Firbas, Jan

Thoughts on functional sentence perspective, intonation and emotiveness. Part two

Brno studies in English. 1987, vol. 17, iss. 1, pp. [9]-49

THOUGHTS ON FUNCTIONAL SENTENCE PERSPECTIVE, INTONATION AND EMOTIVENESS

Part Two

Jan Firbas

The present paper is the sequel to a study bearing the same name published in the previous volume of *Brno studies in English* (Firbas 1985). Its main purpose is to offer an analysis of a continuous stretch of conversation. Lack of space made it impossible to include such an analysis in the previous study.

Like the previous study, the present paper analyzes the material offered in phonetic transcription with tonetic marks by G. F. Arnold and Olive M. Tooley in their reader *Say it with rhythm 3* (Longman, London 1972). The passage analyzed is to be found there on pp. 34—39. It has been chosen at random and is presented here in the normal spelling but with tonetic marks. (Thanks are due both to the publishers and to the authors for permitting to reprint and use the passage indicated.)

The principles of analysis have been discussed in the previous study and in other papers of mine. I shall therefore refrain from going over all the problems previously dealt with in these publications, which contain definitions of the concepts used in the framework of my inquiries into FSP. I have to beg the interested but uninitiated reader to refer at least to the previous study (Firbas 1985) and perhaps also to Firbas 1979, 1981, 1983 and 1986. Of immediate relevance to the inquiry into the relation between FSP and intonation are, apart from the previous study, for instance Firbas 1972, 1975 and 1980.

The organization of the present paper is the following. The dialogue to be analyzed is first presented below in the normal spelling. On pages 19—33 it is reprinted, but provided with tonetic marks and an FSP analysis. Additional explanations are occasionally offered in footnotes. Before studying the analysis, the reader will find it useful to consult the explanations of the symbols and other conventions used (see pp. 12—18). To facilitate a better understanding of the analysis, some of the relevant findings discussed in detail in previous writings are recalled. The paper closes with summarizing evaluations of the results of the analysis. The evaluations are accompanied by a number of tables.

ANALYSIS OF A DIALOGUE

JOAN:	(1) Mum!
	(2) We're back.
SIMON:	(3) Yes, and we've had a marvellous day.
	(4) I played an electric guitar.
	(5) I've got a fine sense of rhythm, the man in the shop said.
FRANK:	(6) What he actually said was, 'A remarkable sense of rhythm'.
SIMON:	(7) It's the same thing.
FRANK:	(8) Not necessarily.
	(9) And anyway . . .
JOAN:	(10) Oh, stop squabbling, you two,
	(11) and let's tell Mum about our day out.
	(12) D'you know, Mum?
	(13) I lost all the money.
MRS. BROWN:	(14) You what, Joan?
	(15) But with your money, and Simon's, and the lunch money, that was more than . . .
JOAN:	(16) Yes, I know how much it was.
	(17) Only too well.
	(18) That's why I felt so awful about it.
	(19) And I'd got Frank's money, too.
FRANK:	(20) Yes, it was a nasty shock for all of us, Aunt Anne.
	(21) We hadn't got enough money for lunch.
MRS. BROWN:	(22) Still, you all seem very cheerful about it now.
	(23) This must be some kind of joke.
SIMON:	(24) Oh, it was no joke.
	(25) Not having enough money for lunch.
JOAN:	(26) Then Marjorie said she'd pay for the lunch.
	(27) She'd got enough for that.
	(28) You see hers wasn't mixed up with ours.
MRS. BROWN:	(29) Then I shall have to pay Marjorie back.
	(30) But Joan, how did you lose the money?
	(31) What happened?
JOAN:	(32) Well, you see, I sneezed.
MRS. BROWN:	(33) Joan, do have a bit of sense.
	(34) You can't lose money by sneezing.
SIMON:	(35) Joan can.
	(36) Clever girl, my sister.
JOAN:	(37) Well, we were in Oxford Street, near Selfridges.
	(38) I felt a sneeze coming on.
	(39) So I opened my bag quickly,

	(40)	and pulled out a hanky.
	(41)	I must have pulled out my notecase with it.
FRANK:	(42)	And none of us noticed.
	(43)	We were too busy watching Joan's performance.
SIMON:	(44)	Yes, she sneezed hundreds of times.
	(45)	Lots of people stopped to watch.
MRS. BROWN:	(46)	Well, when did you discover you'd lost the notecase?
JOAN:	(47)	Not till a bit later.
	(48)	Inside the shop.
FRANK:	(49)	In fact we'd just chosen Robert's beer mug,
	(50)	and Joan went to get out the money for it.
SIMON:	(51)	But no money!
	(52)	So no money, no beer mug.
	(53)	But we did have lunch.
MRS. BROWN:	(54)	Right.
	(55)	So you hadn't got any money,
	(56)	and you abandoned Robert's present.
	(57)	Then, you tell me, you went off to gorge yourselves at Marjorie's expense.
	(58)	I cant't believe a silly tale like that.
FRANK:	(59)	Oh, it's perfectly true, Aunt Anne, so far.
JOAN:	(60)	Anyway, to cut a long story short, we went to the police.
	(61)	And what d'you think?
	(62)	Whoever'd picked up the notecase had handed it in.
SIMON:	(63)	With all the money in it, too.
MRS. BROWN:	(64)	So there are still some honest people about, thank goodness.
	(65)	You were lucky.
JOAN:	(66)	Yes, and that's not the end of it.
	(67)	Near the police station we saw an antique supermarket.
	(68)	We went in,
	(69)	and found just the beer mug we wanted for Robert.
FRANK:	(70)	Much nicer than the one we nearly bought in Oxford Street.
	(71)	And not so expensive as those in the street market.
SIMON:	(72)	And if we hadn't been to the police station we wouldn't have seen the antique supermarket.
MRS. BROWN:	(73)	So all's well that ends well.
	(74)	Are you going to show me the beer mug?
FRANK:	(75)	Yes, here it is, Aunt Anne.
SIMON:	(76)	Frank!
	(77)	Quick!
	(78)	Robert's coming.
	(79)	He mustn't see it yet.
JOAN:	(80)	No, no.
	(81)	Of course Robert mustn't see it yet.
	(82)	His present's still in the future.

COMMENTS ON SYMBOLS AND OTHER CONVENTIONS USED IN THE ANALYSIS

1. DISTRIBUTIONAL FIELDS

Sentences are regarded as fields of syntactic relations, at the same time serving as distributional fields of communicative dynamism (CD) and distributional fields of prosodic weight.

Elements performing the syntactic functions of subject, predicative verb, subject complement, object, object complement and adverbial constitute communicative units at the level of FSP. On account of the special role performed by the TMEs (the temporal and modal exponents of the finite verb) in FSP, the finite verb is interpreted as two communicative units in the present analysis, one constituted by the notional component of the finite verb, the other by its TMEs. This is a simplification which does not deal exhaustively with the FSP functions of the categorial exponents of the finite verb. For instance, an element serving as a TME can simultaneously serve as a PNE (exponent of person and number) and be co-referential with the subject. (This fact is not explicitly indicated in the analysis.) The simplification, however, does not distort the outcome of the interplay of FSP factors determining the distribution of the degrees of CD.

Subordinate clauses, semi-clauses (structures containing expanded non-finite verb forms) and attribute constructions constitute communicative units, at the same time providing distributional subfields with communicative units of their own. There is a hierarchy of distributional fields, the basic distributional field (superordinate to all other possible fields) being constituted by a separate verbal (simple or complex) or a separate verbless sentence structure.

In the text, the basic distributional fields are preceded by Arabic numerals. In the analysis beneath the text, the interpretations of the subfields provided by clauses or semi-clauses are enclosed within brackets. In order not to make the analysis too complicated, I have refrained from adding interpretations of subfields provided by non-clausal attributive structures. These subfields, however, are dealt with summarily on pp. 17—18.

2. FUNCTIONS IN FSP

The functions of the communicative units in the distributional fields are indicated by abbreviations placed beneath the units. The following abbreviations are used: Th/eme/, Tr/ansition/ Pr/oper/, Tr/ansition/ and Rh/eme/. With short initial or short medial units, the abbreviations as a rule coincide with the beginnings of the units; with longer initial, medial or final units, with their ends.

For the purpose of the present analysis, Theme Proper, Diatheme and Rheme Proper are not indicated by special abbreviations. Nevertheless, in a majority of cases, the diatheme, and with consistency, the rheme proper, are indicated by the two-digit numeral notation as explained below.

Because of the special character of the function of transition proper, the abbreviation TrPr is consistently used throughout the analysis. As has been ex-

plained in greater detail elsewhere (Firbas 1981.49—51; 1986.52), this function consists first and foremost in starting to build up the core of the information to be conveyed upon a foundation, i.e. the information provided by the thematic elements. It provides a link (and at the same time a boundary) between the foundation (the theme) and the core (non-theme). It is usually performed by the TMEs (temporal and modal components of the finite verb). It is the essential purpose of a distributional field to establish a link between these two types of information.

The core of the information to be conveyed is always expressed, but not necessarily the foundation upon which it is to be built up. The latter can be substituted for by its referent in the extralingual reality. If not implemented by the TMEs, the link can be indicated by ellipsis or by intonation. (This function of intonation is partly parallelled in the written language by sentence-initial capitalization and the stops, especially the full stop. This does not merely signal the end of the field, but together with sentence-initial capitalization effects a unity of the elements occurring between them.) A distributional field can be themeless, but is never rhemeless nor without transition proper. (It need not contain any other transitional element.) A rhemeless distributional field is not a distributional field in the proper sense of the term. It can be regarded merely as an unfinished or truncated distributional field.

If not implemented by the TMEs, the function of transition proper is indicated in the analysis by the abbreviation 'TrPr' placed in square brackets:[TrPr]; cf. 1, 8 and 10.

Parallel to the abbreviations, the FSP functions are also indicated by two-digit numerals added as superscripts to the abbreviations, e.g. Th^{10}, Rh^{32}. Numerals beginning in 1, 2 and 3 indicate thematic, transitional and rhematic elements, respectively. If only one thematic, one transitional or one rhematic element is present in the distributional field, the numerals 10, 20 or 30 are respectively used. In the presence of further thematic, transitional or rhematic elements, the numerals 11, 12..., 21, 22... or 31, 32... are employed in accordance with the rising degrees of CD.

The highest number within the rheme indicates rheme proper. If only one rhematic element (indicated by the superscript 30) is present, it is this element that takes over the rheme proper function. Similarly, if more thematic elements than one are present, the element having the highest thematic number serves as the diatheme. However, if there is only one thematic element (indicated by the superscript 10), it can — depending on contextual conditions — serve either as theme proper or diatheme (cf. Svoboda 1983.79 and Firbas 1985.20, note[13]). In such cases, the superscript does not indicate which of the two thematic functions is performed. The diathemes resulting from re-evaluating prosodic intensification, however, are all duly marked (cf. e.g. field 16 on p. 21).

Within distributional subfields provided by subordinate clauses, the FSP functions are indicated in the same way. An interpretation applying to a subfield is enclosed within round brackets and the function of the subfield as a unit within a superordinate fields is indicated by an abbreviation placed after the closing bracket.

3. DEGREES OF PROSODIC WEIGHT

The degrees of prosodic weight were discussed in detail in the previous study (Firbas 1985). Let me therefore again recall only the most relevant points.

O'Connor and Arnold's interpretation of the English system of intonation and their system of tonetic notation (O'Connor and Arnold 1973) allows of the following conclusions. In the first place, the very configuration of prosodic features within what may be termed a tone-unit suggests the hierarchy of prosodic weight: the section constituted by the head and the nucleus is prosodically weightier than the sections serving as pre-head and tail. Within the head, and in consequence within the entire tone-unit, the weightiest feature is the nucleus. On the other hand, the lightest feature, occurring both outside and inside the head, is represented by absence of stress. In line with the prominence on the head and the nucleus, O'Connor and Arnold regard the stress inside the head as well as the nucleus as accented, and the stress occurring in the pre-head and tail as unaccented (O'Connor and Arnold 1973.31−6). All this suggests at least four degrees of prosodic weight: (i) absence of stress (occurring on unstressed syllables inside and ouside the head), (ii) stress not combined with accent (occurring on stressed syllables in the pre-head and the tail), (iii) stress combined with accent occurring inside the head, (iv) nucleus.

