Second Round Table on Communicative Dynamism

Namur, 13-14 September 2016

Programme and abstracts

Programme outline

Tuesday 13 September 2016

8.30 - 9 am	*Welcome coffee*
9 - 9.10 am	**Lieven Vandelanotte** (UNamur) Opening remarks
9.10 - 9.50 am	**Eirian C. Davies** (Royal Holloway, University of London) Construction telling: Modes of subject-predicate bonding and directions of travel in the English clause
9.50 - 10.30 am	**Margaret Berry** (University of Nottingham) 'Actually given' versus 'presented as given' and 'actually new' versus 'presented as new': What happens when the 'presented as' gets out of step with the 'actually'?
10.30 - 11.10 am	**Martin Drápela** (The Vilém Mathesius Society) Dick Whittington yet again: A multi-parallel analysis of a CD ambiguity
11.10 - 11.40 am	*Coffee and tea break*
11.40 - 12.20 am	**Ben Clarke** (University of Portsmouth) Dynamism as a component of the linguist's toolkit: A case study with the use of *clear* in political discourse
12.20 - 1 pm	**Tom Bartlett** (Cardiff University) Dynamicity: Starting points and methods of progression
1 - 2.20 pm	*Lunch break*

2.20 - 3 pm	**Estela Inés Moyano** (Universidad Nacional de General Sarmiento) System and realization of Theme in Spanish: Towards a paradigmatic description
3 - 3.40 pm	**Jorge Arús Hita** (Universidad Complutense Madrid) Maintaining participant identity in discourse: A contrastive English/Spanish account
3.40 - 4.10 pm	*Coffee and tea break*
4.10 - 4.50 pm	**Anna Mauranen** and **Svetlana Vetchinnikova** (Helsingin yliopisto) Chunking as the cognitive basis of a dynamic grammar: What evidence do we have?
4.50 - 5.30 pm	**Gerard O'Grady** (Cardiff University) Linearity and tone in the unfolding of information
7 pm	**Conference dinner** for invited speakers at L'Espièglerie (Hôtel des Tanneurs, Rue des Tanneries 13)

Wednesday 14 September 2016

8.30 - 9 am	*Welcome coffee*
9 - 9.40 am	**Wout Van Praet** (UNamur/FNRS), **Kristin Davidse** (KU Leuven), **Ditte Kimps** (KU Leuven) and **Lieven Vandelanotte** (UNamur/KU Leuven) The information structure of copular clauses: Can the prosody-grammar interface tell us something about copular typology?
9.40 - 10.20 am	**Kristin Davidse**, **Ditte Kimps** and **Ngum Meyuhnsi Njende** (KU Leuven) Making the case for defining clefts broadly as secondary specification structures: Prosody and information structure
10.20 - 12 am	Coffee and tea, followed by closing discussion, chaired by **Kristin Davidse** (KU Leuven)
12 am - 1 pm	*Lunch and send-off drink*

The abstracts are listed in chronological order.

Construction telling: Modes of subject-predicate bonding and directions of travel in the English clause

Eirian Davies (Royal Holloway, University of London)

Tuesday 13 September 2016, 9.10 - 9.50 am

This paper is based on a proposed approach[1] to a fragment of English grammar (sentence types and non-deontic modal verbs) seen as 'built up' in layers from a basic nexus of a subject-predicate pair. In this approach,"telling" is treated as the central language-forming operation involved[2]: it is what is done with reality (events and states of affairs, knowledge of them and decisions and wishes about them) to construct and present language between people in interaction. Telling is said to be of two kinds, both of which involve bonding. "Construction telling" applies to the bonding of subject and predicate to form a propositional base. "Presentation telling" applies to bonding between a participant and what is said: participants (speaker and/or addressee) may be shown to be associated more or less closely with a propositional attitude as conveyed in grammatical form. Informally, construction telling produces what is said; and presentation telling produces an association between what is said and those involved in saying it. Telling is seen as the central element in the semantics.

The semantics of construction telling has its roots in linguistic philosophy. It is based on a paper by J.L. Austin[3], and relates to his concept of the "locutionary act". In it, far from adopting a Chomskyan approach to sentence structure, in which the **division** between subject and predicate is the fundamental basis of grammatical analysis, Austin presents the **bond** between these two parts of the sentence as the foundation for understanding its structure, and in terms that modify its use. He establishes four different modes of such bonding, and goes on to associate these with different kinds of assertion: *describing*, *calling*, *classing* and *exemplifying*. These distinctions run closely parallel with Halliday's subsequent (1968, 1985:112-128, 2014: 276-289) studies of different kinds of identifying clauses; and in this way they have links with Davidse's work in the area of intensive transitivity[4].

