



Twelfth International

Columbia School Conference
on the Interaction of Linguistic Form and Meaning
with Human Behavior

Columbia University
New York, NY
February 14 - 16, 2015



Columbia School Linguistics

The Columbia School is a group of linguists developing the theoretical framework first established by the late William Diver and his students at Columbia University. Language is seen as a symbolic tool whose structure is shaped both by its communicative function and by the characteristics of its human users. In grammatical analyses, we seek to explain the distribution of linguistic forms as an interaction between hypothesized meaningful signals and pragmatic and functional factors such as inference, ease of processing, iconicity, and the like. In phonological analyses, we seek to explain the syntagmatic and paradigmatic distributions of phonological units within signals, also drawing on both communicative function and human physiological and psychological characteristics. The Columbia School Linguistic Society was founded in 1996 to promote and disseminate linguistic research along these theoretical lines. The Society furthers this goal by sponsoring this series of conferences as well as summer institutes, bi-monthly seminars, invitational seminars, general scholarly exchange, as well as through our electronic discussion list CSLING and our web site www.csling.org

Columbia University Seminars

The Columbia University Seminars bring together professors and other experts, from Columbia and elsewhere, who gather to work on problems that cross disciplinary and departmental boundaries. The Seminars have the additional purpose of linking Columbia with the intellectual resources of the surrounding communities. Since their founding by Frank Tannenbaum in 1944, the University Seminars have provided a means of exchanging, recording, validating and responding to new ideas. As independent entities, the Seminars encourage dialogue and intellectual risks in a culture that is open, innovative, and collaborative, placing them among the best contributions that the University makes to the intellectual community and to the society at large.

Conference Organizing Committee

Radmila Gorup

Columbia University

Ricardo Otheguy

Graduate Center, City University of New York

Jaseleen Ruggles

Recumen

Nancy Stern

The City College, City University of New York

The generous support of the Columbia University Seminars
and of the Columbia School Linguistic Society is gratefully acknowledged.

Special thanks to Wallis Reid and Jaseleen Ruggles for additional support.



Conference Schedule

Saturday, February 14, 2015

- 9:00-9:30 Registration
- 9:30-9:45 *Greetings*
Radmila Gorup, President, Columbia School Linguistic Society
Ricardo Otheguy, for the conference organizers
- Session chair: Ellen Contini-Morava
- 9:45-10:15 *Extending Diver's Focus Hypothesis for Latin*
Joseph Davis
- 10:15-11:00 *Is there a place for parts of speech in Columbia School theory?*
Wallis Reid
- 11:00-11:15 Break
- Session chair: Rob Leonard
- 11:15-11:45 *Vowels and consonants: A new vision of syllable structure from PHB*
Bob de Jonge
- 11:45-12:15 *Un-debunking the phoneme: How the space character and the Roman alphabet led phonology astray*
Tom Eccardt
- 12:15-1:30 Lunch
- 1:30-2:00 Poster Sessions
- Metadiscourse in Arabic and English research abstracts*
Hmoud Alotaibi
- Spanish a: A Columbia School road to homonymy*
Joanna Birnbaum
- Control and Focus in Gurung*
Danielle Ronkos



Saturday, February 14, continued

Session chair: Tanya Christensen

2:00-2:45 *Pragmatic analysis of wiretaps, foreign intelligence surveillance, pretext and consensual recordings: "smoking guns" vs speech event theory*
Rob Leonard

2:45-3:15 *Linguistic and semiotic mechanisms and ideology in Israeli textbooks*
Nurit Peled-Elhanan

3:15-3:30 Break

Session chair: Jaseleen Ruggles

3:30-4:15 *Semantic variation in Danish epistemic markers*
Tanya Christensen

4:15-4:45 *The usefulness of imperfect paraphrases*
Bob Kirsner

4:45-5:00 Break

Session chair: Joseph Davis

5:00-5:30 *The Focus System and the so-called nominalizers koto and no in Modern Japanese*
Hidemi Sugi Riggs

5:30-6:00 *A sign-based account of the distribution of the forms any and some*
Nadav Sabar

6:00-6:45 Reception at Faculty House

6:45-8:45 Dinner at Faculty House



Sunday, February 15

Session chair: Wallis Reid

- 9:00-9:30 Arrival and continental breakfast
- 9:30-10:00 *A comparative discourse study of the restrictive markings of Mandarin jiù, cái, and zhǐ*
Xuehua Xiang
- 10:00-10:45 *A little common sense, please! Chinese word order versus the grammatical tradition*
Alan Huffman
- 10:45-11:00 Break
- Session chair: Eduardo Ho Fernández
- 11:00-11:30 *Scene, meaning, and message and the English System of Degree of Control: Giving the wall a push*
Nancy Stern
- 11:30-12:15 *Using big data to test a Columbia School hypothesis*
Ricardo Otheguy and Lauren Spradlin
- 12:15-1:30 Lunch
- Session chair: Bill Carrasco
- 1:30-2:00 *El “juego” intra-paradigmático: Una mirada al uso actual de los clíticos en Buenos Aires*
Angelita Martínez
- 2:00-2:30 *Pay attention: Discourse prominence and subject expression in Spanish*
Berenice Darwich
- 2:30-2:45 Break



Sunday, February 15 (continued)

Session chair: Nadav Sabar

- 2:45-3:15 *What is que? A monosemic approach*
Eduardo Ho Fernández
- 3:15-3:45 *You can say that again: The communicative utility of that repetition*
Andrew McCormick
- 3:45-4:00 Break

Session chair: Berenice Darwich

- 4:00-4:45 *The puzzle of 'determiners' in Mopan Maya*
Ellen Contini-Morava and Eve Danziger
- 4:45 -5:15 *Linguistic creativity and children's literature:
The case of Pinkalicious*
Bill Carrasco

Monday, February 16

- 9:00-9:30 Arrival and continental breakfast
- Session chair: Bob de Jonge
- 9:30-10:00 *Observing speech acts in hospitality situations: the role of
linguistic forms*
Leanne Schreurs
- 10:00-10:30 *A new approach to case meaning in Russian*
Mary Anne Cosentini
- 10:30-11:00 *The characterization of referents in Serbo-Croatian*
Radmila Gorup
- 11:00-11:15 Break
- 11:15-12:00 Business Meeting



ABSTRACTS



Spanish *a*: A Columbia School road to homonymy

**Joanna Birnbaum,
Graduate Center, CUNY**

A Columbia School (CS) analysis of the Spanish form *a* would naturally start with an attempt at monosemy. But such an effort appears to face insurmountable difficulties. The only existing CS analysis (García 1975) seems to accept the traditional separation of accusative, dative, and prepositional *a*'s. And it concentrates, as does most of the literature, on the accusative. This poster lays out the reasons for moving to the next step in a CS analysis, namely a consideration of polysemy, and for the need to consider a human-factor proposal regarding routinization.

In the history of this problem, the goal of most of the literature has been to distinguish between direct objects that take *a* and those that do not. One frequent proposal is that *a* is used when objects are animate. Yet not all animate objects are marked with *a*, leading thereby to other proposals. Traditional generative and OT accounts consider specificity, definiteness, or the topical status of marked nouns as possible triggers for *a*, while typological and functional approaches regard *a* as a device to avoid ambiguity between subjects and objects. But none of these approaches account for the *a*-marking of inanimate objects. Moreover, their polysemous account is a-prioristic; it is taken following the tradition, without actually spelling out the reasons for giving up on monosemy.

A CS approach would support the initial exploration of a single *a*, whose meaning would be deployed, among other reasons, and more or less as in functionalist proposals, to distinguish between in-focus and out-focus participants. This approach would apply not only for most of what the tradition calls accusatives but for datives as well; most of these are animate or human, and are therefore strong candidates for in-focus interpretations and in need of something indicating their out-focus status. But a serious initial attempt at monosemy under a CS approach would not be limited to the traditional argument categories, but would have to consider all forms of *a*, including the traditional prepositions.

