

2 The role of intonation in functional sentence perspective

Intonation carries meaning – it signals different degrees of communicative importance of language units and different attitudes of the speaker. English and Czech intonation will be discussed in this study in close relation to the FSP theory developed by Firbas (1980, 1985, 1987, 1990 and 1992) and supplemented by Svoboda (1981, 1987 and 1989). This chapter gives a brief survey of the concepts and principles of FSP that are of major importance for the present analysis. It will focus on the operation of FSP, first in written communication and later in spoken communication. It is in spoken communication that intonation can assert itself as a factor of FSP. The survey will mostly refer to Firbas's book *Functional sentence perspective in written and spoken communication* (Firbas 1992) because it provides an extensive summary of the FSP theory as adopted by the 'Brno School'.

2.1 The sentence as a field of distribution of degrees of communicative dynamism

Firbas views a sentence as a field of distribution of degrees of communicative dynamism (CD) over the sentence elements. According to Firbas (1992: 7), communicative dynamism "is an inherent quality of communication and manifests itself in constant development towards the attainment of a communicative goal; in other words, towards the fulfilment of a communicative purpose. Participating in this development, a linguistic element assumes some position in it and in accordance with this position displays a degree of communicative dynamism." Firbas (1992: 8) defines the degree of communicative dynamism as "the relative extent to which a linguistic element contributes towards the further communication." The degree of CD of an element (relative to the degrees of CD of the other elements within the same sentence) is determined by the interplay of FSP factors. At the level of written language, it is determined by the linear modification factor, the semantic factor, and the contextual factor. In spoken language, the interplay of FSP factors is joined by intonation.

2.2 The non-prosodic factors of FSP

2.2.1 The linear modification factor

The non-prosodic factors of FSP are hierarchically ordered. The lowest in rank is the linear modification factor. Linear modification operates within the system of FSP and, at the same time, within the system of word order. It is one of the FSP factors co-determining the degrees of CD of the elements of a sentence and it is one of the word-order principles (referred to by Firbas 1992: 118, 120, 128 as the FSP-linearity principle) co-determining the actual position of the elements in a sentence. Bolinger, in his paper 'Linear modification' (1952: 1125), claims that "gradation of position creates gradation of meaning when there are no interfering factors". According to Firbas (personal communication), the theory of FSP interprets the gradation of meaning as an essential property of the development of the communication. In developing the communication, the meanings continually move closer to the high point of the communication. In gradually moving closer to this point, which signals the completion of the message and

in this way fulfils the language user's communicative purpose, the meanings gradually gain in communicative value (cf. Firbas 1992: 105) in regard to the development of the communication. In doing so, they differ in the extent to which they contribute towards the further development (the dynamics) of the communication. They show different degrees of communicative dynamism (CD).

All Indo-European languages display a strong tendency to allow linear modification to assert itself, though not to the same extent. If fully implemented, linear modification induces the sentence elements to show a gradual rise in CD in the direction from the beginning of the sentence to the end. Firbas (1992: 10) refers to such an arrangement as the basic distribution of CD. In terms of word order principles, linear modification operates as the FSP linearity principle. In Czech, the FSP linearity principle has become the leading principle of word order. The word order location with the most dynamic element in the final position, i.e. the objective word order, is perceived as unmarked; the subjective word order with the most dynamic element at the beginning of a sentence is perceived as marked (emotionally or otherwise). In English, the leading word order principle is the grammatical principle; an English sentence first has to satisfy the requirements of ordering individual sentence elements in accordance with their syntactic functions (subject – verb – complement – object – adverbial). Under certain conditions, observation of the grammatical principle is impossible without violating the FSP linearity principle; if the highest degree of CD within the distributional field of a sentence is carried by the subject, then the sentence will start with the most dynamic element. The occurrence of the most dynamic element at the beginning of a sentence is not perceived as marked in English. Marked word order in English is that which deviates from the requirement of the leading, i.e. the grammatical, principle (cf. Firbas 1992: 122). The examples below demonstrate the difference between Czech and English in regard to the operation of the linear modification factor. Both sentences are unmarked. The most dynamic element in the English sentence, the subject *An elderly woman*, occurs in the initial position; its equivalent in the Czech sentence, *starší paní*, occupies the final position.

