

Firbas, Jan

Can the functional perspective of a spoken sentence be predicted from that of its written counterpart? : an inquiry based on a comparative analysis of J.D. O'Connor's and R. Kingdon's tonetic transcriptions of Abraham Lincoln's Gettysburg Address

Brno studies in English. 1993, vol. 20, iss. 1, pp. [23]-49

ISBN 80-210-0889-X

ISSN 0231-5351

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/104392>

Access Date: 22. 02. 2024

Version: 20220831

Terms of use: Digital Library of the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use, unless otherwise specified.

CAN THE FUNCTIONAL PERSPECTIVE OF A SPOKEN SENTENCE BE PREDICTED FROM THAT OF ITS WRITTEN COUNTERPART?

AN INQUIRY BASED ON A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF J. D. O'CONNOR'S AND R. KINGDON'S TONETIC
TRANSCRIPTIONS OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN'S *GETTYSBURG ADDRESS*

Jan Firbas

1 The framework of the analysis, pp. 23-6. 2 Notes on O'Connor's and Kingdon's tonetic transcriptions, pp. 26-9. 3 The non-theme in the written text of *The Gettysburg Address*, pp. 29-33. 4 The non-theme in O'Connor's tonetic transcription, pp. 33-8. 5 The non-theme in Kingdon's tonetic transcription, pp. 38-40. 6 The theme in the written text of *The Gettysburg Address*, pp. 40-4. 7 The theme in O'Connor's tonetic transcription, pp. 44-6. 8 The theme in Kingdon's tonetic transcription, pp. 46-7. 9 Summing up the answer to the question posed, pp. 47-9.

1 THE FRAMEWORK OF THE ANALYSIS

In attempting to give an answer to the question posed by the title of the present paper, I propose to analyse two tonetic transcriptions of Abraham Lincoln's *Gettysburg Address*, one of which has been offered by Roger Kingdon (1958) and the other by J. D. O'Connor (1971). I shall do so in order to inquire into the relationship between the functional perspectives of the sentences of the written text of the *Address* and the functional perspectives of their tonetic implementations as reflected by the two transcriptions. In carrying out the analysis, I shall have recourse to the theory of functional sentence perspective (FSP) as presented in Firbas 1992. For the benefit of the reader who may not be familiar with my approach to FSP, I shall briefly recall at least some of the essential conclusions offered by Firbas 1992 that concern (a) the degrees of communicative dynamism (CD), (b) the degrees of prosodic prominence (PP), (c) the operation of intonation as a factor of FSP, and (d) the relationship between the written language and the spoken language. For a detailed discussion and illustrations of these and other concepts employed in my approach, I beg the reader to refer to Firbas 1992. (In the present paper, references to this publication open with the year of publication, 1992, without stating the name of the author.)

(a) DEGREES OF COMMUNICATIVE DYNAMISM (CD)

In the act of communication, a syntactic component serves as a communicative unit (Svoboda 1968; 1981.4). As I see it, it does so through its semantic content. The structure of which it forms part serves as a communicative field. Participating in the development of the communication it carries a degree of communicative dynamism (CD). The degree of CD carried by a unit is determined by the relative extent to which the unit contributes towards the development of the communication within the communicative field (1992.7-8). This distribution of degrees over the communicative units determines the functional perspective of the field. It is the communicative unit carrying the highest degree of CD towards which the field is perspectived (1992.6).

There is a hierarchy of fields (Svoboda 1968). A first rank communicative field is provided by the sentence. Any of its syntactic constituents that is implemented as a subordinate clause, semiclausa or noun phrase provides a second rank communicative field (subfield). In fact, a constituent of any rank implemented in the way described provides a communicative field (subfield) of lower rank. The analysis offered by the present paper will deal with subfields provided by subordinate clauses and semiclauses. Subfields provided by noun phrases will be dealt with only occasionally.

In the written language the distribution of degrees of CD over a communicative field is the outcome of an interplay of three factors: (a) linear modification, (ii) the contextual factor and (iii) the semantic factor. At the moment the written sentence is produced and/or perceived, these factors operate as formative forces that co-operate in modifying the intrinsic communicative values with which the syntactic constituents enter into the communication. The interplay of the factors takes place as follows: (i) Unless worked counter to by the other two factors, linear modification (1992.6-11) gradually raises the intrinsic communicative values of the units in the direction from the beginning to the end of the field. The closer to the end a unit comes to stand, the more it contributes towards the development of the communication – in other words, the higher degree of CD it carries within the field. (ii) The contextual factor (1992.21-40) predominates over both linear modification and the semantic factor in that a unit conveying information retrievable from the immediately relevant context (1992.22-5), verbal or situational, contributes less towards the further development of the communication and therefore carries a lower degree of CD than a unit conveying information irretrievable from that section of context. (iii) If not prevented by the contextual factor, the semantic factor (1992.41-65) operates through the semantic characters of the units and the character of their semantic relations, these characteristics either permitting linear modification to assert itself or working counter to it. Seen in this light, the degree of CD carried by a unit is its intrinsic communicative value modified by the outcome of the interplay of FSP factors at the moment of utterance and/or perception.