When such a true CS attempt at monosemy is made, the problems multiply. First, it turns out that the vast majority of *a*-marked entities are inanimate and therefore poor candidates for focus, e.g. *llamó a la ambulancia* 'she called the ambulance'; *le dio agua a la planta* 'she gave water to the plant'. Second, some *a*'s can actually be a part of traditional subject phrases, that is, they can occur inside phrases that attract focus, e.g. *El senador, junto a la presidenta, se presentó ante la prensa* 'The senator, together with the president, spoke to the press'. These two facts would undermine the rationale for the deployment of *a* as a form that forestalls incorrect in-focus inferences in animates.



More generally, the monosemous account would need to take into consideration the vastly different uses of *a*, including the following: Direction: *Voy a casa*; Location: *Junto a la oficina*; Recipient: *Le dio el libro a María*; Goal: *Va a regar los tomates*; Inception: *Empieza a nevar*; Relatedness: *vinculado al tema*. And to these would have to be added, in an initial exploration, such forms of *a* as may by now no longer be separate signals, such as *a veces* 'at times.'

These problems suggest giving serious thought to an alternative analysis. A usage that originated as a communicative strategy appears to have extended its boundaries through over-generation by creatures of habit. This linguistic routinization may also account for the chunking, or lexicalization, of a great number of yet another type of *a*-phrase that is seldom discussed in the literature.



Linguistic Creativity and Children's Literature: The Case of *Pinkalicious*

William Carrasco

Hunter College and The City College of New York, CUNY

Working from a Saussurean perspective, we will examine the distribution of semantic forms and backgrounds in a selection of passages from *Pinkalicious*¹ with a focus on word formations involving the colors 'pink' and 'green'. We will demonstrate how a textual perspective is required in order to identify and qualify these passages as linguistic data to begin with. Then, we will consider how the linguistic norms of *genre* (i.e., children's literature) contribute to their interpretation. In this way, we maintain the view that language is inseparable from the social practice in which it happens. By seeing language as a creative human action instead of as an instrument, we can also appreciate creativity as the transmission of new cultural (i.e., semiotic) formations rather than as the communication of new or pre-existing ideas. The intertextual trajectory of words invented in *Pinkalicious* and reprised in other books from the same series is an example of this. Ultimately, this study offers a way to objectify segments of *parole* as moments of interpretation and "active forces"² in the creation of linguistic values.

¹ by Victoria Kann and Elizabeth Kann

² Saussure, Ferdinand de. *Writings in General Linguistics*. French text edited by Simone Bouquet & Rudolph Engler, Translated by Carol Sanders and Matthew Pires. Oxford University Press, 2006, p. 196.



Semantic variation in Danish epistemic markers

Tanya Karoli Christensen
University of Copenhagen

It is a long-standing dispute in variationist sociolinguistics whether and in what sense the linguistic variants under study need to be semantically equivalent to collectively form a variable (e.g. Sankoff 1973; Lavandera 1978; Romaine 1984; Dines 1980; Terkourafi 2011; Pichler 2010; Hasan 2009 [1989]). Labov's famous tenet states that sociolinguists should study "variable ways of *saying the same thing*" (1972; my italics). But especially when studying variables above 'and beyond phonology' (Sankoff 1973), some sort of meaning difference will generally play a part in determining the distribution of each variant.

Instead of suggesting yet another way of circumventing the problem of semantic variation, I will present results from a study of epistemic markers in Danish, highlighting the most central distinction in meaning within this domain, namely that between certain and uncertain knowledge. Both may express the degree of knowledge about the propositional content a speaker purports to have, see examples in (1-4).

- (1) *muligvis har han fortalt noget om ham*
possibly has he told something about him
'possibly he has told you something about him'
- (2) *så sagde de jamen du kommer **helt sikkert** ind til Søværnet*
then said they well you come certainly in to the-Navy
'then they said well certainly you will get in the Navy'
- (3) ***selvfølgelig** var det anstrengende at have hende med **det er klart***
of-course was it tiresome to have her with that is clear
'of course it was tiresome to have her along, that's for sure'
- (4) *han var andenmester dengang **tror jeg** i maskinen*
he was second-engineer then think I in the-engine
'he was the second engineer back then I think in the engine room'

The data for this project form part of the LANCHART corpus on spoken Danish, a corpus formed to enable real time analyses of language change by including recordings of informants from two time periods (80s and 00s) (Gregersen 2009). The sub-corpus contains speech from 66 speakers totalling 1.3 million words. All occurrences of epistemic adverbials and phrases, based on lists compiled from other studies (e.g. Mortensen 2010), were automatically located and coded for a range of intra-linguistic features.



While sub-study of epistemic phrases has not been completed at the time of writing, the sub-study of epistemic adverbials show a complex picture of change through time, such that adolescents from the 80s used a larger relative proportion of adverbials expressing certain knowledge than adolescents of the 2000s do.

In this talk, I will pursue the semantic differences further, and attempt to reveal usage patterns that may contribute to an explanation of this change in the use of epistemic variants.

References

- Cheshire, Jenny. 2007: Discourse variation, grammaticalisation and stuff like that. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 11(2): 155-193.
- Dines, Elizabeth R. 1980: Variation in Discourse: "And Stuff like That" . *Language in Society* 9(1): 13-31.
- Dubois, Sylvie. 1992: Extension particles, etc. *Language Variation and Change* 4: 179-203.
- Gregersen, Frans. 2009: The data and design of the LANCHART study. *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 41: 3-29.
- Hasan, Ruqaiya. 2009 [1989]: Semantic variation and sociolinguistics. In *The Collected Works of Ruqaiya Hasan* Vol. II, ed. by Jonathan J. Webster. London/Oakville: Equinox.
- Labov, William. 1972: *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell
- Lavandera, Beatriz L. 1978: Where does the sociolinguistic variable stop? *Language in Society* 7(2): 171-182.
- Mortensen, Janus. 2010: *Epistemic stance marking in the use of English as a lingua franca*, Roskilde University.
- Pichler, Heike. 2010: Methods in discourse variation analysis: Reflections on the way forward. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 14(5): 581-608.
- Romaine, Suzanne. 1984. On the Problem of Syntactic Variation and Pragmatic Meaning. *Folia Linguistica* 18 (3/4): 409-437.
- Sankoff, Gillian. 1973. Above and beyond phonology in variable rules. In *New Ways of Analyzing Variation in English*, ed. by C.-J. Bailey & Roger Shuy, 42-62. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Terkourafi, Marina. 2011. The pragmatic variable: Toward a procedural interpretation. *Language in Society* 40: 343-372.



A new approach to case meaning in Russian

Mary Anne Cosentini

This paper presents an analysis of Russian case morphology, applying theories of the Columbia School of Linguistics. According to this approach, the morphology known as nominative, instrumental, dative and accusative case endings are signals which convey information regarding the relative degree of control that each participant has in the event expressed by the lexical verb: nominative case morphology signals the highest degree of control (most control), instrumental case morphology signals the next highest degree of control (more control), dative case morphology signals a lesser degree of control (less control) and accusative case morphology signals the lowest degree of control (least control). The following example, taken from *Ledjannoj dom* by I. Lazhechnikov, contains all four elements of the control system.

Artemij	Petrovich	дал	знак	рукой		цыганке...	
Artemij	Petrovich(N)	gave	sign	(A) hand	(I)	gypsy-woman (D)...	
	MOST				LEAST	MORE	LESS

This study of authentic data, analyzed in context, demonstrates that in instances where a verb can occur with only one grammatical case, for example ревновать (to be jealous of someone) which occurs with accusative case morphology and завидовать (to envy someone) which occurs with dative case morphology, the distribution of case morphology reflects a semantic compatibility between the lexical meaning of the verb and the semantic meaning of the case morphology and not an arbitrary rule of verbal government. In cases of "double government," where one and the same verb can co-occur with one of two cases, as with the verbs простить (to forgive) or покачать (to shake), the choice—either conscious or intuitive-- of one case morphology rather than another reflects the desire of the author or speaker to express a specific nuance of meaning.