[15]

There was a knock at the door. An elderly woman entered the room.

[16]

Ozvalo se zaklepání. Do pokoje vstoupila starší paní.

[Sounded (refl.) a-knock. Into the-room entered an-elderly woman.]

2.2.2 The contextual factor

The most powerful factor of FSP, superior to both the linear modification factor and the semantic factor, is the contextual factor. Context is a very complex phenomenon closely related to the concepts of given (old, context-dependent) information and new (context-independent) information. Firbas (1992: 21–40) introduces the concept of the immediately relevant verbal and situational context and the concepts of retrievability and irretrievability from the immediately relevant context. These concepts are of major importance for FSP theory because they play an important role in the process of the distribution of degrees of CD over the sentence elements. The immediately relevant context is a very narrow conception of context; it represents only a fraction of the en-

tire verbal context and the situational context accompanying it, which are embedded within a still larger context of human knowledge and experience.

Questions concerning the complexity of context and context dependence have been discussed extensively in linguistics and different scholars have different views of phenomena related to context. Firbas's conception of given and new information is narrower than Chafe's (1976, 1994, and 1996) conception, for instance. Chafe's criterion for assessing the status of a piece of information as given or new is based on the assumption of the speaker about whether or not the information is active in the listener's consciousness.⁴ Firbas's criterion is the actual presence of the information in the immediately relevant (i) verbal and/or (ii) situational context. A piece of information is old, context-dependent, or retrievable only if it is expressed in the relevant verbal context (i.e. if it was mentioned in the preceding text within the retrievability span; see Firbas 1995), or if its referent is actually present in the situational context. As to the immediately relevant verbal context, according to Firbas (1992: 23–31, 1995: 17–45), the retrievability span is usually not longer than approximately six to eight sentences; this is usually the stretch of text after which an element becomes irretrievable if not re-expressed. The element then remains present in the wider verbal context extending beyond the immediately relevant context. The entire preceding verbal context is naturally one of the sources of knowledge shared by the speaker and the listener. Firbas's study of co-referential strings (i.e. sequences of co-referential elements in a communication) suggests that co-referential elements are usually not separated from each other by more than three sentences (three distributional fields; cf. Firbas 1995: 39). An inquiry into the hierarchy of activation in the process of natural language understanding carried out by Hajičová and Vrbová (1982) does not seem to be in disagreement with Firbas's observation concerning members of co-referential strings. Firbas's concept of context dependence and Sgall, Hajičová, and Panevová's (1986) concept of contextual boundness are closely related, even if Firbas's concept is much narrower. A contextually bound element is not always retrievable from the immediately relevant context; if a contextually bound element is 'activated' at a moment when it is no longer retrievable from the immediately relevant context, it is identified by Firbas as context independent. It will be demonstrated later that context independence and thematicity are not mutually exclusive categories in Firbas's theory of FSP. Below are examples of context dependent and context-independent elements.

[17]

Na dálnici D1 došlo k vážné dopravní nehodě.

[On motorway D1 came about a-serious traffic accident.]

[18]

A serious accident happened on the D1 motorway.

All elements of [17] and [18] above are context-independent: the sentences represent an introduction to an item from a news broadcast; at the moment of their utterance, none of the elements can be retrieved from the immediately relevant verbal context, and neither can they be retrieved from the immediately relevant situational context. The information

4 He considers given ideas as *active* and new ideas as *inactive*. In addition to given and new ideas, he distinguishes 'accessible' ideas, which are *semi-active* (Chafe 1994).