Austin divides up his manners of subject-predicate bonding according to two dimensions of contrast: "direction of fit" and "onus of match"[5]. Both of these have a dynamic characterization. "Direction of fit" concerns what might be called a "centre of attraction" and "movement" towards it. Using Austin's metaphor of a bolt and a nut which is screwed onto it, the "bolt" is the "centre", a fixed element to which a (moveable) "nut" is added (and to which the nut must conform in order for its thread to match that of the bolt and so fit). Austin associates the bolt with the "given" element. The "given" is the item(s) in the subject in what he calls "name-giving" (*describing* and *calling*); and the name in the predicate in what he calls "sense-giving" (*classing* and *exemplifying*). This distinction has the effect that the direction of the "adding movement" (from given to new) is "forwards" (from subject to predicate) in name-giving; and "backwards" (from predicate to subject) in sense-giving.

---

[1] Davies, forthcoming. See also, Davies, 2015: chapter 3, 78-79.
[2] *Cf*. Davies, 2015: chapter 5.
[3] Austin (1970)
[4] For example, Davidse (1992, 1996, 1999).
[5] He presents these as independent variables; but I argue elsewhere that this is not strictly speaking the case (Davies, forthcoming: Chapter 4).

The second dimension, that of "onus of match", concerns the question of which element (subject or predicate) is assessed for assimilation to the other. Here, the distinction is between one element (subject or predicate) being presented as a standard of comparison and the other being assessed in terms of the extent to which it matches up to the first. The "onus of match" is said to "lie" on the assessed element. Where this assessed element is the subject, we have *describing* and *classing*; where the assessed element is the predicate, we have *calling* and *exemplifying*. This distinction has the effect that the direction of assimilation (from the assessed element to the standard in terms of which the assessment is taking place) is "forwards", from subject to predicate, in *describing* and *classing*; and "backwards", from predicate to subject, in *calling* and *exemplifying*.

If we combine the two dimensions, there is a tension between conflicting "directions of travel" in *calling* and *classing*; but "harmony" between theses directions in *describing* and *exemplifying*. However, this "harmony" is of a very different kind in the two cases: *describing* has "forward movement" on both dimensions; but *exemplifying* has "backwards" direction on both. I associate forward movement of this kind with communicative dynamism.

The paper is in two parts: semantics and pragmatics. With respect to pragmatics, I will attempt to account for input from context, which Prague School linguists make integral to their approach, by using the "Significance Generating Device" suggested in Davies (2015: chapter 2, 37-38 [1979]) and later developed and applied (Davies, 1985, 1988).

References
Austin, J. L. (1970, [1952-3]) 'How to talk', in J.O. Urmson & G.J. Warnock (eds.) *J. L. Austin, Philosophical Papers*, 2nd edn. Oxford/London/New York: Oxford University Press. 134-153.
Daneš, František (1966) 'A three level approach to syntax'. *Travaux Linguistiques de Prague*, 1. 225-240.
Davidse, Kristin (1992) 'A semiotic approach to relational clauses'. In, Dirk Noel (ed.) *Occasional Papers in Systemic Linguistics, (OPSL), Volume 6*. 99—131. Nottingham: Nottingham English Language and Linguistics Research Group.
Davidse, Kristin (1996) 'Turning grammar on itself: identifying clauses in linguistic discourse'. In, Margaret Berry, Butler, C., Fawcett, R., & Huang, G. (eds.) *Meaning and Form: Systemic Functional Interpretations*. (Meaning and Choice in Language: Studies for Michael Halliday, vol.3; Advances in Discourse Processes, vol LVII). Norwood, NJ: Ablex. 367-393.
Davidse, Kristin (1999) *Categories of experiential grammar*. Nottingham: University of Nottingham
Davies, Eirian (2015 [1979]) *On the semantics of syntax*. London: Routledge.
Davies, Eirian (1985)`On types of meaningfulness in Discourse', in James D. Benson and William S. Greaves (eds.), *Systemic Perspectives on Discourse, Volume 1*. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex. 229-47.
Davies, Eirian (1988)`English Questions', in, Erich H.Steiner and Robert Veltman (eds.), *Pragmatics, Discourse and Text*. London: Pinter. 28-45.
Davies, Eirian (Forthcoming) *Elements of English functional grammar*. Berlin/ Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Firbas, Jan (1966) 'Non-thematic subjects in contemporary English'. *Travaux Linguistiques de Prague,* 2. 239-256.