References

- Diver, William. "The Nature of Linguistic Meaning." *Language: communication and human behavior: the linguistic essays of William Diver*. Ed. A. Huffman, J. Davis. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2012. 47-63.
- _____. "Theory." *Language: communication and human behavior: the linguistic essays of William Diver*. Ed. A. Huffman, J. Davis. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2012. 444-519.
- Diver, William, Joseph Davis. "Latin Voice and Case." *Language: communication and human behavior: the linguistic essays of William Diver*. Ed. A. Huffman, J. Davis. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2012. 195-245.
- Gorup, Radmila. "Verbs of Double Government in Serbo-Croatian." *Slovene Studies* 9/ 1-2 (1987): 93-99.
- Zubin, David. Meaning versus Government. *CUWPL* 5, 1980. 20-33.



The puzzle of ‘determiners’ in Mopan Maya

Ellen Contini-Morava and Eve Danziger
University of Virginia

In Mopan (Mayan, Belize/Guatemala), words interpreted as nouns are generally preceded either by a Gender Marker (GM: *aj*, Masculine or *ix*, Feminine) or by the Article *a*. All three forms indicate that what follows is to be understood as an entity, and they are in complementary distribution. However, presence/absence of the Article is sensitive to discourse factors that do not affect the GM, whereas the GM are more closely tied to particular lexical items regardless of discourse context. Example 1 shows how the Article is omissible in a list of desired game animals, whereas the GM *ix* is not. (Positions in which the Article might appear but does not are indicated with \emptyset).

Both GM and Article have productive uses aside from noun-introduction. The GM form agentives from lexical items usually translated as verbs (example 2a), whereas the Article forms non-agentive nominalizations (2b). A GM may precede an adjectival modifier of a noun that is not normally gendered (3). The Article creates entities from words/phrases that would not otherwise be thus interpreted (4a-b).

Although the productive uses of the GM and Article can be connected with their uses preceding words that are typically construed as nouns, the GM and Article do not appear to form a grammatical system. We argue that the Article is a grammatical sign meaning BOUNDED ENTITY, whereas the GM subdivide part of the lexicon into a folk taxonomy associated with gender differentiation. The productive uses of the GM can be seen as motivated by the non-productive ones, but as is typical with gender in the lexicon, no unified meaning explains all the uses. We illustrate with examples from Mopan narratives.

(1) Article more sensitive than GM to discourse context. [Data from Eve Danziger]

<i>Ix</i>		<i>koolol,</i>	$[\emptyset]$ <i>k'ämb'ul,</i>	$[\emptyset]$ <i>kox</i>	
GM.Fem		partridge	curassow	cojolito	
<i>etel</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>kek'enche'</i>	<i>etel</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>yuk=u</i>
with	ART	wild_pig	with	ART	antelope=Echo_Vowel
<i>Le'ek-\emptyset</i>		<i>kuchi</i>	<i>in-k'ati</i>	<i>tz'on-oo'</i>	
those-3.UNDERGOER		indeed	1sg.ACTOR-want	shoot-3.UNDERGOER.PL	
<i>pere</i>	<i>ma'</i>	<i>yan-\emptyset</i>	<i>kut'an</i>		
but	NEG	exist-3.UNDERGOER	he.said		



“**[ix] partridge**, **[Ø] curassow** [type of bird], **[Ø] cojolito** [type of bird], and **[ART] wild pig**, and **[ART] antelope**, those are what I really want to hunt, but they aren’t there!” he said.’

- (2) a. Productive use of GM to form agentive from Active Intransitive.
[Ventur 1976 1: 01]

<i>aj</i>	<i>jook'</i>	
GM.Masc	fish	‘fisherman’

- b. Productive use of Article to form non-Agentive nominal from Active Intransitive.

<i>a</i>	<i>jook'</i>	
ART	fish	‘fishing’

- (3) Productive use of GM with adjectival modifier of normally non-gendered noun.

<i>aj</i>	<i>nene'</i>	<i>ch'o'oj</i>
GM.Masc	small	rat

‘(the) small rat’ (*ch'o'oj* ‘rat’ not normally gendered)

- (4) Productive use of Article to create entities from expressions not usually so interpreted. [Ventur 1976, 1:03]; [Ventur 1976, 3:16]

a.	<i>kichpan-Ø</i>	<i>b'in</i>
	beautiful-3.UNDERGOER	hearsay

<i>a</i>	<i>ichil-oo'</i>	<i>uy</i>	<i>otoch a</i>	<i>kisin=i</i>
ART	inside-3.UNDERGOER.PL	3.POSS	house	ARTdemon-echo_vowel

‘Apparently **the inside of the demons’ house** was beautiful’.

b.	<i>tal-i</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>nene'=e</i>
	come-3.UNDERGOER.INTR.PRFCTV	ART	small=Echo_Vowel

‘**the little [one]** came’

Reference

Ventur, Pierre. (1976) *Mopan Maya Folklore Texts*. Smithsonian Institution (Accession #80-38).



Pay attention: Discourse prominence and subject expression in Spanish

Berenice Darwich
Graduate Center, CUNY

In the Columbia School literature, the Spanish subject personal pronouns (*yo, tú, él/ella*, etc.) carry a meaning of IN FOCUS and are said to “merely repeat (and hence emphasize) the meaning of the verb-ending” (García 1975: 69). But García did not explain the circumstances in which such emphasis would occur. That is, she never articulated the strategy of communication that motivated the common, even if infrequent, deployment of the pronouns. For its part, the variationist literature documents that the absence of these pronouns is especially notable when the participant in focus remains unchanged in the discourse (in what this literature calls conditions of ‘same reference’ as opposed to conditions of ‘switch reference’). But here too we have a gap in the account. Just as Garcia never told us what the special circumstances were that led to the deployment of pronouns in general, the variationists never tell us why these pronouns are persistently found, even if infrequently, under conditions of same reference.

Based on a corpus of transcribed interviews from Mexico, we support with qualitative and quantitative data a specific proposal regarding the motivation that speakers have for using IN-FOCUS pronouns under conditions of same reference. I take up this problem in the most intractable environment, namely second coreferential clauses, that is, adjacent clauses where same reference is maintained in verbs that are in the closest of proximity, and where therefore pronouns should be totally unnecessary. In (1) and (2) the second coreferential clauses show the majority usage, that is, absence of pronoun.

(1) **mi mamá**₁ va, \emptyset ₁ habla con los maestros de las del grupo de danza y \emptyset ₁ le dice
‘my mom goes, she talks to the teachers of the dance group and she tells her/him...’

(2) \emptyset ₁ dice que \emptyset ₁ se metió a un curso así súper rápido y \emptyset ₁ aplicó su examen y \emptyset ₁ dice...
‘(he) says that he enrolled in an intensive course and he took his exam and he says...’

But we see the opposite in (3) and (4), where the pronoun does appear:



(3) **yo**₁ te lo dije, **yo**₁ fui algo tremendo, **yo**₁ fui algo especial
'I told you, I was naughty, I was something special'

(4) desde chiquitas \emptyset ₁ nos empezó a meter a clases de pintura y **ella**₁ nos llevaba a pintar al campo
'since little (she) started putting us in painting classes and she took us to the country side to paint'

I motivate the constructs of *discourse theme* and *discourse theme competitor*. I demonstrate that in the context of same reference, subject expression in the second clause, as in (3) and (4), serves to forestall the competition for the status of discourse theme in the presence of competitors in the context. Correspondingly, I show that the familiar absence of pronouns, in cases like (1) and (2), is due to the absence of competitors. The notions of discourse theme and competitor, and the detailed evidence provided here, articulate a communicative strategy that fills the gap left by both the Columbia School and variationist analyses.

Reference

Garcia, Erica. 1975. *The Role of Theory in Linguistic Analysis*. North-Holland P.C.: Amsterdam/Oxford.



Extending Diver's Focus Hypothesis for Latin

Joseph Davis
The City College of New York, CUNY

Data bearing upon Diver's Latin Focus hypothesis suggest an extension for wider coverage. The system is not limited to nouns accompanying verbs.

Diver proposed that the nominative case signals the meaning IN Focus, while three oblique cases signal OUT of Focus. In Diver's discussion, Focus clearly had to do with relative degrees of attention to participants in events in narrative, each event typically represented by a verb. The nominative signals that one participant is more deserving of attention than others. Less clear is whether Diver acknowledged that there is not always a verb.