Let me just add three important notes. (i) What has been termed a communicative field serves as a distributional field of degrees of CD. (ii) As long as it conveys some meaning, any linguistic element participates in the development of the communication and acts as a carrier of CD. But as not every linguistic element can function as a syntactic constituent, it has to be emphasized that whereas every communicative unit is a carrier of a degree or degrees of CD, not every carrier of CD serves as a communicative unit (1992.19). (iii) In the spoken language the interplay of the FSP factors is joined by intonation.

(b) DEGREES OF PROSODIC PROMINENCE (PP)

In the spoken language a distributional field of CD of any rank simultaneously serves as a distributional field of prosodic prominence (PP). Degrees of PP are signalled by prosodic features of different phonic type. For instance, O'Connor and Arnold distinguish (i) absence of stress, (ii) unaccented stress, (iii) accented stress and (iv) nuclear stress (1973.31-6). I accept their classification. According to them, the most prominent prosodic feature is the nucleus, which acts as the constitutive feature of what may be termed 'the tone unit' (a term not used by them). If fully implemented, the tone unit consists of a pre-head, head, nucleus and tail. In contrast with the pre-head and the tail, the head shows greater salience. It is the stresses that cause this salience that are regarded as accented. (Accentedness naturally also accompanies nuclear stress.) On the other hand, the stresses that occur in the pre-head and the tail are regarded as unaccented. The gamut of the four degrees just characterized is expandable. If a distributional field contains more prosodic features of the same phonic type, then of two features of such type the one occurring later in the distributional field is considered to be prosodically more prominent. (This is due to the operation of linear modification in the spoken language.) One of the most important qualifications of this observation is necessitated when within a distributional field a fall is followed by a low rise. If this occurs, it is the fall that exceeds the low rise in PP (1992.151-3). An important phenomenon is the representative prosodic feature of a communicative unit. A communicative unit can bear more prosodic features than one. It is its most prominent prosodic feature that represents the unit in relation to the other units of the same rank, i. e. in relation to the other units occurring in the same distributional field (1992.149-50).

(c) INTONATION

Following Mathesius, Daneš has further developed the conception of three functional spheres of sentence intonation: (i) that of the structuration function, (ii) that of FSP, and (iii) that within which 'intonation

represents a steady subjective commentary on the utterance, mostly with an emotive or emotional colouring' (Daneš 1987.19-20). The present inquiry concerns mainly spheres (ii) and (iii). In doing so, it will examine the relationship between the distribution of degrees of CD as determined by the non-prosodic factors of FSP and the distribution of degrees of PP. As to the subjective commentary supplied by intonation, it is a special type of information. In fact, it is an integral part of oral communication (see Uhlenbeck 1983.17). In consequence, it is capable of raising degrees of CD carried by the communicative units and so affecting the distribution of CD over the fields constituted by these units.

(d) THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE WRITTEN AND THE SPOKEN LANGUAGE

I subscribe to Vachek's extensive inquiries into the written language (e. g. Vachek 1989). They have established the spoken language and the written language as two language norms which differ not only materially (phonic vs. graphic substance) but also functionally (cf., e. g., *ibid.* 54). Their substance being phonic, the prosodic features are not means of the written language. As a factor of FSP, intonation, which does not operate in the written language, joins the interplay of FSP factors in the spoken language. It does so by producing different degrees of PP.

2 NOTES ON O'CONNOR'S AND KINGDON'S TONETIC TRANSCRIPTIONS

In analysing O'Connor's and Kingdon's tonetic transcriptions of Abraham Lincoln's *Gettysburg Address*, I am extending a series of text analyses carried out from the point of view of FSP (see, e. g., Firbas 1987, 1989 and 1992). Dealing with the text sentence by sentence and taking into consideration the interplay of all the FSP factors involved necessarily proves to be a lengthy procedure, but simultaneously serves as a useful tool for testing the viability of the theory of FSP and for helping to throw light on the relationship between semantics, syntax, FSP and intonation in general and on such a specific problem as that posed by the title of the present paper in particular. But before starting the analysis, I must insert some notes on O'Connor's and Kingdon's tonetic transcriptions.