Halliday, Michael (1968) 'Notes on transitivity and theme in English, 3.' *Journal of Linguistics* 4. 179-215.

Halliday, Michael (1985) *An Introduction to Functional Grammar.* London: Edward Arnold.

Halliday, Michael (2014) *Halliday's introduction to Functional Grammar.* 4th edn., revised Christian Matthiessen. Abingdon, Oxon/ New York: Routledge.

Poldauf, Ivan (1966) 'The third syntactical plan'. *Travaux Linguistiques de Prague*, 1. 241-256.

Trnka, Bohumil (1966) 'On the linguistic sign and the multilevel organization of language'. *Travaux Linguistiques de Prague*, 1. 33-40.

'Actually given' versus 'presented as given' and 'actually new' versus 'presented as new': What happens when the 'presented as' gets out of step with the 'actually'?

Margaret Berry (University of Nottingham)

Tuesday 13 September 2016, 9.50 - 10.30 am

The paper will review different approaches to the study of 'given' and 'new', building on work by Gerard O'Grady at the previous Round Table. Particular attention will be paid to the following distinctions:

- between approaches which assume 'given' means 'presented as given' and approaches which assume 'given' means 'actually given', in the sense of having been referred to earlier in the text;
- between approaches which assume 'given' and 'new' are realised intonationally and approaches which assume 'given' and 'new' are realised syntactically;
- between approaches which assume a simple cut between 'given' and 'new' and approaches which assume that both 'given' and 'new' are graded phenomena;
- between approaches which assume 'givenness' and 'newness' are in the text and approaches which assume 'givenness' and 'newness' are in the mind.

It will be argued that these different approaches should not in fact be seen as rival approaches, but rather as complementary approaches. Often more than one of them is needed to explain what is happening when problems occur in real life. For instance, in the UK, listeners to radio and television frequently complain that newsreaders "don't seem to understand what they are reading". Mention is made of "accent" and "inflection", by which the complainers seem to mean that the wrong intonation is used. What seems to be happening on these occasions is that things are being intonationally presented as given, which are not given in the sense of having been referred to earlier in the text. And things are being presented as new, which are not new from the earlier text

perspective. This also means that conversely there is a failure to present as given things which really are given and a failure to present as new things which really are new.

This problem and others will be exemplified and discussed.

Dick Whittington yet again: A multi-parallel analysis of a CD ambiguity

Martin Drápela (The Vilém Mathesius Society)

Tuesday 13 September 2016, 10.30 - 11.10 am

In the Firbasian approach to the issues connected with *functional sentence perspective* (*FSP*, for a list contributions to this approach see e.g. Drápela (ed.) 2015), it is held that in written language, the contextual factor and the semantic factor, "together with linear modification, ... participate in modifying the communicative value of a linguistic element in regard to its place in the development of the communication, in other words, its degree of CD [communicative dynamism]" (Firbas 1996: 24). It has also been argued in this approach that, under circumstances, a cooperation of these factors may give way to ambiguities in the assignment of the degrees of CD within a sentence: "If equivocal, the interplay of factors potentially leads to more than one interpretation." (Firbas 1992: 11).

In spoken language, it is usually prosody that may serve as a successful disambiguating device – a fourth FSP factor – in cases like these. For written language, Firbas (especially in 1995, 1999) suggested that, for instance, the concept of *semantic homogeneity* may lend itself to provide the reader with some clues that lead to the correct or to the more probable perspectivization of the problematic sentence. An example of the operation of this concept was published more than thirty years ago in Firbas (1984) in the form of a short FSP analysis of the introductory part of the story of *Dick Whittington and His Cat*. In an attempt to verify Firbas's application of the concept in the analysis, Drápela (2013) concludes that Firbas's solution can be supported by the results of a parallel FSP analysis of the same stretch of text carried out by nine Czech post-graduate students of English linguistics.

This contribution to the round-table will present the results obtained from even a broader parallel FSP analysis of the same text, this time carried out by thirty-six student-annotators who had zero or very little previous knowledge of the FSP theory and five of whom were native speakers of English.

References

Drápela, M. (2013) "Testing semantic homogeneity of the rhematic track through parallel annotation of information structure (A case study in FSP potentiality)", *philologica.net* [online], 2013-12-30 [cited 2016-07-04]. Available from World Wide Web: <http://philologica.net/studia/20131230123000.htm>.