In data from three sources, all nominal cases occur without verbs. The examples suggest that Focus must be understood as a communicative tool that is, in principle, independent of the verb; its effect is simply a concentration of attention on the referent of the nominal. When a verb is present, that word adds to the message the ingredient of activity and constrains interpretation so that Focus relates to that event.

The understanding of Focus as relating strictly to participants was picked up by Zubin for modern German. Zubin's wording, like Diver's, can be read, however, as noncommittal as to whether a verb is strictly required for Focus to be signaled. Both writers note that the quantitative validation of Focus requires a context larger than the clause, i.e., that the effects of Focus are observed at the discourse level.

In other Columbia School work, too, Focus has been understood as operating essentially at the level of the individual verb, even if its effects are more global. But in these grammars—Spanish, English, French, and Italian—nouns do not have case, and hypothesized signals of Focus are morphologically tied to a verb; thus Focus is more plausibly tied semantically to that event.

References

- Davis, Joseph. 1995. "The Linguistic Sign as Unifying Principle Behind Syntactic Peculiarities: The Italian Clitic *ne*." *CLS 31: Papers from the 31st Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society, Vol. 2: Parasession on Clitics*, 79-90.
- Diver, William. 1981. "On Defining the Discipline." *CUWPL* 6: 59-117.
- _____. 1982. "The Focus-Control Interlock in Latin." *CUWPL* 7: 13-31.
- _____. 1984. *The Grammars of Homeric Greek and Classical Latin*. Unpublished textbook, Columbia University, New York.
- _____. 1987. "Latin Is a Language." Unpublished MS, Columbia University, New York.
- _____. 1990. "And Now for Something Completely Different." Unpublished MS, Columbia University, New York.



- García, Erica C. 1975. *The Role of Theory in Linguistic Analysis*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Gildin, Bonny L. 1989. *Subject Order in French: A Signal-Meaning Analysis*. Diss. New York: Columbia University. UMI 9005873.
- Huffman, Alan. 1997. *The Categories of Grammar: French lui and le*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Huffman, Alan, and Joseph Davis (Eds.). 2012. *Language: Communication and Human Behavior. The Linguistic Essays of William Diver*. Leyden / Boston: Brill.
- Reid, Wallis. 2011. "The Communicative Function of English Verb Number." *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 29: 1087-1146.
- Zubin, David. 1979. "Discourse Function of Morphology: The Focus System in German." *Syntax and Semantics, Vol. 12: Discourse and Syntax*, Talmy Givón (ed.). 469-504. New York: Academic.

Sources of data

Caesar. *De Bello Gallico*.

Cicero. *De Senectute*.

The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.



Vowels and consonants: A new vision of syllable structure from PHB

Bob de Jonge
Center of Language and Cognition Groningen
University of Groningen

It is generally assumed that CV is the unmarked syllable structure in human language, both in traditional phonology (cf. for instance Nespor 1993) and in Phonology as Human Behavior (PHB, cf. De Jonge 2012 and Tobin 2011: 180-1). In PHB an explanation for this hypothesis is given: assuming that the vowel is the nucleus of the syllable, the initial (preferably voiceless plosive) consonant provides the ideal physical circumstance for its production.

There are a few remaining questions, however:

1. Why are there consonant clusters in human speech?
2. Why are some clusters favored over others?
3. Why do disfavored clusters nevertheless occur?

It appears that there are languages that show a relative preference for clusters, (e.g. Slavic languages, Portuguese) and other (variants) of languages for the reduction of syllables through the elimination of intersyllabic consonants (Spanish, in particular Southern and Caribbean variants). These phenomena are generally related to syllable-timed vs. stress-timed characteristics of the languages in question, but this can hardly be taken as an explanation for these facts.

It will be argued that these strategies in human behavior are another example of the minimax struggle between communicative load and economy of effort (Tobin 2009). Moreover, it might be necessary to reconsider the division between vowels and consonants in the phoneme inventory of languages.

References

- Diver, William. 2012. Phonology as Human Behavior. Huffman, Alan and Joseph Davis (eds.), *Language: communication and human behavior*. Leiden/Boston: Brill. 293-321.
- Jonge, Bob de. 2012. Type vs. token frequency in PHB. Lezing tijdens het Eleventh International Columbia School Conference on the Interaction of Linguistic Form and Meaning with Human Behavior, Rutgers University Conference Center. New Brunswick, New Jersey. 13-15 oktober 2012.
- Nespor, Marina. 1993. *Fonologia*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Tobin, Yishai. 1997. *Phonology as Human Behavior. Theoretical Implications and Clinical Applications*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Tobin, Yishai. 2011. Phonology as human behavior from an evolutionary point of view. In Bob de Jonge & Yishai Tobin (eds.): *Linguistic Theory and Empirical Evidence*. SFLS 64. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 169-195.



Un-debunking the phoneme: How the space character and the Roman alphabet led phonology astray

Thomas Eccardt

In phonology, the phoneme used to be the essential unit that signaled and differentiated all the morphemes in a spoken human language. But then the space character essentially was renamed “juncture” and became a phoneme itself. The space occurs so frequently that it provides mutually exclusive environments where there really are none in connected speech. This led to two crises in phonemics. First, phonetically dissimilar phonemes such as /h/ and /ng/ seemed to be in complementary distribution. Second, Yuan-ren Chao's analysis of Mandarin Chinese seemed to show that more than two sounds could be in complementary distribution, and if they were phonetically dissimilar, combining them into one phoneme was an arbitrary choice. This paper will show that the space character does not behave like a letter in actual texts, turning these crises into false alarms.

The Roman alphabet perhaps was adequate for Latin, but it has no characters for aspirated phonemes. A careful analysis of English will show aspiration to be a phonemic rather than allophonic distinction. This paper reanalyzes aspirated /t/, unaspirated /t/, and /d/ into /d'/, /'d/ and /d/ respectively, where the apostrophe (') stands for a voice interruption. This transcription properly accounts for the phonemic distinction that can be found between “night rates” /nai'drei'dz/ vs. “nitrates” /naid'rei'dz/, without the use of a juncture phoneme. Furthermore, it vitiates the archiphoneme /S/ for the English plural, making it a regular /z/ phoneme “allophonically” devoiced by its proximity to the apostrophe phoneme. Finally, it accounts for such “oronyms” (homonymic strings) as “We backed Ann” and “We back Dan” with the simple concatenation of the individually phonemicized morphemes. No transformations necessary.



The characterization of referents in Serbo-Croatian

Radmila Gorup
Columbia University

My paper presents an analysis of System of Sharpness of Focus in Serbo-Croatian that is reminiscent of the analysis by William Diver for Homeric Greek

The meanings of this semantic substance produce various effects in messages all having to do with the ways a referent can be viewed. A referent can be entirely in our attention or only partially so. A referent can be something we are interested in talking about or introduced only as an attribute to something else. A referent can be a clearly delineated object or one with somewhat indefinite boundaries.

The Serbo-Croatian System of Sharpness of Focus is shown here:

Sharpness of Focus	SHARP (Accusative morphology)
	DIFFUSE (Genitive morphology)

The distinction SHARP - DIFFUSE is perhaps best seen in what grammars call Count and Substance (including abstract) nouns, the first having to do with discrete objects that can be counted and the latter with materials of indefinite extent. Example (1a) and (1b) illustrates this:

- 1a. Imate li **mleko** (acc.)?
'Do you have milk (**SHARP**)?'
- 1b. Imate li **mleka** (gen.)?
'Do you have [any, some] milk (**DIFFUSE**)?'

In example 1a, the meaning SHARP gives the reader/hearer a clue to view the referent as an item on the list of other items being sold in the store. In 1b, however, the meaning DIFFUSE steers the reader/hear to view the referent as material of indefinite extent. The Count and Substance nouns are not categories of the lexicon but characterizations of the objects being talked about. In this example different grammatical meanings differentiate two referents of the same lexical item.

In a previous paper (Gorup, 2006) I showed that the clitic *se* interferes with the Control ranking among participants. In this paper, I'll show how the presence of clitic *se* interacts with the meanings SHARP and DIFFUSE to produce to produce different interpretations of messages.