It is important to note that Kingdon's approach, like that of O'Connor (or O'Connor and Arnold, for that matter), permits one to reckon with four basic degrees of PP. In terms of stress, Kingdon (1958.1) speaks of unstressed syllables, partially stressed syllables and fully stressed syllables, which indicates three degrees of PP. In terms of pitch, he distinguishes between static and kinetic tones, the former being characterized by absence, and the latter by presence, of movement in pitch (1958.3-8). This indicates another significant difference in PP: the static tones are strikingly exceeded in PP by kinetic tones. As combinations of changes

in stress and pitch are considered by Kingdon to be the basic elements of English intonation, and his concepts of pre-head, head, nucleus and tail tally with those of O'Connor and Arnold, the compatibility of the two approaches is evident. In either case, it is possible to speak of a gamut that is constituted by the four basic degrees of PP (absence of stress, unaccented stress, accented stress and nuclear stress) and that is further expandable (see p. 25).

For our purposes, the systems of tonetic marks applied in O'Connor's transcription of 1971 and Kingdon's of 1958 can be regarded as compatible as well. For the benefit of the reader who may not be familiar with the two systems, let me briefly explain the meanings of the tonetic marks used by O'Connor and Kingdon. Detailed explanations are to be found in O'Connor 1971. ix-xii and Kingdon 1958.1-21. My explanations only serve to account for the uses of the marks in the two transcriptions. Both transcriptions are brought by Chart Two of the *Appendix*, attached in the form of loose sheets to the present volume of *Brno Studies in English*. The reader is advised to refer to Chart One for examples while studying the explanations. A special reference is given when, because of its low frequency in the transcription, a tonetic mark may be difficult to find promptly.

The tonetic marks are either raised (placed at the top of the line) or lowered (placed at the bottom of the line). With a proviso required by a special case stated below, they indicate either high or low pitch, respectively.

A raised vertical stress mark indicates accented stress. A double raised vertical stress mark, which occurs only in Kingdon's transcription, indicates additional emphasis.

In O'Connor's transcription a lowered vertical stress mark indicates unaccented stress. If occurring after a fall-rise, it indicates the continuation of the rise; see, e. g., the words following the fall-rises occurring on *larger*, *we*, *we* and *hallow* of (distributional field) 6. In Kingdon's transcription, it indicates unaccented stress if occurring in a pre-head or a tail, or within what he calls 'an expanded nucleus' (1958.20-1) and O'Connor and Arnold 'a compound tune' (1973.33); see the stresses on *nation*, *conceived* and so of 2, between the high fall on *any* and the low rise on *dedicated*. (The high fall and the following low rise act here as a constitutive feature of the tonal configuration.) In other cases, the lowered vertical mark indicates accented stress in Kingdon's transcription.

In O'Connor's transcription, a lowered double vertical stress mark indicates accented stress. In Kingdon's transcription, it signals additional emphasis; see the words *dedicate*, *consecrate* and *hallow* of 6. Because of its occurrence in the tail of a tone unit, the stress does not attain the status of genuine accentedness.

In Kingdon's transcription, a raised dot indicates unaccented stress. In O'Connor's, it is used to indicate unaccented stress 'that does not deviate from the pitch previously specified' (O'Connor 1971.x).

Slanted stress marks indicate nuclei. A stress mark slanted from right

to left indicates a rise; one slanted from left to right indicates a fall. A combination of the two indicates either a fall-rise or a rise-fall. Kingdon uses double slanted stress marks to indicate additional emphasis; see, e. g., *did* of 9.

O'Connor and Arnold differ from Kingdon in the interpretation of the stressed syllables within what they call 'a compound tune' and Kingdon 'an expanded nucleus'. Whereas O'Connor and Arnold interpret the stresses on the words occurring between the two nucleus bearers as accented (1973.33), Kingdon regards them as instances of partial stress (1958.19), i. e. as unaccented. I believe that in regard to the expanded gamut of PP, the two views can be reconciled. Occurring after the high fall, the low rise in fact occurs in its prosodic shade and consequently recedes into the background. So do the stressed syllables following the fall and preceding the rise. This reduces the prosodic prominence both of the low rise and of the stresses. In regard to the gamut of rising PP, the low rise does not attain the full prosodic status held in the gamut by nuclear stress, nor do the stresses attain the full prosodic status of accentedness. On the other hand, the low rise remains prosodically more prominent than accented stress and the stresses more prominent than unaccented stress.

Special mention must be made of a prosodic feature that O'Connor and Arnold refer to as 'Mid-Level nuclear tone' (1973.31). In contrast with all the other tones that have so far been regarded as nuclear in the literature, this tone does not have a *movement* of pitch, but a *sustention* of pitch (ib.). It is the sustention of pitch that gives the tone its nuclear character. As this character was overtly recognized by O'Connor and Arnold only in 1973 (1973.ix) and is therefore not marked in O'Connor's transcription of 1971, I have introduced the appropriate mark into the 1971 transcription, replacing the original stress mark not suggesting the nuclear character of the tone. The Mid-Level nuclear tone is borne, for instance, by *forth* and *men* of 1, *engaged* of 2, *lives* of 4 and *dead* of 7 in O'Connor's transcription. In Kingdon's terms, this tone does not involve a change in pitch and is therefore not kinetic, but static. I find, however, that O'Connor and Arnold are justified in according the Mid-Level tone nuclear status. A word group containing it becomes a tone unit, the Mid-Level tone serving as its constitutive feature.

