

PART ONE

ANALYSING SENTENCE STRUCTURE AND FUNCTION



JANA CHAMONIKOLASOVÁ

WORD ORDER AND LINEAR MODIFICATION IN ENGLISH

Abstract

The paper examines the role of linear modification in shaping the syntactic structure of an English sentence. Linear modification – the principle of presenting ideas in an order of gradual rise in importance – co-determines word order in all Indo-European languages, though it is less powerful in languages with fixed word order than in languages with flexible word order. English syntax changed quite significantly on the way from Old English to Modern English. The shift from flexible word order to fixed word order, which was closely related to certain phonological and morphological features of English, was accompanied by a reduction of the power of linear modification as a word-order principle. The paper tests this reduction by an analysis of written Old English and Modern English texts.

Key words

Word order; linear modification; functional sentence perspective; Old English; Modern English; word-order principles

1. The concept of linear modification

The term *linear modification* was introduced in linguistic theory by Bolinger (1952: 1125), who claims that within a sentence, ‘gradation of position creates gradation of meaning when there are no interfering factors’. Bolinger’s study of the relationship between syntax and semantics suggests that speakers and writers tend to express pieces of information in order of increasing information value. The placement of less important (context dependent or accessible) ideas in initial position and more important ideas in final position reflects the processes taking place in the communication participants’ minds. Word order respecting linear

modification is referred to as *objective* and word order violating linear modification as *subjective* (see Mathesius 1975: 83–4). Below are examples of objective (1) and subjective (2) word order.

- (1) In the middle of the night the villagers heard a fearsome cry.
- (2) A fearsome cry could be heard in the middle of the night.

2. Word order and information structure

Mathesius (1975: 153–63), Firbas (1992: 117–140) and Vachek (1994: 32–40) identify principles determining word order in Indo-European languages. The most important are the linearity principle (ordering elements in accordance with linear modification) and the grammatical principle (ordering elements in accordance with a grammaticalized word-order pattern).¹ The linearity principle is stronger in languages with flexible word order, the speakers of which are able to produce ‘gradation of meaning’ more easily than speakers of languages with fixed word order, in which the linearity principle is subordinate to the grammatical principle. In English, the grammatical principle enforces the sequence subject (S), verb (V), object (O), complement (C), adverbial (A). Since objects, complements and adverbials often express more important ideas than subjects, a large number of English sentences observe the grammatical principle without necessarily violating the linearity principle.

Linear modification operates not only at the syntactic level but also at the level of information structure of a sentence. According to the Brno theory of functional sentence perspective created by Firbas, the interpretation of the information structure of a sentence relies on specific syntactic, semantic, contextual, and – in spoken language – prosodic criteria (cf. e.g. Firbas 1989 and 1992; Dušková 1985 and 2002; Svoboda 1981 and 1989; and Chamonikolasová 2005 and 2007). Different degrees of communicative prominence (dynamism) carried by communicative units (sentence elements) correspond to different FSP functions. A simplified scale starting with the least dynamic, i.e. thematic elements, and ending with the most dynamic, i.e. rhematic elements is presented below:

theme proper (ThPr)
 diatheme (DTh)
 transition proper (TrPr)
 transition (Tr)
 rheme (Rh)
 rheme proper (RhPr)

Sentences with objective word order starting with thematic elements and ending with rhematic elements comply with the principle of linear modification, while in sentences with subjective word order starting with rhematic elements and ending

with thematic elements, linear modification is violated (cf. examples 2 and 3-Pr); partial violation of the principle of linear modification occurs e.g. in sentences with a rhematic element in penultimate position followed by a thematic element in final position.

3. Word order in Modern English

As mentioned above, Modern English is an analytical language with limited morphological variation and a relatively fixed word order governed by the grammatical principle. Owing to the operation of the grammatical principle, variation within word-order patterns in English is rather limited. Unmarked sentence patterns contain a subject immediately followed by the verb. The remaining sentence elements occur in post-verbal positions; non-obligatory adverbials are alternatively placed before the subject in initial position. Quirk et al. (1985: 720–21) lists the following unmarked sentence patterns:

- (3) SV The sun is shining.
- (4) SVO He'll get a surprise.
- (5) SVC He's getting angry.
- (6) SVA He got through the window.
- (7) SVOO He got her a splendid present.
- (8) SVOC Most students have found her reasonably helpful.
- (9) SVOA He got himself into trouble.

The sentences above all observe the leading grammatical principle. With the exception of sentence (3), they also observe the linearity principle: they start with thematic context-dependent or easily accessible elements carrying low degrees of communicative dynamism and end with context-independent rhematic elements.

When occurring in the most natural context, sentence (3) is interpreted as a sentence presenting the rhematic phenomenon *the sun* on the scene. The subject carries the highest degree of communicative dynamism and the highest degree of prosodic prominence (indicated by capitalization):

(3-Pr) [What is the weather like today?] – The SUN is shining.

Under very special contextual conditions, the subject of example (3) can perform the function of a thematic quality bearer; the highest degree of communicative dynamism is then carried by its quality “shining”:

(3-Q) [The sun is now probably hidden in the clouds, isn't it?] – No. The sun is SHINING.

Example (3-Q) is in harmony with both the grammatical and the linearity principles. Example (3-Pr) complies with the grammatical principle but violates the linearity principle – its word order is *subjective*. *The sun* is rhematic but has to be placed in the initial position because it fulfils the syntactic function of the subject. The grammatical principle in this case acts as a factor interfering with a gradual rise in communicative value.² However, the deviation from the linearity principle, which is subordinate to the grammatical principle in English, does not render the sentence marked.³

Although the grammatical principle is superior to the linearity principle in English, in certain types of existential sentences, the struggle between the two principles ends with a partial or complete victory of the subordinate linearity principle:

- (10) There was a large cloud in the sky.
 (11) Next to the window hung a small picture.

The development of sentences containing the existential *there* is related to the natural need of the speaker to present ideas in the objective order (see Breivik 1983). The operator *there* occupies the initial position of the grammatical subject, satisfying the grammatical principle; the postponement of the actual rhematic subject/phenomenon satisfies the linearity principle (10). Existential sentences without existential *there* like (11) are reflections of earlier stages of syntactic development. However, they are rather rare and mostly restricted to written language.

4. Word order in earlier stages of the development of English

The syntactic structure of present-day English outlined above results from a substantial transformation of the syntactic structure of Old English and Middle English. While Old English was an inflected language with a relatively flexible word order, in Modern English – as illustrated above – word order variation is very limited. The shift from flexible to fixed word order is the result of a number of linguistic and sociolinguistic changes in the history of the English language. The most significant factor acknowledged by most scholars is the levelling of inflection accompanied by the loss of morphological signals indicating semantic relations between syntactic elements of a sentence, e.g. the relation between the agent (subject) and the patient (object) of the process expressed by the verb. Other, less significant, factors affecting the mentioned transformation are the operation of the principle of end-weight, the integration and grammaticalization of language units expressing afterthought, and language acquisition in contact areas (cf. e.g. Seoane 2006 and Jucker 1995).

The gradual modification of English morphology and syntax resulted in a typological shift of English from a predominantly synthetic to a predominantly analytical language. The wide range of grammatical changes involved in this process

have been described e.g. by Firbas (1957); Mathesius (1975); Breivik (1983) and (1991); Vachek (1994); Sauer (1995); Baekken (1998); Čermák (2000); Schendl (2001); Pintzuk and Taylor (2006); and Seoane (2006).

The syntactic change of the English language manifests itself in the word-order patterns applied at different stages of the development of the language. Numerous studies (e.g. Breivik 1983: 358–403) describe Old English as a V2 language, i.e., a language with the verb-second constraint similar syntactically to Modern German and Dutch. The common feature of languages that have or have had the verb-second constraint is the development of dummy subjects such as the existential *there* or the dummy *it* in English (cf. Haiman 1974; Breivik 1983: 358–403 and 1991). During its historical development, English changed from a verb-second language to a verb-medial language: in Modern English, the verb has a tendency to follow the subject and to precede the object or adverbial and complement, but not necessarily as the second element in a sentence. Even if the sentence starts with an adverbial, the verb is not inserted between the adverbial and the subject but occurs in the medial position, i.e. after the adverbial and the subject.

Looking at the gradual syntactic change of English from a different angle, some authors (cf. Pintzuk and Taylor 2006) describe it as a change from an OV to a VO language, i.e. from a language in which the object precedes the verb to a language in which the object follows the verb. This change is closely related to the loss of the verb-second constraint and represents just another consequence of the major shift of English from a synthetic inflectional language with a relatively free word order to an analytical non-inflectional language with a grammaticalized word order.

5. Analysis

The power of linear modification as word order principle in the history of the English language will be tested by the analysis of the communicative loads of initial and final syntactic elements in Old English and Modern English texts. The material analyzed includes selected extracts from the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*,⁴ and the *Chronicle of Britain and Ireland* (1992).⁵ The Modern English chronicle is written in a contemporary language and style but it resembles ancient chronicles in form: historical events are presented as if they happened recently. The material consists of 100 Old English and 100 Modern English sentences.

Below are examples of the analysis of the syntactic and information structure patterns of sentences selected from the two chronicles.⁶ The syntactic analysis is based on conceptions presented in *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language* (Quirk et al. 1985) and the *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English* (Biber et al. 1999). Each main independent clause and each conjoined main clause (i.e. each of the clauses conjoined by a co-ordinate conjunction) represents one sentence pattern and one field of distribution of communicative dynamism. Subordinate clauses are considered as a component of the main clause functionally equivalent to simple (non-clausal) elements; clausal and non-clausal

sentence elements are denoted by identical symbols – for example, ‘A’ denotes adverbial phrases as well as adverbial clauses. Conjunctions and relative pronouns are considered to be in ‘zero’ position and are therefore not counted as initial elements.

Anglo-Saxon Chronicle:

- (12) We || witon || oþer igland her beean, þær ge magon eardian gyf ge wyllað.
We || know || about an island here to the east where you may dwell if you wish.
 S V O
 ThPr TrPr+Tr RhPr
- (13) 7 gyf hwa eow wiðstent, || we || eow || fultumiað || þæt ge hit magon gegangan.
And if someone to you stands up, || we || you || will support || that you may gain it.
 A S O V A
 DTh ThPr ThPr TrPr+Tr RhPr
- (14) Ða || genamon || þa Walas || 7...
Then || went || the Welsh || and...
 A V S
 DTh TrPr+RhPr DTh
- (15) Subonweard || hit || hæfdon || Bryttas.
Southward || it || possessed || the Britons.
 A O V S
 DTh ThPr TrPr+Tr RhPr

Chronicle of Britain and Ireland:

- (16) Patricius (Patrick), the missionary who converted many Irish to Christianity, || has died.
 S V
 RhPr TrPr+Tr
- (17) (The newcomers derive from a variety of Germanic tribes)
 but || [S] || fall || into three principal groups: Angles, Saxons, and Jutes.
 [S]⁷ V A
 [ThPr] TrPr+Tr RhPr
- (18) In his *Confession* || he || tells || how he had a second vision in which ...
 A S V O
 DTh ThPr TrPr+Tr RhPr
- (19) Opposite the mouth of the Rhine || is || a great island, divided down the middle by a wall.
 A V S
 DTh TrPr+Tr RhPr

6. Results

The results of the analysis of the Old English and Modern English texts are presented in Tables 1–6 below. Tables 1 and 2 provide a survey of word-order patterns in the two texts; Tables 3–6 indicate the communicative loads of initial and final sentence elements. Elliptical subjects are not included in the data because they do not have any formal realization; in clauses with elliptical subjects, the initial position is usually occupied by the verb, performing the transitional function.