Drápela, M. (ed.) (2015) *A Bibliography of Functional Sentence Perspective 1956-2011 (Czech and Slovak Authors, Firbasian Approach Oriented)*, Brno: Masaryk University

Firbas, J. (1984) "Scene and perspective", *Brno Studies in English* 14, 37-79.

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 the text" in B. Wårvik, S-K. Tanskanen & R. Hiltunen (eds): *Organization in Discourse. Proceedings from the Turku Conference*, Turku: University of Turku, pp. 59-72.

Firbas, J. (1996) "A case study in linear modification (On translating Apoc. 21.6b)", *Brno Studies in English* 22, pp. 23-48.

Firbas, J. (1999) "On dynamic semantic homogeneity in functional sentence perspective" in U. Carls & P. Lucko (eds): *Form, Function and Variation in English: Studies in Honour of Klaus Hansen*, Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, pp. 305-317.

Dynamism as a component of the linguist's toolkit:
A case study with the use of *clear* in political discourse

Ben Clarke (University of Portsmouth)

Tuesday 13 September 2016, 11.40 - 12.20 am

In this paper, I aim to demonstrate how the dynamic qualities of language use can aid the practice of discourse description (Firth, 1951: 123). In order to do so, I distinguish a number of types of dynamism according to the size and function of the linguistic environment and its 'constituents' as these are made relevant by the act of dynamism in question: *intra-clausal* (akin to Firbaš's (1992) 'communicative dynamism'), *inter-clausal – intra-textual* (wide-span collocation, cohesion, Daneš's (1974) 'thematic progression', Fries's (1995) 'method of development', Matthiessen's (2002) 'logogenesis', etc.), and synchronic and diachronic *inter-textual* types. This approach generalises across various and sometimes disparate language phenomena which may be recognised as 'dynamic'; that is, in contrast to Firbaš's (1992) definition of dynamism as attainment of communicative purpose served by those elements which, in terms of information flow, push the message forward the most – here a looser definition of dynamism is preferred along the lines of "a matter of the varying degrees to which different parts of some use of language contribute to acts of meaning-making" (Clarke & Arus, 2016: 1). As method, this – I will argue – keeps the eye of the discourse analyst sensitive to how meaning is construed in text – much as is achieved by shunting between language strata and their corresponding methods and units of analysis (e.g. Clarke, 2016).

Throughout, points are illustrated by reference to a study of the use of the adjective lexeme 'clear' in political discourse in the United Kingdom. This work shows 'clear' increases diachronically over a recent time period in language texts with a political subject-matter, owing to a small number of emergent senses of its use. These senses are determined by observing lexicogrammatical and

discourse patternings across text. It is speculated that their occurrence may, in turn, be explained (Fairclough, 1989) by considering practices of an intertextual and diachronic kind.

References

Clarke, B.P. (2016) '"We're hearing from Reuters that…": The role of around-the-clock news media in the increased use of the present progressive with mental process type verbs'. In Gardener, S & Alsop, S. (eds.) *Systemic Functional Linguistics in the Digital Age*. Sheffield: Equinox, 68-84.

Clarke, B.P. & Arus, J. (2016) 'Introduction: The dynamicity of communication below, around and above the clause'. *English Text Construction*, 9:1, 1-8.

Daneš, F. (1974) 'Functional Sentence Perspective and the organisation of the text'. In Daneš, F. (ed.) *Papers on Functional Sentence Perspective.* The Hague: Mouton.

Fairclough, N. (1989) *Language and Power*. London: Longman.

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

Firth, J.R. (1951) 'Modes of meaning'. *Essays and Studies of the English Association*, 4, 123-149.

Fries, P.H. (1995) 'Themes, methods of development, and texts'. In Hasan, R. & Fries, P.H. (eds.) *On Subject and Theme: A Discourse Functional Perspective.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 317-359.

Matthiessen, C.M.I.M. (2002). 'Lexicogrammar in discourse development: Logogenetic patterns of wording.' In Huang, G. & Wang, Z. (eds.) *Discourse and Language Functions*. Shanghai: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press, 2-25.

Dynamicity: Starting points and methods of progression

Tom Bartlett (Cardiff University)

Tuesday 13 September 2016, 12.20 - 1 pm

Building on my presentation at the inaugural Round Table and the ensuing publication (Bartlett 2016), in this paper I will discuss textual development in Scottish Gaelic and English, focusing on an original text and its translation by the author. In general I will consider the relationship between Theme as a grammatically marked element of the clause and textuality as a property of text. I go on to make a distinction between two aspects of textuality: *textualisation*, as the immanent and dynamic production of coherent language, and *texture,* as the quality of whole texts as cohesive products.