In one case, O'Connor uses a raised arrow pointing downwards; see *we* of 6. It indicates accented stress opening a falling head. In one case, Kingdon uses a lowered short level mark; see *what* of 9. It indicates unaccented stress.

A word must be added on the strokes dividing up the texts of the two transcriptions. O'Connor intends the strokes to represent boundaries realized in speech either by a very brief pause (or simply by lengthening the preceding syllable), or by an unmistakable pause (cf. O'Connor 1971.ix). (He accordingly uses a single or a double stroke in his *Reader* of 1971.) It is important to note that the boundaries indicated by the strokes in fact occur at ends of tone units. As Kingdon does not mark

the boundaries of tone units with any special signs, I have additionally done so by inserting boundary strokes in his transcription. Not being in a position to decide in every case with absolute certainty whether he would insert a short or a long pause, I have decided to have recourse to a simplification. In both transcriptions, I employ only single strokes. In addition, no stroke is placed by me at the end of a sentence (which always coincides with the end of a tone unit) if the end of the sentence is marked with a full stop.

It should also be mentioned that whereas Kingdon's transcription is only tonetic, O'Connor's is phonetic in the full sense of the word, covering the pronunciation of individual words as well. But with the exception of the indications of glottal stops (see, for instance, the glottal stop mark preceding *our*, *are* and *equal* of 1, and *any* of 2), I present only O'Connor's transcription of the tonetic implementation.

3 THE NON-THEME IN THE WRITTEN FORM OF THE GETTYSBURG ADDRESS

In my analysis I shall first concentrate on the written text of *The Gettysburg Address* (see Chart One of the *Appendix*) and then proceed to its spoken implementations as reflected by O'Connor's and Kingdon's tonetic transcriptions. A convenient starting point of the discussion is the functions performed by the verb in the development of the communication. In discussing them I shall treat the verb as representing two communicative units, one being constituted by its notional component and the other by its categorial exponents. The necessity of this distinction has been accounted for in detail in my presentation of the theory of FSP (1992.70-3).

In regard to the subject, the notional component of the finite verb form serves one of the following two functions in the development of the communication (1992.5-6): it either participates in perspectiving the field in which it occurs towards the subject (in which case the subject serves as the communicative unit carrying the highest degree of CD), or away from the subject (in which case the highest degree of CD is carried by another communicative unit than the subject). As the analysis of the text of *The Gettysburg Address* will show, all the finite verbs occurring in it participate in perspectiving their fields away from the subject. With a qualification to be stated below, this means in terms of the dynamic semantic functions (1992.66-9) that the fields implement the Quality Scale. The subject performs the dynamic function of expressing the Bearer of quality (the B-function) and the notional verbal component the dynamic semantic function of expressing the Quality ascribed to the bearer (the Q-function). This opens the possibility for the notional component of the verb to complete the development of the communication within the field in which it operates. It can do so in the absence of units performing the dynamic semantic function of expressing a Specification,

or a Further Specification, of the quality expressed by the verb (the Sp-function or the FSp-function). The units the presence of which prevents the verb from completing the development of the communication are looked upon as its successful competitors. They consequently carry higher degrees of CD. The analysis adduced below demonstrates that the notional components of the non-finite verb also perform the Q-function in their fields in the short text under discussion. It is from the angle just indicated that I shall examine the operation of the notional component of the verb, finite or non-finite.

Examining the written text, we find that the basic distributional field 1 (or 'field 1', or '1', for short) contains four verb forms, *brought forth*, *conceived*, *dedicated* and *are created*, the first operating in the basic field and the others in subfields. None of the notional components of these verb forms proves to be the unit that completes the development of the communication within the respective field. It does not do so because of the presence of a successful competitor, which exceeds it in CD. In this way, *brought forth* is exceeded in CD by *a new nation ...*; *conceived* by *in liberty*; *dedicated* by *to the proposition that ...*; and *are created* by *equal*. In each case, the communicative unit exceeding the verb form in CD performs the Sp-function. In the absence of a Further Specification (FSp), this Sp-unit completes the development of the communication within the respective field, consequently carrying the highest degree of CD.

