

TABLE 4. Length of post-IC prosodic shade

6. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In the course of analysis and interpretation, while searching for existing analogies between the discrepancies so as to find some reasons for the narrator's prosodic treatment, we realized what a "slippery phenomenon" intonation indeed was (Brazil, 1985, 240) and how difficult it was to assess it. In order to ascertain that our original FSP analysis (viewed by the non-prosodic factors) was correct we also worked with the Czech translation of *The Hobbit* (first published in 1978) by the acclaimed Czech translator František Vrba; it confirmed our assessment of the most dynamic rhematic elements in each of the nine instances. Eventually, it was possible to identify, albeit tentatively, three types of deviations and their potential causes. In the following examples the rheme-proper units are shown in bold while the newly assigned IC bearers are capitalized; the line below the example provides the Czech equivalent with the rheme-proper unit in bold and marked with F.V. (František Vrba) at the end, and finally a word-for-word translation back to English follows in square brackets.

(I) ERRONEOUS RE-EVALUATING INTENSIFICATION

> (22) **Supper** is preparing over THERE… [130]
> *Chystá se tam **večeře**.* (F.V.)
> [is-preparing (refl.) there supper]

In this example the prosodic intensification of the last word results in a re-evaluation of the sentence perspective. The unit *supper* now appears to be a contextually dependent

element which fulfils the role of a Quality Bearer in a Q-Scale. The preceding context of the utterance, however, does not allow for such interpretation: there is no mention of any food or a meal, and *there* refers to a house described earlier in the paragraph. It may be feasible to assume that this occurrence is a mere slip on the part of the speaker and a manifestation of the reading stereotype mentioned above (see section 5.1).

(II) NON-REEVALUATING INTENSIFICATION
The following utterance (23) and its recorded version could be classified as a case of prosodic intensification which results in boosting the degree of CD of a unit, yet it does not alter the theme-rheme articulation. The element *air* was clearly emphasized in the recording; this could be put down either to the narrator's desire to add an "extra climatic punch" to the utterance (Bolinger, 1986, 78), or, more likely, to his effort to make use of contrastive stress (putting the unit *in the air* in contrast to the previous unit *on the floor*) thus providing a vivid picture of the cave (the place in question) in its entirety.

(23) *[There were bones on the floor] and* **a nasty smell** *was in the AIR…* [123]
      […] a ve vzduchu se vznášel **ohavný puch**. (F.V.)
      [and in the-air (refl.) floated a-nasty smell]

(III) RE-EVALUATING INTENSIFICATION
In sentence (24) below, the unit *the stone-giants* — even though it appears as a new notion for the first time in that very sentence — becomes a thematic element and the expectable Pr-Scale is again turned into a Q-Scale by means of intonation in the recording. As a result, the theme-rheme structure of the sentence is re-evaluated. This changed perspective of the sentence finds, at the syntactic level, justification in the use of the definite article; the Czech translation adduced below, however, testifies of *the stone-giants* being perceived as rhematic.

(24) *[… he saw] that across the valley* **the stone-giants** *were OUT…* [137]
      [… viděl přes údolí,] jak tam vyrukovali **skalní obři**… (F.V.)
      [as there turned-up the-stone giants]

Firbas (1992, 176–178) discusses a similar phenomenon that concerns the potential involvement of the reader in constituting as well as interpreting a text, viz. the so-called "to-be-in-the-know" effect. The non-prosodic analysis of example (24) invariably identifies the subject (*the stone-giants*) as a carrier of irretrievable information, as there is no immediately relevant context from which it could be retrieved. Nonetheless, it is presented as context-dependent as, incidentally, corroborated through the use of the definite article. This technique is used by the writer to engage the reader in such a way that a new fact is presented as if its existence was taken for granted. In other words, the reader is *assumed to know* already, hence the Firbasian felicitous expression the "to-be-in-the-know" effect (Firbas, 1992, 195, 178).[4]

....

4   Originally, we felt inclined to interpret this sentence in relation to what Firbas calls "in medias res effect" (1992, 40). This phenomenon (or perhaps a poetic technique), which is

In our view, such an effect is definitely used for this purpose in example (24) above: the preceding context describes a thunderous storm in the mountains and the travelling party trying to find some shelter, when suddenly one reads (for the very first time) about *"the" stone-giants* as if they are a perfectly natural occurrence in the mountains, and the writer, his characters and the reader know this only too well. Viewed in this light, it perhaps can be concluded that the narrator shared the desired sense of involvement and consequently his prosody rendered the unit *the stone-giants* thematic, while the new intonation centre was shifted onto the rightward element *out*. After all, in authentic communication, it is up to the speakers to present the reality in the manner they wish, inducing thus a "high degree of intimacy" between the speaker and the "initiated listener" (Firbas, 1992, 178):

"Against the background of phenomena objectively existing in this sphere, the speaker can 'present' context-independent notions as context-dependent and the attentive listener will duly respond, recognizing the true character of such notions. In this way the speaker can employ intonation in successfully manipulating context dependence/independence for his communicative purposes" (ibid. 177).

To conclude, a perfect correspondence between the distribution of the degrees of PP and CD was confirmed in a majority of cases (88%). In the remaining data, different types of non-reevaluating as well as re-evaluating intensification were detected, the possible reasons being, we believe, the reading stereotype, the length of the post-IC prosodic shade, auctorial style (attempt at climatic intensification and/or emotiveness), or even misinterpretation. Our study thus suggests that despite the prosodic specificity of Type 2 Pr-sentences, it is not a laborious task for native speakers of English to place the intonation centre appropriately (cf. Headlandová Kalischová, 2010a), as they appear to respect the principle of assigning the nuclear stress to initial rhematic subjects with ease; the same, however, cannot be said about non-native speakers of English, for whom the appropriate placement of IC in this type of sentences may pose many a problem.

