The Grammar–Pragmatics Interface

Pragmatics & Beyond New Series

Editor

Andreas H. Jucker
University of Zurich, English Department
Plattenstrasse 47, CH-8032 Zurich, Switzerland
e-mail: ahjucker@es.unizh.ch

Associate Editors

Jacob L. Mey
University of Southern Denmark

Herman Parret
Belgian National Science Foundation, Universities of Louvain and Antwerp

Jef Verschueren
Belgian National Science Foundation, University of Antwerp

Editorial Board

Shoshana Blum-Kulka
Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Jean Caron
Université de Poitiers

Robyn Carston
University College London

Bruce Fraser
Boston University

Thorstein Fretheim
University of Trondheim

John Heritage
University of California at Los Angeles

Susan Herring
University of Texas at Arlington

Masako K. Hiraga
St. Paul's (Rikkyo) University

David Holdcroft
University of Leeds

Sachiko Ide
Japan Women's University

Catherine Kerbrat-Orecchioni
University of Lyon 2

Claudia de Lemos
University of Campinas, Brazil

Marina Sbisà
University of Trieste

Emanuel Schegloff
University of California at Los Angeles

Deborah Schiffrin
Georgetown University

Paul O. Takahara
Kobe City University of Foreign Studies

Sandra Thompson
University of California at Santa Barbara

Teun A. Van Dijk
Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona

Richard J. Watts
University of Berne

Volume 155

The Grammar–Pragmatics Interface: Essays in honor of Jeanette K. Gundel
Edited by Nancy A. Hedberg and Ron Zacharski

The Grammar–Pragmatics Interface

Essays in honor of Jeanette K. Gundel

Edited by

Nancy A. Hedberg
Simon Fraser University

Ron Zacharski
New Mexico State University

1st proofs

Table of contents

List of contributors

Mira Ariel
Department of Linguistics
Tel Aviv University
Tel Aviv
Israel

Betty Birner
Department of English
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, Illinois
USA

Kaja Borthen
Department of Linguistics
Norwegian University of Science and
Technology
Trondheim
Norway

Francis Cornish
University of Toulouse
Toulouse
France

Lorna Fadden
Department of Linguistics
Simon Fraser University
Vancouver
Canada

Harwell Francis
Department of Linguistics
Department of Anthropology and
Sociology
Western Carolina University
Cullowhee, NC
USA

Thorstein Fretheim
Department of Language and
Communication Studies
Norwegian University of Science and
Technology
Trondheim
Norway

Mei Jia Gao
Institute of Linguistics, English as a
Second Language and Slavic Languages
and Literatures
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota
USA

Nancy Hedberg
Department of Linguistics
Simon Fraser University
Vancouver
Canada

Michael Hegarty
Department of English
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, Louisiana
USA

Jeffrey Kaplan
Department of Linguistics and Oriental
Languages
San Diego State University
San Diego, California
USA

Laura Michaelis
Department of Linguistics
University of Colorado
Boulder, CO
USA

Ann Mulkern
Institute of Linguistics, English as a
Second Language and Slavic Languages
and Literatures
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota
USA

Maria Polinsky
Department of Linguistics
Harvard University
Cambridge, MA
USA

Suellen Rundquist
Department of English
Saint Cloud State University
Saint Cloud, Minnesota
USA

Hooi Ling Soh
Institute of Linguistics, English as a
Second Language and Slavic Languages
and Literatures
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota
USA

Polly Szatrowski
Institute of Linguistics, English as a
Second Language and Slavic Languages
and Literatures
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota
USA

Gregory Ward
Department of Linguistics
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois
USA

Introduction

We present this volume of papers in honor and celebration of Jeanette undel, Professor of Linguistics at the University of Minnesota. This book represents a selection of papers by people influenced by Jeanette's work, including her colleagues and former students.

1. Biographical information

Jeanette Gundel received her Ph.D from the University of Texas at Austin in 1974 for a dissertation on "The Role of Topic and Comment in Linguistic Theory." This dissertation, produced in the tradition of Generative Semantics, introduced to generative linguists in the United States and abroad the pragmatic notions of topic and comment that were simultaneously being introduced in Europe by Prague School linguists. In 1988, her dissertation was reintroduced in the series *Outstanding Dissertations in Linguistics* (Garland Press).

After holding visiting appointments at the Ohio State University and the University of Hawaii in the mid-1970s, Jeanette took a tenure-track position at the University of Minnesota in 1980. She progressed through the ranks at the University of Minnesota, achieving the rank of Full Professor in 1992. Since then she has also held the position of Adjunct Professor in the Department of Philosophy and Adjunct Professor in the Department of Communication Disorders at the University of Minnesota. From 1997 to 1999, she additionally served as Professor of English Linguistics at the Norwegian University of Science and Technology in Trondheim, Norway.

As well as serving as a graduate and undergraduate teacher and researcher, Jeanette continues to have a distinguished career as an administrator. We mention here three prominent examples. Since 1999, she has served as the Head of the Academic Program in Linguistics at the University of Minnesota. She has also frequently served as Director of Graduate Studies for Linguistics there, and she has long been an active member of the Governing Council of the Center for Cognitive Sciences at the University of Minnesota

Jeanette's research and teaching has flourished during the last thirty years, including works published by herself alone as well as works coauthored by students and colleagues, especially on topic-comment (focus) in English and other languages, cleft sentences in English and Norwegian, and the cognitive status of referring expressions in English and other languages. Since all of her research focuses on interactions between syntax and pragmatics and between semantics and pragmatics, her research

falls solidly into the area that constitutes the theme of this volume: the grammar–pragmatics interface.