Table 1. Word-order patterns in Old English (*Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*)⁸

Basic word-order pattern	Variations within the basic word-order patterns	No. of occurrences
SV	(A)SV, (O)S(O)(C)V	16
SVO	(A)SVO(O)(A), Sv ⁹ OV(A)	21
SVA	(A)SVA(A), (A)SvAV(A)	12
SVC	(A)SVC(A)	9
SOV	(A)SOV(O)(A)	9
AVS	(A)AV(A)(C)S(A)(O), AvSV(A)	30
OVS	(A)OVS	3
Total		100

Table 2. Word-order patterns in Modern English (*Chronicle of Britain and Ireland*)

Basic word-order pattern	Variations within the basic word-order patterns	No. of occurrences
SV	(A)SV, S _o V(A)S _o ¹⁰	13
SVO	(A)SVO(O)(A)	15
SVA	(A)SVA(A)(O),	50
SVC	(A)SVC(A)	14
sVS	s ¹¹ V(C)(A)S(A)	7
AVS		1
Total		100

Table 3. FSP functions of initial syntactic elements in Old English (*Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*)

		S	V	O	A	C	Total	
ThPr	theme	14	---	---	11	---	25	85
DTh		6	---	15	39	---	60	
TrPr+Tr	transition	---	15	---	---	---	15	
RhPr	rheme	---	---	---	---	---	---	
Total		20	15	15	50	---	100	

Table 4. FSP functions of initial syntactic elements in Modern English (*Chronicle of Britain and Ireland*)

		S+s	V	O	A	C	Total	
ThPr	theme	20	---	---	---	---	20	74
DTh		29	---	---	25	---	54	
TrPr+Tr	transition	---	17	---	---	---	17	
RhPr	rheme	9	---	---	---	---	9	
Total		58	17	---	25	---	100	

Table 5. FSP functions of final syntactic elements in Old English (*Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*)

		S	V	O	A	C	Total	
ThPr	theme	---	---	---	---	---	---	7
DTh		2	---	1	3	---	7	
TrPr+Tr	transition	---	7	---	---	---	7	
RhPr	rheme	6	13	20	42	5	86	
Total		8	20	21	47	5	100	

Table 6. FSP functions of final syntactic elements in Modern English (*Chronicle of Britain and Ireland*)

		S	V	O	A	C	Total	
ThPr	theme	---	---	1	---	---	1	17
DTh		---	---	2	13	1	16	
TrPr+Tr	transition	---	3	---	---	---	3	
RhPr	rheme	8	4	19	34	15	80	
Total		8	7	22	47	16	100	

The results of the analysis of word-order patterns presented in Tables 1 and 2 testify to a greater flexibility of word order in the Old English text compared to the Modern English text. While the basis of the majority of Modern English sentences (92) is the pattern SV (SV, SVA, SVO, and SVC), the Old English material contains a greater variety of sentence patterns (SV, SOV, OVS, AVS); in almost one third of them, the subject is preceded by the verb.¹²

Tables 3 and 4 provide a survey of syntactic and FSP functions of elements occurring in the initial position. The most frequent in Old English are thematic adverbials (50), followed by thematic subjects (20), thematic objects (15), and transitional verbs (15). In Modern English, there is no object in initial position, and thematic subjects (49) are more frequent than thematic adverbials (25). The modern English text contains 9 presentation sentences with initial rhematic subjects, which do not occur in the Old English material at all.¹³ The results of the

comparison of sentence beginnings in Old English and Modern English texts presented in Tables 3 and 4 suggest certain differences in the communicative loads of initial sentence elements. Although most of the elements (85/74) in both texts perform thematic functions, the ratio of themes is slightly lower in Modern English, where 9 initial elements perform rhematic functions. Both Old English and Modern English texts contain initial transitional elements in conjoined coordinate clauses after a conjunction (15/17).

Tables 5 and 6 indicate the frequency of different syntactic and FSP functions of sentence elements in final position. In the Old English text, the most frequent element in final position is rhematic adverbial (42), followed by rhematic object (20), verb (13), subject (6), and complement (5). A small number of final elements are non-rhematic units: thematic subjects occurring in sentence final position due to verb-second constraint and the use of the adverbial *þa* in initial position (cf. example 14); thematic adverbials and objects expressing settings; and transitional verbal units¹⁴. In the Modern English text, the most frequent unit in final position is rhematic adverbial (34), followed by rhematic object (19), complement (15), subject (8), and verb (4). Most of the rhematic subjects in final position are split subjects¹⁵ or subjects in cleft sentences; sentences like example 19 are exceptional. Non-rhematic elements occurring in final position include thematic adverbials and a small number of thematic objects and complements, and transitional verbs. The comparison of data in Tables 5 and 6 suggests that the tendency for the final placement of rhematic elements is very strong in both Old and Modern English. The ratio of rhematic elements in Modern English, however, is slightly lower than in Old English (80/86).

The comparison of Old English and Modern English chronicles suggests that the syntactic change from Old English to Modern English was accompanied by a reduction of the flexibility within word order patterns; an increase in the frequency of initial subjects at the expense of initial adverbials and objects; an increase in the potential of the initial syntactic element to convey rhematic information and to express the goal of the message of the whole sentences; and a slight reduction of the frequency of rhematic elements in final position. The change of the hierarchy within the word-order principles during the development of the English language, however, did not result in a *significant* increase in sentences with subjective word order owing to the gradual development of sentence structures like existential there-sentences and cleft sentences that satisfy both the grammatical and the linearity principle.

Notes

- 1 These are supplemented by the rhythmical and the emphasis principle.
- 2 In languages with flexible word order, such element naturally occurs in final position (cf. the Czech sentence *Svítil slunce* [Is shining the sun.]).
- 3 (3-Pr) is in reality more natural than (3-Q), which only functions in a rather constructed context.

- 4 Manuscript D, Cotton Tiberius B iv (copied from older manuscripts around 1050): Introduction and entries for years 47, 62–68, 716, and 755.
- 5 Entries for years 480, 490, 500, 540, 550, and 563.
- 6 This paper presents a simplified form of FSP analysis. In sentences with more thematic elements Firbas (1992) distinguishes the following units: theme proper, theme proper oriented theme, diatheme oriented theme, and diatheme. In this paper, the abbreviation ThPr denotes themes proper and theme proper oriented themes; DTh denotes diathemes and diatheme oriented themes.
- 7 Elliptical subject.
- 8 Word order in OE was influenced by a wide range of factors. For instance, sentences with subjects expressed by a personal pronoun rarely showed verb-second; in sentences with initial *þa*, by contrast, verb-second was categorical (cf. Fischer & Wurff 2006: 184). Since the focus of this paper is the communicative load of initial and final sentence elements, these factors have not been dealt with. However, it should be noted that of the 30 occurrences of the AVS pattern listed in Table 1, 25 contain the adverbial *þa* preceding the verb.
- 9 Auxiliary verb.
- 10 Split subject.
- 11 Dummy (grammatical) subject.
- 12 Shann (1964: 13) and Bean (1983: 67) indicate a lower percentage of the patterns VS. Due to different categorization of sentence types, however, a precise comparison of the data is not possible.
- 13 However, some of the rhematic subjects in the Old English material occur in a post-initial position following the adverb *þa*.
- 14 Most transitional verbs in final position are preceded by rhematic elements, e.g. “...7 wæs heora heretoga Reoda gehaten”.
- 15 Example of a split subject: “Reports are circulating in this region of a decisive victory...”.

Acknowledgement

This paper was written under the auspices of the *Centre for Interdisciplinary Research into Ancient Languages and Early Stages of Modern Languages* (research program MSM 0021622435) at Masaryk University in Brno, Czech Republic.

Texts analyzed

Anglo-Saxon Chronicle MS D – Cotton Tiberius B iv. (1926) Classen, E. and Harmer, F. E. (eds.) Manchester: The University Press.

Chronicle of Britain and Ireland (1992). Heald, Henrietta (ed.) JL International Publishing.

References

- Baekken, Bjørg (1998) *Word Order Patterns in Early Modern English, with Special Reference to the Position of the Subject and the Finite Verb*. Oslo: Novus Press.
- Bean, Marian C. (1983) *The Development of Word Order Patterns in Old English*. London: Croom Helm.

- Biber, Douglas, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad, and Edward Finegan (1999) *Longman Grammar Spoken and Written English*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- Bolinger, Dwight L. (1952) 'Linear modification'. *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* 67, 1117–1144.
- Breivik, Leif E. (1983) *Existential THERE*. Bergen: University of Bergen.
- Breivik, Leif E. (1991) 'On the typological status of Old English'. In Kastovsky, Dieter (ed.) *Historical English Syntax – Topics in English Linguistics 2*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 31–50.
- Chamonikolasová, Jana (2005) 'Dynamic semantic scales in the theory of functional sentence perspective'. In: Panevová, Jarmila and Barbora Vidová-Hladká (eds.) *Aleg(r)ace pro Evu. Papers in Honour of Eva Hajičová*. Praha: Univerzita Karlova, 61–67.
- Chamonikolasová, Jana (2007) *Intonation in English and Czech Dialogues*. Brno: Masaryk University.
- Chamonikolasová, Jana (2009) 'Initial syntactic elements in Old English and Modern English sentences'. In Loudová, Kateřina, Marie Žáková (eds.) *Early European Languages in the Eyes of Modern Linguistics*. Brno: Masaryk University, 99–110.
- Čermák, Jan (2000) 'A Typological note on the category of gender in Old English'. In: Čermák, Jan and Aleš Klégr (eds.) *The Tongue is An Eye. Studies Presented to Libuše Dušková*. Praha: Ústav anglistiky a amerikanistiky FFUK a Kruh moderních filologů, 15–20.
- Dušková, Libuše (1985) 'The position of the rheme in English and Czech sentences as constituents of a text'. *Philologica Pragensia* 67, 128–135.
- Dušková, Libuše (2002) 'Constancy of syntactic function across languages'. In Hladký, Josef (ed.) *Language and Function. To the Memory of Jan Firbas. Studies in Functional and Structural Linguistics* 49. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 135–53.
- Firbas, Jan (1957) 'Some thoughts on the function of word order in Old English and Modern English'. *Sborník prací Filozofické fakulty Brněnské univerzity* A5, 72–98.
- Firbas, Jan (1979) 'A functional view of "ordo naturalis"'. *Brno Studies in English* 13, 29–59.
- Firbas, Jan (1989) 'Degrees of communicative dynamism and degrees of prosodic prominence'. *Brno studies in English* 18, 21–66.
- Firbas, Jan (1992) *Functional sentence perspective in written and spoken communication*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fischer, Olga and Wim van der Wurff (2006) 'Syntax'. In: Hogg, Richard and David Denison (eds.) *A History of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 109–198.
- Haiman, John (1974) *Targets and Syntactic Change*. Janua Linguarum Series Minor 186. The Hague and Paris: Mouton.
- Jucker, Andreas H. (ed.) (1995) *Historical Pragmatics: Pragmatic Developments in the History of English*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Mathesius, Vilém (1975) *A Functional Analysis of Present-Day English on a General Linguistic Basis*. transl. Libuše Dušková, ed. Josef Vachek. Prague: Academia.
- Pintzuk, Susan, and Taylor, Ann (2006) 'The loss of OV order in the history of English'. In: Kamenade, Ans van and Los Bettelou (eds.) *The Handbook of the History of English*. Maldon/Oxford/Carlton: Blackwell Publishing, 249–274.
- Quirk Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik (1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. New York: Longman.
- Sauer, Hans (1995) 'Das gegenwärtige Englisch und seine historischen Hintergründe' [Present-Day English and its Historical Background]. In: Ahrens, R. et al. (eds.) *Handbuch English als Fremdsprache*. Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 17–23.
- Seoane, Elena (2006) 'Information structure and word order change: The passive as an information-rearranging strategy in the history of English'. In: Kamenade, Ans van and Los Bettelou (eds.) *The Handbook of the History of English*. Maldon/Oxford/Carlton: Blackwell Publishing, 360–391.

- Shannon, Ann (1964) *A descriptive syntax of the Parker manuscript of the Anglo-Saxon chronicle from 734 to 891*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Svoboda, Aleš (1981) *Diatheme*. Brno: Masaryk University.
- Svoboda, Aleš (1989) *Kapitoly z funkční syntaxe* [Topics in functional syntax]. Prague: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství.
- Vachek, Josef (1994) *A Functional Syntax of Modern English*. Brno: Masaryk University.

JANA CHAMONIKOLASOVÁ is an associate professor in the Department of English and American Studies at the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University in Brno, Czech Republic, where she teaches classes in functional syntax and the history of the English language. She has published a monograph *Intonation in English and Czech dialogues* and papers in various linguistic journals. In her research she focuses on the interpretation of spoken language from the viewpoint of the theory of functional sentence perspective and intonation.