REFERENCES

Adam, M. (2013) *Presentation Sentences (Syntax, Semantics and FSP)*. Brno: Masaryk University.

Adam, M. (2014) Prezentační versus kvalifikační škála: interpretace hraničních případů v FSP analýze narativního textu [Presentation versus quality scale: interpreting borderline cases in FSP analysis of narrative texts]. *Časopis pro moderní filologii*, 96/2, 180–195.

Adam, M. (2016) A case study in verbs operating in the presentation and/or quality scale respectively: buzz and seize. In: Crhová, M. and M. Weiss (eds) *Silesian Studies in English 2015*, 7–18. Opava: Silesian University in Opava.

Bolinger, D. (1986) *Intonation and Its Parts*. London: Arnold.

typical of fiction, is said to be an effective — albeit inconspicuous — stylistic device which helps to make the reader feel more involved and part of a situation. It is, nevertheless, prototypically employed in initial sections of text, such as an opening chapter of a book or at least an opening paragraph; in our case, the situation is, in fact, opposite — the sentence under examination (24) is found in the final section of the text.

Brazil, D. (1985) *The Communicative Value of Intonation in English.* Birmingham: English Language Research.

Brůhová, G. and M. Malá (2017) On English locative subjects. *Acta Universitatis Carolinae, Philologica* 1, *Prague Studies in English*, 19–38.

Chamonikolasová, J. (2007) *Intonation in English and Czech Dialogues.* Brno: Masaryk University.

Chamonikolasová, J. (2010) Communicative dynamism and prosodic prominence of pronouns in English and Czech. *The Prague School and Theories of Structure*, 143–162. Göttingen: V&R Unipress.

Cruttenden, A. (1986) *Intonation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, D. and D. Davy (1969) *Investigating English Style.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Dušková, L. et al. (1988) *Mluvnice současné angličtiny na pozadí češtiny [A Grammar of Contemporary English Against the Background of Czech].* Praha: Academia.

Dušková, L. (1999) *Studies in the English Language. Part II.* Prague: Karolinum.

Dušková, L. (2015) *From Syntax to Text: the Janus Face of Functional Sentence Perspective*. Prague: Karolinum.

Firbas, J. (1985) Thoughts on functional sentence perspective, intonation and emotiveness. *Brno Studies in English* 16, 11–48.

Firbas, J. (1992) *Functional Sentence Perspective in Written and Spoken Communication.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Gimson, A. C. (1994) *Gimson's Pronunciation of English.* Revised by Cruttenden, A. London: Arnold.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1967) *Intonation and Grammar in British English.* The Hague: Mouton.

Headlandová Kalischová, I. (2010a) *Intonation in Discourse: English Intonation as (Mis)used by Czech Speakers.* Brno: Masaryk University.

Headlandová Kalischová, I. (2010b) Intonation in discourse: why do Czech speakers of English not always use it to enhance the meaning? *Brno Studies in English* 36, 77–94.

O'Connor, J. D. and G. F. Arnold (1973) *Intonation of Colloquial English*. London: Longman.

Roach, P. (1994) *English Phonetics and Phonology.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rohrauer, L. (2015) *Presentation sentences in fiction and academic prose: a syntactico-semantic, FSP and textual view.* Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation. Prague: Charles University.

Stehlíková, L. (2016) *Contextual Disengagement in Functional Sentence Perspective*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation. Brno: Masaryk University.

Svoboda, A. (2005) Firbasian semantic scales and comparative studies. In: Čermák, J. et al. (eds) *Patterns (A Festschrift for Libuše Dušková)*. Praha: Charles University, 217–229.

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

Wells, J. C. (2011) *English Intonation: An Introduction.* Cambridge: CUP.

SOURCES

Tolkien, J. R. R. (1991) *The Hobbit.* London: Grafton.

Tolkien, J. R. R. *The Hobbit.* Audiobook. Retrieved on 28 Nov 2016 from http://esl-bits.net/ESL.English.Learning.Audiobooks/The.Hobbit/indice.html.

Vrba, F. (1978) *Hobit aneb Cesta tam a zase zpátky*. Retrieved on 28 Nov 2016 from http://milan.cernoch.net/download/004_pan_prstenu.pdf.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

B — the DSF of a Bearer of Quality; **CD** — communicative dynamism; **DSF** — dynamic-semantic function; **DTh** — diatheme/diathematic; **FSP** — functional sentence perspective; **IC** — intonation centre; **Ph** — the DSF of a Phenomenon; **PP** — prosodic prominence; **Pr** — the DSF of a Presentation; **Pr-Scale** — presentation scale; **Q** — the DSF of a Quality; **Q-Scale** — quality scale; **Rh** — rheme/rhematic; **RhPr** — rheme proper; **Set** — the DSF of a Setting; **Sp** — the DSF of a Specification; **Th** — theme/thematic; **ThPr** — theme proper; **Tr** — transition/transitional

Martin Adam
Department of English Language and Literature
Faculty of Education, Masaryk University, Brno
Poříčí 7, 603 00 Brno
adam@ped.muni.cz

Irena Headlandová Kalischová
Department of English Language and Literature
Faculty of Education, Masaryk University, Brno
Poříčí 7, 603 00 Brno
kalischova@ped.muni.cz