Nancy Hedberg, Suellen Rundquist, and Ann Mulkern, all included in this volume, were Ph.D. students of Jeanette's in the Linguistics Program at the University of Minnesota during the 1990s and 2000s. Their dissertations represent the breadth of Jeanette's expertise, ranging from the syntax, semantics and pragmatics of cleft sentences (Hedberg), the sociolinguistics of apologies (Rundquist), and elaborations on the cognitive status of referring expressions in Irish (Mulkern). In addition, Jeanette advised one of the co-editors of the present volume (Ron Zacharski) at the University of Minnesota in the area of the meaning of intonation in English from the perspective of computer science. She has also advised many students who are not represented in the present volume.

The current volume also presents papers by some colleagues of Jeanette's at the universities in which she has taught over the past 25 years. Michael Hegarty and Hooi Ling Soh are currently or were recently close colleagues of Jeanette's in the Linguistics Program at the University of Minnesota, and Polly Szatrowski is a colleague in East Asian Languages there. Jeanette also had an influence on students and colleagues when she taught in Norway. Represented in this volume are Kaja Borthen, who completed a Ph.D in Trondheim, and Thorstein Fretheim, who is a colleague there. Mira Ariel, Betty Birner, Francis Cornish, Lorna Fadden, Hartwell Francis, Mei Jia Gao, Jeffrey Kaplan, Laura Michaelis, Maria Polinsky, and Gregory Ward, who are also represented in this volume are colleagues in the worldwide community of linguists working on the grammar–pragmatics interface.

2.   Jeanette Gundel on the Grammar–Pragmatics Interface

Jeanette Gundel is well known for her work in the area of the grammar–pragmatics interface. Throughout her career she has been concerned with the relation between the pragmatics and syntax/semantics of such notions as topic and comment (or focus), starting with her dissertation (Gundel 1974). In her dissertation she introduced the notions of 'topic' and 'comment' into generative grammar, from a generative semantics perspective. She inserted topics into the left-adjunct of S position at deep structure, and then derived left-dislocated sentences, canonical sentences, topicalized sentences, wh-cleft sentences, and other forms of sentences through transformational rules that lowered and copied references to the topic into the lower S constituent, which represented the comment at the initial deep structure stage of semantic representation, and included a transformational rule of 'stress placement' that placed primary stress within the comment.

For right-dislocated sentences, she proposed a rule moving the topic from initial position to final position and still copied down the resumptive pronoun. Thus, even at this stage in her thinking, she viewed topic-comment as a linguistic distinction, directly

represented at the level of semantic representation—deep structure in the conventions of that time. Her dissertation also provided an analysis of it-cleft sentences, which was later elaborated in a paper in *Language* in 1977. She argued on syntactic, semantic and pragmatic grounds that it-cleft sentences are derived from right-dislocated wh-clefts. Gundel 1974 also proposed deriving 'Focus Topicalization' sentences, i.e. the 'Focusing Preposing' constructions of Prince (1985), from it-clefts, thus giving them a distinct derivation from 'Topic Topicalization' constructions, which represent deep structure quite transparently.

Gundel's generative-semantics-style rules of topic lowering were later reanalyzed in interpretive variants of generative grammar as 'topic raising' rules, in a way similar to the way that 'quantifier lowering' (Lakoff 1971) was later analyzed as 'quantifier raising' (May 1985) in interpretive semantic generative frameworks. An important point to note is that for Gundel, the distinction between 'topic' and 'comment' has always been a grammatical distinction, being represented directly in the semantic or conceptual representation of the sentence.

Gundel further discussed the pragmatics of clefting, as well as other topic and focus marking constructions, in Gundel (1985, 1988), relating it-clefts to wh-clefts, and predicting that final it-cleft clauses that express topics are necessarily 'activated', or contain information that is 'given' in the discourse, while initial wh-cleft clauses can express information that is new to the discourse. The 1985 paper concentrated on English, while the 1988 paper extended the analysis to a multitude of languages. In the 1985 paper, she also contrasted the information status requirements on left-dislocated phrases, which can introduce new topics, and right-dislocated phrases, which can only refer to already activated topics. Gundel 1988 derives the result that initial topics need only be familiar (prototypically) while final topics need to be activated, from the interaction of two universal principles: the Given–Before–New Principle, which predicts that topics will typically precede comments, and the First-Things-First Principle which predicts that a focus (comment) is important in conveying new information and will therefore tend to precede the topic when marking the topic is not important. It follows that comments will precede topics only when the topic is activated, and therefore is predictable in the context. In this way, she anticipated later optimality theory accounts of violable constraints on well-formedness. Recently, Gundel has returned to her study of clefts in comparing the use of clefts in English–Norwegian and Norwegian–English translations (Gundel 2002 and Gundel 2006), arguing that clefts are more often used in Norwegian than English due to the greater tendency in Norwegian for information structure to be mapped directly to the syntax.