represented by 'D1 motorway' is part of the general experiential context shared by the speaker (the TV or radio announcer) and the community of listeners for whom the news is being broadcast. It is, however, irretrievable from the immediately relevant context just as are the other elements in the sentence because at the moment of the opening of the utterance there is no signal of what the news is going to be about. The listener expects that something has happened or is going to happen, but does not know where and what. Though the elements of the sentence do not differ in regard to context dependence, they carry different degrees of CD. The semantic factor defines *serious accident, k vážné dopravní nehodě* i.e. what happened, as being more dynamic than *on the D1 motorway, na dálnici D1*, i.e. where the accident happened (cf. Firbas 1992: 59–65). This distribution of CD is further supported by word order in the Czech sentence: the elements are arranged in accordance with a gradual rise in CD, which is the result of the operation of the FSP linearity principle. In the English sentence, the FSP linearity principle does not assert itself, because the grammatical principle plays a more dominant role.

[19]

[Mary went downtown.] She bought a present for her daughter.

Sentence [19] above contains both context-dependent and context independent elements. The element *she* is context-dependent because it can be retrieved from the immediately relevant context provided by the preceding text. The elements *bought, a present* and *for her daughter* are context-independent because they cannot be retrieved from the immediately relevant context. The element *For her daughter* is heterogeneous in regard to context dependence: it contains a context-dependent pronoun *her*, related to *she/Mary*, and context-independent elements *for* and *daughter*; in the narrow conception of retrievability within Firbas's FSP theory, *for her daughter* is interpreted as context-independent because the unit as a whole cannot be retrieved from the immediately relevant context.

[20]

[Is he going by bus or by train? -] He's going by train.

In sentence [20] above, all elements except *by train* are context-dependent because they were mentioned in the preceding text. The element *by train* was also mentioned and therefore a part of the information it carries is also context-dependent. The act of selecting *by train* from the two options, however, is not retrievable from the immediately relevant context, since the context does not indicate in advance which choice will be made. Owing to the dominant irretrievable character of the 'outcome of a selection', the element expressing it operates as if it were entirely context-independent (cf. Firbas 1995: 22–3).

Sentences [17]/[18], [19] and [20] above differ in their contextual conditioning. They are examples of a semantic and syntactic sentence structure at two different instance levels (see Firbas 1979: 45, Firbas 1992: 111, 164):

(i) the basic instance level: all elements are context independent and the degrees of CD are determined by the interplay of the semantic factor and the linear modification factor (sentence [17]/[18])

(ii) the ordinary instance level: one or more elements are context-dependent, other elements are context-independent; the degrees of CD are determined by the interplay of all three factors (sentence [19])

An extreme type of ordinary instance level is illustrated by sentence [20]. With the exception of two features, this sentence conveys context-dependent information: *by train* conveys an additional piece of irretrievable information, i.e. the outcome of a selection; and the temporal and modal exponents of the verb establish a link between the context dependent and context-independent information. This link is a piece of irretrievable information *sui generis* (see Firbas 1992: 90).

2.2.3 *The semantic factor*

In the hierarchy of FSP factors, the semantic factor stands between the linear modification factor and the contextual factor. The degree of CD of an element is co-determined by its semantic character and the character of its semantic relations to other elements. Firbas has analyzed the semantic content of the verb and its semantic relations to the other sentence elements and has made (1992: 41–87) the following observations concerning the distribution of degrees of CD over the elements. The formal signals of temporal and modal indication within the finite verb, i.e. the temporal and modal exponents of the verb (=TMEs), convey a medium degree of CD, irrespective of the position of the verb in a sentence, unless context (the dominant factor) determines the CD distribution otherwise. The degree of CD of the notional component of the verb (which is a separate communicative unit, see below) depends on the semantic relations within the sentence. In the absence of successful competitors to the verb (i.e. more dynamic elements), the notional component of the verb completes the development of the communication within the distributional field, e.g.

[21]

And then he left.

[22]

A pak odešel.

[And then he-left.]

In the presence of a successful competitor in the form of a more dynamic context-independent element, the notional component of the verb carries a medium degree of CD, higher than the TMEs, but lower than the degree carried by the competitor. In examples [23] and [24], for instance, the message is completed by a successful competitor – an adverbial phrase specifying the time of departure.

[23]

He left at five o'clock.