References

- Davis, Joseph. 2002. "A Surprisingly Simple Analysis," in Wallis Reid, Ricardo Otheguy and Nancy Stern (eds.) *Signal, Meaning and Message: Perspectives on sign-based linguistics*. Philadelphia/Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 113 – 137.
- Diver, William. 1984. "System of Sharpness of Focus (Greek)" in the *Grammar of Greek and Latin*, 21-29.
- Gorup, Radmila. 2006, "Se without deixis," in Joseph Davis, Radmila Gorup and Nancy Stern (eds). *Advances in Functional Linguistics*, Philadelphia/Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 195 – 211.



Layers of meaning in Arabic research abstracts

Hmoud Alotaibi
Shaqra University

This paper examines 22 Arabic research article abstracts written by Arab scholars who were specialists in the English language. Writers in Arabic are encouraged to employ only formal language in all types of genres, and especially in the research article. Similar to the case in other languages, there are some words in Arabic that are formal but can be used informally. Through many extracted examples and expressions, the paper demonstrates how writers opt for the colloquial meanings and functions of some words and expressions because they are used more often in today's language. For example, some texts used كما (*kama*) to mean *also*. This usage, however, is not standard because according to the Arabic grammar, *kama* has only two meanings: draws similarity (similar to *as*) and gives the reason (similar to *because*). This example, and many others, shows that writers may use informal meanings of words in spite of prescriptive tents that do not sanction those meanings. The tradition in Arabic asserts using only the formal language/function in writing as well as in speaking whether it is common or not in order to keep associating the language with Quran and thus helps preserve the meanings in Quran and make them understandable throughout time. Writers in this study might be influenced by the changing nature and flexibility of English language since they are specializing in it. The findings in general suggest that writers have a free choice to use what serve the message (as pointed out in Kirsner, 1979, and Reid, 1979). The paper concludes by arguing that the analysis of Arabic prose has to be deep to capture all possible meanings, i.e. those in the standard and informal versions.



What is *que*? A monosemic approach.

Eduardo Ho Fernández
Graduate Center, CUNY

The Spanish particle *que* has been defined as a morpheme that chiefly serves the following grammatical functions:

1. Relative pronoun:

*Las noticias **que** vinieron fueron peores.*
The news that [*que*] came in were worse.

2. Subordinating conjunction:

*Dijo **que** estaba harto.*
He said that [*que*] he was fed-up.

3. Interrogative pronoun:

*¿**Qué** dices?*
What [*qué*] are you saying?

4. Exclamatory pronoun:

*¡**Qué** hombre!*
What [*qué*] a man!

5. Comparative pronoun:

*Ella es más alta **que** su padre.*
She is taller than [*que*] her father.

6. Periphrastic pronoun:

*Tengo **que** vender libros.*
I have to [*que*] sell books.

*Hay **que** vender libros.*
One must [*que*] sell books.

Even though descriptive grammars cannot always differentiate one function from the other (for example a relative vs. a conjunction or the interrogative vs. the exclamatory), a Columbia School analysis would first attempt to unify all of the above uses of *que*, in order to establish a one signal to one meaning relationship, before considering the existence of homonymous forms.



Attempts to define *que* have ranged from: (a) it taking its meaning from its antecedent (Alarcos, 1994; Alonso and Henríquez Ureña, 1968; Bello, 1847; etc.); (b) it being semantically null (Alonso and Henríquez Ureña); to (c) it serving as an “announcer” of information (Bello). In our review of the literature, no single attempt has tried to account for all the above uses of *que* (ex’s. 1 – 6 above) as one signal; however, during the early stages of the Columbia School, Lavandera (1971) proposed the following unitary meaning for *que*:

“La proposición siguiente está necesariamente incluida en otra proposición” (p. 23).

The proposition that follows is obligatorily included in another proposition (my translation)

We argue that Lavandera’s proposed meaning is simply a rewording of the traditional definition of a relative pronoun and a subordinating conjunction; and after concluding that the remaining three hypothetical meanings for *que* are falsifiable, by testing them with tokens obtained from several textual corpora, we propose instead that the meaning that *que* consistently contributes to the message, in a vein similar to Bello, is that: MORE INFORMATION IS REQUIRED. We will demonstrate how this meaning better applies to examples that do not seem to support the meaning hypotheses proposed to-date for *que*; and also, that this meaning is better able to account for the somewhat inexplicable distribution of *que* as a ‘periphrastic’ pronoun (Alarcos, 1970), which has either been ignored from the overall analytics of *que* as a signal or it has been hypothesized as a separate sign (Gili Gaya, 1970; Olbertz, 1998.)

References

- Alarcos Llorach, Emilio (1970): *El Español /QUE/*. *Estudios de Gramática Funcional del Español*. Madrid: Gredos.
- _____. (1994): *Gramática de la Lengua Española*. Real Academia Española. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe.
- Alonso, Amado y Henríquez Ureña, Pedro (1968): *Gramática de la Lengua Castellana*. Primer y Segundo Curso. Buenos Aires: Losada.
- Bello, Andrés (1970 [1847]): *Gramática de la lengua castellana*. Octava Edición. Buenos Aires: Editorial Sopena Argentina.
- Gily Gaya, Samuel (1970): *Curso superior de sintaxis española*. Novena edición. Madrid: Vox.
- Lavandera, Beatriz (1971): La forma *que* del español y su contribución al mensaje. *Revista de Filología Española* 54: 13-36.
- Olbertz, Hella (1998): *Verbal periphrasis in a Functional Grammar of Spanish*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.



A little common sense, please!
Chinese word order versus the grammatical tradition

Alan Huffman
The City University of New York

The Chinese languages, everybody knows, have no inflectional morphology or paradigms, no declensions, cases, genders, singulars or plurals; no conjugations, no tenses, very little if any derivational morphology—all of these being precisely the items that have most fascinated linguists operating in the Diverian tradition. What would a Columbia School grammar of Chinese look like?

Mandarin Chinese appears to have a word-order-signaled system of Degree of Control much like that of English. The grammars, at least, talk about Subject—Verb—Indirect Object—Direct Object word order as being a basic pattern. Books on Chinese tell us that one of the salient differences between Mandarin grammar and the grammar of another Chinese language, Cantonese, is this ordering: that in Cantonese, the Direct Object comes first, and the Indirect Object follows it. But is this really so? It turns out that that depends very much upon what you are willing to call an Indirect Object. As in English, there is little formal control on the category of Indirect Object. Like English, Chinese appears to have both a “word order dative”, as in *John gave Mary a ring*, and a “prepositional dative”, as in *John gave the ring to Mary*, but with a richer selection of prepositions. In Chinese, the confusion is greatly augmented by the fact that the list of words belonging to the part of speech “preposition” appears to overlap very substantially with that of “verbs”. Chinese grammars for foreigners try hard to hammer the round pegs of Chinese data into the square holes in the template of Universal Grammar as represented by English, and the result, as could be expected, is hardly credible.

This talk will deal mainly with Cantonese and will suggest that the facts of Chinese be allowed to speak for themselves. When they do, a very different kind of grammar emerges. This grammar is nonetheless entirely consistent with previous Columbia School analyses, albeit with a shift of emphasis. In this grammar, word order plays a major role, not only as a device for signaling meaning in the narrow sense, but also as being motivated by broader communicative and pragmatic factors; and the familiar but seldom-evoked constructs of Satellite Center and Satellite Cluster assume new eminence.



The usefulness of imperfect paraphrases

Robert Kirsner
University of California, Los Angeles

We discuss two cases in Modern Dutch where the comparison of messages communicated with a form and putative paraphrases of those messages elucidates the meaning signaled by the form. The first are the paraphrases of presentative sentences such as (1a) with existential expressions such as (1b) or (1c); cf. Kraak 1966.

- (1) a. *Er loopt een jongen* 'There walks a boy/ A boy is walking'
b. *Er is een jongen en die jongen loopt* 'There is a boy and the boy walks/ is walking'
c. *Er is een jongen die loopt* 'There is a boy who walks/is walking'

While *loopt* in (1b, c) can be taken as either describing an event of walking or a general characteristic, *loopt* in (1a) must be taken as describing an event; cf. Kirsner 1979. Sentence (2a) below, describing a particular kind of metal with a special general characteristic cannot paraphrase (2b):

- (2) a. *Er is een bijzonder metaal dat drijft* 'There is a special metal that floats.'
b. *Er drijft een bijzonder metaal* 'There floats a special metal/A special metal is floating.'