In Gundel (1978, 1985, 1988), she began distinguishing activated from familiar and identifiable information, distinctions fully elaborated in the Givenness Hierarchy of Gundel, Hedberg and Zacharski 1993. Six 'cognitive statuses' are currently distinguished: in focus, activated, familiar, uniquely identifiable, referential and type identifiable. Each status is identified as a necessary condition on a different type of pronominal or determiner form: e.g. in English, the referent of an unstressed pronominal *it* must be

in the focus of the addressee's attention in order to be felicitously used, while the referent of a distal demonstrative determiner phrase, *that* N, must be familiar to the hearer, while the referent of a definite determiner phrase, *the* N, need only be uniquely identifiable. A theory of necessary and sufficient conditions on felicitous use of several different forms of referring expression is thus offered. These authors have also published within the same framework later articles on indirect anaphora (cf. Erkü and Gundel 1987) and on the non-necessity that the referents of definite article phrases be familiar (Gundel, Hedberg and Zacharski 2000, 2001, respectively). In a series of recent articles (e.g., Hegarty, Gundel and Borthen 2002; Gundel, Hegarty and Borthen 2003 and Gundel, Hedberg and Zacharski 2005), Gundel and her colleagues have extended this work to explore reference by *this/that* to entities like facts and speech acts, which are more abstract and less directly activated than the entities like events and states, which tend to be referred to by *it*.

In relating Gundel's work on topic and comment (focus) to her work on reference, it must be pointed out that one very important contribution she has made to the field of the grammar–pragmatics interface at large is explicating the fundamental distinction between these two types of phenomena, first proposed in Gundel 1988. Topic-comment status involves 'relational givenness'—the topic is given in relation to the comment; whereas cognitive status involves the 'referential givenness' of the discourse entities under discussion. The two types of givenness are related in that topics (which are relationally given) must have some degree of referential givenness (prototypically familiarity) in order to be felicitous, but the two types of givenness status are crucially distinct.

In the late 1990s and early 2000s, Gundel has elaborated on this 'referential/relational givenness' distinction in articles such as Gundel 1999a on different types of focus, Gundel 1999b on the grammar–pragmatics interface, Gundel 2003 on the relation between grammar and pragmatic categories, and Gundel and Fretheim 2004 on topic and focus. In these articles, she has also clarified how she views the distinctions as relating to the distinction between grammar and pragmatics. She views the different cognitive statuses as the conventional meanings of the various pronominal and determiner forms involved and thus part of the grammar, but recognizes that this type of meaning, which relates to memory and attention states of the addressee, is extralinguistic, in that non-linguistic representations can also be said to be activated or familiar to an addressee. Also, since the statuses involve the speaker's belief about the hearer's cognitive states, these meanings are inherently pragmatic. With regard to relational givenness, she persists in viewing the partition of the sentence into 'topic/ground/theme' versus 'comment/focus/rheme' as a fundamental part of the "semantic/conceptual representation" of the sentence (Gundel and Fretheim 2004: 177). Like referential givenness, this is a grammatical distinction; however, it does not apply extralinguistically. The meaning of the distinction is an inherently linguistic one, but one that has implications for pragmatics: i.e. by means of the topic–comment distinction, which is prosodically marked by placement of primary stress on the comment, speakers convey to

hearers the way that their utterances are intended to relate to the context, and thereby are intended to change the context.

Interestingly, it is in relating relational givenness to referential givenness that Gundel's current views on the grammar–pragmatics interface become the most clear. In her early work, she defended the claim that 'topics' (a relational category) must always be 'familiar' (a referential category). That is, in order for it to be possible for the comment to be psychologically assessed relative to the topic, the topic must be familiar to the hearer. However, researchers such as Reinhart (1982), Prince (1985), and Erteschik-Shir (1997) have claimed that topics need only be referential. The most convincing cases are those put forward by Prince drawn from natural speech corpora, which show that referential indefinite noun phrases can be left-dislocated in spoken English, and expressed in a position that Gundel claims is an exclusively topic-marking position:

(1) An old preacher down there, they augured under the grave where his father was buried.

To account for such examples, in Gundel (1999b) and Gundel and Fretheim (2004), Gundel brings together her views on the information structural interpretations of grammatical constructions and her views on relevance accounts of pragmatics. She proposes that to be semantically well-formed, a topic need only be referential, but that in order to be pragmatically construable, it needs to have contextual effects, as Relevance Theory (Sperber and Wilson 1986/1995) proposes. Pragmatically speaking, a sentence normally needs to have a familiar or identifiable topic in order for the comment to be assessable with regard to it, but in a sentence like (1), perhaps due to the 'anchoring' by 'down there', this constraint is suspended and the entire proposition is processed as all new information, or else as information about what happened 'down there'. In support of the idea that sentence (1) is exceptional in some way with regard to topic-comment structure, note as she does that the corresponding question is infelicitous:

(2) ??An old preacher down there, did they augur under the grave where his father was buried?

Thus, Gundel has an account of the prototypicality of topics expressing familiar information (a pragmatic preference), but also an account of the exceptions—where the topic is only referential (a semantic or grammatical requirement). Consideration of the distinct roles played by grammar and pragmatics is crucial to this account.