As the fields examined implement the Quality Scale, the following interpretation in terms of thematic and non-thematic functions applies (1992.67-87), with the qualification to be stated presently. If not completing the development of the communication, the notional verbal component performs the function of transition (Tr) in regard to its successful competitors, which are all rhematic (Rh), the one completing the development of the communication serving as rheme proper (RhPr). If in the absence of successful competitors it completes the development of the communication, the notional verbal component acts as rheme proper itself. While the notional verbal component shows a strong tendency to be transitional, its temporal and modal components (TMEs) perform the transitional function invariably, acting as transition proper (TrPr or '+'). Units performing the transitional and rhematic functions are regarded as non-thematic. An essential precondition of their non-thematicity is context-independence, i. e. their expressing information that is irretrievable from the immediately relevant preceding verbal context and/or the immediately relevant situational context. (This does not, however, mean that every context-independent unit is necessarily non-thematic; cf. 1992.71). If context-dependent, i. e. expressing information retrievable from the immediately relevant contextual sphere characterized (1992.23ff), a unit becomes part of the theme; cf 1992.66-87 and here pp. 41-2. (In the present paper, the terms 'context dependence' and 'context independence' are used in the narrow sense specified above.)

The qualification to be made concerns the fact that like any other unit the notional component of the verb becomes thematic when it is rendered context-dependent. Unlike the B-function and the Set-function, which are exclusively thematic irrespective of context dependence/independence and are therefore thematic functions *par excellence*, the Q-function tends to become neutralised in the thematic sphere. Through becoming context-dependent, a unit that if context-independent would perform the Q-function has its dynamic semantic status weakened and in a sense reduced to that of a Setting. (The dynamic semantic Set-function consists in expressing concomitant, background information; 1992.49-59 and 66-9). But as the analysis shows, none of the verbs in the text examined participates in perspectivising its field to the subject; in fact, none of the fields implements the Presentation Scale (1992.66-9).

See the interpretation of field 1 below now. (In the interpretations, numerals not followed by asterisks stand for basic distributional fields. Numerals with asterisks indicate distributional subfields. The number of asterisks indicates the rank of subordination. Letters *a*, *b* and *c* signify coordinate basic distributional fields or subfields. In all the interpretations, 1 – 11***d, the communicative units italicized serve as rheme proper. Seven verb forms – *dedicate* of 4*, *dedicate* of 6a, *consecrate* of 6b, *hallow* of 6c, *consecrated* of 7, *dedicated* of 10* and *dedicated* of 11* – which convey context-dependent, and therefore thematic, information – are enclosed within reversed virgules, \\. The abbreviation 'NegFocAnt' stands for 'negation focus anticipator'; cf. 1992. The NegFocAnt is an element of negation, for instance *not*, which in terms of the interpretative arrangement – see 1992.12-3 – precedes and points to the negation focus, i. e. the rheme proper of a negative field. In this sense it is rhematic. At the same time, it opens the scope of negation and in this sense it is transition proper oriented.)

- (1) brought forth (+; Q, Tr) ... *a new nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal* (Sp; RhPr).
 (1*a) conceived (+; Q, Tr) *in liberty* (Sp; RhPr) ...
 (1*b) dedicated (+; Q, Tr) *to the proposition that all men are created equal* (Sp, RhPr).
 (1**)are (+) created (+; Q, Tr) *equal* (Sp, RhPr).

With due alterations, the same interpretation applies to the notional verbal components in 2*, 2**, 3, 4, 8a, 8b, 9, 10**, 11**, 11***a*, 11***c and 11***d; in each field the presence of a Specification prevents the notional component from completing the development of the communication. (Detailed interpretations of the non-themes of individual fields are adduced below.) Neither can the notional verbal component complete the development of the communication in 5, 2, 4**, 10, 11, 11***a and 11***b. In 5 it is a unit performing the Q-function that acts as its successful competitor; this is because *is* serves as a copula and its notional component merely performs the A(scription)ofQ(uality) (1992.68). In 2, 4**, 10, 11***a, and 11***b, the notional component of the verb is exceeded in CD by a Specification and a Further Specification; in each

case the Specification occurring last in the field proves to be the most successful competitor of the notional component of the verb (1992.81-3).

In 4*, 7, 10* and 11*, the notional component of the verb cannot complete the development of the communication, because it is context-dependent. Hence it is thematic (see 1992.71 and here pp. 41-2) and exceeded in CD even by the TMEs. The latter, however, cannot complete the development of the communication in the presence of a Specification in 7, 10* and 11*, and of a Specification, Further Specification 1 and Further Specification 2 in 4*.

Out of the 37 verb forms under examination, there are nine that in the absence of successful competitors complete the development of the communication. Six verb forms, occurring in 4***, 5*, 7*, 8*, 9* and 10***, do so through the notional component, and three, occurring in 6a, 6b, and 6c, through the TMEs. Under the circumstances, the TMEs can complete the development of the communication, for owing to the context dependence of the notional component of the verb they have become competitorless.