It is assumed that not only at the level of the written language, but also at that of the spoken language linear modification manifest itself. It is assumed that prosodic features of the same rank (i, ii, iii or iv) gain in prosodic weight in the direction from the beginning to the end of the distributional field. (An important modification of this observation will be adduced below.) This means an expansion of the gamut of the degrees of prosodic weight.

I take it that the reader is acquainted with O'Connor and Arnold's system of tonetic notation. I shall, however, at least mention the features most relevant to the present analysis. The following symbols (numbered by me) occur in the text.

1. ₒm, 2. 'm, 3. ₁m, 4. ˇm, 5. ₊m, 6. ⌄m, 7. ˋm, 8. ^m,

9. ⌐m, 10. ´m, 11. ˅m, 12. ˃m, 13. ¯m, 14. |m.

Let me also remind the reader that (i) absence of stress is left unmarked. (ii) Stressed syllables occurring within the pre-head or within the tail are preceded by a small circle (see No. 1). (iii) The first syllable of the head, which is regarded as accented, is marked by one of the following symbols: No. 2, indicating a high head; No. 3, indicating a low head; No. 4, indicating a falling head; No. 5, indicating a rising head. The other stressed syllables within the head, which are equally regarded as accented, are marked by a small circle (see No. 1). It follows that they are marked in the same way as the stressed syllables within the pre-head and the tail. It must be remembered, however, that as they occur within the head, i.e. between the first stressed syllable of the head and the nucleus, they are to be regarded as accented. (iv) A nucleus is marked by one of the following symbols: No. 6, indicating a low fall; No. 7, a high fall; No. 8, rise-fall; No. 9, low rise; No. 10, high rise; No. 11, fall-rise; No. 12, mid-level. In this way the four basic degrees of prosodic weight are indicated in O'Connor and Arnold's system of tonetic notation. It should be added that symbol No. 13 indicates a high pre-head; it does not, however, indicate stress. For a more detailed explanation of the significance of the symbols adduced, the reader is referred to O'Connor and Arnold 1973. It should also be added that in the text a vertical stroke (see No. 14) indicates the end of one tone-unit, and the beginning of another. The capital letter of the first word of a sentence

and the full stop may be taken to indicate the beginning and the end of a tone-unit, respectively. The vertical stroke is not used in these cases.

As a distributional field of prosodic weight, the sentence may coincide with a tone-unit, but not necessarily so, for it may contain more than one tone-units. It follows that a sentence may have more than one nucleus. Recalling what has been said about linear modification also manifesting itself at the level of spoken language, I consider the nucleus that follows weightier than the one that precedes; see, for instance, 37, 62 and 67.

Under special modifying conditions, this observation ceases to be valid. There is one modification that is of particular importance: it has been known for some time that a low rise after a fall does not exceed the latter in prosodic weight (cf. Firbas, e.g., 1980.126; but also, e.g. Halliday 1970.38; O'Connor and Arnold 1973.82). Though occurring last, such a low rise will not signal a rheme; cf. 33, 34 and 75. I agree with Chamonikolasová (1985.52), who in the gamut of prosodic weight places such a low rise between the stress combined with accent and the (unspecified) nucleus.

Further, but only minor, modifications have been established (Firbas 1972.86; 1980.130; 1985.19) and others, equally minor in character, can be expected to be found necessary in the future, but the extent to which the basic unmodified observation is valid is undoubtedly very great.

4. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NON-PROSODIC DISTRIBUTION OF CD AND THE DISTRIBUTION OF PROSODIC WEIGHT

The relationship between the distribution of degrees of CD brought about by the interplay of the non-prosodic factors of FSP and the distribution of prosodic weight is either perfect or reflects prosodic intensification, which is either non-re-evaluating or re-evaluating. It is against the background of perfect relationship between the two kinds of distribution that prosodic intensification is determined. In the analysis, the type of relationship shown by the distributional field is indicated in capitals placed after the interpretation of the FSP functions performed by the communicative units. The following indicators are used: PERF. CORR., O.V. INT., N.-R. INT., R. INT., REC. DESH. If in brackets, the indicators concern a distributional subfield. (The interpretation of the FSP functions performed by the communicative units of a subfield is likewise presented in brackets.)

PERF. CORR. stands for 'perfect correspondence' and indicates perfect correspondence between the distribution of degrees of CD brought about by the interplay of non-prosodic factors of FSP and the distribution of prosodic weight. Perfect correspondence is reflected in the degrees of prosodic weight indicated by the tonetic notation tallying with the degrees of CD indicated by the numerals. For a more detailed discussion, see Firbas 1985.14−20.

It should be born in mind that the weightiest prosodic feature of a communicative unit is regarded as representative in regard to the weightiest (and therefore equally representative) features of the other units within the distributional field; for instance, the representative prosodic features of the communicative units (which in fact serve as distributional subfields) *some kind of joke* of 23, *a sneeze coming on* of 38 and *What he actually said* of 6 are respectively the high fall on *joke*, the high fall on *sneeze* and fall-rise on *actually*.

Another point worth mentioning is the relationship between the prosodic weight and CD in the case of a word of complex semantic content. Such

a word is heterogeneous in regard to CD and can perform more than one FSP function. The prosodic feature borne by such a word is associated with the degree of CD carried by it on account of its most dynamic semantic component; for instance, *said* of 6 bears tail stress (i.e. stress occurring on an element placed in the tail) on account of its notional component, associated with the transitional function assessed at 22; it does not do so on account of its TMEs, performing the function of transition proper assessed at 21.

OV. INT. stands for 'overall intensification' and indicates prosodic intensification that raises the degrees of prosodic weight of all the communicative units of a distributional field in an even way, preserving the perfect correspondence between the non-prosodic distribution of CD and that of prosodic weight. At the level of the spoken language, overall prosodic intensification proportionally raises the degrees of CD carried by the communicative units; cf. 13 and 14. For a more detailed discussion, see Firbas 1985.21–2.

N.-R. INT. stands for 'non-re-evaluating intensification' and indicates prosodic intensification that raises the degrees of prosodic weight of a non-rhematic element, causing an absence of perfect correspondence between the non-prosodic distribution of CD and that of prosodic weight within the non-rhematic section of the distributional field. The prosodic intensification raises the CD of the element concerned, but does not lead to a re-evaluation of the FSP functions of the other communicative units. See, for instance, 5, where the thematic *the man in the shop* exceeds the transitional *said* in prosodic weight, but not in CD, *said* remaining transitional. The relationship between the non-prosodic distribution of CD and that of prosodic weight within the rhematic sphere remains perfect. In consequence, the theme-rheme relationship is not affected by the intensification. For a more detailed discussion, see Firbas 1985.22–4.

R. INT. stands for 're-evaluating intensification' and indicates prosodic intensification that is reflected by an absence of correspondence between degrees of prosodic weight and degrees of CD within the sphere signalled by the interplay of the non-prosodic factors of FSP as rhematic. The absence of correspondence is highly functional. It lends strong emotional colouring to the information conveyed by the distributional field. This emotional colouring is so strong as to effect a prosodic re-evaluation of the outcome of the interplay of the non-prosodic FSP factors. The re-evaluation, however, does not obliterate the outcome of the interplay, but is rather superimposed on it, conveying additional information. In the analysis, sentences showing R. INT. are accompanied with two interpretations, the first presenting the outcome of the interplay of the non-prosodic FSP factors and the second the prosodic re-evaluation; see, for instance, 16, 22 and 33. For a more detailed discussion, see Firbas 1985.25–35.

REC. DESH. stands for 'recapitulatory deshading' and indicates the placement of the intonation centre on a final element that, strictly speaking, conveys context-dependent information and should therefore occur in the post-intonation-centre prosodic shade. In essence, the effect produced is not really emotive, but primarily serves some other purpose, for instance, that of a summarizing statement; see, for example, 25 and 56. For a more detailed discussion, see Firbas 1985.36–8.

5. ABSENCE OR PRESENCE OF POST-INTONATION-CENTRE PROSODIC SHADE

The following symbols serve to indicate the absence or the presence of the post-intonation-centre prosodic shade: 0, 1, 2, 3, 1 + 2; 0_D, 0_d; 0_1, 0_2, 0_3. A special purpose is served by the symbol X (see below).

It should be remembered that the intonation centre (IC) is the prosodically weightiest feature within a distributional field. The elements placed after it in the distributional field occur in the post-IC prosodic shade. (Cf. Firbas 1980.)

Symbol 0.   This indicates absence of post-IC prosodic shade; its absence reflects the interplay of the non-prosodic factors of FSP, the communicative unit in end-position carrying the highest degree/s/ of CD.

Symbol 1.   This indicates presence of post-IC prosodic shade; its presence reflects the interplay of the non-prosodic factors of FSP, which places the communicative unit/s/ in the shade on account of its (their) context dependence.

Symbol 2.   This indicates presence of post-IC prosodic shade; its presence reflects·the interplay of the non-prosodic factors of FSP, which places the communicative unit/s/ in the shade on account of its (their) semantic character.

Symbol 3.   This indicates presence of post-IC prosodic shade; its presence is due to the re-evaluating prosodic intensification of the interplay of the non-prosodic features of FSP.

Symbol 1+2.   This indicates presence of post-IC prosodic shade; its presence reflects the interplay of the non-prosodic factors of FSP, which places the communicative units in the shade partly because of their context dependence and partly because of their semantic character.

Symbol 0_D.   This indicates absence of post-IC prosodic shade; its absence is due to emotive or recapitulatory deshading affecting an entire unit of a basic distributional field.

Symbol 0_d.   This indicates absence of post-IC prosodic shade; its absence is due to emotive or recapitulatory deshading affecting a final communicative unit within a distributional subfield.

Symbol 0_1.   This indicates presence of post-IC prosodic shade that arises in a subfield provided by a communicative unit occurring terminally in a superordinate distributional field; its presence is due to the context dependence of the shaded element/s/.

Symbol 0_2.   This indicates presence of post-IC prosodic shade that arises in a subfield provided by a communicative unit occurring terminally in a superordinate distributional field; its presence is due to the semantic character of the shaded element/s/.

Symbol 0_3.   This indicates presence of post-IC prosodic shade that arises in a subfield provided by a communicative unit occurring terminally in a superordinate distributional field; its presence is due to re-evaluating prosodic intensification of the interplay of the non-prosodic FSP factors within the subfield.

Let me add a general remark concerning a final subfield. The nucleus serving as its IC has a twofold aspect: it is the weightiest prosodic feature within the final subfield, as well as the weightiest prosodic feature within the entire superordinate field.

Symbol X.   This indicates an uncompleted or truncated distributional field.

6. ATTRIBUTIVE CONSTRUCTIONS

As has been shown, the weightiest prosodic feature of a subfield performs the representative function and is borne by the element carrying the highest degree of CD within the subfield. A parallel observation applies to a semi-clause. The attributive construction, on the other hand, requires special comment. The weightiest prosodic feature of such a construction performs the representative function as well, but is not necessarily borne by the element carrying the highest

degree of CD. Let me comment at least on attributive constructions in which the attributive (qualifying) elements are non-clausal.

First, a note on the semantic relationship between the headword and its attribute (qualifying element) from the viewpoint of the communication. Provided both the headword and the attribute are context-independent, the following observation applies. Ascribing a quality to a phenomenon conveyed by the headword, the attribute takes the development of the' communication a step further than the headword (Svoboda 1968). The ascription of quality is consummated by expressing the quality to be ascribed. Under the conditions stipulated, the attribute carries a higher degree of CD than the headword. This holds good irrespective of sentence position and even irrespective of the location of the weightiest prosodic feature, which under the conditions stipulated appears on the last element of the attributive structure, cf. *an electric guitar* of 4 and *a fine sense of rhythm* of 5. The weightier prosodic feature performs the representative function, but does not necessarily fall on the bearer of the highest degree of CD within the attributive construction.

Other contextual conditioning presents a different picture. If the headword is context-dependent (cf. *a remarkable sense of rhythm* of 6) or — owing to re-evaluating prosodic intensification — is presented as such (cf. *a marvellous day* of 3), the weightiest prosodic feature not only performs the representative function, but also falls on the bearer of the highest degree of CD. A different location of the weightiest feature would blur the interplay of the non-prosodic and the prosodic factors of FSP. An element that is context-dependent or presented as such on account of emotive re-evaluation cannot bear the weightiest prosodic feature.