Finally, it must be noted that Jeanette Gundel has also had influence in areas outside of her specialized areas of research into information structure and reference. She has multiple publications in the areas of second language acquisition and typological markedness theory, for example. She has also served on the committees of graduate students who work in related areas such as sociolinguistics, philosophy of language and communication disorders. Not only has she maintained close ties with faculty in other areas of linguistics such as syntax, semantics, and psycholinguistics, she has also main-

tained ties with colleagues in related disciplines such as computer science and foreign language teaching. Some of the contributions to this volume exhibit the influence that she has had on convincing colleagues working primarily on syntax and semantics to take into consideration pragmatic phenomena such as conversational implicature and cognitive status, and also on influencing students and colleagues focusing on socio-linguistic aspects of pragmatics to relate their work to grammar. This influence is an-other way that Jeanette Gundel has contributed to the examination of the grammar–pragmatics interface.

3.   Introduction to the individual papers in the volume

The first section of the book contains papers relating pragmatics to syntax, and thus address the grammar–pragmatics interface at the sentential level. The paper by Laura Michaelis and Hartwell rancis relates subjects to the notion of topic since, in their an-alysis, subjects are the grammatical relation that most typically encodes topics. This paper is based on a large-scale analysis of the Switchboard Corpus, examining more than 31,000 subjects. Only 9% of the subjects in this conversational corpus were lexical as opposed to pronominal. These examples represent violations of Lambrecht's (1994) 'principle of separation of reference and role': i.e., do not introduce an entity and talk about it in the same clause. The authors examine the 'conflation strategy' represented in this small percentage of sentences and suggest that whereas the more common strategy favors the hearer, this strategy favors the speaker for effort conservation, introducing the new topic entity as a subject. The authors examine the cognitive status of the lexical subjects and find that they are at least uniquely identifiable on the Givenness Hierarchy and that they tend to contain anchors to activated entities. This behavior supports Gun-del's predictions about the referential givenness cognitive status of relationally given topics (e.g., Gundel 1985). The authors propose that the lexical subjects strike a bal-ance between Q-based transparency ('be as clear as you can about what your com-municative intentions are') and R-based effort conservation ('say as little as you can'), using Horn's (1984) pragmatic principles of communication. This reliance on commu-nicative principles for explanation also relates to Gundel's reliance on Grice's Quantity Maxim (e.g., in Gundel, Hedberg and Zacharski 1993) and on the Principle of Rele-vance (e.g., in Gundel 1996, Gundel and Mulkern 1998).

Nancy Hedberg and Lorna Fadden present a paper on the function of wh-clefts, re-verse wh-clefts and it-clefts in English discourse. They propose that wh-clefts have the topic-comment organization that would be expected given that cleft clauses present presuppositions, which can readily be associated with topics. However, they also claim that it-clefts and reverse wh-clefts can have either the comment-topic organization that would be expected under the above assumptions, or, more frequently even, a top-ic-comment organization. They thus propose that a distinction must be recognized be-tween the referential givenness status of the two parts of the cleft, which always results

in at least a uniquely identifiable status to the cleft clause, and the relational givenness status, which is relatively free. They also propose that the condition on wh-cleft clauses, that they be relationally given (i.e., topics) better explains the data presented in Prince (1978) that led to her conclusion that wh-cleft clauses compared to it-cleft clauses must be 'in the consciousness of the hearer' or 'Chafe-given' (i.e., activated in Gundel, Hedberg and Zacharski terms). Unactivated but familiar or uniquely identifiable wh-cleft clauses that present relevant new topics support this conclusion. The authors rely on a corpus of clefts drawn from a television political discussion program as well as examples drawn from a variety of spoken and written sources. They consider a number of syntactic and pragmatic subtypes of clefts in arriving at their conclusions of how the different parts of clefts map onto topic or comment status.

Gregory Ward, Jeffrey aplan and Betty irner consider a cleft analysis for their work on one type of epistemic *would* construction in English—e.g., *That would be me*—in which the subject NP is anaphoric to the variable in a salient Open Proposition (OP) in the context. They show that such constructions are epistemically stronger than counterpart constructions with epistemic *must*, and suggest that they might be analyzed as truncated clefts (Hedberg 2000): *That would be me that you are talking about.* They show that these constructions share many pragmatic properties with clefts: Both permit apparent number disagreement, convey exhaustiveness of the postcopular constituent, and support a systematic ambiguity with respect to the referent of the subject. However, because epistemic *would* requires an OP independently, i.e., even in cases where there is no truncated cleft analysis available, the authors end up proposing that the overlap in properties with clefts is due to a shared OP requirement in combination with equative syntax and a demonstrative subject Nhat is, the shared properties may derive from the fact that both constructions are cases of a more general category of OP-requiring constructions, including preposings and contrastive accent (cf. Prince 1986, inter alia). In arriving at their conclusions, the authors rely on examples collected from natural conversation or text.

Hooi Ling Soh and Mei Jia Gao write about the semantics and pragmatics of the verbal particle *-le* in Mandarin Chinese. They explore sentences of different situation types (Smith 1997) in determining the semantics/pragmatics of *le*, carefully distinguishing semantic entailments from pragmatic implicatures, thereby simplifying the grammatical analysis of the verbal particle *-le* by characterizing it simply as a perfective aspect marker. For example, purported continuative readings of verbal *–le* in achievement sentences are analyzed as implicatures deriving from the fact that a state continues after the achievement is obtained. This paper shows that consideration of whether semantic or pragmatic explanations of different facets of the data lead to more illuminating conclusions about that data can result in considerable ground to be gained, and thereby explores the grammar–pragmatics interface.