In the previous work cited, I used the parallel Gaelic and English texts to problematise the concept of Theme as a crosslinguistic category, questioning the transferability of its emic realisation in English as the first experiential element of the clause and also its etic conceptualisation as the "point of departure of the message" (Halliday 1985: 39). In the present paper I will continue this discussion by (i) outlining the textual resources available in Gaelic and (ii) tracing the realisation in the Gaelic text of the Thematic element from the English original, in order to (iii) compare the dynamics of progression between the two languages as these relate to the characterology (Mathesius 1964) of

each as an integrated system and (iv) raise further crosslinguistic questions on the concepts of Theme and textuality.

References

Bartlett, Tom. 2016. Phasal dynamism and the unfolding of meaning as text. In J. Arús and B. Clarke (Eds) special issue of *English Text Construction*.

Halliday, M.A.K. 1985 (1st edition). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar.* London: Arnold.

Mathesius, V. 1964. On linguistic characterology with illustrations from Modern English. In V. Josef (ed.) *A Prague School Reader in Linguistics.* Bloomington IN: Indiana University Press.

System and realization of Theme in Spanish:
Towards a paradigmatic description

Estela Inés Moyano (Universidad Nacional de General Sarmiento)

Tuesday 13 September 2016, 2.20 - 3 pm

In previous work (Moyano, 2016) it has been proposed that Theme in the Spanish declarative clause is realized by agreement. In this description, Theme is realized by a participant which is signalled by the verbal affix. This participant can be explicit, and placed at the beginning or at the end of the clause, or elided, and conflated with New. In this paper, a small corpus of different registers will be analysed, in order to explore interrogatives and imperatives. Declarative clauses will be revisited, to show that the clitics in Spanish cannot perform the function of Theme, as proposed by other scholars (Taboada, 1995; Montemayor-Borsinger, 2009; Arús, 2010; Lavid et al, 2010). The main objective of this presentation is to outline a provisional system of Theme in Spanish. The perspective assumed is language typology in SFL, which highlights the peculiar characteristics of the language at stake based on patterns found in actual discourse and which observes the phenomenon "from above, from round about and from below" (Martin, 1983; Caffarel, Martin and Matthiessen, 2004; Matthiessen & Halliday, 2009; Quiroz, 2013).

References

Arús Hita, J. (2010) On Theme in English and Spanish: A comparative study. In *Thresholds and Potentialities of Systemic Functional Linguistics: Multilingual, Multimodal and Other Specialised Discourses*, Elisabeth Swain (ed.). Trieste: EUT, 23-48.

Caffarel, A., Martin, J.R. and Matthiessen, C.M.I.M. (eds.) (2004). *Language Typology: A Functional Perspective.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Lavid, J.; Arús Hita, J. & Zamorano Mansilla, J.R.. (2010) *Systemic Functional Grammar of Spanish. A Contrastive Study with English*. London: Continuum.

Martin, J.R. (1983) Participant identification in English, Tagalog and Kate. Australian Journal of Linguistics 3(1): 45-74.

Matthiessen, C.M.I.M., & Halliday, M.A.K. (2009). *Systemic functional grammar: a first step into the theory*. Beijing: Higher Education Press.

Montemayor-Borsinger, A. (2009) *Tema. Una Perspectiva Funcional de la Organización del Discurso.* Buenos Aires: Eudeba, Enciclopedia Semiológica.

Moyano, E.I. (2016) Theme in English and Spanish: Different means of realization for the same textual function. En Clark, B. & Arús Hita, J. (Eds.) *Special Issue on Communicative Dynamism, English Text Construction,* 9 (1): 190-220*.*

Quiroz, B. (2013) *The interpersonal and experiential grammar of Chilean Spanish: Towards a principled Systemic-Functional description based on axial argumentation.* PhD Thesis. Department of Linguistics, University of Sydney.

Rose, D. (2001) Some variation in Theme across languages. *Functions of Language* 8(1): 109-145.

Taboada, M. (1995) *Theme markedness in English and Spanish: A Systemic-Functional approach.* MA dissertation, Universidad Complutense de Madrid. <www.sfu.ca/~mtaboada/docs/taboada-theme-markedness.pdf> (Last accessed on December 31 2015).