[24]

Odešel v pět hodin.

[He-left at five o'clock.]

With respect to different dynamic semantic functions of the verb, Firbas (1992: 66–87) distinguishes two types of dynamic semantic scales: the presentation scale and the quality scale. In each sentence, the notional component of the verb performs either the function of presenting a phenomenon or the function of expressing the quality of a quality bearer. In the presentation scale, the verb ‘perspectives’⁵ the communication towards the phenomenon presented by the subject. In the quality scale, it

⁵ A term consistently applied by Firbas in this connection in his later works.

perspectives communication towards the quality ascribed to the subject or beyond this quality towards its specification. The expressions 'presentation' and 'quality' have to be understood in the widest sense of the word; most verbs are capable of performing two functions and may occur in either of the semantic scales. In sentences containing a copula or a copula-like verb (e.g. feel, seem, etc.), the copula or the copula-like verb is classified as an element ascribing a quality (AofQ) to the quality bearer; the quality itself (Q) is then expressed by a non-verbal element. The two dynamic semantic scales are represented by two different sets of dynamic functions (based on Firbas 1992: 66–87):

The presentation scale:

Setting – Presentation of Phenomenon – Phenomenon Presented

(Set) (Pr) (Ph)

The quality scale:

Setting – Bearer of Quality – Ascription of Quality – Quality – Specification – Further Specification

(Set) (B) (AofQ) (Q) (Sp) (FSp)

A modified type of presentation scale, containing Sp in addition to Set, Pr, and Ph, is presented in Chamonikolasová and Adam (2005).

The items of the two sets are arranged in accordance with a gradual rise in CD from the beginning to the end of the sentence; the scales represent the interpretative, not the actual linear, arrangement of elements and their functions. The actual linear arrangement may coincide with the interpretative arrangement as in examples [25], [27] and [28], or it may deviate from it as in examples [26], [29] and [30]. Boundaries between elements performing the different dynamic semantic functions are marked with a vertical line.

[25]

Na obzoru	se objevil	mrak.
Set	Pr	Ph

[On the-horizon (refl.) appeared a-cloud.]

[26]

A cloud	appeared	on the horizon.
Ph	Pr	Set

[27]

Letos	Brownovi	strávili	dovolenou	ve Španělsku.
Set	B	Q	Sp	FSp

[This-year the-Browns spent their-holidays in Spain.]

[28]

This year	the Browns	spent	their holidays	in Spain.
Set	B	Q	Sp	FSp

[29]

Tom	dnes ráno	uzavřel	smlouvu	s holandskou společností.
B	Set	Q	Sp	FSp

[Tom this morning made a-contract with a-Dutch company.]

[30]

Tom	made	a contract	with a Dutch company	this morning.
B	Q	Sp	FSp	Set

The examples above contain the full sets of dynamic semantic functions that can occur in a sentence (except AofQ which is only realized by copulas). Some of the functions, however may be left unimplemented. The sentences below do not contain any elements which would perform the functions of a setting or that of a further specification.

[31]

Father	arrived.
Ph	Pr

[32]

Mary	is watching	TV.
B	Q	Sp

According to Firbas (1992: 42-3), the presentation scale and the quality scale may be combined into one. Below is the interpretative arrangement of the combined scale in its full realization (with AofQ omitted).

Set - Pr - Ph - B - Q - Sp - FSp

Some of the elements of the combined scale may be ellipled or may fuse. The sentence below is an example of the ellipsis of Pr and the fusion of Ph and B. (The quality bearer is ascribed a quality without having been introduced into the context as a phenomenon occurring on the scene.)

[33]

V roce 1620	skupina puritánů	odplula	do Ameriky	v lodi zvané Mayflower.
Set	B	Q	Sp	FSp

[In 1620 a-group of-Puritans set-sail for America in a-ship called The Mayflower.]

In a modified conception of dynamic semantic scales presented in Chamonikolasová (2005), sentences with fused Ph and B and ellipled Pr are dealt with as representations of the quality scale; this type of the combined scale does not differ structurally from the regular quality scale. Another type of combined scale, represented by sentences with fused Ph and B, and ellipled Q (not ellipled Pr), is regarded as an 'extended presentation scale'.