The second section of the book relates pragmatics to reference, thus examining the grammar–pragmatics interface at the level of the noun phrase. Ann Mulkern applies the Givenness Hierarchy theory to Irish, focusing on explicating differences be-

tween three types of human-referring pronouns that have the same cognitive status—activated. She bases her conclusions on a collection of naturally occurring Irish data. She makes a valuable distinction between 'inherent salience', having to do with the centrality of the entity already in the discourse, and 'imposed salience', having to do with signaling how the entity should be ranked relative to other discourse entities in subsequent discourse. She also carefully defines two motivations for imposing salience: 'contrast', which establishes a partition between members of a salient semantically appropriate set, with the salience of the two parts remaining equal; and 'emphasis', which promotes one discourse entity as the most important (salient) relative to others. With regard to the activated Irish pronominals, the suffixed form is used to signal that the salience of its referent is equal to or less than another entity in the discourse, e.g., in contexts where the speaker establishes a contrast, parallel relationship, reciprocal relationship, or comparison between two sets of discourse entities with respect to the applicability of some property. Pronouns suffixed with *féin* ('lexically free reflexives'), on the other hand, signal the promotion of their referent to the most salient position relative to other discourse entities, or signal that the entity remains the most salient activated entity, e.g. to establish the entity as the discourse topic or to signal a perspective shift to the referent of that pronoun. Finally, third-person pronominal forms augmented with a demonstrative element function like the suffixed pronominals, with an additional deictic dimension of time or location added.

Kaja Borthen extends the Givenness Hierarchy framework from individual entity references to generic references in English and Norwegian. Generic reference was outside the scope of the original Gundel, Hedberg and Zacharski 1993 paper. Borthen shows how the correspondence between NP forms and cognitive statuses can explain why kind-referring NPs achieve different interpretations depending on their form. Amongst other things, the tendency for kind-referring definite singular NPs to refer to so-called 'well-established' kinds and for indefinite singular NPs to typically trigger a so-called 'taxonomic' interpretation (Krifka et al. 1995) are explained as resulting from an interaction between the Givenness Hierarchy and general pragmatic meaning.

Michael Hegarty also extends the original focus of Gundel, Hedberg and Zacharski (1993), with further inquiry into the interpretation of clauses when they themselves, or anaphors for which they serve as antecedents, appear as arguments of a higher predicate. He first explicates the notion of a higher-order situation by considering it to consist of a basic state or event along with its ramifications in the context, and also explicates the notion of a fact in terms of a situation exemplifying a proposition, in this latter consideration following Kratzer (2002). Then he uses diagnostics from the literature, including facts about the possibility of pronominal as compared to demonstrative reference to higher order entities investigated by Hegarty et al. (2002) and Gundel et al. (2003), inter alia, to show that the denotation of a situation-introducing clause is a set of situations consisting of a base event or state recovered directly from the predicate-argument and quantificational structure of the clause, together with its ramifications, computed within the discourse context. In light of evidence that events

and states are of type e, this yields the higher type $\langle e, t \rangle$ for clausally introduced situations. This is distinct from the semantic type of events in natural language semantics, since events, on Davidsonian grounds, are consistently first order. Putting this result together with Kratzer's analysis of facts, and proposals from Hegarty (2003), regarding the semantic type of clausally introduced propositions, means that clauses introducing facts exhibit referential duality between a situation of type $\langle e, t \rangle$ and a proposition of type $\langle \langle s, t \rangle, t \rangle$. Thus the standard inventory of abstract entities denoted by clauses, including propositions, facts, and events, can be expanded to include situations, with fine-grained articulation of differences among these entities in terms of semantic type. While Hegarty's paper focuses primarily on the area of semantics, it relates to the semantics–pragmatics interface in that it addresses the accessibility of clausal denotations to reference with different pronominal forms reflecting the cognitive status of the referents, and in the thoroughgoing context dependence of the denotations it assigns to clausally-introduced propositions and situations. For data, he relies mostly on examples drawn from everyday discourse and variants constructed on that basis.

Francis Cornish examines the interpretation of zero or 'implicit' objects in English. His major claim is that there is an interaction of aspectual structure and lexical-semantic structure (including the lexical host predicate's *Aktionsart* as well as semantic selectional restrictions) with various discourse-contextual factors. This interaction is relevant both in licensing the non-realization of the argument and in giving rise to the interpretation. There are two main types of interpretation, involving two subtypes: a non-referential type (either generic or indeterminate) and a referential one (corresponding either to the introduction of a discourse-new referent, or to the anaphoric retrieval of a salient discourse referent). Cornish concludes that the three types of interpretation of English zero complements can be insightfully understood in terms of all but one Givenness Hierarchy cognitive status category: the referential-anaphoric value is 'in focus', the referential discourse-new value is 'familiar', 'uniquely identifiable', or 'referential', and the non-referential value is 'type identifiable'. He relies for much of his data on natural examples drawn from everyday discourse.