Maintaining participant identity in discourse: A contrastive English/Spanish account

Jorge Arús-Hita (Universidad Complutense de Madrid)

Tuesday 13 September 2016, 3 - 3.40 pm

This presentation draws upon and expands previous research on textual progression in English and Spanish (Arús-Hita 2014). One of the findings of that research was the radically opposite nature of pronominal Subject Theme realisation in English and in Spanish in terms of communicative dynamism. Such realisation is English is associated with low communicative dynamism. Thus, in example (1) the personal pronoun *they* is procedurally used to maintain participant identity, *the tutors*, in this case. It is in fact necessary to use the pronoun to ensure the grammaticality of the clause. In Spanish, conversely, the pronominal realisation of Subject Themes carries high communicative dynamism, as is the case in (2), where the second clause would have been perfectly grammatical without the pronoun *ellas* ('they'). The pronoun is exceptionally used on this occasion to reinforce the singularity of *female* adolescents.

(1) This also reflects the tutors' experience; **they** found the warm-up activities essential to get people talking…

(2) *Cuando las adolescentes imaginan…. Además, **ellas** se ven con menor frecuencia en situaciones laborales sexistas…* ('when (female) adolescents imagine… Besides, they see themselves less often in sexist situations at work')

Here we delve into this contrast by looking at a number of written and spoken texts in order to explore the different ways in which English and Spanish maintain participant identity in the unfolding of text and communicative exchange, and, in particular, the role that the pronominal realisation of Subject Themes plays in such tasks within each language. We will see that English and Spanish are, regarding the issues here at stake, more similar in writing than in speaking. Finally,

some consequences will be drawn concerning the grammatical and semantic environments of the Subject and the different ways in which these environments determine the resources used in each of these two languages for maintaining participant identity in discourse.

Reference

Arús-Hita, Jorge (2014) Communicative Dynamism and Textual Progression in English and Spanish. Paper delivered at the 1st Round Table on Communicative Dynamism, Cardiff University, 4-5 September.

Chunking as the cognitive basis of a dynamic grammar: What evidence do we have?

Anna Mauranen and Svetlana Vetchinnikova (University of Helsinki)

Tuesday 13 September 2016, 4.10 - 4.50 pm

In this paper, we build on *Linear Unit Grammar* developed by Sinclair and Mauranen (2006) and hypothesise that humans make sense of incoming linear speech flow by intuitively breaking it down into manageable chunks. The properties of such on-line chunking should be primarily determined by (1) the linearity of text; (2) constraints of human cognition and (3) mechanisms of meaning construction. To examine them, we conducted an experiment where participants were asked to listen to short audio clips of natural language interaction and follow them from the transcripts. Their task was to mark boundaries between chunks as they listened by putting a boundary where they felt a chunk ends. Each audio clip was followed by a comprehension question to correlate chunking behaviour with understanding. The chunking task was designed as a web-based application for tablets which records all the boundaries marked by the participants. These boundaries were then analysed both individually and in the aggregate to see (1) whether they correspond to predictions of Linear Unit Grammar; (2) which boundaries are perceptually more salient being most commonly marked; (3) which chunk types are perceived as least breakable in that participants never insert a boundary within them.

Linearity and tone in the unfolding of information

Gerard O'Grady (Cardiff University)

Tuesday 13 September 2016, 4.50 - 5.30 pm

In this talk I want to explore how the interaction of primary tone and grammatical expectation functions in the linear unfolding of unplanned spoken text. Tones with end falling movement are generally thought to signal completion in Southern Standard British English. But as is well known not

every non-interrogative utterance is completed by a falling tone. Similarly, in English New information in the unmarked case follows Given information within the clause with the "Newest' information found clause finally. Yet, in spoken discourse clauses frequently do not correlate with speaker turns and neither are speaker turns restricted to a single point of information. In previous work I have identified a unit which realizes an act of telling called the increment. Increments which may be multi-clausal are identified on the basis of three criteria: (1) the satisfaction of grammatical expectations, (2) the presence of a falling or rise-falling tone and (3) the perturbation of existing shared knowledge.

I use a small corpus of monologue and dialogue produced by a group of UK university students to illustrate how the interplay of grammar, intonation and shared context enables individual speakers to foreground the parts of their message which they project as maximally informational in real time. I will specifically describe cases where maximally informational parts of the message do not occur in increment final position and discuss their significance.

The information structure of copular clauses: Can the prosody-grammar interface tell us something about copular typology?