Examples [15], [18], [26], [30], [31] above, in which the actual linear order of elements and the interpretative order (which reflects a gradual rise in CD) do not coincide, demonstrate the superiority of the semantic factor to the linear modification factor. An element performing a more dynamic function carries a higher degree of CD than an element performing a less dynamic function even if in actual linear order, the less dynamic element is closer to the end of the sentence.

2.3 Communicative units

Within the distributional field of a sentence (simple or complex), communicative dynamism is distributed over the sentence elements. According to Svoboda (1968: 49-101) and Firbas (1992: 67-87), the syntactic sentence constituents serve as communicative

units carrying different degrees of CD. Each syntactic sentence constituent (whether expressed by one word or a whole clause) corresponds to one communicative unit, except for the predicative verb, which splits into two communicative units. The categorial modal exponents of the finite verb invariably fulfil the function of transition proper (Firbas 1992: 71–3, 89–93). Transition proper carries a medium degree of CD in relation to the rest of the communicative units in the same distributional field; units carrying a lower degree of CD form the thematic part of the sentence and units carrying a higher degree of CD form, together with the transition proper, the non-thematic part of the sentence. The function of the notional component of the verb is determined by the interplay of factors of FSP as either non-thematic, or (less frequently) thematic (see below).

2.3.1 *Thematic units*

Within the communicative field of a sentence, thematic units provide a foundation for the message to be completed in the sentence. The foundation may be expressed by one or more elements of the following types:

- (i) context-dependent B-elements
- (ii) context-dependent Set-elements
- (iii) context-independent Set-elements
- (iv) context-independent B-elements
- (v) any other elements that are context-dependent and in consequence have had their dynamic semantic status reduced to that of a setting.

According to Svoboda (1981: 5–6 and 1983: 49–85) and Firbas (1992: 80–81), the thematic elements perform different functions. In fully implemented themes, the least dynamic foundation-laying elements perform the function of theme proper (ThPr); the most dynamic elements within the thematic sphere of the sentence perform the function of diatheme (DTh). Theme-proper *oriented* elements and diatheme-*oriented* elements rank between ThPr and DTh. In this study, the differences between themes proper and theme-proper oriented themes, and diathemes and diatheme-oriented themes will not be taken into consideration, and all thematic elements will be classified as either theme proper or as diatheme. Theme-proper oriented themes are included in the group of themes proper, diatheme-oriented themes in the group of diathemes. The function of ThPr is expressed by context-dependent elements which are firmly established in the thematic layer of the utterance, i.e. have already occurred in a thematic function in the immediately relevant context. The function of the diatheme is performed by context-dependent elements which were only introduced in the immediately relevant context as non-thematic elements and have not yet performed a thematic function and by all foundation-laying context-independent elements.

2.3.2 *Transitional units*

Transitional units (see Firbas 1992: 69–79) belong to the non-thematic part of the communicative field of the sentence. This part builds up the message upon the foundation provided by the theme. It consists of the transition and the rheme. In the former an important role is played by the categorial exponents of the verb – those of tense, mood, person, number, and polarity (positive or negative) – which have come to be regarded

as one communicative unit. It is especially through the exponents of tense and mood (TMEs) that all categorial exponents begin constructing the core upon the foundation and in this way provide a link between the theme and the non-theme. Performing this function, they act as transition proper (TrPr). They do so invariably. Apart from this function, the categorial exponents can simultaneously display thematic or rhematic functions.⁶ The most dynamic element of the transitional sphere is the transition (Tr), which is expressed by the notional component of the verb or (less frequently) a nominal part of the predicate. The notional component of the verb is less stable in regard to the performance of communicative functions than the TMEs; under certain conditions, the notional component of the verb leaves the transitional sphere and completes the message as the most dynamic element of the distributional field (cf. [21] and [22] in section 2.2.3). In special cases, the nominal component of the verb performs a thematic function. In addition to TrPr and Tr, the transitional sphere contains transition proper oriented elements⁷ which, through their temporal and/or modal features, come close to the TMEs. Transition proper oriented elements are especially adverbials of indefinite time and sentence adverbs. In this study, transition proper oriented elements and transitions proper will be treated as one group referred to as TrPr.