- (2) are (+) engaged (+; Q, Tr) in a civil war (Sp, Rli) *testing whether that nation or any nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure* (FSp, RhPr).
- (2*) testing (+; Q, Tr) *whether that nation or any nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure* (Sp, RhPr).
- (2**) can (+) long (Sp, RhPr) endure (+; Q, Tr).
- (3) are (+) met (+; Q, Tr) *on a great battlefield of that war* (Sp, RhPr).
- (4) have (+) come (+; Q, Tr) *to dedicate a portion of that field as a final resting place for those who here gave their lives that that nation might live*
- (4*) to (+) \dedicate (+; Set, Th)\ *a portion of that field (Sp, Rh) as a final resting place (FSp1, Rh) for those who here gave their lives that that nation might live (FSp2, RhPr).*
- (4**) gave (+; Q, Tr) *their lives (Sp, Rli) that that nation might live* (FSp, RhPr).
- (5) is (+; AofQ, Tr) *altogether fitting and proper* (Q, RhPr) ...
- (5*) should (+) *do* (Q, RhPr) ...
- (6a) can (+; Q, RhPr) not (NegFocAnt, Rh) \dedicate (+; Set, Th)\ ...
- (6b) can (+; Q, RhPr) not (NegFocAnt, Rh) \consecrate (+; Set, Th)\ ...
- (6c) can (+; Q, RhPr) not (NegFocAnt, Rh) \hallow (+; Set, Th)\ ...
- (7) have (+) \consecrated (+; Set, Th)\ ... *far above our power to add or detract* (Sp, RhPr).
- (7*) *struggled* (Q, RhPr) ...
- (8a) *little* (Sp, RhPr) *note* (+; Q, Tr) ... (See p. 34.)
- (8b) *long* (Sp, RhPr) *remember* (+; Q, Tr) ... (See ib.)
- (8*) *say* (+; Q, RhPr) ...
- (9) can (+) never (NegFocAnt) *forget* (+; Q, Tr) *what they did here* (Sp, RhPr).
- (9*) *did* (+; Q, RhPr) ...
- (10) is (+; Q, Tr) *for us the living (Sp, Rli) rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced* (FSp, RhPr).
- (10*) to be (+) \dedicated (+; Set, Th)\ ... *to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced* (Sp, RhPr).
- (10**) have (+) ... *so nobly* (Sp, RhPr) *advanced* (+; Q, Tr). (See ib.)
- (10***) *fought* (+; Q, RhPr) ...

- (11) is (+; Q, Tr) rather for us (Sp, Rli) [*THE ENTIRE REST OF THE BASIC DISTRIBUTIONAL FIELD*] (FSp, RliPr).
- (11*) to be (+) ... \dedicated (+; Sct, Tli)\ *to the great task remaining before us* (Sp, RliPr)
- (11**) remaining (+; Q, Tr) *before us* (Sp, RliPr) ...
- (11***a) take (+; Q, Tr) increased devotion (Sp, Rli) *to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion* (FSp, RliPr).
- (11***a*) ... gave (+; Q, Tr) *the last full measure of devotion* (Sp, RliPr).
- (11***b) \highly (Sp, Rli) resolve (+; Q, Tr) *that these dead shall not have died in vain* (FSp, RliPr).
- (11***b*) ... shall (+) not (NegFocAnt) have (+) died (+; Q, Tr) *in vain* (Sp, RliPr) ...
- (11***c) shall (+) have (+; Q, Tr) *a new birth of freedom* (Sp, RliPr) ...
- (11***d) shall (+) not (NegFocAnt) perish (+; Q, Tr) *from the earth* (Sp, RliPr).

The foregoing analysis has determined the FSP functions of the verbs and its successful competitors. With the exception of seven context-dependent, and hence thematic, notional components of the verb forms (4*, 6a, 6b, 6c, 7, 10** and 11*), all the notional verbal components, all the TMEs and all the successful competitors are non-thematic. Together with the transition proper oriented units recorded on Charts O'Connor 2/1 and 2/2 and Kingdon 2/1 and 2/2, they all constitute the non-themes of the fields under examination. Within the non-theme, the lowest degree of CD is carried by the TMEs; they are exceeded in CD by units performing the dynamic semantic functions of AofQ, Q, Sp, FSp1 and FSp2, this arrangement reflecting a gradual rise in CD.

4 THE PROSODIC IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NON-THEME IN O'CONNOR'S TONETIC TRANSCRIPTION

It is now possible to turn attention to the relationship between the distribution of degrees of CD over the non-thematic units as determined by the interplay of the non-prosodic FSP factors on the one hand and the distribution of degrees of PP on the other. First, I shall examine the tonetic transcription offered by J. D. O'Connor from this point of view. Charts O'Connor 1/1 and 1/2 accompanying my examination are to be found in the *Appendix*. (The communicative units serving as rhemes proper are not italicized on them, but underlined. The thematic units are placed within reversed virgules, \\. For the use of ordinary virgules, //, and the sign >, see p. 36.)