Wout Van Praet[1], Kristin Davidse[2], Ditte Kimps[3] and Lieven Vandelanotte[4]
(UNamur[1,4], FNRS[1] and KU Leuven[1,2,3,4])

Wednesday 14 September 2016, 9 - 9.40 am

In the typology of copular clauses, the most basic distinction, we have argued (Van Praet & Davidse 2015), is the one between specificational (1) and ascriptive (2) clauses.

(1) the ^one !qu\ality I`ve g/ot# for ^being a polit/ician# is that ^I !sleep the :whole night :thr/ough# (LLC)

(2) I am the sh\op ass/istant # Matthew </name#> you're the person coming into the sh\op# (LLC)

Specificational clauses, like (1), set up a pragmatically presupposed variable (e.g. *the one quality I've got for being a politician*), to which the speaker assigns a specific value (e.g. *that I sleep the whole night through*). Ascriptive clauses like (2), on the other hand, ascribe a description (e.g. *being the shop assistant*) to a typically familiar entity (e.g. *I, you*).

This paper sets out to investigate whether and how the functional difference between the two clause types is reflected in their respective information structures. Our particular concern is to check the traditional assumption (e.g. Halliday 1994, Huddleston & Pullum 2002) that the specificational-ascriptive distinction is rooted in a difference in focus assignment, with the focus typically falling on the value in the former and on the description in the latter. To do so, we compiled a set of

prosodically transcribed data from the London Lund Corpus, 500 specificational and 500 ascriptive clauses.

The results, we argue, show that, while there is a basic truth to this view of specificational vs. ascriptive information structure, it needs to be nuanced to provide replicable recognition criteria. Ascriptive clauses, mostly realized on one tone unit or even only part of a tone unit , do have as their default the assumed dichotomy between an element that has low communicative dynamism (CD) and one high in CD, which is most often the ascriptive complement, as in (2). Specificational clauses, which are not uncommonly spread over several tone units with a corresponding plurality of intonational peaks, as in (1), require a more nuanced formulation of their informational principles. Esser & Polomski's (1988) proposal that a hierarchy of foci be recognized may have to be developed for them (p.c. O'Grady). In addition, examples such as (1) and (2) suggest that it is worth considering Esser's (1983) idea that the contrast less vs. more foregroundworthy should be distinguished from that between non-final and final. In the first contrast, the nuclearity of the tonic syllable as such marks the most newsworthy element, or the focus. (Non-)finality, on the other hand, is said to be signalled by pitch change, with a rise conveying non-finality (see also Kimps 2016), as illustrated in both (1) and (2).

References

Esser, J. (1983). Tone units in Functional Sentence Perspective. *Journal of Semantics* 2: 121-140.
Esser, J., A. Polomski (1988) *Comparing Reading and Speaking Intonation*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
Kimps, D. (2016). *English Variable tag questions: A typology of their interpersonal meanings*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis. Linguistics Dept. KU Leuven.
Halliday, M.A.K. 1994. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar.* 2nd ed*.* London: Arnold.
Huddleston, R., G. Pullum (2002) *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: CUP.
Van Praet, W., K. Davidse (2015). *Revisiting the typology of English copular clauses: ascription and specification in categorizing and identifying clauses*. Leuven Working Papers in Linguistics, 4: 15.

Making the case for defining clefts broadly as secondary specification structures: Prosody and information structure

Kristin Davidse, Ditte Kimps and Ngum Meyuhnsi Njende (KU Leuven)

Wednesday 14 September 2016, 9.40 - 10.20 am

In this presentation we argue that English cleft constructions may have as matrix *it be* + NP (1), *there be* + NP (2), or *I/you/we have (got)* + NP (3) (Davidse 2000, Lambrecht 2001). They all specify values for the variable designated by the relative marker (which may be zero) in the cleft relative clause, e.g. the value *garden space* for the variable 'x that is so precious for kids' in (1). The value typically has prosodic prominence, signalling information focus.

(1) and it's **g\arden** space // that is {**s\o**} **pr\ecious** {for **k\ids**//}//not **h\ouse** space// (quoted Collins 2006: 1708)

(2) [in reaction to question if there are any known academics in the department] A: well ^f\/irst of 'all//there's a ^man called ''!**H\ocking**//who ^has I 'think :taken his **de:gr\ee**//^in this **de!p\artment**//and is ^**kn\own**//[@] who ^**s\eemed** [@:m]//to ^be [s @] !**f\/airly** 'strong//^and there is ''!**H\erman**//who is ^**\also** 'known// (LLC)

