Chapter 1 : Discourse Markers | Grammar Quizzes

In this collection of carefully selected papers connectivity is looked at from the vantage points of language contact, language change, language acquisition, multilingual communication and related domains based on various European and Non-European languages.

You either do your work or prepare for a trip to the office. Either do or prepare He is not only handsome but also brilliant. Not only A but also B Neither the basketball team nor the football team is doing well. Both the cross country team and the swimming team are doing well. You must decide whether you stay or you go. Just as many Americans love basketball, so many Canadians love ice hockey. The more you practice dribbling, the better you will be at it. Football is as fast as hockey is fast. Football is as much an addiction as it is a sport. No sooner did she learn to ski than the snow began to thaw. I would rather swim than surf. Subordinating conjunctions[edit] Subordinating conjunctions, also called subordinators, are conjunctions that join an independent clause and a dependent clause , and also introduce adverb clauses. The most common subordinating conjunctions in the English language include after, although, as, as far as, as if, as long as, as soon as, as though, because, before, even if, even though, every time, if, in order that, since, so, so that, than, though, unless, until, when, whenever, where, whereas, wherever, and while. Complementizers can be considered to be special subordinating conjunctions that introduce complement clauses: Some subordinating conjunctions until and while , when used to introduce a phrase instead of a full clause, become prepositions with identical meanings. The subordinating conjunction performs two important functions within a sentence: The equivalents to the subordinating conjunctions of non-verb-final languages such as English are either clause-final conjunctions e. In this sense, the subordinate clauses of these languages have much in common with postpositional phrases. In other West Germanic languages like German and Dutch, the word order after a subordinating conjunction is different from that in an independent clause, e. The clause after the coordinating conjunction has normal word order, but the clause after the subordinating conjunction has verb-final word order. Hij gaat naar huis, want hij is ziek. Er geht nach Hause, denn er ist krank. Disputes in English grammar It is now generally agreed that a sentence may begin with a coordinating conjunction like and, [10] but, [11] or yet. One conjecture is that it results from young children being taught to avoid simple sentences starting with and and encouraged to use more complex structures with subordinating conjunctions. Garner , the "widespread belief Because is a subordinating conjunction and introduces a dependent clause. It may start a sentence when the main clause follows the dependent clause. Please improve the article by adding more descriptive text and removing less pertinent examples. March "But she must give security that she will not marry without royal consent, if she holds her lands of the Crown, or without the consent of whatever other lord she may hold them of. But it seems to me that the question of whether it is fair, just and reasonable is better considered against the background of whether a sufficiently proximate relationship exists. In unembedded contexts, Warlpiri uses the coordinator manu, such that P manu Q translates to "P and Q": Cecilia manu Gloriapala yanu tawunu kurra means "Cecilia and Gloria went to town".

Chapter 2 : Corpora, grammar and discourse : in honour of Susan Hunston in SearchWorks catalog

Note: Citations are based on reference standards. However, formatting rules can vary widely between applications and fields of interest or study. The specific requirements or preferences of your reviewing publisher, classroom teacher, institution or organization should be applied.

Addressing people directly MALES Often when directly speaking to someone, we say the name of a person followed by the information. This has two functions: Smith, will you be flying to New York this weekend? Uncle Jay, will you watch a game with me? Bro, will you watch a game with me? Darling, will you watch a game with me? Son, will you watch a game with me? Mister, will you be flying to New York this weekend? Officer Smith, will you be flying to New York this weekend? Professor Smith, will you be flying to New York this weekend? President, will you be flying to New York this weekend? Your Royal Highness, will you be flying to New York this weekend? Gentlemen, would you like copies of your receipts? Increasingly, women avoid some of these distinctions. Sanders, will you be flying to New York this weekend? Aunt Jill, will you watch a game with me? Sis, will you watch a game with me? Dear, will you watch a game with me? Sanders, will you be flying to New York? President Sanders, will you be flying to New York this weekend? Madam Secretary, will you be flying to New York this weekend? Your Majesty, will you be flying to New York this weekend? Ladies, would you like copies of your receipts? The missus does the food shopping. The missus and I are going on vacation. Note that in a title, Mrs. Madam may I take your coat? Madam President, is there any truth to these rumors?

Chapter 3 : Conjunction (grammar) - Wikipedia

The volume is organized along central concepts: A general section deals with connectivity in language change and language acquisition, subdivisions are devoted to pronouns, topics and subjects, the role of finiteness in text and discourse, coordination and subordination and particles, adverbials and constructions.