The transitional sphere of the communicative field is provided by the following elements (cf. Firbas 1992: 72):

- (i) the TMEs of the verb
- (ii) non-verbal elements expressing temporal and modal features similar to TMEs
- (iii) AofQ-elements (copulas and copula-like expressions)
- (iv) Q-elements in the presence of Sp-elements
- (v) Pr-elements

Elements belonging to categories (i) and (ii) perform the function of TrPr; elements of categories (iv) and (v) perform the function of Tr; elements of category (iii) perform both functions (TrPr and Tr).

2.3.3 *Rhematic units*

Rhematic units exceed the transitional units in their degrees of CD. The most dynamic element of the rhematic sphere and of the whole distributional field of a sentence is the rheme proper (RhPr). Any elements carrying a higher degree of CD than Tr and a lower degree than RhPr are denoted as rheme (Rh). Through the interplay of FSP factors, an element can become rhematic if it conveys entirely irretrievable information or if in addition to retrievable information, it contains irretrievable information that predominates.⁸ The rhematic sphere of the distributional field is provided by the following elements:

6 For a detailed treatment of the multifunctional character of the verbal categorial exponents see Firbas 1992: 70–1, 88–93, 100.

7 The concept of the transition proper oriented elements, which was introduced by Svoboda, is discussed in greater detail in Firbas 1992: 79.

8 Different types of additional predominating irretrievable information are discussed in Firbas 1995: 22–3. For instance, a personal pronoun, which normally conveys retrievable information, can

- (i) Ph-elements
- (ii) Q-elements in the absence of Sp-elements
- (iii) Sp-elements
- (iv) FSp-elements

The common feature of all rhematic units is context independence. In this respect, the rhematic sphere differs from the thematic sphere, which contains both context dependent and context independent elements. Context dependent elements always belong to the thematic sphere of the sentence; context-independent elements may belong to any of the three spheres of the sentence – they may be rhematic, transitional, or thematic.

2.3.4 The hierarchy of communicative units and the scale of dynamic semantic functions

The interpretative arrangement of the thematic and non-thematic (transitional and rhematic) communicative units – starting from the unit carrying the lowest degree of CD – is the following.

ThPr – DTh – TrPr – Tr – Rh – RhPr

The thematic and non-thematic functions need not all be implemented within one sentence. Two of them, however, must always be present: the function of RhPr and of TrPr (see Svoboda 1983: 80, Firbas 1992: 93). In most sentences, the starting point of the message (understood in terms of the interpretative arrangement) is a thematic element, irrespective of its actual position. In the absence of any thematic element, the starting point is provided by TrPr. The high point of the message is provided by RhPr, an element which completes the message of a sentence and which has to be present in all communicative fields (at least those that are perceived as complete).

The examples below illustrate the hierarchy of communicative units and the correlation between the scale of thematic and non-thematic functions and the scale of dynamic semantic functions (cf. section 2.2.3). Communicative units conveying context-dependent information are indicated as *D*, units conveying context-independent information as *I*.

[34]

Last night	John	went out	with Alice.
Set	B	Q	Sp
DTh	DTh	TrPr+Tr	RhPr
I	I	I	I

[35]

He	would have preferred	to be with Maggie
B	Q	Sp
ThPr	TrPr+Tr	RhPr
D	I	I

become irretrievable and rhematic if, under particular conditions, it is contrasted with another element.