Thorstein Fretheim extends the analysis of anaphoric NP referring expressions to anaphoric adverbials, namely Norwegian *ellers* and English *else* and *otherwise*, which have propositions as antecedents. He develops an account of the semantics and pragmatics of these 'switch polarity anaphors' within Relevance Theory (Sperber and Wilson 1986/1995). He proposes a semantic meaning for these items that is procedural as opposed to conceptual (Wilson and Sperber 1993). That is, the conventional lexical meaning he proposes for these items is an instruction to the hearer to construct a proposition Q that is interpreted in the context of a proposition that has the opposite polarity to the antecedent proposition P. Pragmatics comes into the picture as the inferential means to identify the antecedent proposition. In addition to working directly on the cusp of semantics and pragmatics, Fretheim's paper relates to Jeanette's published work in Relevance Theory (e.g. Gundel 1996; Gundel and Mulkern 1997). Furthermore

most of his examples come from an English–Norwegian/ Norwegian–English translation corpus (the English–Norwegian Parallel Corpus), and the direct and indirect translations shed light on the meaning of switch-polarity anaphors in both languages. His work thus also relates methodologically to some of Jeanette's recent work in comparative English Norwegian/Norwegian–English translations of cleft sentences (Gundel 2002, 2006).

Maria Polinsky examines one type of wh-expression in English and other languages, especially Russian, namely the 'aggressively non-discourse-linked wh-expressions' (NDLs), which correspond to such English expressions as *what on earth* or *what the hell*. These expressions differ from the other two types of interrogatives (discourse-linked wh-expressions, which resemble definite noun phrases, and regular wh-expressions, which resemble pronominals) in a systematic way. The paper lists several relevant differences between NDLs and other wh-expressions with regard to the way they are represented in syntax. The main point of the paper is that NDLs differ from interrogative pronominals and discourse-linked expressions both in referentiality and activation. With respect to referentiality, Russian NDLs only have intensional reference, encoding properties, not objects in the world. The referential status of these expressions is used to account for all of their grammatical behaviors; many of the apparent syntactic restrictions on NDLs are presented as mere side effects of their semantic status, which has direct implications for their inability to be maintained in working memory. The paper compares NDLs to universally quantified expressions with 'any', which seem to offer the closest parallel. The implications of the paper are threefold. First, it offers a three-way distinction of wh-expressions which finds parallels to the distinctions found in noun phrases between definite noun phrases (d-linked wh-expressions), pronouns (regular wh-expressions), and universally quantified expressions/polarity items (NDLs). Second, the paper proposes that information-structural inquiries should adopt a more fine-grained approach to wh-expressions. As a result, this would allow researchers to move beyond the traditional association between focus and wh-expressions. The paper argues that the contribution made by wh-expressions to information structure is richer and more diverse than that. Third, the paper addresses the need to conduct more cross-linguistic work on NDLs. Little is known about the referential properties of NDLs in other languages, but the very fact that the Russian NDLs resemble their counterparts in Italian and English with respect to syntactic properties makes for a testable prediction that such NDLs are intensionally-referential expressions in other languages as well.

The final section of the book relates grammar more widely to pragmatics in the sense of social variables. Mira Ariel, who works in Accessibility Theory, a theory related to the Givenness Hierarchy framework, addresses forms of referring expressions in different registers. Specifically she asks the question of whether cases where given registers or genres exhibit statistically significant differences in the distribution of referring expressions mean that register-specific or genre-specific grammatical conventions need to be posited. Looking at definite descriptions in particular, she argues that for the most

part the answer is negative. The connection between genre and referring expressions is indirectly mediated by extralinguistic motivations: different registers prototypically call for different types of discourse entities. While the discourse function of definite descriptions remains constant across all registers (indicating a low degree of accessibility for the mental representation of the entity referred to on her theory), its implementation naturally varies according to the discourse entities involved. In other words, the same grammatical rule, used to encode different entities, will naturally yield different surface realizations in different pragmatic contexts. To give just one example, assuming that definite descriptions code various degrees of low accessibility, it is only to be expected that definite descriptions should be more frequent in registers which call for the use of many low accessibility discourse referents. This paper thus directly discusses the grammar–pragmatics interface in arguing that a common grammar of definite descriptions can result in different pragmatic distributions of uses. In arriving at her conclusions Ariel cites a number of studies of definite descriptions in natural discourse, including that of Gundel, Hedberg and Zacharski 2001.

Suellen Rundquist examines the form and use of apologies in casual conversations between families and close friends in American English. She finds that speakers often make direct apologies, expressing different aspects of the full form that apologies have been analyzed to take, e.g. the apology itself, an explanation, and an acknowledgement of responsibility. However, speakers sometimes apologize indirectly, without using conventionalized apology formulae, and sometimes the apology form is used for purposes other than to make an apology, e.g. for purposes of making a joke. Men more often than women are found to apologize indirectly and to pretend to make an apology. Her research relates to the grammar–pragmatics interface in the sense that the conventional forms of apologies can be seen as part of discourse grammar, which may or may not be directly reflected in the use or pragmatics of these forms.

Polly Szatrowski presents a sociolinguistic study, analyzing subjectivity, perspective and footing in 50 co-constructions taken from spontaneous Japanese conversations. A co-construction takes place when a second speaker finishes a first speaker's utterance. Phenomena such as person restriction and perspective in deictic verbs in Japanese, which have been accounted for traditionally in grammatical terms, can be overridden by pragmatics in spontaneous speech. For example, speakers can violate person restrictions as well as the empathy hierarchy (Kuno 1987) in their use of the verb *iku* 'go' in conversational interaction because they can speak on another participant's footing (Goffman 1981) and take the other speaker's perspective while speaking from their own footing when completing a co-construction. Many co-constructed sentences can only be grammatically pronounced in their entirety by the first or the second speaker and in some cases by neither of the speakers. Also it is necessary to refer to the psychological position of the speaker vis-à-vis the addressee or referent and the participant status (information presenter vs. supporting participant), utterance function, and whether or not the utterance is addressed to another participant in the interaction to account for how co-constructions are used in actual interactions. The grammar–prag-

matics interface is addressed in examining how different grammatical forms are manipulated in actual interactive speech situations.