The second case concerns paraphrases of the Dutch expression *ho maar* 'whoa but/stop = fuhgeddaboutit' with *vergeet het maar*, literally 'forget it but/just = forget it', cf. Kirsner 2014. Here the literal expression *vergeet het maar* communicates *directly* a message which, in the case of *ho maar*, is the end product of an inferential process beginning with the meaning 'stop' and which the speaker must explicitly prepare for the hearer. Unlike *vergeet het maar*, *ho maar* can only be used to dismiss a possibility which the speaker him/herself has mentioned, as in *Een hoger salaris willen ze wel, maar harder werken, ho maar* 'They want a higher salary, but work harder?, fuhgeddabout it'.

References

- Kirsner, Robert S. 1979. *The Problem of Presentative Sentences in Modern Dutch*. Amsterdam: North Holland Publishing Company.
Kirsner, Robert S. 2014. *Qualitative-Quantitative Analyses of Dutch and Afrikaans Grammar and Lexicon*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
Kraak, Albert. 1966. *Negatieve Zinnen: Een Methodologische en Grammaticale Analyse*. Hilversum: W. de Haan.



Pragmatic analysis of wiretaps, foreign intelligence surveillance, pretext and consensual recordings: “smoking guns” vs speech event theory

**Robert A. Leonard
Hofstra University**

Decoys such as undercover agents, or turned cooperating witnesses, directly manipulate secretly recorded conversations to steer their targets into making apparently inculpatory statements. Often juries are asked to assign guilt via brief “smoking gun” utterances taken from transcripts, often with little detailed linguistic context. Analysis of undercover recorded evidence by Roger Shuy and Rob Leonard in cases where defendants were variously accused of smuggling restricted weaponry, bribing foreign officials, and solicitation to murder reveals how decoys, prosecution, and defense are all actually waging a battle—first of manipulation, and then of interpretation—of conversational strategies, schemas, and, ultimately, speech events.



**You can say *that* again:
The communicative utility of *that* repetition**

**Andrew McCormick
Graduate Center, CUNY**

The present paper offers a communicative and semiotic account of *that* in its role as what is generally labeled a complementizer in English. Often held to be semantically void and at best a reflex of structure in formal circles, but widely argued to be meaningful and shaped by discourse factors among pragmatists and functionalists, immediately postverbal *that* has been the subject of a large body of literature. Seeking to add a new angle to the discussion, I will present a communicative account of a largely overlooked use of *that*: its repetition after digressionary subordinate material, as encountered in spoken examples like (1) as well as written ones like (2):

- (1) 'It is gratifying **that** even after all these years, **that** there's still a chance for justice to be done,' he said.
- (2) The language of the compact purports to give states power over health care law but says nothing about federal tax law. Therefore, one has to necessarily conclude **that** even under the best of circumstances **that** the states will not be able to "suspend" the individual mandate under the Compact.

I will draw upon Diver (1975), in which *that* is seen as an attention signal, and Bolinger (1972), in which *that* retains some of the deixis associated with this form's demonstrative role. Presenting free web and corpus data as well as plans for a small pilot study, I will add to these classic functional accounts. I will suggest that repeated *that* contributes to the sense of culmination achieved with intonation and pause before the final clause. These contributions are particularly helpful after clauses and phrases that convey distance or suspenseful build-up to rhetorically frame the pending, final clause. Following Cheshire (1996), I will also suggest that repeated *that* smooths out utterance cohesion much like discourse markers do. This account will be shown to contrast with generative studies like Ferreira (2003), who regards *that* in its role as complementizer as semantically null.



El “juego” intra-paradigmático: Una mirada al uso actual de los clíticos en Buenos Aires

Angelita Martínez
Universidad Nacional de La Plata

El uso variable de los clíticos de tercera persona *lo(la)* y *le* manifiesta, en la variedad rioplatense, alta frecuencia relativa del acusativo con verbos como *preocupar*, *angustiar*, *molestar*, tal como se hace evidente en numerosos trabajos (García 1975; Martínez 2008 y 2011). El empleo variable del acusativo se ha instalado, incluso, actualmente, con verbos que denotan situaciones de tres participantes, tales como *robar*.

Dicha variación se manifiesta hasta en la prensa escrita más ligada al prescriptivismo.

El hecho resulta de interés, entre otras cosas, porque se constituiría en una tendencia inversa a lo que se ha señalado como un aumento generalizado de la selección del dativo sobre el acusativo en un proceso de cambio lingüístico que tiene lugar desde el español antiguo (Company 2001).

Nos vamos a detener, en esta presentación, en el análisis de la variación de los clíticos en el contexto correspondiente al verbo *robar*:

(1) Fue asaltado por cuatro delincuentes quienes **le robaron**, lo golpearon y lo ataron. (La Nación, 16/01/2013)

(2) Cuando quiso pasar el piquete sindical, fue víctima de los manifestantes que, además de no dejarlo pasar, **lo robaron**, le pegaron y lo tiraron del puente Avellaneda. (La Nación, 12/03/2014)

Desde la consideración de que los clíticos de tercera persona en el español de la Argentina comparten con la terminación verbal un paradigma de base CASO que categoriza el grado de actividad del actante en el evento (García 1975; Martínez 2000; Mauder 2009), intentaremos explicar el uso variable de las formas. En dicha búsqueda, serán considerados diferentes tipos de factores contextuales para tratar de probar una hipótesis etnopragmática (García 1995) relacionada, en este caso, con la necesidad comunicativa de señalar representaciones actuales sobre el delito.



Using big data to test a Columbia School hypothesis

Ricardo Otheguy and Lauren Spradlin
Graduate Center CUNY

For both English and French, Huffman (1996, 1997:40ff.) has posed the question of what motivates speakers to sometimes resort to Control meanings and sometimes to the meanings of prepositions. According to Huffman, part of the answer for French has to do with differences of **precision**. The meanings of Control are imprecise, and thus useful for familiar combinations of nouns and verbs, where the roles are easy to infer. For less familiar roles, the imprecise meanings of Control give way to the more precise meanings of particular prepositions. Huffman's examples include (1) and (2).

- (1) La fille de Marie a vu une jolie robe, et Marie **la lui** a acheté.
Marie it her has bought
'Marie's daughter saw a nice dress, and Marie bought it for her.'
- (2) Marie n'aimait pas la robe, mais sa fille l'a acheté malgré **elle**.
her daughter it has bought despite her.
'Marie does not like the dress, but in spite of her opinion, her daughter bought it.'

By hypothesis, in (1) the relationship between the daughter and the event of purchasing has been presented through the imprecise meaning of MID CONTROL (*lui*). But in (2), the relationship between the mother (Marie) and the event of purchasing is handled by the more precise lexical meaning of *malgré* ('despite').

We apply Huffman's reasoning of precision to English. In (3), the imprecise meaning of MID CONTROL can be used to describe the different relationships between leaving and Thurman that in (4) and (5) are described by the more precise prepositions *to* and *for*.

- (3) Mary left Thurman money.
(4) Mary left money to Thurman [in her will].
(5) Mary left money for Thurman [on the dining room table].

To be sure, speakers do not treat all verb-noun combinations like *leave-money*. With many verb-noun pairs, only one preposition is regularly abandoned for MID CONTROL, the other prepositions generally showing no imprecise Control alternative. In addition, there are pairs, such as *donate* and *cause*, with which only the precise alternative is taken (cf. *Mary donated money for the cause*). But still, the generalization holds about the grammar that the meaning of each of the prepositions is more precise than the meaning of MID CONTROL. Precision manifests itself in the deployment of prepositions, and is especially clear when, as in (4) – (5), more than one preposition is used with the same verb-noun combination.



We test this generalization making several predictions using the *Corpus of Contemporary American English* (COCA). We expect, among others, that the imprecise MID CONTROL will be more frequent overall than the precise prepositional alternative; that it will be more frequent with pronouns than with nouns; and that these tendencies will be attenuated in verbs that occur with more than one preposition. The results support the generalization that Control systems are rough, imprecise tools for relating participants to events, while prepositions can offer a more delicate and precise alternative, and that this difference of precision is part of the answer to the distributional problem posed by English cases like (3) - (5).