Address: doc. PhDr. Jana Chamonikolasová, Ph.D., Department of English and American Studies, Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University, Arna Nováka 1, 602 00 Brno, Czech Republic. [email: chamonik@phil.muni.cz]



LIBUŠE DUŠKOVÁ

NOUN MODIFICATION IN FICTION AND ACADEMIC PROSE

Abstract

The article examines noun modification in fiction and academic prose with a view to ascertaining features classifiable as style markers. Noun phrases in two text samples were classified according to whether or not they contained modification, and in the case of modified noun phrases with respect to the types, realization forms and distribution of the modifiers. Noun phrases devoid of modifiers displayed a significant distinction in the relatively high representation of proper names in fiction as compared with their marginal occurrence in academic prose. Modified noun phrases revealed qualitative, rather than quantitative differences, especially in the semantics of premodifiers. In academic prose premodifying adjectives and *ing*-participles were mostly classifiers constituting components of zoological terms, while premodifiers in fiction were largely descriptive or evaluative. The differences in the quantitative results compared with the data in *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English* are to be ascribed to the limited amount of the research material and the specific features of the employed text sample within the respective text genre.*

Key words

Noun modification; realization forms; semantics; style markers; fiction; academic prose

1. Introduction

The following discussion is concerned with the occurrence, structural variety and semantics of modification of complex noun phrases, defined as NPs containing, in addition to a determiner and a head noun, one or more modifiers. Two sorts of texts were examined from these aspects, a sample of fiction (Ishiguro) and a sam-

ple of academic prose (Morris), see *Sources*. They are attached in the Appendix.¹ The study attempts to confront the results of an analysis of the two texts with the description of noun phrase modification in different text sorts as presented in representative grammars, in pursuit of uncovering some less investigated, potentially novel, albeit minor points, and thus to contribute to the overall description. Admittedly, the findings of the analysis are limited both by the number of the samples and the number of excerpts. Moreover, authors' styles vary, especially in fiction, and so does the style in academic prose, in particular between different fields of study. Nevertheless where the differences are consistent with the character of the respective text sort, they can be afforded some stylistic relevance.

The overall material of the study comprises 510 noun phrases all but equally drawn from the running text of the fiction sample (256 instances) and running text of academic prose (254 instances). All noun phrases, i.e. both with and without modification, were counted except nouns in complex prepositions of the type preposition + noun + preposition (e.g. *on behalf of*, *for the sake of*, etc.) and nouns in fixed phrases (like *of course*, *for example*, etc.). Since the point under study was the structure of the noun phrase, nouns in the possessive case are included among modifiers, although they mostly operate as determiners (cf. Quirk et al. 1985: 326). Accordingly, the concept of determiner is here limited to the articles and the determinative function of pronouns and quantifiers.

The material includes some noun phrases with non-substantival heads, mostly indefinite pronouns, numerals and demonstrative pronouns functioning as substantival proforms. These instances, generally regarded as noun phrases², were registered where the head was modified and noted as NPs with non-substantival heads. As regards non-substantival NPs without modification, they lack either defining feature of the type of NP here studied. Containing neither a determiner, nor a noun in their structure, they were left out of account, i.e. they are not included in the group of non-modified NPs. Though this structure is of interest from the viewpoint of which non-substantival heads allow modification and what modification types, this aspect was not followed because in the examined samples the structure is marginal.³ Noun phrases with non-substantival heads are illustrated in (1).

- (1) a. nothing objectionable [Ishiguro 89]
 b. one of my pupils who first brought it to my attention [Ishiguro 47]
 c. those who had not wished the house to pass out of the family [Ishiguro 115ib]

In the analysis a problem sometimes arose as to how to class a prepositional phrase following an object, or the subject in existential construction. Some prepositional phrases in this position presented neither a clear-cut instance of postmodification, nor of an adverbial. In these cases the adopted solution is only one of the ways of dealing with the problem and other solutions may be preferred. Conveniently for the quantitative data, these instances are again statistically insignificant. Compare (2):

(2) There is a label [1] on a cage [2] at a certain zoo [2b] (Morris)

Is the prepositional phrase [2] to be regarded as a modifier of *a label* (There is a label located on a cage...) or as an adverbial of place (on a cage there is a label...); and similarly does *at a certain zoo* modify *the cage* (a cage which is at a zoo...) or are both prepositional phrases separate locative adverbials (At a zoo, on a cage, there is a label...)? Or finally do they both successively postmodify the head noun (a label stuck on a cage located at a zoo)? As shown by the marking in square brackets, the solution adopted here is classing the two prepositional phrases as one locative adverbial in which the second specifies the first. The tests applied here were alternative word order *On a cage at a certain zoo there is label* and the question test (*where is there a label?*). As pointed out above and shown by the other alternative forms, instances of this kind are mostly indeterminate and may be treated differently.

2. Realization forms of noun phrases

Noun phrases in the two samples under study were first grouped according to whether or not the head noun was modified. The respective figures are given in Tables 1 and 2.

Table 1. Realization forms of noun phrases: Ishiguro

Noun modification		
Nouns without modifiers	91 (100%)	35.5%
Common nouns	81 (89%)	
Proper names	10 (11%)	
Nouns with modifiers	165	64.5%
Total	256	100%

Table 2. Realization forms of noun phrases: Morris

Noun modification		
Nouns without modifiers	78 (100%)	30.7%
Common nouns	77	
Proper names	1	
Nouns with modifiers	176	69.3%
Total	254	100%

The figures in Tables 1 and 2 show more or less expectable results, viz. that the noun phrase in academic prose is more complex than that in fiction: in the former,

noun phrases without modification are by 5% more frequent. However, when we take into account the proportion of the two groups of nouns subsumed under non-modified nouns, this distinction appears in a different light. While non-modified noun phrases in academic prose are almost exclusively accounted for by NPs with determiners, there being only one proper noun (a geographical name, for that matter, cf. *Africa*, Morris [8]), in fiction the proportion of proper names is much higher (10 instances, 11%). Evidently, this reflects the nature of fiction: all proper nouns are here personal names referring to the characters of the story being told. If proper nouns are subtracted, the representation of non-modified NPs in the two samples differs only by 1% (77 instances out of 254 [30.3%] in academic prose, and 81 out of 256 [31.6%] in fiction). The relatively high representation of proper names in fiction may play a role in the relatively lower representation of modified NPs in this sample insofar as modification of proper names is in general greatly restricted, and hence rare (the examined sample contains no instance of a modified proper name). Thus the only distinction between the two texts sorts emerging from the group of non-modified NPs is the relatively high representation of proper names as a feature of fiction. This is doubtless one of fiction's general features, more or less independent of the style of the author and the role of the narrator.

3. Realization forms of modifiers

The second point of potential relevance for the present discussion concerns the realization forms of the modifiers. The forms found in the two samples are presented in Tables 3 and 4.

Table 3. Realization forms of modifiers: Ishiguro

Types of modification	Abs.	%
Adjective	71	36.4
Prepositional phrase	61	31.3
Relative clause	18	9.2
Converted noun	12	6.2
Possessive case	9	4.6
<i>ed</i> -participle	9	4.6
Gerund	5	2.6
<i>ing</i> -participle	4	2.1
Infinitive	2	1.0
Apposition	3	1.5
Adverb	1	0.5
Total	195	100.0

Table 4. Realization forms of modifiers: Morris

Types of modification	Abs.	%
Adjective	92	45.3
Prepositional phrase	55	27.1
<i>ing</i> -participle	12	5.9
Relative clause	12	5.9
Converted noun	9	4.4
Apposition	9	4.4
Gerund	6	2.9
Possessive case	3	1.6
<i>ed</i> -participle	2	1.0
Adverb	2	1.0
Infinitive	1	0.5
Total	203	100.0

The differences in the totals between Tables 1 and 2 on the one hand, and Tables 3 and 4 on the other, are due to instances of multiple modification, i.e. noun phrases with one head noun modified by more than one modifier none of which contains an NP in its structure, cf. the examples listed under (3):

- (3) a. the fine cedar gateway [Ishiguro 21]
 (adjective + converted noun)
 b. the special food of the district [Morris 43, 43b]
 (adjective + prepositional phrase)
 c. The great advantage we have when studying... [Morris 64]
 (adjective + relative clause)

3.1. Noun modification by adjectives and prepositional phrases

The two realization forms ranking highest in both samples are the adjective and the prepositional phrase, 36.4% and 31.3% in Ishiguro, and 45.3% and 27.1% in Morris, respectively. These results are in agreement with the data in Biber et al.: “Common adjectives (i.e. non-participial adjectives) are the most common category of premodifiers in all registers” (1999: 589). “Prepositional phrases are by far the most common type of postmodification in all registers” (1999: 606). In the examined texts prepositional phrases were more frequently registered in fiction than in academic prose. Here Biber et al. do not offer comparable data, relative frequencies of occurrence being presented only for the different forms of pre- and postmodifiers separately. Similarly, the considerable difference between the representation of adjectives and prepositional phrases in fiction and academic prose (5% and 18%, respectively) cannot be related to comparable data in Biber et al. As regards the noticeably higher representation of adjectives in academic

prose than in fiction, partly comparable data can be found in Figure 8.7 (Biber et al. 1999: 589), but the difference between the two registers in this respect does not appear to be so prominent.

3.1.1 In the academic sample, the higher representation of adjectival premodification may be partly accounted for by the recurrence of collocates of the descriptive adjective *new* + *form* (3 instances), *species* (3 instances), *squirrel(s)* (2 instances), *type* (one instance) in reference to the hypertheme of the passage. The adjective *new* has altogether 11 occurrences in the text, its use with other head nouns being also connected with the novelty feature of the hypertheme, cf. (4) a. and b.

- (4) a. new form [Morris 22, 28, 51], new species [46, 55, 102], new squirrel(s) [35, 73], new type [45b]
 b. new trend [23], new medium [138]

Another factor contributing to adjectival modification in the academic sample is the realization form of some zoological terms, which includes, in addition to the head noun, a classificatory adjective denoting a subclass of the species designated by the head noun. The adjective performs this function alone or in conjunction with other premodifiers, cf. the examples listed under (5):

- (5) a. black-footed squirrel [Morris 9, 65], the African black-footed squirrel [60]
 b. aquatic animals [146], human animal [67], human being [71], tailless great apes [83b], reptilian ancestors [119], the naked mole rat [144b]

While the recurrence of the adjective *new* is connected with the treatment of a new hypertheme and is derivable from the text build-up, the two-word structure of zoological terms is a noticeable terminological feature in general and may be assigned stylistic relevance.

3.1.2 The relatively higher representation of adjectives in academic prose than in fiction is also apparent in instances of multiple premodification, the prevalence of this type in the former being commensurate with the overall predominance of adjectival premodification in this sample (15 vs. 10 instances). In the examined samples, apart from coordinated adjectives multiple premodification includes converted nouns, participles and the possessive case, cf. (6) a. and b.

- (6) a. this old and hidebound family [Ishiguro 91], certain interesting rumours [Ishiguro 107]; various other anatomical features [Morris 75d], their protective furry covering [Morris 117]
 b. the city's most respected and influential men [Ishiguro 19]; a constant high body temperature [Morris 121b], a thick hairy, insulating coat [Morris 127b].

The fiction sample contained two instances of a coordination type characteristic of informal speech, viz. modification with *or so* to express approximation (cf. Quirk et al. 1985: 981). Compare (7).

(7) for a year or so [Ishiguro 44]

Two instances of multiple modification by adjectives deserve to be mentioned for displaying special features. Fiction provides an example of discontinuous adjectival premodification due to the insertion of a comment clause in the function of parenthetical disjunct (cf. Quirk et al. 1985: 1112–1117), a configuration indicative of the style of fiction.

(8) a most curious – some may say – foolish procedure [Ishiguro 28]

The other instance of discontinuous modification, found in the academic sample, represents a case of complex modification structure constituted by multiple adjectival coordination and multiple apposition. The discontinuity involves two of three coordinated adjectives, and the entire multiple apposition, cf. (8).

(9) a new species [Morris 46] would have evolved, separate and discrete, a unique form [46b] of life [46b α], a three hundred and sixty-seventh kind [46c] of squirrel [46c α]

As regards other instances of postposed adjectives, apart from obligatory postposition in the case of indefinite pronoun heads (cf. ex. (1) a., altogether three instances) and two occurrences of the adjective *worth* (cf. (20) c.), the texts under study did not provide any examples.