4.   Concluding remarks

Jeanette has been and remains an extremely inspiring teacher and colleague, well known for mentoring graduate students by coauthoring papers with them, and for co-authoring also with close colleagues. To a large extent it is her ability to listen and learn from other people that we, the editors, appreciate about and have learned from Jeanette. She is open to other people's ideas (including those of her students), and to ideas from a variety of disciplines, including not only linguistics, but also psychology, philosophy, computer science, and beyond, thus to cognitive science in general.

At the same time she is persistent in sticking with her own ideas. This steadfastness has served her well, and we have learned from her to respect our own ideas and to not give them up in the face of opposing viewpoints. It is this persistence that has resulted, for example, in the recent renaissance in the popularity of the notion of 'topic', which Jeanette was influential in initiating in the 1970s.

Even within linguistics, Jeanette is open to a variety of frameworks, as witnessed by the fact that she has been sought out for participation in discussions relating pragmatic factors to different syntactic frameworks, such as her contribution to the Chomsky birthday celebration on the World Wide Web in 1999 and her contribution to a recent annual conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar (Gundel 2003). She has also prominently published articles relating her own research to other work in discourse and pragmatics such as Relevance Theory (Gundel 1996 and Gundel and Mulkern 1997) and Centering Theory (Gundel 1998). In sum, she has worked in or inspired work by students and colleagues in a large variety of sub-areas within linguistics, including syntax, semantics, pragmatics, computational linguistics, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, and prosody.

A hallmark of Jeanette's research is that she bases her conclusions to a large extent on examples drawn from naturally occurring discourse. However, she relies equally on intuitive judgments of constructed examples in drawing her conclusions, following the mainstream methods of generative linguistics. This approach, which results in accurate empirical observation in support of sound theoretical constructs, leads to insightful conclusions. Most of the papers in this volume rely on both approaches, drawing their conclusions from intuitive judgments as well as naturally occurring data, whether collected ad hoc from everyday life, from collections of spoken and written texts, or drawn from small-scale or large-scale electronic corpora.

The students and colleagues represented in this volume can here with our papers and editing work only offer a token of appreciation for Jeanette's teaching and research and for her personal inspiration. We all present this collection of papers as a joyful celebration of her life and work, and gratefully dedicate this volume to her.

5.   Bibliography

Davidson, Donald. 1980. "The logical form of action sentences." In *Essays on Actions and Events*, 105–22. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Erku, Feride and Gundel, Jeanette K. 1987. "The pragmatics of indirect anaphors." In *The Pragmatic Perspective,* J. Verscheuren and M. Bertucelli-Papi (eds.). Amsterdam: John Benjamins,533–45.

Erteschik-Shir, Nomi. 1997. *The Dynamics of Focus Structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goffman, Erving. 1981. *Forms of Talk.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Grice, H. Paul. 1975. "Logic in conversation." In *Speech Acts. Syntax and Semantics, Volume 3,* P. Cole and J. L. Morgan (eds.), 41–58. New York: Academic Press,.

Gundel, Jeanette K. 2006. "Clefts in English and Norwegian: Some Implications for the Grammar–Pragmatics Interface." In *The Architecture of Focus*, Valéria Molnár and Susanne Winkler, (eds.), 517–48. Mouton de Gruyter.

Gundel, Jeanette K. 2003. "Information structure and referential givenness/newness: How much belongs in the grammar?" *Journal of Cognitive Science* 4: 177–99. (Also in S. Mueller, ed. Proceedings of the 2003 Conference on Head Driven Phrase Structure Grammar. Stanford CSLI. http://cslipublications.stanford.edu/HPSG/4/)

Gundel, Jeanette K. 2002. "*It*-clefts in English and Norwegian." In *Information structure in a cross-linguistic perspective,* B. Behrens, C. Fabricius-Hansen, H. Hasselgård, and S. Johansson, (eds.), 113–28. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Gundel, Jeanette K. 1999a. "On three kinds of focus." In *Focus. Linguistic, Cognitive and Computational Perspectives,* P. Bosch and R. van der Sandt (eds.), 293–305. Cambridge University Press.

Gundel, Jeanette K. 1999b. "Topic, focus, and the grammar–pragmatics interface". U Penn Working Papers in Lingustics. http://www.ling.upenn.edu/papers/pwpl/v6.1/gundel.pdf

Gundel, Jeanette K. 1998. "Centering theory and the givenness hierarchy: A proposed synthesis." In *Centering Theory in Discourse,* M. A. Walker, A. K. Joshi, and E. Prince (eds.), 183–97. Oxford University Press.

Gundel, Jeanette K. 1996. "Relevance theory meets the givenness hierarchy: An account of inferrables." In *Reference and Referent Accessibility,* T. Fretheim and J. Gundel, (eds.), 141–53. John Benjamins & Co.