Similarly, the weightiest prosodic feature cannot be borne by a context-dependent attributive element; cf. *my* and *Joan's* in *my notecase* and *Joan's performance* of 41 and 43, respectively. In *It was my notecase, not Joan's, my* and *Joan's* would, of course, be regarded as context-independent on account of the contrast they convey.

(1) $^\vee$<u>Mum</u>!

$[_{TrPr}{}^{20}]^\vee\underline{Rh}{}^{30}$ **PERF. CORR., 0**

(2) We're $^\vee$<u>back</u>.

$Th^{10'}Tr^{22}\text{-}TrPr^{21}$ $^\vee\underline{Rh}{}^{30}$ **PERF. CORR., 0**

(3)* Yes,   we've   had   a $^\backslash$<u>marvellous</u> <u>day</u>.

$TrPr^{21}$ $Th^{10'}TrPr^{21}$ $TrPr^{21}\text{-}Tr^{22}$ $^\backslash\underline{Rh}{}^{30}$

                                                 PERF. CORR., 0₃

(4) I $^|$played   an e$^\circ$lectric gui$^\backslash$tar.

Th^{10} $^|Tr^{22}\text{-}TrPr^{21}$ $^\circ{}^\backslash\underline{Rh}{}^{30}$ **PERF. CORR., 0**

(5) I've   got   a $^|$fine sense of $^\backslash$rhythm,

$(Th^{10'}TrPr^{21}$ $Tr^{22}\text{-}TrPr^{21}$ $^{|\!|}\underline{Rh}{}^{30})$ $^{|\!|}\underline{Rh}{}^{30}$

the $_\circ$man in the $_\circ$shop   said.

                $_{\circ\circ}Th^{10}$ $Tr^{22}\text{-}TrPr^{21}$ **N.-R. INT., 2**

(6)* What   he $^\vee$actually $_\circ$said$^|$

$(Th^{13}\text{-}TrPr^{21}\text{-}QFocAnt^{31}$ Th^{11} $^\vee\underline{Rh}{}^{32}$ $_\circ Th^{12}\text{-}TrPr^{21}$ $Th^{10})^|$

was, $^\iota$A$^\backslash$re<u>markable</u> <u>sense</u> of <u>rhythm</u>'.

$Tr^{22}\text{-}TrPr^{21}$ $^\backslash{}_{\circ\circ}\underline{Rh}{}^{30}$ **N.-R. INT., 0₁**

                                                   PERF. CORR., 1

An asterisk appended to the number of the distributional field refers to a note relating to the interpretation and placed at the bottom of the page.

Note on 3. Close to the predicative function performed by the TMEs at the syntactic level and to their function of starting the core-constituting process at the FSP level come the functions of the conjunctions and those of various attitudinal sentence adverbs. In a majority of cases, these elements are to be regarded as TrPr-oriented. In the analysis, they have been tentatively interpreted as $TrPr^{21}$ or $TrPr^{22}$ elements. In 3, the adverb *yes* co-conveys the positive polarity expressed by the TMEs. To a certain extent, the problems touched upon here are connected with the problems raised by so-called loose elements (cf. Chamonikolasová 1987 97—105). The same interpretation applies to the cases of *yes* in 16, 20 and 75. But cf. notes on 44 and 66.

Note on 6. The correspondence between the distribution of CD as determined by the non-prosodic factors of FSP and the distribution of prosodic weight within the subordinate clause has been interpreted as perfect. This is not quite exact, because the prosodic weight of *what*, which is regarded as heterogeneous in respect of the degrees of CD, does not correspond to the degrees of CD carried by it on account of its functioning as a question focus anticipator. But as has been discussed in another place, the semantic character of *what* is such as to ensure a practically constant interpretation of its FSP functions irrespective of prosodic weight. (Firbas 1976.35—6.) With due alterations, the same applies to *why* of 18.

(7) ⁻It's   the ˈsame thing.

   $-Th^{10}Tr^{22}-TrPr^{21}$ | $\underline{Rh}^{30}$ N.-R. INT., 0

(8) ⁻Not   ˇnecessarily.

   $[TrPr^{20}]^{-}NegFocAnt^{31}$ $\check{}\underline{Rh}^{32}$ PERF. CORR., 0

(9) And ˋanyway...

         $\diagdown TrPr^{20}$ N.-R. INT., X

(10)* Oh,   ˈstop   ˋsquabbling, ₒyou ₒtwo, |

   $TrPr^{21}$ $|Tr^{22}-TrPr^{21}-Th^{11}$ $\diagdown\underline{Rh}^{30}$ $_{\infty}Th^{12}$ |

                 PERF. CORR., 2

(11) and ˈlet's   tell ˃Mum | aˈbout our day ˋout.

   $|TrPr^{21}{}^{,}Th^{10}$ Tr^{22} $>Rh^{31}|$ $|\diagdown\underline{Rh}^{32}$

                 N.-R. INT., 0

(12) ⁻D'you   know, ₒMum?

   $\neg TrPr^{20}{}^{,}Th^{11}$ $\underline{Rh}^{30}$ $_{\circ}Th^{12}$ PERF. CORR., 1

(13) ⁻I   ₍lost   ₒall the ˋmoney.

   $-Th^{10}$ $_{,}Tr^{22}-TrPr^{21}$ $_{\circ}\diagdown\underline{Rh}^{30}$ PERF. CORR., OV. INT., 0

(14) ⁻You   what,   ₒJoan?

   $-Th^{11}$ $TrPr^{20}-Rh^{30}$ $_{\circ}Th^{12}$ PERF. CORR., OV. INT., 1

Note on 10. ⁻Not constituting a separate verbless sentence (cf. 1), the vocatives are regarded here as thematic. For a discussion of the heterogeneity of the imperative form of the verb, see Firbas 1982.103—4.

(15) But with _your ᵒmoney,| and _Simen's,| and the _lunch

ᵒmoney| that was _more than| ...

$TrPr^{20}$ _ᵒ|_|_ᵒ|↗Th   N.-R. INT., X

(16)* Yes, ˅I̲   know   how ₒmuch it was.

$TrPr^{21}$ Th^{10} Tr^{22}-$TrPr^{21}$ (Rh^{30} Th^{11} Tr^{22}-$TrPr^{21}$) Rh^{30}

$TrPr^{20}$ ˅R̲h̲^{30} Th^{11}-TrPr ^{20} ₒTh^{12}

                                        R. INT., 3

                                     (PERF. CORR., 0)

(17) |Only ᵒtoo ˋwe̲l̲l̲.

[$TrPr^{20}$] |ᵒˋR̲h̲^{30} PERF. CORR., 0

(18) |That's   why   I   ᵒfelt

|Th$^{10'}$ Tr^{22}-$TrPr^{21}$ (Th^{13}-TrPr^{22}-QFocAnt^{31} Th^{11} ᵒTr^{22}-$TrPr^{21}$

so˖a̲w̲f̲u̲l̲ aₒbout it.

      ˋR̲h̲^{30} ₒTh^{12}) ᵒˋₒR̲h̲^{30} N.-R. INT., 0₁

                                     (PERF. CORR., 0)

(19)* And I'd   got   ˋFrank's ₒmoney,| ˋtoo.

    Th$^{10'}$$TrPr^{21}$ Tr^{22}-$TrPr^{21}$ ˋₒ|ˋR̲h̲^{30}

                                     PERF. CORR., 0

(20) Yes, it was   a |nasty ᵒshock f̲o̲r̲ ˋa̲l̲l̲ ̲o̲f̲ ̲u̲s̲,

    $TrPr^{21}$ Th^{11} Tr^{22}-$TrPr^{21}$ |ᵒR̲h̲^{31} ˋR̲h̲^{32}

Aunt ₒAnne.

    ₒTh^{12} PERF. CORR., 1

Note on 16. Mrs. Brown is interrupted by Joan, who says that (i) she is in the know and (ii) can give the total amount of the money lost. These two pieces of information can be regarded as irretrievable. *I*, on the other hand, conveys a piece of information that is well established in the preceding context and hence undoubtedly thematic. The IC on *I* is therefore evidently re-evaluating. It makes *I* convey additional information emphasizing that Joan indeed is the very person in the know (cf. 17) and that there is in fact no need to speak to her about the amount of money lost. As borne out by 18, the emphasis also has a strong apologetic aspect: being in possession of such unpleasant knowledge makes Joan feel awful (cf. 18). All the additional information that *I* is induced to convey is, of course, irretrievable.

Note on 19. *Too* is regarded here as part of the rheme, intensifying its meaning by emphasizing that even the person named was involved. Note the parallelism of the two high falls. (See also the note on 63.)

(21)* ‾We ˌhadn't got enˠough ˠmoney

    —Th^{10} ˌTrPr^{21}-NegFocAnt^{31} Tr^{22}-TrPr^{21} ∞Rh^{31}

fǫr ＼lunch.

   ＼Rh^{32} N.-B. INT., 0

(22) ＼Still,| you ˌall seem ˠvery ˠcheerful about it ˌnow.

    TrPr^{22}| Th^{11} Th^{13} Tr^{23}-TrPr^{21} Rh^{30} Th^{12} Th^{14}

   ＼Rh^{32} | Th^{11} ˌTh^{13} Th^{14}-TrPr^{20} ∞Th^{15} Th^{12} ˌRh^{31}

                                          R. INT., 3

(23) This ˈmust be ˠsome kind of ＼joke.

    Th^{10} ˈTrPr^{22} Tr^{23}-TrPr^{21} ˠ＼Rh^{30}

                                       N.-B. INT., 0

(24)* Oh, it was ˅no ˅joke.

    TrPr^{20} Th^{11} Tr^{22}-TrPr^{21} ˅＼Rh^{30}

                                    PERF. CORR., 0$_3$

(25)* ˅Not having enough ˠmoney fǫr ˅lunch.

   ˇNegFocAnt^{31} Tr^{22}-TrPr^{21} ˠRh^{32} ˅Rh^{33}

                                PERF. CORR., REC. DESH., 0$_D$

Note on 21. The thematic *we*, bearing a high pre-head, is prosodically weightier than the unstressed transitional *got*. This relationship, causing non-re-evaluating prosodic intensification, together with the long jump emphasizes the shocking result of Joan's misfortune.

Note on 24. From the point of view of the interplay of non-prosodic FSP factors, *it* and *joke* convey retrievable information. The irretrievable, and simultaneously most important, piece of information is the negation conveyed by the determiner *no*. In unmarked use, this would be reflected by placing the context-dependent headword *joke* in the post-IC prosodic shade. (On the other hand, if context-independent, *joke* would have to bear the IC in unmarked use; cf. Palmer and Blandford 1969.77) Under the circumstances, the deshading of *joke* is marked. It effectively underlines Simon's protest and his disagreement with Mrs. Brown's appraisal of the situation. In a similar way, *enough money for lunch*, which is retrievable from 21, becomes deshaded as well. — The deshading of *joke* takes place within the attributive construction, which serves as a distributional subfield; hence the interpretation 'PERF. CORR., 0$_3$'.

Note on 25. From the point of view of the interplay of the non-prosodic FSP factors, the entire structure (a semi-clause that has acquired the status of a separate sentence) expresses retrievable information (cf. the information conveyed by 21). In non-emotive use, it would not acquire sentence status, remaining a sentence constituent forestalled by an anticipatory *it* and only qualifying for a place in the post-IC shade; cf. *It wasn't a joke not having enough money for lunch*, with a high fall on *wasn't* and a low rise on *lunch*. Its emotive deshading is in keeping with Simon's vehement protest. — 25 can be regarded as an element loosened in the sense of Chamonikolasová's discussion in the present volume (Chamonikolasová 1987).

(26)* Then | Marjorie said ＼she'd ₀pay

Th^{11} Th^{12} $Tr^{22}-TrPr^{21}$ $(Th^{11'}TrPr^{21}$ $Rh^{30}-TrPr^{21}$

Th^{11} $|Th^{12}$ $Tr^{22}-TrPr^{21}$ $(\searrow \underline{Rh}^{30'}TrPr^{20}$ $_{0}Th^{12}-TrPr^{20}$

for the ₀lunch.

$Th^{12})$ Rh^{30}

$_{0}Th^{11})\searrow Rh^{30}$

<u>N.-R. INT., 0_3</u>

(R. INT. 3)

(27)* She'd ＼got enough <u>for</u> ˅<u>that</u>.