3.1.3 Potential stylistic relevance was further sought in the semantics of the modifying adjectives. Following the semantic classification in Biber et al. (1999: 508–515), the adjectives were first classed as descriptors or classifiers, the distinction between the two groups consisting in the delimiting or restricting function with respect to a noun's referent in the case of classifiers, while descriptors prototypically denote such features as colour, size, weight, age, etc. Needless to say, semantic classification, whatever model may be used, is hardly ever univocal. Hence the quantitative data are of the more-or-less kind rather than representing exact figures. In consequence of the overall larger number of adjectival modifiers in the academic sample, all semantic groups number more examples in this text, the only measure of comparison thus being the relative representation of the different semantic groups within each sample.

According to the corpus findings in Biber et al. (1999: 510–511) evaluative descriptors are equally represented in both fiction and academic prose, whereas the greatest difference is found in the case of relational classifiers, where the ratio of their representation in fiction and academic prose is 2:18 (cf. Table 7.2, p. 511).

In the texts under study nearly a half of the adjectives found in fiction are evaluative, about 30% descriptive and 20% classificatory. In academic prose this scale is reversed: about 47% are classifiers, 35% descriptors and 18% evaluators. The semantic characteristics of adjectival modification in the two samples thus appear to consist in the prevalence of evaluators in fiction in contrast to the predominance of classifiers in academic prose. This has already been suggested by the adduced examples of adjectival modification. A qualitative distinction moreover emerges when the evaluators in the two text samples are compared. While fiction displays emotive or attitudinal evaluation, the evaluators in the academic sample are intellectual. Compare examples (3) a., (6), (8) and (10) a. with (3) c. and (10) b.

- (10) a. the roof with its elegant tiles [Ishiguro 21c α], two haughty, grey-haired ladies [54c], an eccentric procedure [88], some bitter arguments [110]
 b. a primate of a very odd kind [Morris 76c], of vital importance [126], simple observation [104ib], a slight advantage [29]

Notably, the evaluator *simple* occurs three times (Morris 104, 59). Evaluating adjectives comparable with those found in the fiction sample are few: in addition to *odd* in (10) b., a clear example is *drastic* (this drastic step [136]).

3.2 Premodification of nouns by converted nouns and possessive case

Other realization forms of premodifiers found in the texts under study comprised converted nouns and the possessive case (see Tables 3 and 4). The representation of these forms in the two samples (converted noun and possessive case in Ishiguro 12 and 9 instances, respectively; in Morris 9 and 3 instances, respectively) suggests that only the possessive case may have some stylistic relevance.

3.2.1 According to Biber et al. (1999: 589) converted nouns account for c. 30% of all premodifiers in academic prose and judging from figure 8.7 (ibid.), they are approximately twice as common in this text sort as in fiction. Neither of these corpus findings corresponds with the data given in Tables 3 and 4. In the total of all premodifiers converted nouns account for some 8% in academic prose and for over 12% in fiction. As in several previous points, the fiction sample here appears to be rather atypical. Of the many semantic relations obtaining in the noun + noun sequences (cf. Biber et al. 1999: 590–591), most premodifying nouns in the academic sample express the genitive relation (*of*-relation), cf. (11) a. Other relations are illustrated in (11) b.

- (11) a. squirrel family [Morris 16b α], primate species [93], skin surface [92], body temperature [121ib], body processes [122b]
 b. heat loss (object relationship [129]), hair covering (source/composition [145])

The semantic relations expressed by noun modifiers in fiction are more varied, some of them fitting in none of the types listed in Biber et al.

- (12) garden wall (location [21b α], marriage negotiation (content [90]), ginkgo trees (kind [4b], cedar gateway (material [21], family members (partitive [150]), ink brush (purpose [75id]), art enthusiast (object [106b])

Whether variety of semantic relations in this form of premodification has stylistic relevance remains to be ascertained on the basis of larger and more varied text samples.

3.2.2 The possessive case appears to be more suggestive in this respect. Although the absolute figures do not exceed ten, there is a marked difference in the representation of this form in favour of fiction: nine vs. three occurrences (see Tables 3 and 4). This is expectedly connected with the nature of the head nouns in the two examined text sorts. Over a half of the instances drawn from fiction refer to the characters of the story, the remaining forms being comparable both in number and semantic type with the head nouns of the genitives found in academic prose, cf. (13) a. b. and c.

- (13) a. our children's marriage prospects [Ishiguro 39b], Akira Sugimura's house [48b], their late father's house [60c α], the younger sister's words [104b α], the Sugimuras' high-handedness [148b]
 b. his patient's disease [Morris 54b α], one's moral conduct [Ishiguro 137ib α], one's purse [Ishiguro 137if α] (generic personal head)
 c. the animal's history [Morris 58b], the sun's rays [Morris 132b α], the city's most respected and influential men [Ishiguro 19b], half the property's true value [Ishiguro 26b α / α] (genitive of non-personal nouns)

As can be seen, the adduced instances of possessive genitive largely reflect the relatively high representation of proper names in fiction, noted in 1 as its special feature, thus contributing to this feature's stylistic relevance.

3.3 Modification forms occurring in both pre- and postmodification

Of the realization forms that occur both as pre- and postmodifiers the texts under study contain *ing*- and *ed*-participles and the gerund. Biber et al. (1999) offer relative frequencies of occurrence only for each of these forms with respect to the other pre- and postmodifiers, but not for each form in regard to its occurrence in pre- and postmodification. While postmodifying past participles are described as more common in academic prose than in any other register (Biber et al. 1999: 606), occurrence in premodification is noted "as somewhat more common in academic prose than in the other registers" (Biber 1999: 589). Within fiction,

the representation of *ing*- and *ed*-participle appears to be approximately equal, whereas in academic prose *ed*-participles predominate (cf. Biber et al 1999: 606, Fig. 8.13). The figures for the premodifying *ing*-participle presumably also include the gerund, since this category is not recognized. The occurrence of post-modifying gerunds can be only guessed at from the data for *of* + *ing* in comparison to *to*-infinitive, content *that*- and interrogative *wh*-clauses (ibid. 647, Fig 8.23), where *of* + *ing* is shown to be three-to-four times more frequent in academic prose than in fiction.

3.3.1 In the texts under study the *ing*-participle has 12 occurrences in academic prose and 4 in fiction. In the former it ranks third on the frequency scale, following the two most frequent modifiers, whereas in fiction with four occurrences it falls in the group of the four least frequent forms. Out of the 12 *ing*-participles in Morris, seven occur in premodification and all operate here as classifiers, cf. (14):

- (14) living species [Morris 15], independent breeding population [19], starting point [57], living mammals [116b α], flying mammals [139], burrowing mammals [143]

The fiction samples displays two *ing*-participles in premodification, both of which convey evaluative, qualifying meaning, cf. (15):

- (15) a commanding position on the hill [Ishiguro 5, 5b], the imposing air of the house [10, 10b]

The semantic distinction appears to be connected only with the premodifying function of the *ing*-participle. In postmodification no similar distinction has been noted, cf. (16) a. and b.:

- (16) a. special modifications, making interbreeding with other kinds... unlikely [Morris 41b]; a starting point, telling us... [57i]
 b. the steep path leading [2i] up from the little wooden bridge [Ishiguro 2i]; its stylishly carved ridgepole [21c β] pointing [ii] out over the view

As shown in (14), most premodifying *ing*-participles constitute components of zoological terms, thus performing the same function as many classifying adjectives (see 3.1) and may be regarded as style markers.

3.3.2 Noun modification by the *ed*-participle in the two texts presents a reversed picture, at least with respect to relative frequency of occurrence: there is considerable prevalence of *ed*-participles in fiction, viz. nine occurrences against two in academic prose. This result is presumably due to the limited length of the samples, or else the relatively high representation of the *ed*-participle may be a specific feature of the style of the novel's author. Most *ed*-participles here oc-

cur in postmodification, again without evaluative colouring of meaning, cf. (17) a. and b.

- (17) a. a simple descriptive name based [Morris 104i] on a simple observation
 b. the little wooden bridge still referred to [Ishiguro 2ibii] around here as the Bridge of Hesitation

The fiction sample contains three premodifying *ed*-participles, one of which conveys evaluative meaning by itself, and another is evaluatively modified, cf. (18):

- (18) a. the exaggerated [Ishiguro 51i] respect my pupils always had for me
 b. its stylishly carved [Ishiguro 21cβ] ridgepole

3.3.3 The gerund is represented about equally, having five occurrences in fiction and six in academic prose (see Tables 3 and 4). While all instances in fiction illustrate the postmodifying function, the academic sample contains three premodifying gerunds (in one case gerunds in coordination) which, in connection with what has been observed about a notable number of premodifying adjectives and *ing*-participles in this sample, appears to be of stylistic relevance, cf. (19):

- (19) their mating calls and displays [Morris 44ia, ib], heating and cooling problems [Morris 153id], on the dissecting table [Morris 72bai]

These gerunds fall in the semantic class of classifiers, the instances themselves being well on the way to becoming terms.

Gerunds in the postmodifying function were found after several prepositions, of which only *of* had more than one occurrence (three instances), and two gerunds occurred as complements of *worth*, cf. (20) a. b. c.

- (20) a. the importance of our having a house [Ishiguro 37i], the great physiological advantage of being able [Morris 121i] to maintain a constant, high body temperature
 b. my surprise at receiving [Ishiguro 55i] such personal attention, a very powerful reason for abolishing it [Morris 134i]
 c. one worth having suffered [Ishiguro 143i] a few inconveniences for, something worth pursuing [Morris 57non-sb head iii]

As noted in the case of adjectives and *ing*-participles, also here it is the premodifying use that appears to play a role as a marker of stylistic distinction.

3.4 *Postmodification by apposition, relative clauses, infinitives and adverbs*

The remaining noun modifiers occurred only in postmodification. Two of these, apposition and relative clauses, are represented by a number of examples that allows drawing some conclusions.

3.4.1 As regards apposition, in Biber et al. (1999: 639) it is described as a maximally abbreviated form of postmodification characteristic of registers with the highest informational density, viz. news and academic prose, where it accounts for about 15% of all postmodifiers. This is in agreement with the findings of the present study, apposition being represented by 9 examples in academic prose as against three in fiction (cf. Tables 3 and 4). In the total of all postmodifiers, in the academic text under study apposition accounts for 10%, which is less than the figure adduced in Biber et al., but still more than three times higher than the representation of apposition among the postmodifiers in fiction, viz. 3%.

However, as noted in several cases before, more illustrative than the quantitative findings are the qualitative differences in the types of apposition found in the two texts. Of the three instances of apposition drawn from fiction, two are of the kind most frequently displayed by this text sort, viz. equivalence involving appellation (Quirk et al. 1985: 1309), cf. (21) a.; a title in pre-position (ibid. 1319), cf. (21) b.; the third example expresses equivalence of the identification kind (ibid. 1309), cf. (21) c.

- (21) a. Setsuko, our eldest [Ishiguro 41b]
 b. Mr. Ono (in direct speech as a form of address [Ishiguro 99])
 c. a nominal sum – a figure [Ishiguro 26b] probably not even half the property's true value

The examples found in the academic text express identification that further specifies the first appositive, cf. (22) a., exemplification or enumeration (22) b., and a consequence of the content of the first appositive, which is a finite clause (22) c.

- (22) a. the symptoms, the rash [Morris 52b] that gives a doctor a clue; the markings of its fur – its black feet [Morris 50c]; another species, a strange form [Morris 72b] of life; the flying mammals, the bats [Morris 139b]
 b. the tailless great apes such as the chimpanzee and the gorilla [Morris 83c, d]; the burrowing mammals – the naked mole rat, the aardvark and the armadillo [Morris 144b, c, d]; the aquatic animals such as the whales, dolphins, porpoises, dugongs, manatees, and hippopotamuses [Morris 146b, c, d, e, f, g]; those abnormally heavy giants, the rhinos and the elephants [Morris 153b, c]
 c. we ourselves are not black-footed squirrels – a fact [Morris 65b] which forces us into an attitude of humility

Equivalence through identification that further specifies the concept denoted by the first appositive is found in both texts, but appears to be more frequent in academic prose. An obvious factor that plays a role here is the inherent need of academic texts to express meaning with maximal exactness. The other two types appear to be specific to the respective text sort, especially title in pre-position to fiction, cf. (21) b., and enumeration/exemplification in academic prose, as in (22) b.