Includes bibliographical references and indexes. List of Contributors-- 3. Corpora, grammar, and discourse analysis: Recent trends, current challenges by Groom, Nicholas -- 5. Pattern grammar and transitivity analysis by Thompson, Geoff -- 6. Exploring corpus data and speaker knowledge by Romer, Ute -- 7. Some changing uses of prepositions by Francis, Gill -- 8. The textual functions of lexis by Stubbs, Michael -- 9. Examining associations between lexis and textual position in hard news stories, or according to a study by I mean I only really wanted to dry me towels because Organisational frameworks across modes, registers, and genres by Warren, Martin -- Probably most important of all: Importance markers in academic and popular history articles by Bondi, Marina -- Chatting in the academy: Informality in spoken academic discourse by Buttery, Paula -- General extenders in learner language by Aijmer, Karin -- Language description and language learning: The pedagogic corpus and learners as researchers by Willis, Dave -- Individual and communal aspects of attitudinal identity by Bednarek, Monika -- Does Britain need any more foreign doctors? Inter-analyst consistency and corpus-assisted critical discourse analysis by Baker, Paul -- Publications by Susan Hunston-- Nielsen Book Data 1. List of contributors-- 3. Recent trends, current challenges by Groom, Nicholas -- 6. Pattern grammar and transitivity analysis by Thompson, Geoff -- 7. Exploring corpus data and speaker knowledge by Romer, Ute -- 8. Some changing uses of prepositions by Francis, Gill -- 9. The textual functions of lexis by Stubbs, Michael -- Examining associations between lexis and textual position in hard news stories-- or, According to a study by Does Britain need any more foreign doctors?: Publications by Susan Hunston. Not only has it opened up entirely new theoretical perspectives and methodological possibilities for both fields, but it has also to a considerable extent erased the boundaries that have traditionally been drawn between them. This book showcases a variety of current corpus-based approaches to the study of grammar and discourse, and makes a case for seeing grammar and discourse as fundamentally inter-related phenomena. The book features contributions from leading experts in cognitive linguistics, construction grammar, critical discourse studies, genre and register analysis, phraseology, language learning and teaching, languages for specific purposes, second language acquisition, sociolinguistics, systemic functional linguistics and text linguistics. An essential reference point for future research, Corpora, Grammar and Discourse has been edited in honour of Susan Hunston, whose own work has consistently pushed at the boundaries of corpus-based research on grammar and discourse for over three decades. Nielsen Book Data Subjects.

Chapter 4 : BLENDING AS A CENTRAL PROCESS OF GRAMMAR

Connectivity in Grammar and Discourse (Hamburg Studies on Multilingualism) [Jochen Rehbein, Christiane Hohenstein, Lukas Pietsch] on www.nxgvision.com *FREE* shipping on qualifying offers. In this collection of carefully selected papers connectivity is looked at from the vantage points of language contact.

Top 10 unbelievable historical concurrencies In language, pragmatics and discourse are closely connected. Discourse is the method, either written or verbal, by which an idea is communicated in an orderly, understandable fashion. Used as a verb , discourse refers to the exchange of ideas or information through conversation. Comparatively, pragmatics involve the use of language to meet specific needs or for a predetermined purpose. As such, pragmatics and discourse are related in that pragmatics are the means by which the purpose of discourse is achieved. Both pragmatics and discourse involve concepts far deeper than mere word definitions and sentence structure. Unlike grammar, which involves the rules governing proper language structure, pragmatics and discourse focus on the meaningfulness of spoken or written language. Whether storytelling, explaining, instructing, or requesting, a speaker or writer has an intended purpose for communicating. How a speaker or writer constructs sentences to meet his intended purpose involves both pragmatics and discourse. For example, there are several ways to warn a person about the risk of burns associated with a hot surface. The process of explaining the concept must follow a logical order to be understood by listeners. A speaker might change the wording of such explanations, depending on the age and developmental ability of listeners. Determining the order of the explanation is discourse, whereas determining how to word the explanation for different audiences is pragmatics. Ad Pragmatics and discourse go hand-in-hand with context. Changing the language used for an audience is an integral part of pragmatics, but can easily affect context clues and thus, affect discourse. Sentences changed too much or taken out of context lose the ability to further a conversation. Without the necessary information preceding or following a particular sentence, its meaning can easily be lost. Such omissions affect the cohesiveness of a conversation or text, thus making it difficult to maintain common understandings. Likewise, failure to follow the social rules of pragmatics can drastically affect discourse. If a speaker is requesting something, for example, a poor choice of words can make the request sound more like a demand. Alternatively, complex sentence structure or an overly long explanation can undermine the purpose of discourse by making it impossible for listeners or readers to follow along.