$Th^{11'}TrPr^{21}$ Tr^{22} Rh^{30} Th^{13}

$Th^{11'}TrPr^{21}$ $\searrow Tr^{22}$ Rh^{31} $^{V}Rh^{32}$

<u>R. INT., DESH., 0_D</u>

(28) You see | hers wasn't <u>mixed</u> ＼<u>up</u>

$(Th^{10}$ $Rh^{30}-TrPr^{20})TrPr^{22}$ $|Th^{11}$ $TrPr^{21}-NegFocAnt^{31}$ $\searrow TrPr^{21}-Rh^{32}$

with ₀ours.

$_{0}Th^{12}$

<u>N.-R. INT., 1</u>

(29) Then I shall | have to pay ₀Marjorie ＼back.

Th^{12} Th^{11} $TrPr^{21}$ $|TrPr^{22}$ Rh^{30} $_{0}Th^{13}$ $\searrow Rh^{30}$

<u>N.-R. INT., 0</u>

Note on 26. *Pay for the lunch* of 26 could be interpreted as conveying the same piece of information as *having enough money for lunch* of 25 and therefore as context-dependent. This could account for its occurrence in the post-IC shade of 26. Strictly speaking, however, 'having' and 'paying' do not mean the same thing, the latter specifying the way the money was actually used. In this sense, *pay* conveys irretrievable information. If respecting the context-independence of *pay* and treating *she* as fully retrievable and hence context-dependent, the speaker would have to place the IC on *pay*. But by placing it on *she*, he makes the latter convey an additional new piece of information, irretrievable even through association: she expresses the choice of one person to the exclusion of others. Under these circumstances, the distributional subfield constituted by the sub-clause presenting the reported speech undergoes re-evaluating prosodic intensification.

Note on 27. The notions of 'Marjorie' (expressed by *she*), 'possession' (*got*), 'sufficiency' (*enough*) and 'the purpose of lunch' (*for that*) are all retrievable. It must be borne in mind that 27 forms part of reported speech. The immediately relevant context in which the words originally occurred is not identical with that into which they have now been transferred. In the original immediately relevant context it was the notion of 'insufficiency' (*enough*) that conveyed the most important piece of information and therefore qualified for bearing the IC. This interpretation is re-evaluated by prosodic intensification, which induces the field to convey an additional piece of information: a forceful assertion of the availability of the money for the very purpose in hand, i.e. for that of having lunch (note the nucleus on *that*).

(30)* But `Joan,| `how did you ₒlose the ₒmoney?

TrPr^{20} `$\text{Th}^{12}$ | `$\underline{\text{Rh}}^{30}\text{-TrPr}^{20}$ TrPr^{20} Th^{11} ₒTh^{13} ₒTh^{14}

N.-R. INT., 1+2

(31) What `happened?

$\text{Th}^{10}\text{-TrPr}^{20}\text{-QFocAnt}^{31}$ `$\underline{\text{Rh}}^{32}\text{-TrPr}^{20}$

PERF. CORR., 0

(32) `Well, you ₒsee, | I `sneezed.

`$\text{TrPr}^{22}$ ($\text{Th}^{10}$ ₒ$\text{Rh}^{30}\text{-TrPr}^{20}$) ₒ$\text{TrPr}^{22}$| $\text{Th}^{10}$ `$\underline{\text{Rh}}^{30}\text{-TrPr}^{21}$

PERF. CORR., 0

(33) Joan, `do have a ₒbit of ₋sense.

Th^{12} TrPr^{22} $\text{Tr}^{23}\text{-TrPr}^{21}$ Rh^{30}

Th^{12} `$\underline{\text{Rh}}^{30}$ $\text{Th}^{13}\text{-TrPr}^{20}$ ₒTh^{14}

R. INT., 3

(34)* You `can't lose ₒmoney| by ₋sneezing.

Th^{11} `$\underline{\text{Rh}}^{30}\text{-TrPr}^{20}$ Th^{12} ₒTh^{13} | ₋Th^{14}

PERF. CORR., 1

(35)* ˅Joan ₀can.

Th^{10} $\text{Rh}^{30}\text{-TrPr}^{20}$

˅$\underline{\text{Rh}}^{30}$ ₒ$\text{Th}^{10}\text{-TrPr}^{20}$

R. INT., 3

(36) |Clever `girl,| my ₋sister.

[TrPr^{20}] |`$\underline{\text{Rh}}^{30}$ | ₋Th^{10}

PERF. CORR., 1

Note on 30. The field has been interpreted as showing non-re-evaluating prosodic intensification because the transitional *did* bears less prosodic weight than the thematic *Joan* and the thematic elements *lose* and *the money*.

Note on 34. The sentence shows perfect correspondence between the distribution of degrees of CD and prosodic weight. The notions of 'loss', 'money' and 'sneezing' occur in the post IC-shade on account of their context dependence. Nevertheless, the intonation pattern proportionally raises the degrees of CD by inducing the sentence to carry the additional attitudinal meaning of incredulity and surprise. The pause also plays its part in throwing emphasis on *by sneezing*.

Note on 35. Both the notion of 'Joan' and that of 'ability' are retrievable. Owing to the interplay of non-prosodic FSP factors, the only rhematic piece of information is therefore the mere counter-assertion, conveyed by *can*. The re-evaluating prosodic intensification of *Joan* is in keeping with the speaker's taunting his sister, which is also reflected by the remark conveyed by 36.

(37) Well,　we　　were　　　　in　`Oxford　ₒStreet,|
TrPr^{21}　Th^{10}　$\text{Tr}^{22}\text{-TrPr}^{21}$　　　　　　　`ₒRh^{31} |

near　`Selfridges.
　　　`Rh^{32}　　　　　　　　　　　　PERF. CORR., 0

(38)　I　　|felt　　　a `sneeze　　　coming ₒon.
　　Th^{10}　$\text{Tr}^{22}\text{-TrPr}^{21}$　(`Rh$^{30}$　　ₒTh$^{10}$-TrPr$^{20}$)`ₒRh^{30}
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　PERF. CORR., 0₂
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(PERF. CORR., 2)

(39)　So　　I　　|opened　　my ₒbag　>quickly,|
　.TrPr^{21}　Th^{10}　|Tr^{22}-TrPr^{21}　ₒRh^{31}　>Rh^{32} |　PERF. CORR., 0

(40)　and　|pulled out　a `hanky.
　　|Tr^{22}-TrPr^{21}　`Rh^{30}　　　　　PERF. CORR., 0

(41)*　I　`must　have　ₒpulled　out　my　ᵛnotecase|
　　Th^{11}　TrPr^{22}　TrPr^{21}　Th^{12}-TrPr^{21}　　　Rh^{30} |
　　Th^{11}　`TrPr^{22}　TrPr^{21}　ₒTh^{12}-TrPr^{21}　　　ᵛRh^{31} |

　`with it.
　　Th^{13}
　　`Rh^{32}　　　　　　　　　　　　R.-INT., DESH., 0_D

(42)　And　|none of us　`noticed.
　　|Th^{10}-NegFoc Ant^{31}　`Rh^{32}-TrPr^{20}　　　PERF. CORR., 0

Note on 41. The elements *I, pulled out* and *it* (pronominalizing *hanky* of 40) convey retrievable, *must* and *notecase* irretrievable information. Such information, however, is also conveyed by the preposition *with:* the possibility of Joan's having unwillingly pulled out her handkerchief and her notecase at the same time. On account of their relational character, prepositions normally recede into the background and bear little prosodic weight. But if their prosodic weight is intensified, the meaning conveyed by them becomes effectively foregrounded. This accounts for the IC on *with* — in other words, for the deshading of *with*, which emphasizes the notion of simultaneity.

(43)* We were |too busy °watching °Joan's per`formance.

Th^{10} Tr^{22}-$TrPr^{21}$ |Tr^{23} (°Tr^{22}-$TrPr^{21}$ °\$\underline{Rh}^{30}$) °°\$Rh^{30}$

(44)* \Yes, |she sneezed hundreds of °times.

\$TrPr^{22}$ |Th^{11} Th^{12}-$TrPr^{21}$ °\$\underline{Rh}^{30}$ N.-R. INT., 0

(45) |Lots of >people| |stopped to \watch.

|>Th^{10} | |Tr^{22}-$TrPr^{21}$ \$\underline{Rh}^{30}$ N.-R. INT., 0

(46) Well, |when did you dis\cover

$TrPr^{22}$ |Th^{12}-$TrPr^{22}$-$QFocAnt^{31}$ $TrPr^{21}$ Th^{11} \$\underline{Rh}^{30}$

you'd °lost the °notecase?

(Th^{10'} $TrPr^{21}$ °Tr^{22}-$TrPr^{21}$ °Rh^{30}) °°Th^{12} PERF. CORR., 1

(47) |Not till a bit \later.

[$TrPr^{20}$] |$NegFocAnt^{31}$ \Rh^{32} PERF. CORR., 0

(48)* In\side the °shop.

[$TrPr^{20}$] \$\underline{Rh}^{30}$ °Th^{10} PERF. CORR., 0₃

Note on 43. Joan's performance refers to Joan's sneezing described by Joan herself in the immediately preceding section of the conversation (37–41). It conveys retrievable information and on this account does not qualify for bearing IC, but should be placed in the post-IC shade. Its deshading gives the sentence the character of a summarizing statement, simultaneously emphasizing a kind of contrast: not Joan's sneezing, but her dropping the notecase should have been noticed by the young people.

Note on 44. Like *yes* of 3 and those of 16, 20 and 75, which are all unstressed, *yes* of 44, which is a nucleus bearer, also conveys the positive polarity expressed by the TMEs and is tentatively interpreted as TrPr-oriented. But unlike them, is shows prosodic intensification, underlining the positive polarity, which is in keeping with the lexical intensification reflected by *hundreds of times*. These intensifications are set off by the context-dependent *she* and the context-dependent notional component of the finite verb, *sneez-*. (Cf. notes on 3 and 66.)

Note on 48. The notion of 'shop' is connected with the shopping area explicitly mentioned in 37. The shop itself, however, has not been explicitly identified. It may have been Selfridges, the department store mentioned in 37, but just as well another place close to it. In any case, the question arises whether the notion of the shop the party had gone into occurs within the retrievability span. 48 is preceded by a stretch of context that reports on what occured in the street. Seen in this light, the notion of 'shop' is irretrievable, which permits the IC to occur on the element *shop*. Under the same conditions, the absence of the IC from *shop* leads to deshading. In this way the locational specification is thrown into relief, and the contrast between the street and the inside of the shop is lent more emphasis. (Cf. the comment on the prosodic weight of the preposition in the Note on 41.) The subscript 3 is in keeping with this interpretation.

(49) In fact, we'd ǀjust chosen °Robert's ˋbeer mug,ǀ

TrPr²² Th¹⁰-TrPr²¹ ǀRh³¹ Tr²²-TrPr²¹ °ˋRh³² ǀ

PERF. CORR., 0

(50) and ǀJoan went to °get out the ˋmoney ₒfor it.

ǀTh¹⁰ Tr²²-TrPr²¹ (°Tr²⁰ ˋRh³⁰ ₒTh¹⁰)°ˋₒRh³⁰

N.-R. INT., 0ǀ

(51) But ₊no ˋmoney!

[TrPr²⁰] TrPr²⁰ ₊NegFocAnt³¹ ˋRh³²

PERF. CORR., 0

(52) So no ‾money,ǀ no ˋbeer mug.

[TrPr²⁰] TrPr²⁰ ‾Th¹⁰ ǀ ˋRh³⁰

PERF. CORR., 0

(53) But we ˋdid have ˅lunch.

TrPr²² Th¹⁰ ˋTrPr²¹ Tr²³ ˅Rh³⁰

N.-R. INT., 0

(54)* ˋRight.

[TrPr²⁰] ˋRh³⁰

PERF. CORR., 0

(55)* So you ǀhadn't got °any ˋmoney,

TrPr²⁰ Th¹⁰ ǀTrPr²¹-NegFocAnt³¹ Tr²² °ˋRh³²

PERF. CORR., REC. DESH., 0_D

Note on 54–57. Mrs. Brown, in her turn, recapitulates the story. (Note the introductory *Right* of 54 and *So* of 55.) The ICs on *any money* of 55 and *Robert's present* of 56 are cases of recapitulatory deshading. Marjorie's generous act of assistance, on the other hand, is no longer retrievable from the immediately relevant context. 57 does not, therefore, show any deshading, but can be looked upon as re-introducing into the flow of conversation, and reminding the interlocutors of, a piece of information spoken of prior to the beginning of the retrievability span.