3.4.2 Relative clauses are more numerous in the fiction sample than in academic prose in the texts under study, viz. 18 vs. 12 instances. This is in agreement with the data in Biber et al. (1999: 606, Fig. 8.13) which show relative clauses to be most frequent in news and least frequent in conversation, with fiction and academic prose ranking in between, the former taking the place next to news. Even the distribution of the relativizers and the registered types of relative clauses correspond with the description therein (ibid. 607–611). In the fiction sample a half of the relative clauses (9, i.e. 50.0%) identify or characterize personal antecedents. In all but one of these clauses the relative pronoun is *who* in the subject function. The only other relativizer with a personal antecedent is zero in the object function, cf. (23) a. and b.

- (23) a. two haughty grey-haired ladies who turned out to be the daughters of Akira Sugimura [Ishiguro 54bi]; the younger sister, who had barely spoken [Ishiguro 73i]
 b. the house... should pass to one our father would have approved of [Ishiguro 68ibi]

Inanimate entities were antecedents of relative clauses mostly where the relativizer performed the object function, viz. six instances, all displaying zero, cf. (24) a. As antecedents of subject relativizers inanimate entities occurred twice cf. (24) b. In one clause the relativizer performed adverbial function, cf. (24) c.

- (24) a. the exaggerated respect my pupils always had for me [Ishiguro 51i]; the house our father built [Ishiguro 68i]
 b. In the days which followed [Ishiguro 102i]; things that will be to our advantage [Ishiguro 128i]
 c. such a contest, in which one's moral conduct and achievement are brought as witnesses [Ishiguro 137i]

In the sample of academic prose the difference in the syntactic function of the relativizers is more prominent, cf. 9 subjects / 2 objects (within the total of 12 relative clauses) vs. 10 subjects / 7 objects in fiction (within the total of 18 relative clauses). As in the fiction sample, one relative clause contains an adverbial relativizer, *when*. Compare (25) a., b. and c.

- (25) a. i. Even for the zoologist, who is used to calling an animal an animal [Morris 68i]
 ii. a special kind of locomotion which has modified its basic form [Morris 88i]; an attitude of humility that is becoming to proper scientific investigation [Morris 65icii]
 iii. abnormally heavy giants which have heating and cooling problems [Morris 153i]; other species that appear to be closely related [Morris 74i]
 b. all we can be certain about [Morris 49i]; The great advantage we have when studying such animals [Morris 64i]
 c. the moment would eventually arrive when it would be advantageous for them to become isolated [Morris 37i]

As regards the realization form of the relativizer, the two samples are basically comparable. In both the object relativizer is invariably zero (cf. (24) a. and (25) b.), while the subject function is implemented by *who* (referring to a personal antecedent, cf. (23a. and (25) a. i.), and *which* and *that* (in reference to non-personal inanimate and animate antecedents, cf. (24) b. and (25) a. ii and a. iii). Whether *that* or *which* is favoured in the fiction sample cannot be judged since each occurred only once, there being two examples in all. In the academic sample *that* was found to be more common (five vs. three instances of *which*). This differs from the data in Biber et al. (1999: 611), where *which* is characterized as the most frequent relativizer in all registers of academic prose. Looking for potential factors motivating the choice between the two relativizers in the academic sample, a point that presents itself is the nature of non-personal antecedents, viz. animate vs. inanimate. However, the registered examples fail to suggest any tendency in this respect insofar as both *that* and *which* are used to refer to either antecedent type.

As suggested by the representation of the subject relativizers, the greatest difference between the two samples, apart from the prominent prevalence of the subject function over the object function in academic prose, appears to involve the antecedents of the subject relativizers. Whereas in fiction the antecedents are mostly personal, viz. the individual characters of the story, in academic prose there is only one instance of this kind, illustrated in (25) a. i. Notably, even in this instance the antecedent differs in having general reference. In the academic sample a large majority of the antecedents of subject relativizers were inanimate (6 instances), as in (25) a. ii., and non-personal animate (2 instances, cf. (25) a. iii).

Another point characteristic of formal writing is found in the modification structure of the noun phrase in (25) c. in that the postmodifying relative *when*-clause is discontinuous, the intervening element being the verb. Discontinuous postmodification as a feature of formal writing has also been noted in the case of apposition, cf. (9).

3.4.3 The two remaining realization forms of postmodification, the infinitive and the adverb, each represented by three examples, are mentioned for the sake of completeness.

- (26) a. it is not a property to be endangered or discarded lightly [Morris 124i]; nothing further to do with them [Ishiguro 121i]; no attempts to hide [Ishiguro 151i] their hostility
 b. the particular conditions there [Morris 25i α]; their relatives nearby [Morris 27i]; all others nearby [Ishiguro 6b]

Here a comment can be made on the passive form of the infinitive in academic prose, which is suggestive of formal text sorts, and on the phraseological nature of the infinitive *to do* postmodifying an indefinite pronoun in fiction.

3.5. Complexity of the modification structure

The last point to be mentioned is the complexity of the modification structure by which is meant expansion through coordination and subordination. Both have been partly treated before, viz. coordination in the case of premodification (cf. 3.1.2) and enumerative apposition (cf. (22) b.), and subordination in the case of all modifiers on the first level of dependence. What remains to be discussed concerns coordination in the noun phrase structure occurring in the head noun and/or in postmodification, and subordination on lower dependence levels than the first.

Coordination appears to be more common in the academic sample than in fiction, cf. coordination in the head noun in (27) a. and in different kinds of postmodification in (27) b. Coordination in fiction is illustrated in (28).

- (27) a. their mating calls and displays [Morris 44a, b]; overheating and damage [Morris 131, 131b] to the skin;
 b. other living species already known and described [Morris 15i]; every aspect of its behaviour and structure [Morris 61b, c]; species of monkeys and apes [Morris 78b α , β]; conspicuous tufts of hair on the head, in the armpits and around the genitals [Morris 91b α , β , γ]; small naked patches of skin on their rumps, their faces, or their chests [Morris 97b α , β , γ]
- (28) a. one's moral conduct and achievement [Ishiguro 137ib, ic]; the state of the house and alterations [Ishiguro 159b, c]
 b. on grounds purely of good character and achievement [Ishiguro 66, 66b]; a closer investigation of my background and character [Ishiguro 86b, c]

As regards instances of modification with more than one level of subordination, most examples in both texts display two subordination levels in different combinations. A frequent configuration comprises two prepositional phrases in successive dependence, cf. (29).

- (29) at some point in the evolution of the squirrel family [Morris 16, 16b, 16b α], a rapid survey of the whole range of the living mammals [Morris 116, 116b, 116b α], at one end of the row of the skins [Morris 82,

82b, 82b α]; the idea of an ‘auction of prestige’ [Ishiguro 133, 133b, 133b α], the sentiments of a family with such a distinguished history [Ishiguro 118, 118b, 118b α]

Other configurations, illustrated in (30), are rarer, e.g.

- (30) a. the symptoms, the rash that gives a doctor a clue (apposition + relative clause) [Morris 52bi]
 b. the steep path leading up from the little wooden bridge still referred to around here as ‘the Bridge of Hesitation’ [Ishiguro 2, 2i, 2ii] (*ing*- and *ed*-participle)
 c. a visit [Ishiguro 54] one afternoon [54b] from two haughty, grey-haired ladies [54c] who [/R clause/ i] turned out to be the daughters (prepositional phrase + relative clause)

Postmodification in noun phrases as constituents of non-finite clauses involves an additional dependency level, cf. (31).

- (31) no attempts [Ishiguro 151] to hide [151i] their hostility [151ib] towards us [151ib α]

Still more complex instances of postmodification are illustrated in (32).

- (32) a. a fact which [Morris 65bi] forces us into an attitude [65ic] of humility [65ic α] that [65icii] is becoming to proper scientific investigation (two relative clauses in successive dependence, combined with postmodification by prepositional phrase);
 b. another species [Morris 72]. a strange form [72b] of life [72b α] on the dissecting table [72b α i], awaiting [72ibi] analysis (two prepositional phrases in successive dependence, followed by a postmodifying *ing*-participle, the whole structure occurring in apposition);
 c. the fine cedar gateway [21], the large area [/Co-Ord/ 21b] bound [/ed/ i] by the garden wall [21b α], the roof [/Co-Ord/ 21c] with its elegant tiles [21c α] and its stylishly carved [/ed/ i] ridgepole [/Co-Ord/ 21c β] pointing out [/ing/ ii] over the view [21ii β d] (coordination of head nouns combined with postmodification by non-finite clauses and prepositional phrases)

According to Biber et al. (1999: 578–579), the complexity of noun phrases increases across registers with conversation at one extreme and academic prose at the other. Of the other registers the one closest to academic prose is news. The results of the present study diverge in that the modification structure of the two samples does not essentially differ but rather shows a fairly comparable degree of complexity. The differences that have been found consist in a greater representa-

tion of modified noun phrases in the academic sample, which provides ground for a higher representation of NPs with complex modification structure. As regards the complex modification structure itself, the most noticeable difference is the combination of multiple coordination and subordination in the academic sample, especially in the case of apposition. The similarity between the two text sorts in this respect is to be ascribed to the rather formal tenor of the fiction sample, shown in addition to the adduced features, even by one instance of discontinuous structure (cf. (30) c.)

4. Conclusion

The conclusions to be drawn from the foregoing discussion concern both non-modified 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 pre-modifiers. 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.

Notes

- * Stylistics being one of the major spheres of Associate Professor Ludmila Urbanová's academic pursuits, my paper for the present occasion deals with a topic from this field, as a way of paying her a modest but heart-felt tribute.
- 1 In the appended texts noun phrases containing one noun are denoted successively by Arabic numerals (1, 2, 3, ...); noun phrases functioning as components of modification structures are marked by Arabic numerals and letters (1b, 1c, ...). Clausal modifiers (non-finite and finite) are denoted by small Roman numerals (i, ii, iii, iv, ...), and lower dependency levels are indicated by Greek letters (α , β , ...). The marking is given in square brackets after each noun.
- 2 According to Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 326ff.), pronouns are a subcategory of nouns.
- 3 For example, there were no instances of adjectival heads, such as *the poor*; *the city poor*.

Appendix

Text Ishiguro

If on a sunny day [1] you climb the steep path [2] leading up [/-ing/ i] from the little wooden bridge [21b] still referred to [/-ed/ ii] around here as 'the Bridge [2iic] of Hesitation' [2iica], you will not have to walk far before the roof [3] of my house [3b] becomes visible between the tops [4] of two ginkgo trees [4b]. Even if it did not occupy such a commanding [/i/-ing] position [5] on the hill [5b], the house [6] would still stand out from all others [non-sb head] nearby [6b], so that as you come up the path [7], you may find yourself wondering what sort [8] of wealthy man [8b] owns it. But then I am not, nor have I ever been, a wealthy man [9]. The imposing [-ing/ i] air [10] of the house [10b] will be accounted for, perhaps, if I inform you that it was built by my predecessor [11], and that he was none other than Akira Sugimura [12]. Of course, you may be new to this city [13], in which case [14] the name [15] of Akira Sugimura [15b] may not be familiar to you. But mention it to anyone [non-sb head] who [R clause/ i] lived here before the war [16i] and you will learn that for thirty years or so [17], Sugimura [18] was unquestionably amongst the city's [19b] most respected and influential men [19]. If I tell you this, and when arriving at the top [20] of the hill [20b] you stand and look at the fine cedar gateway [21], the large area [/Co-Ord/ 21b] bound [/-ed/ i] by the garden wall [21bia], the roof [/Co-Ord/ 21c] with its elegant tiles [21c α] and its stylishly carved [/-ed/ i] ridgepole [/Co-Ord/ 21c β] pointing out [/-ing/ ii] over the view [21ii β d], you may well wonder how I came to acquire such a property [22], being as I claim a man [23] of only moderate means [23b]. The truth [24] is, I bought the house [25] for a nominal sum [26] - a figure [26b] probably not even half the property's [26ba/ α] true value [26ba] at that time [27]. This was made possible owing to a most curious - some may say foolish - procedure [28] instigated [/i/ -ed] by the Sugimura family [28ib] during the sale [29]. It is now already a thing [30] of some fifteen years [30b] ago. In those days [31], when my circumstances [32] seemed to improve with each month [33], my wife [34] had begun to press me to find a new house [35]. With her usual foresight [36], she had argued the importance [37] of our having [/gerund/ i] a house [37ib] in keeping [/gerund/ ii] with our status [37iic] - not out of vanity [38], but for the sake of our children's [39b] marriage