[36]

but	Maggie	didn't want to go	because she wanted to watch the Davis Cup on TV.
	B	Q	Sp
TrPr	DTh	TrPr+Tr	RhPr
	D	I	I

[37]

She	is	a big tennis fan
B	AofQ	Q
ThPr	TrPr+Tr	RhPr
D	I	I

[38]

and	she	never misses	any opportunity to see an interesting match.
	B	Q	Sp
TrPr	ThPr	TrPr+Tr	RhPr
	D	I	I

[39]

Alice	doesn't care	about sports.
B	Q	Set
DTh	TrPr+RhPr	DTh
D	I	D

[40]

She	likes	pubs and discos
B	Q	Sp
ThPr	TrPr+Tr	RhPr
D	I	I

[41]

and	she	would never stay	at home	when she could go out with friends.
	B	Q	Sp	FSp
TrPr	ThPr	TrPr+Tr	Rh	RhPr
	D	I	I	I

Notes on the interpretations of the sentences:

[34]:

Sentence [34] is the opening of a passage and therefore all its elements are context-independent. If the sentence were a reaction to e.g. *Well, tell me what happened to John last night*, the elements *Last night* and *John* in [34] would be interpreted as context-dependent (D).

[36], [38] and [41]:

The conjunctions *but* and *and* perform the function of a hyper-clausal transition proper or hyper-clausal transition proper oriented transition (cf. Svoboda 1989: 117). They provide a link between two coordinate clauses of a compound sentence.

[39]:

The information conveyed by the element *about sports* is in regard to the immediately relevant context heterogeneous: it is partly irretrievable ('sports in general' have not been mentioned) and partly retrievable (a particular kind of sport has been discussed).

The retrievable feature seems to be dominant and the element is therefore interpreted as context-dependent. It performs the function of a subject-object diathematic setting (cf. Svoboda 1981: 79–86). The notional component of the verb *care* (*about*) completes the message and performs the function of RhPr.

2.4 The prosodic factor of FSP

The preceding sections have illustrated the role of the non-prosodic factors of FSP in the distribution of communicative dynamism over the communicative units of a sentence. Studies in intonation mentioned in Chapter 1 (Cruttenden 1986, O'Connor and Arnold 1973, Crystal 1969, Palková 1994, Daneš 1957, Dokulil 1986, Krčmová 1995, and Firbas 1972 and 1992) suggest that there is a close relationship between the degrees of communicative dynamism (communicative importance) and degrees of prosodic prominence. Firbas (1992: 143–214, 1985 and 1987) studied the relationship between the distribution of degrees of communicative dynamism (CD) as determined by the non-prosodic FSP factors and the distribution of degrees of prosodic prominence (PP). In general, he distinguishes three types of relationship between the CD distribution as determined by the non-prosodic factors of FSP (the non-prosodic distribution of CD) and the distribution of PP:

- (i) perfect correspondence
- (ii) selective non-reevaluating intensification
- (iii) re-evaluating intensification.

In perfect correspondence (i), intonation reflects the distribution of degrees of CD as determined by the non-prosodic FSP factors. Perfect correspondence includes cases of *non-selective*, non-reevaluating prosodic intensification (see Firbas 1992: 154–156) consisting in the use of a marked tune. The intensification affects the neutral relationship between the non-prosodic CD distribution and the PP distribution, but it does not produce a deviation from their perfect correspondence. It does, however, produce a rise in CD. In fact, all types of prosodic intensification do so (see Firbas 1992: 155, 157, 160–1). Conveying the speaker's attitudinal commentary on the utterance (cf. Daneš 1987: 19–20), prosodic intensification offers information *sui generis*, which naturally participates in the development of the communication and hence additionally raises the degrees of CD (Firbas 1992: 147). *Selective* non-reevaluating intensification (ii) and re-evaluating intensification (iii) represent deviations from the perfect correspondence between the two distributions. The selective *non-reevaluating* intensification (ii) does not affect the theme-rheme relationship: an element determined by the non-prosodic CD distribution as thematic is prosodically intensified but remains within the thematic sphere of the distributional field. Under *re-evaluating* intensification (iii), an element determined by the non-prosodic CD distribution as non-rhematic receives the most prominent accent within the distributional field (i.e. comes to bear the intonation centre) and becomes rhematic. Another element within the same distributional field – determined by the non-prosodic distribution as rhematic – appears in a post-intonation centre prosodic shade and is re-evaluated to a thematic element.