Note on 55 and 56. The notion of 'having no money' is retrievable from 52 and 51 and that of 'Robert's present' from 52 and earlier from 49. The notion of 'abandonment' is introduced by Mrs. Brown as a characterization of, or perhaps merely as a means of naming, the way the young people coped with the situation. If the latter interpretation is adopted, 'abandonment' need not necessarily be regarded as a new piece of information. In any case, the ICs fall on context-dependent elements, deshading them in this way. Both 55 and 56 produce a recapitulatory effect. The introductory elements *Right* (54) and *So* (55) substantiate this analysis. — The total degree of context dependence of each field is remarkably high. The raison d'etre of each field seems to be its recapitulatory function.

(56)* and you a|bandoned °Robert's ＼present.
　　　　　Th¹⁰ |Tr²²-TrPr²¹ 　　　　　° Rh³⁰

$$\text{Th}^{10} \quad |\text{Tr}^{22}\text{-TrPr}^{21} \qquad\qquad °\text{Rh}^{30}$$

PERF. CORR., REC. DESH., 0_D

(57)* ＼Then,| you ＿tell me, | you |went off
$$\text{Th}^{12} \mid (\text{Th}^{11} \quad \text{Rh}^{31}\text{-TrPr}^{20}\text{Th}^{12})\text{TrPr}^{22}| \quad \text{Th}^{11} \mid \text{Tr}^{23}\text{-TrPr}^{21}$$

to ＼gorge yourselves| at ＼Marjorie's ex°pense.
$$(＼\text{Tr}^{20} \qquad °\text{Th}^{11} \mid \qquad\qquad\qquad ＼°\text{Rh}^{30}\text{⋀}°\text{Rh}^{30}$$

N.-R. INT., 0

(58)* I ＼can't believe a °silly tale like ˅that.
$$\text{Th}^{10} \quad ＼\text{TrPr}^{21}\text{-NegFocAnt}^{31} \quad \text{Tr}^{22} \qquad\qquad\qquad °˅\text{Rh}^{32}$$

PERF. CORR., 0_d

(59) Oh, it's ＼perfectly ˅true, Aunt °Anne,| ˅so °far.
$$\text{TrPr}^{21} \quad \text{Th}^{10'}\text{TrPr}^{21}\text{-Tr}^{22} \qquad ＼°\text{Rh}^{30} \qquad °\text{Th}^{11} \mid ˅°\text{TrPr}^{23}$$

N.-R. INT., 0

(60) ＼Anyway,| to cut a |long story ＿short, | we |went
$$＼\text{TrPr}^{22} \mid (\text{Tr}^{20} \quad |\text{Rh}^{31} \qquad \text{Rh}^{32}) \mid \text{Th}^{12}| \quad \text{Th}^{11} \quad |\text{Tr}^{23}\text{-TrPr}^{21}$$

to the po＼lice.
$$＼\text{Rh}^{30}$$

N.-R. INT., 0

(61) And ＿what d'you ＼think?
$$\text{Th}^{12}\text{-TrPr}^{20}\text{-QFocAnt}^{31} \quad \text{TrPr}^{20'}\text{Th}^{11} ＼\text{Rh}^{32}$$ 　　PERF. CORR., 0

Note on 58. The element *like that* is regarded as an attributive element and should be placed in the post-IC prosodic shade. But owing to re-evaluating intensification, it is deshaded and bears the IC. Since the shade occurs within the attributive construction, which serves as a communicative unit within the basic distributional field, the attributive construction does not lose its status of rheme proper in relation to the rest of the field and only shows an internal re-evaluation of degrees of CD. Hence the interpretation PERF. CORR. 0_d.

(62) Who˅ever'd   ˅picked   up   the   ₒnotecase | ‾had

(˅Th¹²'TrPr²⁰   ˅Rh³⁰-TrPr²⁰   Rh³⁰   ₒTh¹¹)ₒ˅˅Th¹²| ‾TrPr²⁰

˙handed   it   ˑin.

Rh³⁰-TrPr²⁰   Th¹¹   ˑRh³⁰   N.-R. INT., 0

(63) **   With ˈall the ˑmoney in it,| ˑtoo.

[TrPr²⁰] |ˑRh³⁰   Th¹⁰ | ˑRh³⁰   PERF. CORR., 0

(64)   So   there   are   ˑstill some ₒhonest ₒpeople aₒbout,

TrPr²¹ Th¹¹   Tr²³-TrPr²¹ Tr²⁴   Rh³⁰   Th¹²

TrPr²¹ Th¹¹   Tr²³-TrPr²¹ ˑRh³⁰   ₒₒTh¹³   ₒTh¹²

thank ₒgoodness.

ₒTrPr²²   R.-INT., 3

(65) ‾You ˑwere   ₒlucky.

Th¹⁰ Tr²²-TrPr²¹ Rh³⁰

‾Th¹¹ ˑRh³⁰-TrPr²⁰ ₒTh¹²   R.-INT., 3

(66)* Yes, and ˈthat's   not   the ˑend of it.

Rh³⁰, |Th¹²'Tr²²-TrPr²¹ NegFocAnt³¹   ˑRh³²

                                              N.-R. INT., 1

(67) ˅Near the poₒlice station| we   saw   an ˈantique

                 ˅ₒTh¹²| Th¹¹   Tr²²-TrPr²¹

ˑsuper₋market.

|ˑRh³⁰
ₒ   N.-R. INT., 0

Note on 63. *Too* is regarded here as part of the rheme, especially emphasizing its most dynamic semantic feature, i.e. that of totality. Note the parallelism of the two high falls, which intensify the meaning of 'in addition to' conveyed by *too*. (Cf. also Note on 19.)

Note on 66. Strictly speaking, *Yes* does not form part of the field introduced by *and*, but constitutes a field of its own. Within it, it performs the rhematic function. In this respect, it differs from the other cases of *yes* occurring in the dialogue. (Cf. notes on 3 and 44.) It has, however, not been recorded as a separate field in Table 1 on p. 33.

(68)   We |went   _in_

Th^{10} $|_{Rh}30-TrPr^{20}$ $\underline{Rh}^{30}$ <u>PERF. CORR., 0</u>

(69)*   and found |just the ^{o}beer mug we ^{q}wanted <u>for</u>   \<u>Robert.</u>

$Tr^{22}-TrPr^{21}$ $(Th^{10}\ ^oTr^{22}-TrPr^{21}$ $\backslash\underline{Rh}^{30})|oo\backslash_{Rh}30$

<u>PERF. CORR., 0</u>

(70) $^{\backslash}$Much nicer than the ^{o}one we ^{n}nearly ^{o}bought

$[TrPr^{20}]$ $^{\vee}Rh^{31}$ $(Th^{10}\ ^oTrPr^{22}\ ^oTr^{23}-TrPr^{21}$

<u>in $^{\vee}$Oxford $_o$Street.</u>

$^{\vee}\underline{Rh}^{30})$ $^{ooo\vee}_{o}Rh^{32}$ <u>PERF. CORR., 0</u>

(71)   And $^{\backslash}$not   so ex$^{\vee}$pensive| as |those <u>in the</u>

$[TrPr^{20}]$ $^{\backslash}NegFocAnt^{31}$ $^{\vee}Rh^{32}$

\<u>street $_o$market.</u>

|\$_o\underline{Rh}^{33}$ <u>PERF. CORR., 0</u>

(72)   And if   we $^{\backslash}$hadn't   been   to the$^{\vee}$police

$(TrPr^{21}$ Th^{10} $^{\backslash}TrPr^{21}-NegFocAnt^{31}$ $Tr^{22}-TrPr^{21}$

station | we |wouldn't   have   \seen

$^{\vee}Rh^{30})\ Th^{13}|\ Th^{11}$ $|TrPr^{21}-NegFocAnt^{31}$ $TrPr^{21}$ \$\underline{Rh}^{30}$

the $_o$antique $_o$super$_o$market.

$ooo Th^{12}$ <u>N.-R. INT., 1</u>

(PERF. CORR., 0)

Note on 69.   After the words 'and that's not the end of it', (66), the speaker actually procedes to end his story and closes with 67. It may therefore be possible to regard *the beer mug we wanted for Robert* of 69 as a long-lived theme (Svoboda 1983.73—4) deshaded on account of recapitulation. In any case, the rhematizing force of *just* induces the phrase to carry the additional and the irretrievable meaning of exclusive choice.

(73) So $^|$all's ^{o}well that $^\backslash$<u>ends</u> $_o$well.

$TrPr^{21}$ $|_{Th}10|_{Tr}22-TrPr^{21}$ $_o Rh^{31}$ $(Th^{11}$ $\backslash\underline{Rh}^{30}-TrPr^{20}$ $_oTh^{12}$ $)^\backslash_o Rh^{31}$

N.-R. INT., 0_1

(74) $^|$Are you going to _show me the ^{o}beer mug?

$|_{TrPr}21$ Th^{12} $TrPr^{21}$ $\underline{Rh}^{30}$ Th^{11} $_oTh^{13}$

PERF. CORR., 1

(75) Yes, $^\backslash$<u>here</u> it _is, Aunt ^{o}Anne.

$TrPr^{21}$ $\backslash\underline{Rh}^{30}$ Th^{11} $_Tr^{22}$ $_oTh^{12}$

PERF. CORR., 1+2

(76) $^\backslash$<u>Frank</u>!

$\left[_{TrPr}20\right]$ $\backslash\underline{Rh}^{30}$

PERF. CORR., 0

(77) $^\backslash$<u>Quick</u>!

$\left[_{TrPr}20\right]$ $\backslash\underline{Rh}^{30}$

PERF. CORR., 0

(78) $^\backslash$<u>Robert</u>'s $_o$coming.

$\backslash\underline{Rh}^{30|}$ $Tr-TrPr^{22-21}$ $_oTh^{10}-TrPr$

PERF. CORR., 0

(79) $^\lor$<u>He</u> mustn't $_o$see it yet.

Th^{12} $TrPr^{21}NegFocAnt^{31}$ Rh^{32} Th^{11} $TrPr^{22}$

$^\lor\underline{Rh}^{32}$ $TrPr^{20}NegFocAnt^{31}$ $_oTh^{13}$ Th^{11} Th^{12}

R.-INT., 3

(80) $^|$No, $^\backslash$<u>no</u>.

$\left[_{TrPr}20\right]$ $|_{Rh}31$ $\backslash\underline{Rh}^{32}$

PERF. CORR., 0

(81)*   Of `course`   Robert   mustn't   see   it

         Rh^{30} Th^{12} $Th^{13}-TrPr^{20}$ Th^{14} Th^{11}

         $\backslash Rh^{30}$ $(Th^{12}$ $TrPr^{21}NegFocAnt^{31}$ Rh^{32} Th^{11}

yet.

Th^{15}

$TrPr^{22})$ $TrPr^{20}-Th^{10}$ PERF. CORR., 0

(82)   His |present's   still   in the `future`.

        $|Th^{10'}Tr^{22}-TrPr^{21}$ $TrPr^{23}$ $\backslash Rh^{30}$ N.-R. INT., 0

Note on 81. With one proviso, the string of words *Robert mustn't see it yet* expresses retrievable information and is therefore thematic, in contrast with *Of course,* which expresses a piece of irretrievable information. (The proviso concerns the TMEs, which provide a link between the retrievable and the irretrievable information. Under the circumstances, it is only on account of this linking function that they are context-independent and serve as transition proper.) 81 comes very close to second instance use, i.e. when an entire structure is reused in order to conspicuously foreground only one semantic feature (Firbas 1968.15—8). *Robert MUSTN'T see it yet* would be a genuine second instance implementation. In 81, however, the semantic feature to be foregrounded is that of affirmation and is expressed by a word that has not occured in the immediately preceding verbal context. It is worth noticing that the original distribution of degrees of CD over the string *Robert mustn't see it yet* cannot really be obliterated. The string constitutes an extensive theme proper in relation to *Of course,* but internally continues to reflect the vestiges of the original distribution of degrees of CD.

EVALUATIVE SUMMARIZING COMMENTS ON THE ANALYSIS

The interpretation of the 82 distributional fields of the dialogue are tabulated below. The table is supplemented by the frequencies and the percentages of the types represented.