prospects [39]. I saw the sense [40] in this, but since Setsuko [41], our eldest [41b], was still only fourteen or fifteen, I did not go about the matter [42] with any urgency [43]. Nevertheless, for a year or so [44], whenever I heard of a suitable house [45] for sale [45b], I would remember to make enquiries [46]. It was one [non-sb head] of my pupils [47b] who [/R clause/ i] first brought it to my attention [47ic] that Akira Sugimura's [48b] house [48], a year [48c] after his death [48ca], was to be sold off. That I should buy such a house [49] seemed absurd, and I put the suggestion [50] down to the exaggerated respect [51] [/R clause/ i] my pupils [51ib] always had for me. But I made enquiries [52] all the same, and gained an unexpected response [53]. I received a visit [54] one afternoon [54b] from two haughty, grey-haired ladies [54c] who [/R clause/ i] turned out to be the daughters [54id] of Akira Sugimura [54idα]. When I expressed my surprise [55] at receiving [/gerund/ i] such personal attention [55ib] from a family [56] of such distinction [56b], the elder [57] of the sisters [57b] told me coldly that they had not come simply out of courtesy [58]. Over the previous months [59], a fair number [60] of enquiries [60b] had been received for their late father's [60ca] house [60c], but the family [61] had in the end [62] decided to refuse all but four [non-sb head] of the applications [63b]. These four applicants [64] had been selected carefully by family members [65] on grounds purely of good character [66] and achievement [Co-Ord 66b]. 'It is of the first importance [67] to us', she went on, 'that the house [68] [/R clause/ i] our father [68ib] built should pass to one [non-sb head] [/R clause/ 68ibi] he would have approved of and deemed worthy of it. Of course, circumstances [69] oblige us to consider the financial aspect [70], but this is strictly secondary. We have therefore set a price [71].'At this point [72], the younger sister [73], who [/R clause/ i] had barely spoken, presented me with an envelope [74], and they watched me sternly as I opened it. Inside was a single sheet [75] of paper [75b], blank but for a figure [75c] written [/ -ed/ i] elegantly with an ink brush [75id]. I was about to express my astonishment [76] at the low price [76b], but then saw from the faces [77] before me [77b] that further discussion [78] of finances [78b] would be considered distasteful. The elder sister [79] said simply: 'It will not be in the interests [80] of any [non-sb head] of you [80b] to try to outbid one another. We are not interested in receiving anything [non-sb head] beyond the quoted [/ed/ i] price [81b]. What we mean to do from here on is to conduct an auction [82] of prestige [82b].'They had come in person [83], she explained, to ask formally on behalf of the Sugimura family [84] that I submit myself - along, of course, with the other three applicants [85] - to a closer investigation [86] of my background [86b] and credentials [/Co-Ord/ 86c]. A suitable buyer [87] could thus be chosen. It was an eccentric procedure [88], but I saw nothing [non-sb head] objectionable about it [89b]; it was, after all, much the same as being involved in a marriage negotiation [90]. Indeed, I felt somewhat flattered to be considered by this old and hidebound family [91] as a worthy candidate [92]. When I gave my consent [93] to the investigation [93b], and expressed my gratitude [94] to them, the younger sister [95] addressed me for the first time [96], saying: 'Our father [97] was a cultured man [98], Mr Ono [99]. He had much respect [100] for artists [100b]. Indeed, he knew of your work [101].'In the days [102] which [/R clause/ i] followed, I made enquiries [103] of my own [103b], and discovered the truth [104] of the younger sister's [104ba] words [104b]; Akira Sugimura [105] had indeed been something [non-sb head] of an art enthusiast [106b] who [/R clause/ i] on numerous occasions [106ic] had supported exhibitions [106id] with his money [106ie]. I also came across certain interesting rumours [107]: a significant section [108] of the Sugimura family [108b], it seemed, had been against selling the house [109] at all, and there had been some bitter arguments [110]. In the end [111], financial pressures [112] meant a sale [113] was inevitable, and the odd procedures [114] around the transaction [114b] represented the compromise [115] reached [/ -ed/ i] with those [115ib non-sb head] who [/R clause/ ii] had not wished the house [115iic] to pass out of the family [115iid]. That there was something [non-sb head] high-handed about these arrangements [116b] there was no denying; but for my part [117], I was prepared to sympathize with the sentiments [118] of a family [118b] with such a distinguished history [118ba]. My wife [119], however, did not take kindly to the idea [120] of an investigation [120b]. 'Who do they think they are?' she protested. 'We should tell them we want nothing [non-sb head] further to do [/inf/ 121i] with them.' 'But where's the harm [122]?' I pointed out. 'We have nothing [non-sb head] [/R clause/ i 123] we wouldn't want them to

discover. True, I don't have a wealthy background [124], but no doubt [125] the Sugimuras [126] know that already, and they still think us worthy candidates [127]. Let them investigate, they can only find things [128] that [/R clause/ i] will be to our advantage [128ib]. 'And I made a point [129] of adding [/gerund/ i]: 'In any case [130], they're doing no more than they would if we were negotiating a marriage [131] with them. We'll have to get used to this sort [132] of thing [132b]. Besides, there was surely much to admire in the idea [133] of 'an auction [133b] of prestige' [133ba], as the elder daughter [134] called it. One wonders why things [135] are not settled more often by such means [136]. How so much more honourable is such a contest [137], in which [/R clause/ i] one's [137iba] moral conduct [137ib] and achievement [Co-Ord 137ic] are brought as witnesses [137id] rather than the size [137ie] of one's [137ifa] purse [137if]. I can still recall the deep satisfaction [138] [/R clause/ i] I felt when I learnt the Sugimuras [139] - after the most thorough investigation [140] - had deemed me the most worthy of the house [141] [/R clause/ i] they so prized. And certainly, the house [142] is one [non-sb head] worth having suffered [/gerund/ 143i] a few inconveniences [143ib] for; despite its impressive and imposing [/ing/ i] exterior [144], it is inside a place [145] of soft, natural woods [145b] selected [/ed/ i] for the beauty [145ib] of their grains [145iba], and all [non-sb head] of us [146b] who lived in it [/R clause/ i] came to find it most conducive to relaxation [147] and calm [Co-Ord 147b]. For all that, the Sugimuras' [148b] high-handedness [148] was apparent everywhere during the transactions [149], some family members [150] making no attempts [151] to hide [/inf/ i] their hostility [151ib] towards us [151iba], and a less understanding buyer [152] might well have taken offence [153] and abandoned the whole matter [154]. Even in later years [155] I would sometimes encounter by chance [156] some member [157] of the family [157b] who [/R clause/ i], instead of exchanging the usual kind [157b] of polite talk [157bia], would stand there in the street [158] interrogating me as to the state [159] of the house [159b] and any alterations [Co-Ord 159c] I had made [/R clause/ i]. These days [160], I hardly ever hear of the Sugimuras [161]. I did, though, receive a visit [162] shortly after the surrender [163] from the younger [non-sb head b] of the two sisters [162ba] who [/R clause/ i] had approached me at the time [162baic] of the sale [162baica]. The war years [164] had turned her into a thin, ailing old woman [165].

Text Morris

THERE is a label [1] on a cage [2] at a certain zoo [2b] [/R clause/ i] that states simply, 'This animal [3] is new to science' [4]. Inside the cage [5] there sits a small squirrel [6]. It has black feet [7] and it comes from Africa [8]. No black-footed squirrel [9] has ever been found in that continent [10] before. Nothing is known about it. It has no name [11].

For the zoologist [12] it presents an immediate challenge [13]. What is it about its way [14] of life [14b] that has made it unique? How does it differ from the three hundred and sixty-six other living [/ing-participle/ i] species [15] of squirrels [15b] already known and described [Co-Ord /ed-participle/ i]? Somehow, at some point [16] in the evolution [16b] of the squirrel family [16ba], the ancestors [17] of this animal [17b] must have split off from the rest [18] and established themselves as an independent breeding [/ing-participle/ i] population [19]. What was it in the environment [20] that made possible their isolation [21] as a new form [22] of life [22b]? The new trend [23] must have started out in a small way [24], with a group [25] of squirrels [25b] in one area [25ba] becoming [/ing-participle/ i] slightly changed and better adapted to the particular conditions [25ic] there [/adverb/ α]. But at this stage [26] they would still be able to interbreed with their relatives [27] nearby [/adverb/ i]. The new form [28] would be at a slight advantage [29] in its special region [30], but it would be no more than a race [31] of the basic species [31b] and could be swamped out, reabsorbed into the mainstream [32] at any point [33]. If, as time [34] passed, the new squirrels [35] became more and more perfectly tuned-in to their particular environment [36], the moment [37] would eventually arrive when [/R clause/ i] it would be ad-

vantageous for them to become isolated from possible contamination [38] by their neighbours [38b]. At this stage [39] their social and sexual behaviour [40] would undergo special modifications [41], making [/ing-participle/ i] interbreeding [41ib] with other kinds [41ic] of squirrels [41icα] unlikely and eventually impossible. At first, their anatomy [42] may have changed and become better at coping with the special food [43] of the district [43b], but later their mating [/gerund/ i] calls [44a] and displays [Co-Ord 44b] would also differ, ensuring that they attract only mates [45] of the new type [45b]. At last, a new species [46] would have evolved, separate and discrete, a unique form [46b] of life [46ba], a three hundred and sixty-seventh kind [46c] of squirrel [46cα].

When we look at our unidentified squirrel [47] in its zoo cage [47b], we can only guess about these things [48]. All [non-sb head] [/R clause/ 49i] we can be certain about is that the markings [50] of its fur [50b] – its black feet [50c] – indicate that it is a new form [51]. But these are only the symptoms [52], the rash [52b] that [/R clause/ i] gives a doctor [53] a clue [54] about his patient's [54ba] disease [54b]. To really understand this new species [55], we must use these clues [56] only as a starting [/ing participle/ i] point [57], telling [/ing participle/ ii] us there is something worth pursuing [non-sb head] [/gerund/ iii]. We might try to guess at the animal's [58b] history [58], but that would be presumptuous and dangerous. Instead we will start humbly by giving it a simple and obvious label [59]: we will call it the African black-footed squirrel [60]. Now we must observe and record every aspect [61] of its behaviour [61b] and structure [Co-Ord 61c] and see how it differs from, or is similar to, other squirrels [62]. Then, little by little, we can piece together its story [63].

The great advantage [64] we [/R clause i] have when studying such animals [64ib] is that we ourselves are not black-footed squirrels [65] – a fact [65b] which [/R clause i] forces us into an attitude [65ic] of humility [65icα] that [/R clause/ ii] is becoming to proper scientific investigation [65iid]. How different things [66] are, how depressingly different, when we attempt to study the human animal [67]. Even for the zoologist [68], who [/R clause/ i] is used to calling an animal [68ib] an animal [68ic], it is difficult to avoid the arrogance [69] of subjective involvement [69b]. We can try to overcome this to some extent [70] by deliberately and rather coyly approaching [/gerund/ i] the human being [71i] as if he were another species [72], a strange form [72b] of life [72ba] on the dissecting [/gerund/ i] table [72bai], awaiting [/ing participle/ i] analysis [72ibi]. How can we begin?

As with the new squirrel [73], we can start by comparing him with other species [74] that [/R clause/ i] appear to be most closely related. From his teeth [75], his hands [Co-Ord 75b], his eyes [Co-Ord 75c] and various other anatomical features [Co-Ord 75d], he is obviously a primate [76] of some sort [76b], but of a very odd kind [76c]. Just how odd becomes clear when we lay out in a long row [77] the skins [78] of the one hundred and ninety-two living [/ing participle/ i] species [78b] of monkeys [78ba] and apes [Co-Ord 78bβ], and then try to insert a human pelt [79] at a suitable point [80] somewhere in this long series [81]. Wherever we put it, it looks out of place. Eventually we are driven to position it right at one end [82] of the row [82b] of skins [82ba], next to the hides [83] of the tailless great apes [83b] such as the chimpanzee [83c] and the gorilla [Co-Ord 83d]. Even here it is obtrusively different. The legs [84] are too long, the arms [85] are too short and the feet [86] are rather strange. Clearly this species [87] of primate [87b] has developed a special kind [88] of locomotion [88b] which [/R clause/ i] has modified its basic form [88bic]. But there is another characteristic [89] that [/R clause/ i] cries out for attention [89ib]: the skin [90] is virtually naked. Except for conspicuous tufts [91] of hair [91b] on the head [91ba], in the armpits [Co-Ord 91bβ] and around the genitals [Co-Ord 91bγ], the skin surface [92] is completely exposed. When compared with the other primate species [93], the contrast [94] is dramatic. True, some species [95] of monkeys [95b] and apes [Co-Ord 95c] have small naked patches [96] of skin [96b] on their rumps [97ba], their faces [Co-Ord 97bβ], or their chests [Co-Ord 97bγ], but nowhere amongst the other one hundred and ninety-two species [98] is there anything [non-sb head] even approaching [/ing participle, i] the human condition [99i]. At this point [100] and without further investigation [101], it is justifiable to name this new species [102] the 'naked ape' [103]. It is a simple, descrip-

tive name [104] based [/-ed participle/ i] on a simple observation [104ib], and it makes no special assumptions [105]. Perhaps it will help us to keep a sense [106] of proportion [106b] and maintain our objectivity [107].