Linguistic and semiotic mechanisms and ideology in Israeli textbooks

Nurit Peled-Elhanan

Hebrew University and David Yellin Teachers College

This paper examines reports about massacres in 10 Israeli secondary school history books, published between 1998 and 2014. It shows by a multimodal social-semiotic analysis that massacres, or rather their outcome, are legitimated in these books through a complex rhetoric that involves both verbal and visual signs of meaning, aimed at "transforming reality into a version of this reality." (Van-Leeuwen 2005)

The paper uses analytical tools of Critical Discourse Analysis, Social Semiotics and Multimodality which consider language as a system of resources to make meaning in specific cultures and contexts. Every sign – be it words, phrases, images or complex sign such as a page or a double spread, is seen as motivated by interest, ideologies and communicative function. Grammatical categories are defined semantically and are seen as genre-specific, functioning as signs in communication rather than as conceptual components.

The paper examines Discourse, Genres and style in terms of the relationships between form and meaning, exemplifying how semiotic resources are used to make meaning in a particular context and revealing discursive strategies of legitimation and their semiotic features. It explores the function of different narrative and argument forms, genres of explanation, the use of Modality, socio-semantic and linguistic means such as passive/active and appraisal systems, and the use of grammatical metaphors. The paper goes further to analyze the use of multimodal strategies of legitimation through the special use of layout and colour.

Although the analysis is based primarily on discourse analysis and social semiotics, it also draws on studies in sociology, philosophy and literary studies for the analysis of rhetoric and literary or poetic devices. The paper argues that Israeli mainstream school books use multimodal strategies to legitimate implicitly the killing of Palestinians (and Jews in one case) as an effective tool to preserve a secure Jewish state with a Jewish majority.

Selected Bibliography

- Barthes R. (1984) *Le discours de l'Histoire*. In: *Le Bruissement de la Langue*. Editions de Seuil. Paris, France.
- Coffin, C. (2006) *Historical Discourse*. London: Continuum International.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research* Routledge, London and New York.
- Halliday, M.A.K (1978). *Language as Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning* University Park Press.



- Kress, G. (2010). *Multimodality A Social Semiotic Approach to Contemporary Communication*. Routledge, UK, USA and Canada.
- Lyotard, J.F. (1988) *The Differend: Phrases in Dispute*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Martin, J.R. and White, P.R.R. (2005) *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Van Leeuwen, T. (2007). 'Legitimation in Discourse and Communication', *Discourse & Communication* 1(1): 91-112.



Is there a place for parts of speech in Columbia School theory?

**Wallis Reid
Rutgers University**

Diver is remembered for his provocative rejection of traditional linguistic categories. One of his best-known rejections is that of part-of-speech distinctions, and for many second-generation Columbia School analysts, 'no parts of speech' is regarded as a bedrock principle of the framework. But is it? And would such a rejection be consonant with Diver's a posteriori conception of theory-building?

This paper re-examines Diver's position and concludes that he did not reject part-of-speech distinctions. He rejected them for English, but left open the possibility that they may be justified for other languages. The remainder of the paper considers under what conditions the positing of lexical classes would be justified. It will be argued that lexical classes referentially equivalent to nouns and verbs are necessary for Latin and Spanish. Their justification is, however, purely inductive; they lack the deductive justification they enjoy in traditional grammar.



The Focus System and the so-called nominalizers *koto* and *no* in Modern Japanese

**Hidemi Sugi Riggs
University of California at Irvine**

In Japanese there are three so-called nominalizers, *mono* 'thing', *koto* 'matter', and *no* 'thing/matter/reason/place, etc'. Hitherto, popular analysis of speakers' word selection among the three is discussed in terms of epistemic modality. We demonstrate the analytical shortcoming of this approach by providing actual uses collected from daily language use. We also demonstrate that the three words are actually pronouns that connote abstract concepts. For instance, *mono* represents emotions and *koto* relates to conduct, while *no* behaves as a proxy word for both *mono* and *koto*. Thus *mono* and *no* on the one hand and *koto* and *no* on the other are used interchangeably in various contexts.

For this study we collected examples from books and television. From the latter we collected the context in which audible and visible evidence of focus is displayed. The writers of subtitles express this focus with fonts that are brightly colored, oversized, otherwise draw attention.

Based on the data analysis we concluded that the system comprises two sets of dichotomies. The first is based on the way of focus in a sentence. *Mono* and *koto* draw focus on an antecedent, whereas *no*, which is the proxy of *mono* and *koto*, focuses on consequence. The second set is a dichotomy of motionlessness (*mono* 'thing') vs. movement (*koto* 'matter').

The most significant values of the model is that it can explain the co-occurrence of multiple words in terms of accumulation of focus on a particular part of the sentence. For instance, if a particular part of a sentence is sandwiched by *no* and *koto*, then the focus piled up on the part. The videotape recorded from television program will visually reveal the accumulation of focus.



Control and Focus in Gurung

Danielle Ronkos

Graduate Center, City University of New York

Gurung is an endangered Sino-Tibetan language of Nepal. In this poster I identify and give names to Gurung forms following the most extensive study published to date, a tagmemic analysis by Glover (1974) that points out several intractable analytical puzzles. I propose that some of the puzzles outlined by Glover could be resolved by introducing systems of Control and Focus, as outlined in Diver (2012) and Huffman (2009). According to Diver, Control is a gradable metric tied to the amount of control each participant has over the occurrence in an utterance, while Focus signals the participant to which the listener is intended to pay the most attention. Both Diver and Huffman use these systems in an interlock, assigning both Control and Focus to one signal (in English the signal is word order, while in Latin the signal is case morphology). In my approach, Gurung has Control and Focus, but not in an interlock.

Gurung makes use of no less than ten case suffixes on words that indicate participants in a given utterance. The subject is often marked with ergative morphology and the object is often marked with dative morphology. Glover's analysis does not account for the order of these participants, saying simply that the order is freer than in English. I propose that participants in Gurung do follow a predictable order, but that it is tied to Focus, rather than to thematic roles. I also propose that the suffixes labeled as ergative and dative case can instead be considered signals of a Control system, where ergative case signals HIGH CONTROL and dative case signals LOW CONTROL, which interacts, but does not interlock with, the Focus system. This is captured in the following schematic, where IN-FOCUS is signaled by the first position in an utterance while all others signal NON-FOCUS:

		Focus	
		IN-FOCUS	NON-FOCUS
Control	HIGH	<i>ergative</i>	<i>ergative</i>
	LOW	<i>dative</i>	<i>dative</i>

This proposed system of Control and Focus can be implemented to solve, among others, a confusing dataset that contains a pair of utterances that Glover deems structurally identical with one important exception: in one utterance the participant marked with dative case precedes the participant marked with ergative case, while in the other the opposite order obtains. The utterances are reproduced below with the relevant suffixes in bold:



1. *surje máe a'ba·-d-ám kxi-lai ax-c^hyq̣·-bae tq̣ bi-m [u ax-bi?]*
Surje of father-**ER**-TO you-**DAT** not-good-AJ word say-NP or not
Does Surje's father speak harsh words to you [or not?] (Glover 1974: 85)
2. *kxi-lai cá-maɛ·-d-ám k^hɔyɔ k^hɔyɔ cxá t^hú-l bxí-m [u ax-bxí?]*
you-**DAT** that-PL-**ER**-TO sometimes tea drink-IN give-NP or not
Do they give you tea to drink sometimes [or not?] (Glover 1974: 85)

Glover actually hints at something akin to Focus in his discussion of the utterances, noting that the speaker seems to be drawing attention to different participants with each word order. Introducing a system of Focus and Control into the analysis provides a simple explanation for the contrast between the two utterances, and for word order in Gurung more generally.