The three types are illustrated by examples [42] (O'Connor and Arnold 1973: 275), [43] (LLC: S.1.6.: tone unit no. 599) and [44] (O'Connor and Arnold 1973: 275) below.

The examples are accompanied by an indication of the distribution of CD as determined by the interplay of the non-prosodic FSP factors (first line) and the distribution of CD as determined by the interplay of non-prosodic and prosodic FSP factors (second line). The marks “\” and “√” denote nuclei, “ ’ ” accented stress (head stress), and “ _ ” denotes unaccented stress.

(i) perfect correspondence:

[42]

[But didn't you say your father was teaching her? - He was.]

But	he	'couldn't 'stand	the \pace.
	B	Q	Sp
	ThPr	TrPr+Tr	RhPr
	ThPr	TrPr+Tr	RhPr

(ii) non-reevaluating intensification:

[43]

[but Joseph comes along]

and	\he	'smokes	like a \chimney.
	B	Q	Sp
	ThPr	TrPr+Tr	RhPr
	DTh	TrPr+Tr	RhPr

(iii) re-evaluating intensification:

[44]

[You mean she really does drive too fast?]

\I'	I say	she _does!
B	Q	Sp
ThPr	TrPr+Tr	RhPr
RhPr	TrPr+Tr	DTh

In sentence [42], the distribution of degrees of PP corresponds to the distribution of CD as determined by the non-prosodic factors. The least dynamic element *he* is unstressed. The predicative verb *couldn't stand* carries a higher degree of CD (because it is a context-independent quality of *he*) and a higher degree of PP (an accented stress). The specification of the quality *the pace*, which according to the non-prosodic factors of FSP carries the highest degree of CD, is also the most prominent element prosodically. Its prominence is signalled by the nucleus.

According to the non-prosodic factors of FSP, the interpretative arrangement of the communicative units in sentence [43], starting from the one carrying the lowest degree of CD, is 1. *he* (Bearer of quality), 2. *smokes* (Quality), 3. *like a chimney* (Specification). In a perfect correspondence between the non-prosodic CD distribution and the PP distribution, (as in [42]), the communicative units would carry the following degrees of PP: 1. absence of stress or unaccented stress, 2. accented stress, 3. nucleus. Such perfect correspondence is impaired in [43] by the intensification of the bearer of quality *he*. *He* carries a nucleus and is thus prosodically more prominent than the quality element *smokes*. This intensification is non-reevaluating because it does not reverse the theme-rheme relation within the sentence. The nucleus on the specification *like a chimney* is more prominent than the nucleus on the context-dependent element *he*. The element *like a chimney* carries a higher degree of PP and a higher degree of CD as

determined by the non-prosodic FSP factors and in consequence performs the function of RhPr. The intensified quality bearer *he* remains within the thematic sphere of the sentence. Compared to the unstressed quality bearer functioning as ThPr in [42] (*he*), the intensified quality bearer in [43] (*✓he*) carries a higher degree of CD and performs the function of DTh.

The intensification in [44] produces a stronger deviation from the perfect correspondence between the non-prosodic CD distribution and the PP distribution than the intensification in [43]. It affects the theme-rheme relationship within the sentence. The quality bearer *I* displays the only nucleus and hence the most prominent prosodic feature within the distributional field of [44] and is re-evaluated from a thematic unit (a unit determined by the non-prosodic FSP factors as ThPr) into a rhematic unit (a unit determined by the interplay of all FSP factors as RhPr). The specification *she does* is re-evaluated from a rhematic unit (determined non-prosodically as RhPr) into a thematic unit (determined by the interplay of all FSP factors as DTh). As a result of prosodic intensification, the sentence is emotively marked. The emotive attitude to the content of the sentence is irretrievable from the immediately relevant context and it is the expression of this irretrievable piece of attitudinal information that enables the otherwise dynamically weak element to become the RhPr of the sentence (cf. Firbas 1992: 159–172).