Staring at this strange specimen [108] and puzzling over the significance [109] of its unique features [109b], the zoologist [110] now has to start making comparisons [111]. Where else is nudity [112] at a premium [113]? The other primates [114] are no help [115], so it means looking farther afield. A rapid survey [116] of the whole range [116b] of the living [/-ing participle/ i] mammals [116bα] soon proves that they are remarkably attached to their protective, furry covering [117], and that very few [non-sb head] of the 4,237 species [118b] in existence [118bα] have seen fit to abandon it. Unlike their reptilian ancestors [119], mammals [120] have acquired the great physiological advantage [121] of being [/gerund/ i] able to maintain a constant, high body temperature [121b]. This keeps the delicate machinery [122] of the body processes [122b] tuned in for top performance [123]. It is not a property [124] to be [/-infinitive/ i] endangered or discarded lightly. The temperature-controlling devices [125] are of vital importance [126] and the possession [127] of a thick, hairy, insulating [/-ing participle/ i] coat [127b] obviously plays a major role [128] in preventing [/gerund/ i] heat loss [129]. In intense sunlight [130] it will also prevent over-heating [131] and damage [Co-Ord 131b] to the skin [131bα] from direct exposure [132] to the sun's [132bα] rays [132b]. If the hair [133] has to go, then clearly there must be a very powerful reason [134] for abolishing [/gerund/ i] it. With few exceptions [135] this drastic step [136] has been taken only when mammals [137] have launched themselves into an entirely new medium [138]. The flying [/-ing participle/ i] mammals [139], the bats [139b], have been forced to denude their wings [140], but they have retained their furriness [141] elsewhere and can hardly be counted as naked species [142]. The burrowing [/-ing participle/ i] mammals [143] have in a few cases [144] – the naked mole rat [144b], the aardvark [Co-Ord 144c] and the armadillo [Co-Ord 144d], for example – reduced their hair covering [145]. The aquatic animals [146] such as the whales [Co-Ord 146b], dolphins [Co-Ord 146c], porpoises [Co-Ord 146d], dugongs [Co-Ord 146e], manatees [Co-Ord 146f] and hippopotamuses [Co-Ord 146g] have also gone naked as part [147] of a general streamlining [147b]. But for all the more typical surface-dwelling mammals [148], whether scampering about on the ground [149] or clambering around in the vegetation [150], a dense hairy hide [151] is the basic rule [152]. Apart from those abnormally heavy giants [153], the rhinos [153b] and the elephants [Co-Ord 153c] (which [R clause/ i] have heating and cooling [/gerund/ ii] problems [153id] of their own [153idα], the naked ape [154] stands alone, [marked off by his nudity from all the thousands of hairy, shaggy or furry land-dwelling mammalian species.]

Sources

Desmon Morris, *The Naked Ape*. Triad Grafton Books. London, 1977. Pp. 13–16.
Kazuo Ishiguro, *An Artist of the Floating World*. Faber and Faber. London, 1990. Pp. 7–11.

References

- Biber, Douglas, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad, and Edward Finegan (1999) *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. London: Longman.
Huddleston, Rodney D. and Geoffrey K. Pullum (2002) *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: University Press.
Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik (1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.

LIBUŠE DUŠKOVÁ is Professor Emerita of English Language at the Department of English Language and ELT Methodology, Charles University, Prague. Her books include *Mluvnice současné angličtiny na pozadí češtiny* (A Grammar of Contemporary English against the background of Czech) and two volumes of *Studies in the English Language*. She is the author of the translation of Vilém Mathesius' *Obsahový rozbor současné angličtiny na základě obecně lingvistickém* (*A Functional Analysis of Present Day English on a General Linguistic Basis*), editor of the English translation of *Dictionnaire de l'École linguistique de Prague* (*Dictionary of the Prague School of Linguistics*) and chief editor of the international academic journal *Linguistica Pragensia*. Her recent research concentrates on the relations between syntax and information structure, with extension into text organization.

Address: Prof. PhDr. Libuše Dušková, Dr.Sc., Department of English Language and ELT Methodology, Faculty of Arts, Charles University, nám. Jana Palacha 2, 116 38 Prague 1, Czech Republic. [e-mail: libuse.duskova@ff.cuni.cz]



ALEŠ KLÉGR

“THE FIFTH ELEMENT”: A REMARK ON THE FSP FACTORS

Abstract

It has become canonical when listing the factors signalling Functional Sentence Perspective (FSP) to name four of them: linear modification, semantic structure, context and (emphatic, contrasting, and focusing) intonation. The paper argues for the inclusion of one more candidate for the status of a potential FSP indicator – typography or punctuation – to cover cases where FSP-relevant intonation is marked by typographic devices, such as italics, boldface, small capitals, etc., in written text. Acknowledgement of punctuation marking FSP-relevant prosody in writing, however marginal and discretionary, as a potential contributory factor – the ‘fifth element’ – in decoding FSP would be methodologically sound and consistent. It would also be a useful antidote to the widespread practice of using self-supplied intonation in the FSP analysis of written communication, which, strictly speaking, somewhat presumptuously amounts to confusing two different modes of language and oversteps the boundary between the writer and the reader of the text.

Key words

FSP factors; potentiality; intonation; punctuation; emphasis

Information structure or Functional Sentence Perspective (FSP) – as developed by Firbas (1992) and referred to in this paper – is essentially about a special type of meaning which words acquire in text/sentence, a meaning relevant to what is being communicated and integral to the import of the message. It is this meaning that Leech (1981: 19–20), in his outline of seven types of meaning, calls “thematic meaning” and lists alongside conceptual and associative meanings. Thematic meaning is described there as “what is communicated by the way in which a speaker or writer organizes the message, in terms of ordering, focus, and

emphasis”. Cruse (2006: 181) goes on to add that “the two main dimensions of thematic meaning are topic vs comment and given vs new information.”

Quite clearly, thematic meaning with an information-structure indicating function is not an inherent feature of linguistic units. It has to be generated each time anew with every new text/context. It arises from speaker-hearer interaction and is in principle calculable from the text. Such a description, of course, falls straight into the realm of pragmatics and, although FSP theory came into being long before and independently of the emergence of pragmatics, the investigation of information structure is nowadays subsumed under this field of study. So, for example, Horn and Ward’s (2004) *The Handbook of Pragmatics* devotes two chapters to FSP issues. Both of them mention Firbas (though not his comprehensive monograph), but only the second one, Gundel and Fretheim’s Topic and Focus, gives due credit to the extent of research into this field in Czech linguistics (175–176): “Work of the Czech linguist Mathesius in the 1920s (e.g. Mathesius 1928) initiated a rich and highly influential tradition of research in this area within the Prague School that continues to the present day (see Firbas 1966, Daneš 1974, Sgall et al. 1973, Sgall et al. 1986, inter alia).”

In the Brno approach to FSP the distribution of thematic meaning in the sentence is viewed in terms of communicative dynamism (CD) conveyed by the sentence elements with varying degrees of CD. The pragmatic functional load, i.e. the degree of CD, carried by sentence elements is computed primarily from three FSP factors, the linear modification, context and semantic structure of the sentence. (The semantic factor broadly speaking refers to Leech’s other types of meaning, conceptual and associative.) In the spoken language, the interplay of these factors is extended by a fourth factor, intonation (prosody). To quote Firbas (1992: 218), “Intonation, which is absent from the inventory of the means of the written language, indeed reflects the CD distribution as determined by the interplay of the non-prosodic FSP factors”.

Thus, decoding FSP in a written sentence, according to Firbas (1992: 219), goes by the signals provided by the (i) syntactic implementation of a given sentence element and its relations to other elements, which activates its semantic content and character, and/or its (ii) linear position, and/or (iii) the element’s relation to the immediately relevant context. As regards intonation, Firbas explains that “[it] asserts itself in its specific contributory way if it effects prosodic intensification, non-reevaluating or re-evaluating, and thereby raises the degree of CD already assigned to the element by the non-prosodic factors”. Hence, he rejects claims that CD can be equated with prosodic prominence (PP): “As a participant in the interplay of FSP factors, intonation cannot operate independently of the other FSP factors.” Firbas is said (Adam 2007: 35) to have likened it to a running attitudinal commentary on the content of the utterance, capable of changing the overall distribution of CD, even causing the theme to become the bearer of the highest degree of CD.

The standard description of the role of intonation as an FSP feature, i.e. the relation between the degrees of communicative dynamism and those of prosodic

prominence (PP), appears in Chamonikolasová (1995, 2007, 2010) and Adam (2007: 35–7). There are three types of relation between CD and PP – perfect correspondence, selective non-reevaluating intensification and reevaluating intensification. Perfect correspondence means that the intonation copies the information structure emerging from the non-prosodic factors with the rhematic element receiving the nuclear stress. Selective non-reevaluating intensification affecting the thematic element represents a deviation from the CD signalled by the non-prosodic factors. However, the thematic element, though prosodically intensified, remains thematic and thus the PP distribution does not reevaluate the CD distribution (e.g. ‘His wife is okay, but *he* seems to have troubles’ – with ‘he’ contrastively intensified, but ‘troubles’ remaining prosodically most prominent). Finally, and most importantly, reevaluating prosodic intensification defeats, as it were, the non-prosodic factors, alters the theme-rheme sequence they would signal in the absence of the intensification, and produces an emotionally marked information structure (‘I think she is wrong. – Well, but *she* doesn’t.’). Accordingly, it is maintained that intonation becomes an important FSP factor only when it endows a sentence element with a marked emphasis.

The central idea of the present paper is very simple. Since thematic meaning or FSP has to be calculated, i.e. worked out on the basis of the FSP factors, and since written text offers only three such factors for FSP analysis, analysts may sometimes come up against ambiguities and potentialities and need further help in FSP inferencing. Actually, it is common practice in the FSP analysis of written data to have occasional recourse even to the fourth factor, prosody, as a means of disambiguating the theme-rheme distribution. It is interesting that the test by intonation is used by researchers who are non-native speakers of English and they report having no doubts about the correctness of their assignment of intonation to the written sentence. Methodologically, however, the use of self-supplied prosody in the analysis of a written text is somewhat tricky.

On the other hand, while it is generally recognized that prosody is at least partly, though crudely, reflected by orthographic means, i.e. punctuation, there seems to have been no systematic study to find out what the punctuation practice relevant to theme-rheme distribution in English is like. It is not difficult to imagine that the above CD-PP typology could easily be applied to the relation between CD and ‘typographic prominence’. Such a typology would again include perfect correspondence (typographically unmarked), selective non-reevaluating intensification (typographically marking the thematic element without backgrounding the other non-prosodic factors) and finally reevaluating intensification (typographically re-evaluating a thematic element into rhematic).

Such a study could settle the issue to what extent punctuation and FSP are correlated, in what way, and which punctuation marks are actually used for this purpose and how often. It could resolve such questions as to whether punctuation marks are used only in the two cases mentioned above of ‘selective non-reevaluating intensification’ with no effect on FSP and ‘reevaluating prosodic intensification’, resulting in emotionally marked information structure and outweighing the

non-prosodic factors, or whether there are instances, for example, where punctuation (typographic prominence) coincides with the other FSP factors and produces a typographically extra marked rheme.