Gundel, Jeanette K. 1988. "Universals of topic-comment structure." In *Studies in Syntactic Typology,* M. Hammond, E. Moravcsik, and J. Wirth (eds.) . John Benjamins B. V. , 209–42, 1988. (Also published in *Another Twentieth Anniversary Volume.* Indiana University Linguistics Club, 37–65.

Gundel, Jeanette K. 1985. "Shared knowledge and topicality." *Journal of Pragmatics* 9: 83–107.

Gundel, Jeanette K. 1978. "Stress, pronominalization and the given–new distinction." *University of Hawaii Working Papers in Linguistics,* 10(2): 1–13.

Gundel, Jeanette K. 1977. "Where do cleft sentences come from?" *Language* 53: 543–9.

Gundel, Jeanette K. 1974. *The Role of Topic and Comment in Linguistic Theory*. University of Texas at Austin doctoral dissertation. Reprinted 1988 in *Outstanding Dissertations in Linguistics,* G. Hankamer, (ed.). New York: Garland Publishing Co. Also published in 1977 by Indiana University Linguistics Club.

Gundel, Jeanette K. and Fretheim, Thorstein. 2004. "Topic and focus." In *Handbook of Pragmatic Theory*, G. Ward and L. Horn, (eds.), 175–96. Blackwell.

Gundel, Jeanette K. and Fretheim, Thorstein. 2002. "Information Structure." In *Handbook of Pragmatics* J. Verscheuren, (ed.), 1–17. John Benjamins.

Gundel, Jeanette K., Hedberg, Nancy, and Zacharski, Ron. 2005. "Pronouns without NP antecedents: How do we know when a pronoun is referential?" In *Anaphora Processing: Linguistic, Cognitive and Computational Modeling*, A. Branco, T. McEnory, and R. Mitkov, (eds.), 351–64. Amsterdam: John Benjamins

Gundel, Jeanette K., Hedberg, Nancy, and Zacharski, Ron. 2001. "Definite descriptions and cognitive status in English: Why accomodation is unnecessary." *Journal of English Language and Linguistics* 5 (2): 273–95.

Gundel, Jeanette K., Hedberg, Nancy, and Zacharski, Ron. 2000. "Statut cognitif et forme des anaphoriques indirects." *Verbum* 22 (1), Special Issue on Anaphora: 79–102. Translated from the English (Cognitive status and the form of indirect anaphors) by Francis Cornish.

Gundel, Jeanette K., Hedberg, Nancy, and Zacharski, Ron. 1993. "Cognitive status and the form of referring expressions in discourse." *Language* 69 (2): 274–307.

Gundel, Jeanette K., Hegarty, Michael, and Borthen, Kaja. 2003. "Cognitive status, information structure, and pronominal reference to clausally introduced entities." *Journal of Logic, Language and Information* 12: 281–99.

Gundel, Jeanette K. and Mulkern, Ann. 1997. "Relevance, referring expressions and the givenness hierarchy." *Proceedings of the Workshop on Relevance Theory*. University of Herfordshire.

Hedberg, Nancy. 2000. "The referential status of clefts." *Language* 76: 891–920.

Hegarty, Michael. 2003. "Semantic types of abstract entities." *Lingua* 113: 891–927.

Hegarty, Michael, Gundel, Jeanette K. and Borthen, Kaja. 2002. "Information structure and the accessibility of clausally introduced referents." *Theoretical Linguistics* 27: 1–24.

Horn, Laurence R. 1984. "Toward a new taxonomy for pragmatic inference: Q-based and R-based implicature." In *Meaning, Form and Use in Context: Linguistic Applications,* D. Schiffrin, (ed.), 11–42. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.

Kratzer, Angelika. 2002. "Facts: Particulars or information units?" *Linguistics and Philosophy* 25: 655–70.

Krifka, Manfred, Pelletier, Francis Jeffry, Carlson, Gregory N., ter Meulen, Alice, Chierchia, Gennaro and Link, Godehard. 1995. "Genericity: An introduction." In *The Generic Book*, Gregory N. Carlson and Francis Jeffry Pelletier (eds.). The University of Chicago Press.

Kuno, Susumo. 1987. *Functional Syntax: Anaphora, Discourse and Empathy*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, George. 1971. "On Generative Semantics.: In: *Semantics*, D. Steinberg & L. Jakobovits (eds.), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 232–96.

Lambrecht, Knud. 1994. *Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topic, Focus and the Mental Representation of Discourse Entities*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

May, Robert. 1985. *Logical Form: Its Structure and Derivation*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Prince, Ellen F. 1986. "On the marking of presupposed open propositions." In *Papers from the Parassession on Pragmatics and Grammatical Theory*, 22nd *Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society,* A. Farley, P. Farley, and K. E. McCullough (eds.), 208–22.

Prince, Ellen F. 1985. "Fancy syntax and shared knowledge." *Journal of Pragmatics* 9: 65–81.

Prince, Ellen F. 1978. "A comparison of wh-clefts and it-clefts in discourse." *Language* 54: 883–906.

Reinhart, Tanya. 1982. "Pragmatics and linguistics: An analysis of sentence topics." *Philosophica* 27: 53–94.

Smith, Carlota S. 1997. *The Parameter of Aspect* (2nd Edition). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Sperber, Dan and Wilson, Deidre. 1986./1995 *Relevance: Communication and Cognition.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Wilson, Deirdre and Sperber, Dan. 1993. "Linguistic form and relevance." *Lingua* 90: 1–25.