(3) D: ^well . !their de'partment of 'edu:c\/ation# - [@:] - . ^joined to'gether with the 'paraplegic 'home study :c\ouncil# - the com^{m\/ittee} that :I was 'on with 'Julius !W\/ilton# . ^got some !m\/oney# ^from [dhi] 'Larkish 'state b\ank# . from ^their 'Staat'banken 'Jubi!l\eums 'fund# ^[dhi] - !state 'bank :j\ubilee 'fund# *- ((1 syll))*
A: *^good G/\od# ^th\/at* 'is 'what is# fi^nancing 'Hamar`s pr\oject#
D: ^yes well they they !have ^that **f\/und# ^**is is a !very **!r\/ich -** 'one# (LLC)

Crucial to the grammatical argumentation for this generalization is the systematic contrast with clauses with identifying *be* (4), existential *be* (5) and *have* (6) with complements containing NP-internal restrictive relative clauses (RRCs), which define subtypes of the head nouns (Davidse & Kimps 2016). Prosodically RRCs tend to be integrated into the postverbal NP as part of the tone contour on which the whole clause is uttered (Halliday 1994).

(4) ^**y=es**// ^this is the one I could most **l\ive** 'with // (LLC: 1.8)

(5) A: ((there are)) ^some 'people who :like to 'come :once a 'week just to **s\/ing** //
?A: ^y\es //
D: **\/al**most // to an ^\evening 'class // - *((and))*
A: **.*^**y\es //* ^y\eah // ((but there are)) ^those who 'like to 'come [t] to a !few re'hearsals be:fore a :**c\oncert** //
A: ^[=m] // ^**y\es **//
D: and we ^have !both 'sorts of :**p\eople** // (LLC)

(6) <1 7 A> ***^**in the . ^in the !**\/amplifier#**** I`ve ^got 'one of these *'things that goes !**s\ideways**# (LLC)

In this paper we will closely investigate the prosody and information structure of clefts with two main aims. Firstly, we want to strengthen the – presently contentious – case that constructions with the three types of matrices in (1), (2) and (3) really do form one general type of cleft constructions. Secondly, in light of this broad definition of clefts, we will re-consider what is generally seen as *the* central question about clefts, viz. whether they are focus-marking structures (e.g. Lambrecht 2001) or topic/theme-marking structures (e.g. Halliday 1967), coming down on the position that they are neither. We argue that they are not purely information structure marking devices – in which view some form-meaning mismatch has to be posited, be it viewing the matrix as lexically empty (Lambrecht 2001) or the relative clause as extraposed from the matrix's subject which it is claimed to form a unit with (Halliday 1967). Rather, they are complex sentence constructions in which meaning matches form with the following properties:

(i) They have a matrix whose predicate assigns a semantic role to its complement, such as identifier of identifying *be* in (1), existent of the existential predicate in (2), and patient of *have* in (3).

(ii) The whole complement NP is the head being modified by (and the antecedent of) the cleft relative clause: it designates determined instances, *garden space* in (1), *Hocking* and *Herman* in (2), *that fund* in (3).

(iii) The 'secondary' modification of the postverbal complement is similar to that in some secondary predication constructions (Nichols 1978, McGregor 1997, König & Lambrecht 1998), but, because of its specificational semantics, constitutes a 'secondary specification' construction.

The proposed analysis tallies with the fact that focus placement in attested examples is more variable than either of the two information structure analyses of clefts predicts. As secondary specification constructions, they can convey a plurality of mappings between ideational, interpersonal and textual meanings.

References

Davidse, K. 2001. A constructional approach to clefts. *Linguistics* 38: 1101-1131.

Davidse, K. & Kimps, D. 2016. Specificational *there*-clefts: functional structure and information structure. *English Text Construction* 9.

Halliday, M.A.K. 1967. Notes on transitivity and theme in English 2. *Journal of Linguistics* 3: 199-244.

Halliday, M.A.K. 1994. An introduction to Functional Grammar. London: Arnold.

König, J.-P. & Lambrecht, K. 1998. French relative clauses as secondary predicates: A case study in Construction Theory. In F. Corbin, C. Dobrovie-Sorin & J.-M. Marandin (eds) *Empirical Issues in Formal Syntax and Semantics* 2. The Hague: Thesus, 191-214.

Lambrecht, K. 2001. A framework for the analysis of cleft constructions. *Linguistics* 39: 463-516.

McGregor, W. 1997, *Semiotic Grammar*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Nichols, J. 1978. Secondary predicates. *Berkeley Linguistics Society Proceedings* 4: 114-127.