Certainly the information provided in the standard accounts of English punctuation is not very helpful in this respect, as a look at the two largest authoritative grammars and a sprinkling of others shows. While Appendix I in Quirk et al. (1985) is described as surveying “a set of prosodic devices that help to communicate grammatical and other distinctions in spoken English”, Appendix II is said to “examine the visual devices that perform a similar role for written English”. The question is to what extent prosodic marking in speech is matched by visual marking in writing. Obviously, there are limits to what typography/punctuation can do as well as limits determined by the prevailing conventions as to the use of the existing punctuation marks. A section in Appendix I called ‘Prosodic marking compared with punctuation’ (1606) points out that conventional punctuation is in many respects inadequate to deal with important aspects of prosody, “... although we can indicate emphasis in written English (usually by means of italics in print and underscoring in typescript or handwriting), we cannot distinguish emphases of radically different sound and value” as in ‘You shouldn’t give her *any* flower’; and it indicates how prosodic notation can represent these differences (‘You |shouldn’t give her ↑ÀNy flowers’|). It also shows how prosodic marking helps to identify focused items in cases like these:

|John could only SÈE his wife from the doorway|
 |John could only see his WIFE from the doorway|
 |John could only see his wife from the DÒORway|

In Appendix II punctuation marks are described as serving two purposes, the separation of linguistic units and the specification of a grammatical, semantic, or pragmatic function. It is the latter purpose that appears to be potentially relevant for FSP. Punctuation used for specification includes quotation marks which may “match a heavy prosodic marking in speech” (p. 1635), but the appendix mentions only their use to indicate “a hesitation or apologetic introduction of a doubtful or discordant item” or “doubtful validity”. To mark emphasis, the Appendix says, italics, underlining, wriggle underlining and occasionally capitals, bold face and small capitals are typically used (‘I told him that his ‘wife’ had come and let him know by the way I said that I didn’t think she really *was* his wife.’).

There is no explicit mention of the focusing function in Huddleston et al. (2002). However, in their chapter on punctuation, they introduce some interesting terminological innovations. They call punctuation marks “and the other devices that fall within the domain of punctuation” punctuation indicators. Those indicators which are potential candidates for FSP marking, i.e. italics, capital letters, bold face, and small capitals, are classified as non-segmental and viewed as ‘modifications’ of the default form, i.e. ordinary lower-case roman. Unfortunately, no examples of punctuation indicators used as signals of emphasis are given.

By contrast, Truss’s (2003) popularizing book on punctuation, without mentioning the focusing function either, contains several accidental examples in just a few pages (105–126), illustrating a wide range of focusing devices, such as capitals (Crocodile Dundee’s famous repartee: ‘Call that a knife? **THAT**’s a **KNIFE**.’), quotation marks (‘... remember she said the comma was “servile”?’), colon (a quote from G.B. Shaw: ‘I find fault with only three things in this story of yours, Jenkins: the beginning, the middle and the end.’), and italics (‘The main reason people use it, however, is that *they know you can’t use it wrongly*. – And we have *you* to thank, Special Policeman Semicolon.’).

Finally, Trask (1997: 107–118) in his brief guide on punctuation explicitly mentions and demonstrates the use of punctuation marks to indicate emphasis or contrast. He starts with a specific brand of quotation marks, and it is worth noticing that in his description he employs two more devices, italics and boldface. “What the writer is doing here is *distancing* himself from the term in quotes. ... Quotation marks used in this way are informally called **scare quotes**.” His example is:

The Institute for Personal Knowledge is now offering a course in ‘self-awareness exercises’.

Speaking of italics, he has this to say: “Most commonly, italics are used for emphasis or contrast – that is, to draw attention to some particular part of a text.” Here are some examples:

The Battle of New Orleans was fought in January 1815, two weeks *after* the peace treaty had been signed.

According to the linguist Steven Pinker, ‘Many prescriptive rules of grammar are *just plain dumb* and should be deleted from the usage handbooks’ [emphasis added].

Standard English usage requires ‘*insensitive*’ rather than ‘*unsensitive*’.

Lemmings have, not two, but *three* kinds of sex chromosome.

“The first two examples”, he explains, “illustrate emphasis and the last two illustrate contrast. This is the standard way of representing emphasis or contrast ...” Describing boldface letters (‘A colon is **never** followed by a hyphen or a dash’), he says “they are sometimes used to provide very strong emphasis, as an alternative to italics”, and concludes by a note on small capitals, “Very occasionally, small capitals are used for emphasis, but it is usually preferable to use italics for this, or even boldface.”

The only quantitative study focusing on a punctuation mark and its uses (with possible relevance for FSP) that I have come across so far is Douglas’s (2009) conference paper ‘Encoding Intonation. The Use of Italics and the Challenges for Translation’. In it he examines the distribution of italics in two English fiction texts (Henry James’s *What Maisie Knew*, Frank O’Connor’s *The Complete Stories*, including the total of 278 000 tokens) and two Italian texts and analyzes the functions of this punctuation mark and the way it was dealt with in the respective translations into Italian and English. He distinguishes between uses

due to punctuation conventions (designation of titles, quotations, foreign borrowings, onomatopoeia, representations of dialect, narrative prominence, embedded quotations) and the use marking prosodic effects, i.e. tonic prominence. He finds a significant proportion of tonic-prominence uses (357 tokens/102 types in James, 51/36 types in O'Connor). The twenty most common italic types denoting tonic prominence, which account for 63.8 per cent of the total, include the following words (in descending frequency order): *me, you, I, is, her, him, she, can, that, are, have, will, with, would, do, he, us, was, must, now*.

Unfortunately, the author does not examine these italic uses denoting tonic prominence from the FSP perspective and focuses on translation issues. Among other things, the findings of the paper suggest that the number of italicised items in texts may be far greater than might be expected, on the other hand their use is idiolectal and may vary greatly from author to author. Next, the number of tonic-prominence cases is conspicuously high compared to convention-based uses. Finally Douglas's list of the twenty most frequent italicised words bearing tonic prominence seems to confirm the impression obtained from FSP studies that italics and intonation centre frequently co-occur in personal pronouns in cases where the FSP structure is not unambiguously indicated in the written language, i.e. in cases of potentiality. It is also clear that punctuation marks such as italics are multifunctional and instances unrelated to FSP have to be filtered out and that FSP-related punctuation marking is optional.

However, there is no doubt that written language does have certain systemic means whereby it can substitute for the prosodic FSP factor when the occasion arises. The relation between written and spoken language and their respective norms was of great interest to Vachek (1973, 1989). He speaks of their functional specificity and complementariness and the existence of compensatory means in either of them (1989: 108–9). "One should only realize that opposed to the rich scale of melodic and expiratory means available to the spoken norm its written counterpart has at its disposal only a much poorer inventory of punctuation and other differentiating means (e.g. italics, bold types, spaced print, etc.)." At the same time he stresses that the written norm and its range of devices are not inferior, but simply different.

Speaking of style, Vachek (1989: 45–7) also draws attention to the fact that written stylistic norms and the use of punctuation may differ across languages and even across different stages of one and the same language. Among the parallels he mentions the "use of the italic symbols, signalling the emphatic and/or emotional quality of the words or word-groups ..." and quotation marks that may signal emotion and even carry a special colouring (irony or even sarcasm) in addition to other things. In Russian and other languages using Cyrillic, he notes, italics are used to signal only emphasis or emotion, but not foreign words (as is common in English). In hand-written utterances, he observes, underlining can be used exclusively to signal emphasis. Finally, he mentions one other device signalling emphasis, the spacing out of graphemes which appears to be common in Czech and German, but is rarely used in English. (The list of typographic de-

vices available to signal emphasis and contrast also includes capitalization, font size, wiggly underlining, quotation marks, coloured highlighting, and possibly others.) Firbas (1954), in his article on English sentence punctuation, observes that one of the differences between English and Czech is the fact that in the English punctuation practice the emotive-volitional factor is far more prominent, although even here it is subordinate to the grammatical factor.

To sum up, we started by pointing out the pragmatic nature of the FSP meaning which is inferred from text by considering its linear arrangement, context and semantic structure, and in the case of spoken language, by considering its (emphatic, contrasting, focusing) prosody. At the same time, it is taken for granted that in writing intonation relevant for FSP may be, if partially, denoted by punctuation (italics, etc.) or other typographic means. It was also pointed out that it is common practice to use self-supplied intonation in the FSP analysis of written communication, thus mixing up two different modes of language and blurring the distinction between the producer and the recipient of the text. Yet, punctuation, a feature specific to writing, is never mentioned as a potential contributory factor in decoding FSP at all. It is therefore argued, for the sake of methodological consistence and completeness, that punctuation marking FSP-relevant prosody in writing, however marginal and optional, should be listed among the four FSP factors as the ‘fifth element’ from which FSP may be inferred.

References

- Adam, Martin (2007) *A Handbook of Functional Sentence Perspective*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita.
- Chamonikolasová, Jana (1995) ‘Intonation centre in English and Czech sentences’. *Brno Studies in English* 21, 9–15.
- Chamonikolasová, Jana (2007) *Intonation in English and Czech Dialogues*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita.
- Chamonikolasová, Jana (2010) ‘Communicative dynamism and prosodic prominence of pronouns in English and Czech’. In: Procházka, Martin, Markéta Malá and Pavlína Šaldová (eds.) *The Prague School and Theories of Structure*. Göttingen: V&R Unipress, 143–162.
- Cruse, Alan (2006) *A Glossary of Semantics and Pragmatics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Daneš, František (1974) *Papers on Functional Sentence Perspective*. The Hague: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Douglas, Peter (2009) *Encoding Intonation. The Use of Italics and the Challenges for Translation*. Corpus Linguistics Conference, 5th Corpus Linguistics Conference, 2009, 20–23 July 2009, University of Liverpool, UK, <<http://ucrel.lancs.ac.uk/publications/cl2009/#papers>>.
- Firbas, Jan (1954) ‘Anglická větná interpunkce’. *Časopis pro moderní filologii*, 36(3), 152–164.
- Firbas, Jan (1992) *Functional Sentence Perspective in Written and Spoken Communication*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Firbas, Jan (1966) ‘Non-thematic subjects in contemporary English’. *Travaux linguistiques de Prague* 2, 239–256.
- Gundel, Jeanette K. and Thorstein Fretheim (2004) ‘Topic and focus’. In: Horn, Laurence R. and Gregory Ward (eds.) *The Handbook of Pragmatics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

- Horn, Laurence R. and Gregory Ward (eds.) (2004) *The Handbook of Pragmatics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Huddleston, Rodney and Geoffrey K. Pullum (2002) *Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Leech, Geoffrey (1981) *Semantics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Mathesius, Vilém ([1928]1967) 'On linguistic characterology with illustrations from modern English'. Reprinted in Vachek, Josef (ed.) *A Prague School Reader in Linguistics*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 59-67.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech and Jan Svartvik (1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- Sgall, Petr, Eva Hajičová, and Jarmila Panevová (1986) *The Meaning of the Sentence in its Semantic and Pragmatic Aspects*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Sgall, Petr, Eva Hajičová, and Eva Benešová (1973) *Topic, Focus, and Generative Semantics*. Kronberg: Scriptor Verlag GmbH.
- Trask, R. Lawrence (1997) *Penguin Guide to Punctuation*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Truss, Lynn (2003) *East, Shoots & Leaves*. London: Profile Books.
- Vachek, Josef (1973) *Written Language*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Vachek, Josef (1989) *Written Language Revisited*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

ALEŠ KLÉGR is Professor of English Linguistics at the Department of English Language and ELT Methodology, Faculty of Arts, Charles University, Prague. He specializes in English lexicology and lexicography. His publications include the monographs *The Noun in Translation* (1996) and *English Complex Prepositions of the Type in spite of and Analogous Sequences* (2002), translation of Josef Vachek's *Dictionary of the Prague School of Linguistics* (2003; with L. Dušková, J. Čermák, M. Malá, and P. Šaldová), bilingual collocational dictionaries, e.g., *Czech-English Combinatory Dictionary: Noun and Verb* (2005; with P. Key and N. Hronková), and the Roget-style onomasiological dictionary of Czech, *Tezaurus jazyka českého* (2007).

Address: Prof. PhDr. Aleš Klégr, CSc., Department of English Language and ELT Methodology, Faculty of Arts, Charles University, nám. Jana Palacha 2, 116 38 Praha 1, Czech Republic. [email: ales.klegr@ff.cuni.cz]