TABLE 1

1	11	21	31	41	51	61	71
2	12	22	32	42	52	62	72	82
3	13	23	33	43	53	63	73
4	14	24	34	44	54	64	74
5	15	25	35	45	55	65	75
6	16	26	36	46	56	66	76
7	17	27	37	47	57	67	77
8	18	28	38	48	58	68	78
9	19	29	39	49	59	69	79
10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80

──PERF. CORR.	30	36.3 %						
───PERF. CORR.[1]	16	19.7 %	49	59.6 %		71	86.4 %	
─┐PERF. CORR., REC. DESH.	2	2.4 %						
──┌PERF. CORR., REC. DESH.[1]	1	1.2 %						
＼N.-R. INT.	22	26.8 %	22	26.8 %				
✕R. INT.	7	8.6 %	9	11.1 %		9	11.1 %	
✕R. INT., DESH.	2	2.5 %						
──TRUNC.	2	2.5 %	2	2.5 %		2	2.5 %	
	82	100.0 %	82	100.0 %		82	100.0 %	

[1]Verbless sentences. With the exception of two truncated sentences, all the remaining sentences are verbal. 70, however, is a special case: it contains a clause subordinated to a verbless structure; on account of the missing superordinate verb, it has been classed with verbless fields.

As can be expected, distributional fields provided by verbal sentences outnumber those provided by verbless sentences, the ratio béing 63:17. Only two uncompleted fields provided by unfinished (truncated) sentences have been recorded. It may be assumed that in a truly spontaneous dialogue, the frequencies both of verbless and of truncated sentences will be higher (cf. Firbas 1985.12).

More than half of the distributional fields, 49 in all, show perfect correspondence between the distribution of CD as determined by the non-prosodic factors of FSP and that of prosodic weight. 22 distributional fields are subjected to prosodic intensification that deviates from such perfect correspondence, but does not affect (re-evaluate) the theme-rheme relationship as determined by the non-prosodic FSP factors. 9 distributional fields are subjected to prosodic intensification that re-evaluates this relationship. The re-evaluation, however, does not obliterate the original relationship; essentially, it adds a new, emotive dimension to the distributional field.

It is significant that in all 22 cases of non-re-evaluating prosodic intensification, it is a verbal element that shows a fall in prosodic weight and deviates from perfect correspondence between the distribution of CD as determined by the non-prosodic FSP factors and that of prosodic weight.

In a majority of cases (17 out of 22), a transitional verbal element is prosodically outweighed by a thematic element (see fields 5, 6, 7, 18, 21, 26, 28, 30, 45, 50, 57, 62, 66, 67, 72, 73 and 82). In 4 cases, the intensification is effected within the finite verb form, a TME prosodically outweighing the notional component (see fields 11, 23, 29 and 53). In 1 case, a transition-proper oriented element (*anyway*) prosodically outweighs a transitional finite verb (see field 60).

If the finite verb form, consisting of the notional component and the TMEs, were not regarded as two communicative units, but taken in its entirety, and if only its weightiest prosodic feature were taken into account and regarded as representative in relation to the other, non-verbal sentence elements, the number of fields showing non-re-evaluating prosodic intensification would be reduced and the number of fields showing perfect correspondence raised. But as will be shown below, the non-re-evaluating prosodic intensification serves a good purpose and is therefore functional.

The 9 fields showing re-evaluating prosodic intensification form a group of particular interest. Their rhematic spheres show absence of perfect correspondence between the distribution of CD as determined by non-prosodic FSP factors and that of prosodic weight. The IC occurs on an element that according to the interplay of non-prosodic FSP factors is non-rhematic, i.e. thematic of transitional.

In the 9 fields under discussion, the IC occurs on a thematic context-dependent pronominal subject (see *I* of 16 and *he* of 79), transitional attitudinal adverb (*still* of 22), transition-proper oriented temporal adverb of indefinite time (*still* of 64), transitional auxiliary verb (*do* of 33), transitional copulative verb (*were* of 65), thematic context-dependent subject (*Joan* of 35) and thematic context-dependent pronoun governed by a preposition and together with it forming an adverbial phrase (*that* of 27 and *it* of 41). To the cases enumerated, a context-dependent headword of an attributive construction (*joke* of 24; cf. the note on 24 on p. 22 can be added. In this case, however, re-evaluation takes place within a subfield provided by an attributive construction.

Of the ICs (specified above in brackets), the first seven occur medially and create post-IC prosodic shades containing elements that according to the interplay of non-prosodic FSP factors are not to be shaded. The last three ICs (in-

cluding the one placed in the subfield) occur finally and are placed on elements that according to the interplay of non-prosodic FSP factors would have to be shaded. They do not produce post-IC prosodic shades, but deshade the final elements on which they are placed.

The 'discrepancy' between the outcome of the interplay of the non-prosodic factors of FSP and the distribution of prosodic weight is evident. This 'discrepancy', however, serves a good purpose. It is in fact meaning-creating, effectively adding attitudinal colouring to the information conveyed by the distributional field. It is a vehicle of emotion giving the distributional field a new dimension at the level of the spoken language. The distribution of degrees of CD determined by the interplay of the non-prosodic factors is thereby not obliterated. The new dimension could not originate if it were not for the basis (or background) provided by the phenomenon of perfect correspondence between the distribution of CD as determined by the non-prosodic FSP factors and the distribution of prosodic weight. The effectiveness of the additional dimension is undoubtedly in line with its relatively low frequency.

The notion of a new dimension provides an essential characteristic of the re-evaluating prosodic intensification. It helps to account for the emotive re-perspectiving that results from the shift of the IC onto a thematic or transitional element. This induces the original rheme proper to become diathematic, i.e. to carry the highest degree of CD within the thematic section of the distributional field re-perspectived. It is the IC-bearer that comes to express rheme proper within this field.

THE FINITE VERB

The dialogue under examination contains 63 finite verbs occurring in basic distributional fields.

In a majority of cases, the finite verb is transitional in its entirety in that both its notional component and its TMEs are transitional. The TMEs, however, continue to perform the transitional function even if the notional component becomes thematic or rhematic. They in fact continue to serve as transition proper linking the theme and the non-theme, even if on account of one of their semantic features they perform a thematic or a rhematic function and no longer serve as transition proper in their entirety. In this sense, the TMEs invariably serve as transition proper in all the 63 finite verbs recorded.

The degrees of prosodic weight and the FSP functions of the finite verbs in the dialogue under examination are tabulated below.

TRANSITIONALITY

The number of cases in which at the non-prosodic level the finite verb is transitional in its entirety, that is both because of its notional component and because of its TMEs, is 44. At the prosodic level, 22 show perfect correspondence between their degrees of CD as determined by the non-prosodic FSP factors and their degrees of prosodic weight, 18 are subjected to non-re-evaluating prosodic intensification and 4 are subjected to re-evaluating prosodic intensification.

Re-evaluating intensification places 2 transitional verbs in the thematic sphere (16, 22) and 2 transitional verbs in the rhematic sphere (33, 65). In conse-

TABLE 2

VERBS

(a) showing perfect correspond-
ence between their degrees of
CD as determined by the non-
prosodic factors of FSP and
their degrees of prosodic
weight

(b) subjected to non-re-evaluat-
ing prosodic intensification

(c) subjected to re-evaluating
prosodic intensification
Tr > Th 2 (16, 22)
Rh > Th 2 (35, 79)
Tr > Rh 2 (33, 65)

FSP functions	Prosodic weight												
	o	i	ii	iii	o	i	ii	iii	o	i	ii	iii	
thematic	2	1	—	—	—	—	1	—	2	2^4	—	—	8
transitional	11	—	11^1	—	10	1	7^2	—	—	—	—	—	40
rhematic	—	—	—	$13^{3,6}$	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2^5	15
	13	1	11	13	10	1	8	—	2	2	—	2	63
	38				19				6				63

o = unstressed,   i = stressed, but unaccented,   ii = stressed and accented,   iii = nuclear stress (see here p. 14 and O'Connor and Arnold 1973.31-6).

¹ In 2 cases (55 and 58) the weightier prosodic feature is borne by an auxiliary.
² In 4 cases (11, 21, 23 and 53) the weightier prosodic feature is borne by an auxiliary.
³ In 1 case (34) the notional component is thematic.
⁴ In 1 case (35) only the auxiliary is present in the field.
⁵ In 1 case (33) the notional component has been thematized.
⁶ In 4 cases (28, 29, 62 and 72) non-re-evaluating prosodic intensification is shown by a transitional element of a complex finite verb string in which a notional component serves as rheme proper. With some simplification, these strings have been classed with rhematic verbs showing perfect correspondence.

Even if on account of one or more of their semantic features they occasionally perform thematic or rhematic functions, the TMEs simultaneously continue to serve as transition proper, serving as a link between theme and non-theme. The numbers of cases in which the TMEs perform thematic or rhematic functions are indicated in the footnotes 3, 4 and 5. In the remainig number of cases, the thematic, transitional and rhematic functions as tabulated are performed by the notional component of the finite verb. Finite verbs the notional components of which are thematic and which show perfect correspondence between CD and prosodic weight (aa), finite verbs that are transitional in their entirety and show perfect correspondence (ab), finite verbs that are rhematic and show perfect correspondence (but see footnote⁶) (ac), finite verbs the notional components of which are thematic and are subjected to non-re-evaluating prosodic intensification (ba), finite verbs that are transitional in their entirety and are subjected to non-re-evaluating prosodic intensification (bb), finite verbs the notional components of which are thematic owing to re-evaluating prosodic intensification (but see footnote⁴) (ca), and finite verbs the notional components of which are rhematic owing to re-evaluating prosodic intensification (but see footnote⁵) (cb), occur respectively in fields: (aa) 44 and 78; 81; (ab) 2, 3, 19, 20, 24, 37, 43, 49, 59, 64 and 69; 4, 10, 13, 27, 38, 39, 40, 55, 56, 58 and 75; (ac) 12, 21, 29, 31, 32, 34, 42, 46, 61, 62, 68, 72 and 74; (ba) 41; (bb) 5, 6, 7, 18, 26, 50, 66, 67, 73 and 82; 30; 11, 21, 23, 45, 53, 57 and 60; (ca) 16 and 22; 35 and 79; (cb) 33 and 65.

quence, the number of finite verbs that at the prosodic level remain transitional in their entirety is reduced to 40.

The qualification 'in its/their entirety' takes into account the fact that the TMEs and the notional component of the finite verb carry different degrees of CD. If containig auxiliaries, the finite verb form displays more than one prosodic feature ('unstressed' counting as one).

In 6 cases the weightier prosodic feature is borne by the auxiliary, i.e. a TME element. In 3 cases the auxiliary shows non-re-evaluating intensification in regard to the notional component, its attitudinal content being thereby underlined (see *let* of 11, *must* of 23 and *did* of 53). In the other 3 cases, the auxiliary combines with a Negative Focus Anticipator, which is assigned 31-status (see *hadn't* of 21, *hadn't* of 55 and *can't* of 58; cf. also note on 21 on p. 22). The weightier prosodic feature borne by the combination is not at variance with this status.

A special note must be added on 22 finite verb forms that are subjected to non-re-evaluating prosodic intensification. 18 of them are transitional in their entirety and 4 of them only on account of one of their components (see Table 2, especially notes[6, 7]). The 22 finite verbs have already been touched upon in the preceding section. The following note deals with them from the point of view of transitionality.

Altogether there are 22 fields showing non-re-evaluating prosodic intensification. It is significant that in each case, in showing a fall in prosodic weight, the finite verb either in its entirety or through one of its components participates in bringing about such intensification.

None of this is at variance with the semantic character of the verb or the character of the semantic relations into which it enters. It should be remembered that in FSP the verb tends to perform a transitional role irrespective of sentence position, its TMEs performing this role invariably. Owing to its semantic character and the semantic relations into which it enters, the verb is not prevented from performing the transitional function even if exceeded in prosodic weight by a thematic element. Such prosodic intensification of the thematic element does not interfere with the linking (and simultaneously delimiting) function performed by the transition, i.e. the function of linking the theme with (and simultaneously delimiting it from) non-theme. Such intensification in no way blurs the delimitation of the theme from the non-theme. In its way, it even underlines this delimitation: the prosodically weakened link (boundary) resulting from the intensification participates in putting into relief the theme (or rather diatheme) on the one hand and the rheme (or rather rheme proper) on the other.