An examination of field 1 shows that the verb forms occurring in it, *brought forth*, *conceived*, *dedicated* and *are created*, are all exceeded in PP by their successful competitors. True enough, the verb form *brought forth* bears a nucleus, but its successful competitor, an expanded object serving as a Specification, bears a number of nuclei, which all show higher degrees of PP on account of their occurring later in the field. In any case, the decisive role is played by the nucleus on *equal*, the representative prosodic feature of the Specification. As for the three verb

forms operating in subfields, *conceived* (1*a), *dedicated* (1*b) and *are created* (1**), each bears accented stress, which is exceeded in PP by a nucleus (on *liberty*, *equal* and *equal*, respectively) acting as the representative prosodic feature of a concurring Specification. (The accented stress of the verb form *dedicated* of 1*b is in fact exceeded in PP by three nuclei.) It is not without interest to note that the network of fields permits the nucleus on *equal* simultaneously to serve as representative feature in three fields – 1**, 1*b and 1.

In regard to the section of field 1 discussed above (p. 31), the foregoing comments have established a perfect correspondence between the distribution of degrees of CD as determined by the interplay of the non-prosodic FSP factors and the distribution of degrees of PP. (Henceforth I shall use the term 'perfect distributional correspondence' for short.) This is indicated on the Charts by the abbreviation 'PERF. CORR.' It must be emphasized that the assessment of perfect distributional correspondence applies here to the verb, occurring in finite or non-finite form and constituting two communicative units, and its successful competitors.

With due alterations the same interpretation applies to 21 other fields of the text. They are all represented in the Charts merely by a verb form that is not underlined; see fields 2, 2*, 3, 4, 4*, 4**, 5, 7, 7*, 9, 10, 10*, 11, 11*, 11**, 11***a, 11***a*, 11***b, 11***b*, 11***c, 11***d. Together with the four fields commented on in the preceding paragraph, all the 21 fields display perfect distributional correspondence in the sense specified above, i. e. in regard to the verb and its successful competitors.

In all the 25 fields (4 + 21), the TMEs act as transition proper. With four exceptions in which it is thematic (4*, 7, 10* and 11*), the notional verbal component is always transitional. It is exceeded in PP by its successful competitors, which are rhematic, the one completing the development of the communication within the field serving as rheme proper and bearing the most prominent prosodic feature. This testifies to a perfect distributional correspondence in the rheme as well as in regard to the transition-rheme relationship.

In addition to the 25 fields just discussed, there are another 8 fields interpreted as displaying perfect distributional correspondence in regard to the transition-rheme relationship; see 2**, 4***, 5*, 8a, 8b, 9*, 10** and 10***. In each case it is the notional verbal component that bears the most prominent prosodic feature (a nucleus). As to the notional verbal components of 4***, 5*, 9* and 10* (*live*, *do*, *did* and *fought*), the issue is quite straightforward. In the absence of a successful competitor, each completes the development of the communication within its field and serves as rheme proper and is underlined on the Chart.

The notional verbal components of 2**, 8a, 8b and 10*** (*endure*, *note*, *remember* and *advanced*) require special comment. Each is a nucleus bearer in spite of the presence of an adverbial (*long*, *little*, *long* and *nobly*) that functions as a specification and proves to be a successful competitor. It is important to note that both the adverb, which immediately precedes the notional verbal component, and the notional compo-

nent are context-independent. They form a combination that is reminiscent of a noun phrase implemented through a context-independent attributive adjective immediately preceding a context-independent headword bearing a nucleus; cf., e. g., *a thrilling story* in *I've read a thrilling story*, occurring in a context which only renders the pronoun *I* context-dependent. Although under the contextual conditions stipulated the adjective exceeds the headword in CD within the noun phrase acting as a subfield, it does not bear the nucleus. It is worth noticing that though deviating from perfect distributional correspondence the placement of the nucleus does not affect the perspective of the noun phrase. It does not produce a re-evaluating effect (see 1992.159-72 and below), re-perspectiving the noun phrase to *story*. This is because the placement of the nucleus on the context-independent headword following a context-independent attributive adjective proves to be quite unmarked. In other words, it is the unmarked character of the placement that prevents it from producing a re-evaluating effect within the subfield; in spite of the nucleus occurring on the headword, the noun phrase is perspectived to the attributive adjective, *thrilling*. As for the FSP function of the nucleus on *story*, it serves as the representative feature of the subfield provided by the noun phrase, simultaneously marking it as the rheme proper of the sentence. (For a more detailed discussion of the functions of the prosodic features of the adjective-headword combination, see 1992.167-9.)