Grammar, Syntax, Semantics and Discourse www.nxgvision.comkshmi1+ 1Kingston Engineering College, Katpadi, Vellore Dis, T.N. Abstract. The paper contains a significant role of grammar, syntax, semantics and discourse in the use of.

Suzanne is recipient of phone call. But there is a different way to conceive the entire problem. French, like English, has three basic constructions corresponding to integrated events involving causation: CA E O [notation: O for "object," IO for "indirect object," E for an event or state. Does not admit an IO: E includes causal action and resulting event Pierre eats] Transfer: This is achieved through a Blend of the extended causal sequences with the basic constructions. Because there are three Basic types, we find not just one, but three blends. Notice that if there happens to be an indirect object of the event in the causal sequence e. Now consider a second Blend: The counterpart of EA is the indirect object IO, simply because in the prototypical case, the IO is the agent of the caused event, e. However, since the Blend, like the Basic Construction, has only one IO this is independently a general constraint on role structures in French [6] , if the caused event in the causal sequence happens to have an indirect object of its own, it will have no position to map onto IO is already taken , and a corresponding IO clitic pronoun will be excluded, as in the ungrammatical 8. This time, there is an IO position in the Blend, and furthermore it is mapped onto the IO position of the resulting event in the causal sequence. This predicts that corresponding clitic pronouns will be acceptable, as confirmed by examples like 7 and The preverbal position of the clitics and reflexives is inherited from the integrated Basic input. But the event in the causal sequence may already itself be reflexive conceptually, in which case it is mirrored by a reflexivized verb se-V. It then fits into the Blend according to its remaining number of roles. For example transformer has an object O, but se transformer does not. It is important to see that the Blends are motivated by the existing Basic Constructions. The interesting answer is that the language does not have this formally possible conventional blend because it has no basic transfer verb for which the IO is conceptually the IO of resultant event, and the O is conceptually its EA. Hebrew forms causatives by conceptual blending just like French, but in addition has a morphological process of formal blending, which allows a verb root to blend with a causative pattern into a single word. This allows Hebrew to transfer the integrated event syntax to the blend, just like English does with caused motion. Many expressions prompt for blending. To make this point, we have often cited the example of a modern philosopher saying in seminar, "I claim that reason is a self-developing capacity. Kant disagrees with me on this point. Words like "agree," "disagree," "retort," "answer," "respond," "counter," "yes," "no," "yes and no," and so on can be used to pick out elements in the blend, and we know the relation of that "debate" blend to the input story of Kant and to the input story of the modern philosopher. Adjective-noun compounds like "artificial life" and "military democracy" have the same purpose. Noun-noun compounds like "house boat," "computer virus," "bond ghoul," and "same-sex marriage" also suggest obvious blends. The Ditransitive Construction It may be less obvious that clausal constructions can also prompt for blending. By itself, the verb "give" evokes an abstract conceptual schema in which a causal agent, by some means, successfully causes the transfer of an object to a recipient. Call this schema "D" for "ditransitive schema. Bill causes the transfer of a glass of wine to Mary. For the complexities of the ditransitive construction and its relation to other constructions e. Our purpose here is to use the English ditransitive construction as an illustration of the way in which a clausal construction can prompt for blending, especially including two-sided blending. The ditransitive construction prompts for a blend B that has two inputs, D and I. D is the abstract but highly-integrated ditransitive schema. I is a set of unintegrated elements to which the words refer. The blend B is two-sided, by which we mean that B takes some of its organizing schema-level structure from each of its inputs, D and I. Although Goldberg does not use the model of conceptual integration, various two-sided blends are implicit in her analysis. The following is a restatement of her claims in the vocabulary of the network model, with some slight changes. If D and I have organizing schemas that match closely, their blend takes its organizing schema from both D and I. This is the case for verbs that inherently signify acts of giving an object "give," "pass," "hand," "serve," "feed,". But if the verb is