Seen in this light, the above-described absence of perfect correspondence between the distribution of CD as determined by the non-prosodic factors of FSP and that of prosodic weight cannot be interpreted as a deficiency in the language system. The prosodic intensification of the theme and the prosodic weakening of the transition serve good purposes and are therefore functional. Perfect correspondence is nevertheless maintained in the rhematic sphere of each of the 22 fields under examination. This implies that in each case the rheme exceeds both the theme and the transition in prosodic weight. In this respect the 22 fields come under the same heading as the 49 fields showing perfect correspondence. Together with them, they form a group of 71 fields greatly outnumbering the 9 fields subjected to re-evaluating intensification plus the 2 fields regarded as truncated.

RHEMATICITY .

Only 15 finite verb forms are rhematic at the non-prosodic level. They can perform the rhematic function because they are not prevented from doing so by any competitors. Under the heading of competitors come context-independent objects, context-independent subject or object complements, context-independent adverbial elements serving as specifications, and, in the absence of all the elements frequently context-independent subjects as well. In 14 out of the 15 cases recorded, the finite verb becomes rhematic on account of its notional component. Only in 1 case (34) it is the TMEs that take over the rhematic function. They can do so because of the context-dependent character of the notional component as well as because of the absence of any other 'competitor'. Like the TMEs of all the other finite verbs in the dialogue, however, they they continue to perform the function of transition proper on account of their linking function.

At the prosodic level, 13 out of 15 cases recorded show perfect correspondence between their degrees of CD as determined at the non-prosodic level and their degrees of prosodic weight. 2 cases (35 and 79) show re-evaluating prosodic intensification; they are re-evaluated into themes. (In 35 only the auxiliary *can* is present.)

It should be added that at the prosodic level, altogether 15 finite verbs operate as rhematic. In addition to the 13 cases showing perfect correspondence, there are 2 that have become rhematic owing to re-evaluating prosodic intensification (33 and 65). Owing to re-evaluation, their transitional status has been raised to rhematicity. (In 33, however, this applies only to the auxiliary *do*, the notional component having been thematized by the re-evaluation.)

THEMATICITY

The smallest group is formed by finite verbs that at the non-prosodic level are thematic on account of their notional components and transitional on account of their TMEs. They are only 4 in number, 3 showing perfect correspondence between their degrees of CD and their degrees of prosodic weight and 1 showing non-re-evaluating intensification (41; see note on 41 on p. 25).

The dialogue shows no cases of re-evaluation of a thematic notional component of a finite verb.

Transitional and rhematic notional components that have been thematized by re-evaluating prosodic intensification have been dealt with under the headings of transitionality and rhematicity.

*   *   *

The number of finite verbs functioning in distributional subfields is comparatively low − 14 in all. It is worth noticing that 13 of them shows perfect correspondence between the degrees of CD as determined by the non-prosodic FSP factors and the degrees of prosodic weight. There is no case of non-re-evaluating intensification and only one case of re-evaluating prosodic intensification (in which a rhematic verb is thematized; see 26 and note on 26 on p. 23). The cases showing perfect correspondence are tabulated below.

The findings concerning the functions the and verb performs in the functional perspective of the spoken sentence, the degrees of CD it carries and the

TABLE 3

FINITE VERBS IN DISTRIBUTIONAL SUBFIELDS

(a) showing perfect correspondence between their degrees of CD as determined by the non-prosodic FSP factors and their degrees of prosodic weight

FSP functions	Prosodic weight				
	o	i	ii	iii	
thematic	—	—	—	—	—
transitional	2	2	5^1	—	9
rhematic	1	1	—	3	5
	3	3	5	3	14

o = unstressed, i = stressed, but unaccented, ii = stressed and accented, iii = nuclear stress (see here p. 14 and O'Connor and Arnold 1973.31-6)

[1] Including 1 case of low rise after a fall (76).

The finite verbs occur in the following fields and are respectively transitional (a) and rhematic (b):

(a) 5, 16; 6, 46; 18, 69, 70, 72, 75; (b) 28; 32; 57, 62, 74.

prosodic features it bears are in line with previous research (cf. Firbas 1968, 1969 and 1975). They testify to the central positions the verb occupies in the semantic, the grammatical and the FSP structures of the sentence.

SUBJECTS

Out of the 63 verbal basic distributional fields, 58 contain a subject expressed by a separate word, phrase or clause. As for the remaining 5 fields, 3 of them (10, 11 and 33) are imperative sentences and 2 (40 and 69) show ellipted subjects.

Since one field is implemented by the existential *there* construction, the comments and Table 4 below concern 59, not 58 subjects. Apart from *there* regarded as its formal subject, the existential *there*-sentence contains an 'additional', notional subject.

According to the interplay of the non-prosodic factors of FSP, 57 subjects are thematic and only 2 rhematic.

At the prosodic level, (a) 43 subjects show perfect agreement between their thematic status and their prosodic weight, (b) 12 show non-re-evaluating prosodic intensification, and (c) only 4 have been subjected to re-evaluating prosodic intensification. The representatives of the (a) group predominantly perform the function of theme proper and occasionally that of diatheme. Those forming the (b) group are all diathemes. As for the (c) group, 3 subjects evaluated at the non-prosodic level as themes have become IC-bearers and rhematized (16, 35 and 79), whereas 1 subject evaluated at the non-prosodic level as rhematic has become deshaded and thematized (64).

The FSP functions of the subjects and their prosodic weight are tabulated below on p. 42.

The low degrees of CD and the low degrees of prosodic weight caused by an overwhelming majority of the subjects in the dialogue are in keeping with the well-established tendency to make the subject express the theme. It is worth pointing out that 36 of the above recorded subjects are unstressed thematic personal pronouns. Their contributions towards the further development of the communication are very small and their degrees of CD therefore strikingly low. It appears that the grammatical subjects occurring in conversation are even less dynamic than their counterparts in fictional prose. In other words, the grammatical subjects in conversation tend to carry even smaller amounts of CD than their counterparts in fictional prose. In either case, however, the thematic subject will carry a lower degree of CD than the non-thematic elements occurring in the same sentence. By definition, a degree of CD carried by an element is the relative extent to which a linguistic element contributes towards the further development of the communication, 'relative' implying that the degree of CD carried by an element is always determined in relation to the degrees of CD concurring in the same distributional field. Seen in isolation, a linguistic element may be semantically weighty and therefore considerably informative, but in relation to the non-thematic elements concurring in the the same field it carries a low degree (or low degrees) of CD.

TABLE 4

SUBJECTS

(a) showing perfect correspondence between the distribution of CD as determined by the non-prosodic factors of FSP and that of prosodic weight

(b) subjected to non-re-evaluating prosodic intensification

(c) subjected to re-evaluating prosodic intensification
Rh > Th (64)
Th > Rh (16, 35, 79)

FSP functions	Prosodic weight																		
	o	‾o	i	ii	iii		o	‾o	i	ii	iii		o	‾o	i	ii	iii		
thematic	37	3	2	—	—	42	—	1	7	1	3	12	—	—	1	—	—	1	55
rhematic	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	3	4
						43						12						4	59
Implementations	o	‾o	i	ii	iii		o	‾o	i	ii	iii		o	‾o	i	ii	iii		
personal pronoun	33	3	—	—	—	36	—	1	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	2	2	39
other pronoun	3	—	1	—	—	4	—	—	4	—	—	4	—	—	—	—	—	—	8
there	1	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
noun	—	—	1	—	1°	2	—	—	3	—	—	3	—	—	—	—	1	1	6
phrase	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	2
clause	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	2	—	—	1	—	—	1	3
	37	3	2	—	1	43	—	1	7	1	3	12	—	—	1	—	3	4	59

o = unstressed, ‾o = unstressed high head, i = stressed, but unaccented, ii = stressed and accented, iii = nuclear stress (see here p. 14 and O'Connor and Arnold 1973.31-63).

The thematic subjects showing perfect correspondence (aa); the rhematic subjects showing perfect correspondence (ab), the thematic subjects showing non-re-evaluating prosodic intensification (b), the rhematic subjects subjected to re-evaluating prosodic intensification (ca), and the thematic subjects subjected to re-evaluating prosodic intensification (cb), occur respectively in fields: (aa) 2, 3, 4, 12, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 37, 38, 39, 41, 43, 44, 46, 49, 53, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 64, 67, 68, 72, 74, 75; 13, 21, 65; 42, 81; (ab) 78; (b) 7; 18, 26, 28, 50, 66, 73, 82; 5; 6, 45, 62; (ca) 64; (cb) 16, 35, 79.

OBJECTS

Out of the 63 verbal basic distributional fields, 29 contain one object expressed by a separate word, phrase or clause and linked to the verb directly or by a preposition and 1 (field 11) contains two objects, a direct object and an indirect one. The total number of objects is therefore 31.

According to the interplay of the non-prosodic factors of FSP, 12 objects are thematic and 19 rhematic.

At the prosodic level, 27 objects (10 thematic and 17 rhematic) show perfect agreement between their degrees of CD and their degrees of prosodic weight, and 4 have been subjected to re-evaluating prosodic intensification (2 being presented as thematic and 2 as rhematic).

Let me first deal with objects that show perfect correspondence between the degrees of CD assigned to them by the non-prosodic factors of FSP and the degrees of prosodic weight they carry.

With one exception, all the thematic objects are context-dependent and carry little prosodic weight. (The exception is the interrogative *what* of 61, which is context-independent and apart from a thematic function performs a transitional and a rhematic function as well.)

All the context-independent objects are rhematic. With three exceptions (the objects of 21 and 39 and the indirect object of 11) they are all rhemes proper; with two exceptions (the objects of 21 and 39) they are all nucleus bearers. Of the three rhematic objects not serving as rheme proper, two (21 and 39) bear non-nuclear stress and one (11) is a nucleus bearer.

Let me now turn to the four objects that have been subjected to re-evaluating prosodic intensification.

The 2 objects thematized by re-evaluating prosodic intensification occur in the post-IC prosodic shade (see fields 16 and 33). They exemplify prosodic shading.

On the other hand, the 2 objects rhematized by re-evaluating prosodic intensification have been deshaded. As has been pointed out in the note on fields 55 and 56 (see p. 27), the objects occurring there convey retrievable information and in this respect could be thematic. The ICs falling on them, however, make them participate in fulfilling a specific communicative purpose − that of recapitulation. In each case the recapitulation is oriented towards the piece of information conveyed by the object. As IC bearers, the two objects represent cases of recapitulatory deshading (see Firbas 1985.36). Under the circumstances, the re-evaluating intensification does not produce an emotive effect, but nevertheless adds a specific communicative dimension to the fields.

Prosodic deshading has also occurred in the subfield provided by the object in 58. But this re-evaluation is an internal affair of the subfield. (See note on field 58 on p. 28.)

Table 5 covers the functions performed, and the degrees of prosodic weight carried, by the objects under examination.

The findings presented are in agreement with the results of previous research. These have established that with one proviso a context-independent object carries a higher degree of CD than the verb and acquires rhematic status irrespective of sentence position (Firbas 1959.46), even becoming rheme proper if no adverbial element serving as a specification is present (Firbas 1981.44). This may not apply if the object is placed before a context-independent subject (Fir-

TABLE 5

OBJECTS

(a) showing perfect correspond-ence between the distribution as determined by the non-pro-sodic FSP-factors and the dis-tribution of prosodic weight

(b) subjected to non-re-evaluating prosodic intensification

(c) subjected to re-evaluating prosodic intensification

FSP functions	Prosodic weight												
	o	i	ii	iii	o	i	ii	iii	o	i	ii	iii	
thematic	1	7*	2	—					—	2	—	—	12
rhematic	—	—	2	15		NONE			—	—	—	2	19
	1	7	4	15					—	2	—	2	31

o = unstressed, i = stressed, but unaccented, ii = stressed and accented, iii = nuclear stress (see here p. 14 and O'Connor and Arnold 1973.31-6).

* Including *what* of 61 (see p. 28)

The thematic objects showing perfect correspondence (aa), the rhematic objects showing perfect correspondence (ab), the thematic objects showing re-evaluation (ca), and the rhematic objects showing re-evaluation (cb) occur respectively in fields: (aa) 62; 33, 46, 61, 72, 74, 79, 81; 21 and 30; (ab) 21, 39; 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 13, 19, 26, 38, 40, 49, 53, 67 and 69; (ca) 16 and 33; (cb) 41, 55 and 56.

bas 1979.192). It is against the background of these findings that the meaning-creating prosodic re-evaluation is to be accounted for.