A sign-based account of the distribution of the forms *any* and *some*

Nadav Sabar
Graduate Center, CUNY

The distribution and semantic contribution of the English forms *any* and *some* are notoriously difficult to pin down. Generative linguists, inspired by the constructs of formal logic, consider both forms to represent natural language manifestations of existential quantification and account for their supposed complementary distribution by classifying them as polarity sensitive (PS) items, whose occurrences are mechanically controlled by their logico-semantic sentential environment. In other cases, where *any* seems to represent universal quantification, it is then rendered as a free choice (FC) item, which is not in complementary distribution with *some*, giving rise thereby to two forms of *any*.

Proposed here is a unified sign-based account of *any* and *some* according to which each form constitutes a full-fledged expressive device that, by virtue of its meaning, is chosen by language users so as to advance their communicative ends. Thus, the distribution of *any* and *some* is explained in terms of the forms' hypothesized meanings, noting that meaning pertains to conceptualization, not quantification or reference. A semantic substance of Domain Restrictiveness is hypothesized, where the meaning of *some* is DOMAIN RESTRICTED and of *any* DOMAIN UNRESTRICTED. Qualitative and quantitative analyses of attested occurrences of *any* and *some* support this meaning hypothesis.

Consider the following attested example:

I'm so glad to have people in my life who are willing to drop **anything** to help me when I really need **something**.

The things the speaker's friends are willing to drop are not restricted – that is what makes them good, dependable, friends. But the occasions which call for her friends' devoted help are restricted – it is only when she is in “real” need that she calls upon their help.

The table below illustrates the validation of a quantitative prediction. The numbers indicate hits found on Google searches for these exact strings:

“really needed anything” – 4,630,000	“really needed something” – 16,300,000
“really needed anything that is” – 8	“really needed something that is” – 1,650,000
“really needed anything which” – 5	“really needed something which” – 1,020,000



The clear distributional skewings are predicted by the meaning hypothesis: 'some', whose meaning is RESTRICTED is more likely to occur with a relative clause because the relative clause explicates the speaker's intended restriction. Thus, 'some' and the relative clause constitute expressive devices working cohesively toward the same communicative end.



Observing speech acts in hospitality situations: the role of linguistic form

Leanne Schreurs
University of Groningen

This study addresses the relationship between the pragmatic aspects of messages and the sound waves that are indicative of the linguistic forms (cf. Diver 2012: 451). In our study of the linguistic expression of hospitality, we confront the concept of speech acts (Searle 1969), in which language performs an action, with the concept of meaning, in which language is seen as a system revolving around the notion of the linguistic sign (Tobin 1995: 7). Unfortunately, current pragmatics does not offer any independent tools as to identify these acts, if not the qualitative analysis of individual contexts. Therefore, we are interested in the communicative contribution of a number of specific linguistic signs in a particular set of speech acts. In the present research we address this issue by conducting a case study on a Colombian novel (Carrasquilla 1984 [1928]).

We first conducted a qualitative analysis of individual examples of hospitality situations. It appeared that threats of (positive and negative) face (Brown & Levinson 1987) are relevant to these situations. Moreover, there seemed to be a correlation between face threats on the one hand, and the use of different forms of address and verb mood on the other.

To complement our qualitative analysis, we subsequently conducted a quantitative distribution analysis of verb mood and forms of address. We categorized over 2000 utterances as a pleasant conversation, a meeting, a discussion or a quarrel. In addition, we classified the speakers as relatives, friends or strangers. This allowed us to analyse the distribution of the forms under focus over communicative situations and social relationships.

Our findings suggest that specific linguistic forms may indeed provide an independent means of identifying speech acts, albeit not as a one-to-one relationship. Further analysis is needed to elaborate a system of hospitality and its related subsystems. Furthermore, this research may contribute to Second Language Education by developing students' awareness about the different interpretations of linguistic forms in different circumstances, rather than solely teaching them the translation of linguistic forms in the foreign language.

References

- Brown, Penelope and Stephen C. Levinson. 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. New York, NY US: Cambridge University Press.
- Carrasquilla, Tomás. 1984 [1928]. *La Marquesa de Yolombó*, edited by Kurt L. Levy, Jaime Mejía Duque. Caracas: Biblioteca Ayacucho.



- Diver, William. 2012. "Theory." In: *Language: Communication and Human Behavior: The Linguistic Essays of William Diver*, Alan Huffman and Joseph Davis (eds). Leiden: Brill.
- Searle, John R. 1969. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tobin, Yishai. 1995. *Invariance, Markedness and Distinctive Feature Analysis: A Contrastive Study of Sign Systems in English and Hebrew*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.



Scene, Meaning, and Message and the System of Degree of Control: *Giving the Wall a Push*

Nancy Stern
The City College of New York, CUNY

The English System of Degree of Control (Huffman 2009; Reid 2011) posits that the positions of participants in relation to an event signal varying degrees of Control over that event. In traditional terms, the System pertains to the placement of what are conventionally called subjects as well as both direct and indirect objects.

Examples such as *She gave the wall a push* appear to pose at least two separate challenges for the Control analysis. First, it is not apparent in what sense an inanimate object like *the wall* exerts Control in the event of *pushing*. And second, it calls for an explanation for why a three-participant event is signaled (1), when the scene appears to have just two participants (2). That is, why is *pushing* conceptualized as a participant rather than as an action in (1), which is what appears to be on the scene.

According to the Control analysis, in the three-participant examples the second participant is signaled to have a MID level of Control, while in the 2-participant example, the second participant is signaled to have a LOWER degree of Control:

(1) **She** gave **the wall** **a push** (3-participants)
HIGH MID LOW

(2) **She** pushed **the wall** (2-participants)
HIGHER LOWER

In this paper, an examination of authentic data will reveal that the meanings hypothesized by the Control System do account for differences in messages between these two types of utterances. In the 3-participant examples, we find *the wall* to be more interactively involved in the pushing, and thus exerting a higher degree of Control than in the 2-participant examples. These findings provide support for the Degree of Control analysis.

References

- Huffman, Alan. 2009. The Control-Focus interlock. *Modern English: A Columbia School grammar*, Chapter I, pp. 1-32. Unpublished ms.
- Reid, Wallis. 2011. The communicative function of English verb number. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 29.1087-1146.



A comparative discourse study of the restrictive markings of Mandarin *jiù*, *cái*, and *zhǐ*

**Xuehua Xiang
University of Illinois at Chicago**

Based on naturally occurring data and multiple analytic lenses (sign-based approach to lexical semantics, discourse analysis), the current study compares Mandarin particles 就(*jiù*), 才(*cái*), and 只(*zhǐ*), in their capacities as restrictive markers, translatable into “just,” “only,” “no more than,” “no other than,” and other such expressions of “limitation” and “restriction” (Biq, 1988; Höle, 2004; Lai, 1999; Liu, 1997; Paris, 1987; cf. Aijmer, 2002; Tobin, 1995 on English restrictive particles). Paris (1987) recognized that 就 (*jiù*) vs. 才 (*cái*) are comparable to many such pairs in English (“just” vs. “only”), French, Dutch, German, Spanish, etc.

The study demonstrates that the three Mandarin restrictive markers originate from a distinct semantic core, contributing to differentials in their discourse distributions and expressions of discourse/pragmatic nuances.

Building on Tobin’s (1995) notion of “semantic integrality” (Tobin, 1995), the study shows that the three Mandarin particles feature three distinct representations of restricted situations, vis-à-vis the backdrop of a “spatio-temporal-existential cline.” Specifically, *jiù*’s restrictive meaning is external to the situation; external factors render the situation insufficient in some way without intrinsic relation to the situation itself, (i.e., a situation of and for itself). 才(*cái*)’s marking of restrictivity situates the situation with a backdrop of a temporal cline (i.e., a discrete entity, which expects more intrinsic entities in the situation’s normal/expected temporal progression). 只 (*zhǐ*) is most similar to the commonsensical notion of “only” evoking a sense of negation, presupposing other entities expected of the situation. These expected entities, nevertheless, are not due to potential temporal development of the situation (i.e., various “isolated items on discontinuous spatio-temporal-existential cline”).

The study concludes that, time, albeit metaphorically spatial, is also linear, restricting its semantic extension. The study thus challenges and adds complexity to the spatial-temporal image schemata proposed in cognitive linguistics (cf. Langacker, 1986).