a verb of refusal "refuse," "deny" as in "The boss denied Bill a raise," then the blend B takes the potential recipient and the potential patient from D but the causing of the not receiving from I, with the result that D is counterfactual with respect to B. If the verb is a verb of giving with associated satisfaction conditions "guarantee," "promise," "owe,". If the verb involves a scene of creation "bake," "make," "build," "cook," "sew," "knit,". If you "feed Joe a cake," he almost certainly receives it, but not so if you merely "bake Joe a cake" and even less so if you "bake a cake for Joe". If the verb is a verb of permission "permit," "allow,". If the verb is a verb of future transfer "leave," "bequeath," "allocate," "reserve," "grant,". These blends fall into conceptual classes, each class with its own two-sided organizing schema, and each with its associated classes of verbs. These two-sided conceptual blends, and the use of the ditransitive construction to evoke them, can become conventional, so that the ditransitive can be associated not only with the prototypical schema D but also with these various abstract two-sided blends. In fact, this only scratches the surface of the conventional conceptual integration that can be prompted by the English ditransitive construction. There are various metaphoric blends that have D as one input. Although Goldberg does not use the model of conceptual integration, there is a taxonomy of metaphoric blends implicit in her analysis, as follows: This produces a metaphoric blend in which the effect is an object and causing the effect for the entity is causing the object to come to the entity. This conventional blend inherits the ditransitive syntax from D, so one can say "The medicine brought him relief" and "She gave me a headache. This produces a metaphoric blend, analyzed by Reddy , in which meaning is an object and communicating it to someone is giving it to a recipient. This conventional blend inherits the ditransitive syntax from D, so one can say "She told Jo a fairy tale. In the blend, perceiving is reception of the "perception" by the recipient. This metaphoric blend is exploited as a basis for producing a more detailed metaphoric blend, with D as one input and causing someone to perceive as the other. In this more detailed blend, a perception is an object and causing someone to perceive it is transferring it to him. This blend inherits the ditransitive syntax from D, so one can say, "He showed Bob the view. In this metaphoric blend, the action is an object and directing it at another person is transferring it to her as recipient. This blend inherits the ditransitive syntax from D, so one can say "She threw him a parting glance. In this blend, facts and assumptions used in arguing are parts used in constructing. This blend is exploited as a basis for a more detailed blend, of D and granting facts and assumptions to an arguer. In this more detailed blend, granting a fact or assumption to the arguer is transferring it to her as recipient. Goldberg observes correctly that in expressions like "Slay me a dragon," one of the input spaces has an agent performing an action for the benefit of someone else, and the first postverbal noun refers to the beneficiary while the second postverbal noun refers not to what the recipient receives but rather to what the causal agent acts upon. For example, "Bill gave me a dollar" is typically understood as meaning not only that a dollar was transferred but that a benefit e. The Syntax of Causative Constructions: Cross-language Similarities and Divergencies. Syntax and Semantics 6: The Grammar of Causative Constructions. Communication and Cognition 16, Conceptual Projection and Middle Spaces. Compressed Unix postscript version available from http: Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 4, The University of Chicago Press. Blends in Hebrew Causatives. Conceptual Integration and Formal Expression. Journal of Metaphor and Symbolic Activity, vol. Berkeley Linguistic Society Fusion is explored in Goldberg The account we propose below, however, is substantially different, as to what exactly gets blended, both from Goldberg , and Fauconnier and Turner Researchers in construction grammar and cognitive grammar have pointed out a number of interesting defaults, regularities, and constraints that govern the conceptual integration of events as represented in various grammatical constructions. Let ec be the event type designated by the construction, and ev be the event type designated by the verb. So, in "They laughed the guy out of the room," ec is the caused-motion and ev is the event of laughing, and it is laughing that is the means of causing the motion out of the room. In another example cited by Goldberg, "I knitted my way across the Atlantic," ec is the caused-motion, ev is knitting, and knitting is a manner attached to that motion. In this construal, the agent of the event is a conceived as a non-obligatory oblique argument means. Je lui ai fait venir des idees. Notice that the Blends motivate the use of faire meaning "do" , and justify the absence of passive morphology in examples like 7 that "feel" like passives.

Chapter 6 : Corpora Grammar And Discourse | Download eBook PDF/EPUB

Discourse markers are examined as markers of expressions of (inter)subjectivity and connectivity. â€¢ English as a lingua franca talk in office hours is found to be improved by use of discourse markers.

Chapter 7 : Free modality in grammar and discourse PDF

of results for "discourse grammar" Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament: A Practical Introduction for Teaching and Exegesis (English and Greek Edition).

Chapter 8 : Connectivity in Grammar and Discourse

An essential reference point for future research, Corpora, Grammar and Discourse has been edited in honour of Susan Hunston, whose own work has consistently pushed at the boundaries of corpus-based research on grammar and discourse for over three decades.

Chapter 9 : What Is the Connection between Pragmatics and Discourse?

Matras, Yaron. Contact, connectivity and language evolution. In: Rehbein, Jochen, Hohenstein, Christiane & Pietsch, Lukas. eds. Connectivity in Grammar and.