The degrees of prosodic weight borne by the object reflect its FSP functions, non-re-evaluated or re-evaluated. This is borne out only by the statistics offered by Table 5, but also by the statistics and the comments on them in Firbas 1969 (covering 323 objects) and in Chamonikolasová 1985 (covering 412 objects).

Although the concept of re-evaluating prosodic intensification was introduced only in 1985 (Firbas 1985), the previous papers considered the prosodically re-evaluated objects to be presented as context-dependent, i.e. not to be context-dependent in the proper sense of the word. Such presentation aspect is undoubtedly involved in the process of re-evaluating prosodic intensification.

ADVERBIAL ELEMENTS

In Firbas 1985, it was tentatively stated that an adverbial sentence element can perform three functions in FSP: (i) it can express mere background information and hence serves as a setting and a thematic element; (ii) it can participate in conveying the core of the information and hence serves as a specification and a rhematic element or even a rheme proper; (iii) it can express a temporal indication of indefinite character (cf. the adverbs of indefinite time, such as *usually, sometimes*), or attitudinal information (cf. the sentence adverbs, such as *naturally, obviously*) that stands in close semantic relation to the TMEs and is therefore transition-proper oriented; it can, however, loosen its tie to transition proper and become either a setting and function in the theme, or a specification and function in the rheme. (The formulation under iii has been suggested to me by Aleš Svoboda in a private communication.)

In regard to the thematic and the rhematic functions, the above-mentioned assumptions have been amply illustrated and their validity established in Ludmila Urbanová's dissertation (Urbanová 1984), based on an analysis of a section of the London and Lund Corpus of English conversation (Svartvik and Quirk 1980). The spoken text under examination supplies further examples and also corroborates the interpretation of adverbial functions outlined in Firbas 1981 and 1985.

Of the 35 adverbial elements recorded, 24 show perfect correspondence between their degrees of CD as determined by the non-prosodic FSP factors and their degrees of prosodic weight. The adverbials showing perfect correspondence can be divided into two groups.

The larger group is formed by 17 nucleus bearers, which are all rhematic and with one exception serve as rhemes proper and are IC-bearers. 14 of them convey specifications, 1 is a rhematized attitudinal adverb (see note on field 81) and one is the rhematized *too*; the element that bears a nucleus but not the IC is a local specification followed by another local specification which conveys the very core of the information and is the IC-bearer (see 37).

The adverbials forming the smaller group (7 in all) are prosodically lighter. This is in line with their thematic, transitional and rhematic but not rheme-proper, functions. (See Table below.)

Non-re-evaluating prosodic intensification is shown by 6 adverbial elements. They are all nucleus bearers, but none serves as rheme proper. 4 of them are intensified diathemes and 2 are intensified transitional elements. A special case is the intensified transition of 59, the intensifying nucleus of which occurs after the IC.

TABLE 6

ADVERBIAL ELEMENTS

(a) showing perfect correspondence between their degrees of CD as determined by the non-prosodic factors of FSP and their degrees of prosodic weight

(b) subjected to non-re-evaluating prosodic intensification

(c) subjected to re-evaluating prosodic intensification
Th > Rh   (27, 41)
Tr > Rh   (22, 22, 64)

FSP functions	Prosodic weight												
	o	i	ii	iii	o	i	ii	iii	o	i	ii	iii	
thematic	—	2	1°	—	—	—	—	4	—	—	—	—	7
transitional	1	—	1	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	4
rhematic	—	—	2*	17	—	—	—	—	—	—	1°	4	24
	1	2	4	17	—	—	—	6	—	—	1	4	35

o = unstressed, i = stressed, but unaccented, ii = stressed and accented, iii = nuclear stress (see here p. 14 and O'Connor and Arnold 1973.31-6).

° and * indicate a low rise after a high fall (34 and 22) and an interrogative adverb (30 and 47).

The recorded adverbial elements occur in the following fields: (a) 65, 82, 34; 83 and 80; 47, 50; 3, 19, 21, 29, 30, 37, 37, 39, 45, 46, 58, 61, 63, 69, 76, 82 and 83; (b) 58, 61, 68 and 73; 60 and 61; (c) 22, 22, 27, 41 and 64.

TABLE 7

SUBJECT COMPLEMENTS

(a) showing perfect correspond-
ence between their degrees of
CD as determined by the non-
prosodic factors of FSP and
their degrees of prosodic weight

(b) subjected to non-re-evaluating
prosodic intensification

(c) subjected to re-evaluating
prosodic intensification
$Rh > Th_d$

FSP functions	Prosodic weight															
	o	‾o	i	ii	iii	o	‾o	i	ii	iii	o	‾o	i	ii	iii	
thematic	—	—	—	—	—						—	1	—	—	—	1
transitional	—	—	—	1	—			NONE			—	—	—	—	—	1
rhematic	—	—	—	1	7						—	—	—	—	—	8
	—	—	—	2	7						—	1	—	—	—	10

o = unstressed, ‾o = unstressed high head, i = stressed, but unaccented, ii = stressed and accented, iii = nuclear stress (see here p. 14 and O'Connor and Arnold 1973.31-6).

The subject complements recorded occur in the following fields: (a) 43; 20, 3, 6, 7, 18, 23, 24 and 66; (c) 22.

Re-evaluating prosodic intensification is shown by 5 adverbial elements (14.3 %). They are all nucleus bearers, 4 simultaneously serving as IC-bearers. The ICs occur on a demonstrative pronoun (*that* of 27; see note on 27 on p. 23), an attitudinal adverb (*still* of 22), an adverb of indefinite time (*still* of 64) and a preposition (*with* of 41; see note on 41 on p. 25). The nucleus (borne by *now* of 22) that does not serve as IC is a low rise occurring after a high fall. Together with the high fall, which is the actual IC, it produces the re-evaluating effect.

SUBJECT COMPLEMENTS

There are 10 subject complements in the dialogue under examination. 9 of them show perfect correspondence between the degrees of CD and the degrees of prosodic weight; none has been subjected to non-re-evaluating prosodic intensification; and only 1 has been affected by re-evaluating prosodic intensification.

There are 7 subject complements of the first group serving as rhemes proper and are IC bearers (see 2, 6, 7, 18, 23, 24 and 66). The remaining two are transitional (43) and rhematic, but not conveying rheme proper (20), and bear non-nucleus stress, not exceeding in prosodic weight the rheme proper in the field.

One subject complement singled out by the interplay of non-prosodic FSP factors for rheme proper does not bear the IC, but is placed in the post-IC prosodic shade (22). In this way, it participates in adding an emotive colouring to the field (cf. p. 22).

CONCLUSIONS

Like Firbas 1975, 1981 and 1986, the present paper offers an FSP analysis of a text. A sequel to Firbas 1985, it applies the conclusions arrived at there in an analysis of a short dialogue. The analysis bears out the conclusions summarized at the end of Firbas 1985.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, T., ed. (1982). *Language form and linguistic variation: Papers dedicated to Angus McIntosh* (Amsterdam).
Arnold, G. F. and Tooley, O. M. (1972). *Say it with rhythm 3* (London).
Blandford, F. G. See Palmer, H. E. and Blandford, F. G.
Chamonikolasová, J. (1985). The internal structure, communicative value and prosodic weight of the English object, *Brno studies in English* 16.49—61 (Brno).
Chamonikolasová, J. (1987). Loose elements in colloquial English, *Brno studies in English* 17.97—105 (Brno).
Cooper, Ch. R. and Greenbaum S. (1986). *Studying writing: Linguistic approaches, Written communication manual, vol. 1* (Beverley Hills).
Firbas, J. (1968). On the prosodic features of the modern English finite verb as means of functional sentence perspective, *Brno studies in English* 7.11—48 (Brno).
Firbas, J. (1969). On the prosodic features of the modern English finite verb-object combination as means of functional sentence perspective, *Brno studies in English* 8.49—59 (Brno).

Firbas, J. (1972). On the interplay of prosodic and non-prosodic means of functional sentence perspective, *The Prague School of Linguistics and language teaching*, ed. by V. Fried, 77—94 (London).

Firbas, J. (1975). On the thematic and the non-thematic section of the sentence, in Ringbom 1975.317-34.

Firbas, J. (1976). A study in the functional sentence perspective of the English and the Slavonic interrogative sentence, *Brno studies in English* 12.9—56 (Brno).

Firbas, J. (1979). A functional view of 'ordo naturalis', *Brno studies in English* 13.29—59 (Brno).

Firbas, J. (1980). Post-intonation-centre prosodic shade in the modern English clause, in Greenbaum, Leech and Svartvik 1980.125—33.

Firbas, J. (1981). Scene and perspective, *Brno studies in English* 14.37—79 (Brno).

Firbas, J. (1982). Has every sentence a theme and a rheme?, in Anderson 1982.97—116.

Firbas, J. (1983). On some basic issues of the theory of functional sentence perspective (Comments on Alexander Szwedek's critique), *Brno studies in English* 15.9—36 (Brno).

Firbas, J. (1985). Thoughts on functional sentence perspective, intonation and emotiveness, *Brno studies in English* 16.11—48 (Brno).

Firbas, J. (1986). On the dynamics of written communication in the light of the theory of functional sentence perspective, in Cooper and Greenbaum 1986.40—71.

Golková, E. (1987). On FSP functions of the first syntactic element in the English sentence, *Brno studies in English* 17.87—96 (Brno).

Greenbaum, S., Leech, G. and Svartvik, J. (1980). *Studies in English linguistics for Randolph Quirk* (London and New York).

Greenbaum, S. See Cooper, Ch. R. and Greenbaum, S.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1970). *A course in spoken English intonation* (London).

Kingdon, R. See Palmer, H. E. and Blandford, F. G.

O'Connor, J. D. and Arnold, G. F. (1973). *Intonation of colloquial English*[2] (London).

Palmer, H. E. and Blandford, F. G. (1969). *A grammar of spoken English*[3], revised and rewritten by Roger Kingdon (Cambridge).

Quirk, R. See Svartvik, J. and Quirk, R.

Ringbom, H., ed. (1975). *Style and text: Studies presented to Nils Erik Enkvist* (Stockholm).

Svartvik, J. and Quirk, R., eds. (1980). *A corpus of English conversation* (Lund).

Svoboda, A. (1968). The hierarchy of communicative units and fields as illustrated by English attributive constructions, Brno studies in English 7.49—85 (Brno).

Svoboda, A. (1983). Thematic elements, *Brno studies in English* 15.49—85 (Brno).

Tooley, O. M. See Arnold, G. F.

Urbanová, L. (1984). Prozodická realizace anglického určitého slovesa ve spojení s adverbiálním určením z hlediska aktuálního členění [Prosodic realization of the English finite verb in relation to the adverbial elements with regard to FSP], dissertation presented at Brno University (Brno).

ÚVAHY O AKTUÁLNÍM ČLENĚNÍ, INTONACI A EMOCIONÁLNOSTI
na materiále z anglického hovorového jazyka

Článek navazuje na stejnojmennou studii z předcházejícího svazku řady Brno studies in English. Na souvislém dialogu o 82 větách, který umožňuje důslednou průběžnou analýzu a ilustraci kontextových podmínek vytvářejících aktuální členění intonačně ztvárněné mluvené věty, demonstruje autor nosnost závěrů, k nimž v předcházející studii dospěl.

Potvrzuje se, že při dokonalé korespondenci mezi rozložením stupňů výpovědní dynamičnosti, jak je určuje souhra neintonačních činitelů aktuálního členění, a rozložením stupňů intonační výraznosti intonace jen obráží výsledek této souhry nebo jej zjednoznačňuje. Odchylky od takové korespondence neruší výsledek souhry neintonačních činitelů aktuálního členění, ale dodávají výpovědi prostřednictvím intonace dodatečná významová zdůraznění nebo zabarvení především rázu emocionálního. Vysoce příznakové jsou takové případy, při nichž se nositelem intonačního centra stane složka, která je podle souhry neintonačních činitelů aktuálního členění tematická nebo tranzitní, a tedy nerematická.

V oblasti mluveného jazyka intonace funguje jako další činitel aktuálního členění. Její fungování v aktuálním členění lze pochopit na pozadí dokonalé korespondence mezi rozložením stupňů výpovědní dynamičnosti, jež je výsledkem souhry neintonačních činitelů aktuálního členění (kontextu, lineární modifikace a sémantiky), a rozložením stupňů intonační výraznosti.