As to the combination implemented through a context-independent (one-word) adverb immediately preceding a context-independent notional verbal component, it does not display such close relationship between its two parts as the adjective-headword combination does. Unlike this combination, it does not serve as one syntactic constituent; each of its parts acts as a syntactic constituent in its own right. This looser relationship is also borne out by the absence of constant word order contiguity of the two parts. Nevertheless, in the text under examination, the context-independent adverb immediately preceding the context-independent notional verbal component bears a striking similarity in function to the attributive adjective operating under the same contextual conditions in the adjective-headword combination. At this point, it is worth recalling Kopečný's observation on the qualifying determination of the verb carried out by the adverb. He characterizes the adverb performing this function as a verbal attribute (Kopečný 1962.25). From this point of view, the following can be said about each of the adverbs examined. Though remaining a separate syntactic constituent, the context-independent adverb immediately preceding the context-independent notional verbal component enters into a relationship with it close enough to produce a group that comes very near to an FSP communicative unit. Moreover, the placement of the nucleus on the notional verbal component, which carries a lower degree of CD than the adverb, proves to be as unmarked as the placement of the nucleus on the headword exceeded in CD by the attributive adjective. Under these circumstances

the interpreter can regard the nucleus placed on the notional verbal component as the representative feature of the entire combination. As, in each of the four cases examined, the combination is the carrier of the highest degrees of CD, the interpreter can consider the nucleus to mark the combination as rheme proper of the field. I assume that the arguments adduced permit the conclusion that the placement of the nucleus is not at variance with perfect distributional correspondence. The four combinations are underlined on the Chart.

In addition to 33 fields accompanied by the label 'PERF. CORR.', there are four fields (6a, 6b, 6c and 8*) that have been given the label 'R. INT.' (standing for 're-evaluating intensification'). Why is that so? In 6a, 6b and 6c, it is in each case the auxiliary *can* that in the absence of successful competitors serves as rheme proper. The notional verbal component (*dedicate*, *consecrate* or *hallow*) cannot act as a successful competitor because it conveys retrievable and hence context-dependent information. (In the Charts, context-dependent elements are placed between a pair of reversed virgules, \\\.) Perfect distributional correspondence between the two distributions would therefore place the nucleus on *can* and this is where the nucleus actually occurs in Kingdon's transcription (see Chart Kingdon 1/1). But in O'Connor's transcription the nuclei are placed on *we*, *we* and *hallow* in 6a, 6b and 6c, respectively, which produces a striking deviation from perfect distributional correspondence. The nuclei occur on elements that the interplay of the non-prosodic FSP factors renders non-rhematic (thematic or transitional). This deviation is functional, because it achieves a particular effect. Through it special emphasis is thrown on the idea that it is not the participants in the ceremony who are the consecrators of the resting place of the brave dead.

Let me recall that the placement of the most prominent prosodic feature of the field, i. e. its intonation centre, on an element that has been rendered non-rhematic (thematic or transitional) by the interplay of the non-prosodic factors affects the theme-rheme relationship and produces re-evaluating prosodic intensification (1992.159-72). The distribution of degrees of CD as determined by the non-prosodic FSP factors is not obliterated thereby, but a new dimension is added to the message by intonation. The non-rhematic element is re-evaluated and becomes rheme proper, the elements following it assuming a thematic character. Exempted from re-evaluation, however, are (i) the TMEs, which continue to serve as transition proper irrespective of sentence position, and (ii) the communicative units preceding the IC bearer. Needless to say, the new dimension can be appreciated only against the background of perfect distributional correspondence. The fields 6a, 6b and 6c in Kingdon's transcription have not undergone re-evaluation and hence do not convey the additional special emphasis created by it. (On Charts O'Connor 1/1 and 1/2 and Kingdon 1/1 and 1/2, the units affected by re-evaluation are followed by the re-evaluation sign, >, and enclosed within ordinary or reversed virgules, // or \\. They are restated outside the vir-

gules and provided with the tonetic marks reflecting the outcome of the re-evaluation. On the Charts indicated, the reversed virgules enclose originally thematic units.)

Though refraining from analysing distributional fields provided by noun phrases, I should like to insert the following observation at this point. Both in O'Connor's transcription and in Kingdon's, the possessive pronoun *our* in the expanded noun phrase *Our poor power to add or to detract* of 7 bears the nucleus, although it is rendered thematic by the interplay of the non-prosodic FSP factors. Its prosodic re-evaluation forcefully underlines the idea of the participants not being the consecrators of the final resting place.

As to field 8*, it shows re-evaluating prosodic intensification, because its intonation centre falls on *here*. This adverbial of place occurs eight times in the text; see fields 4**, 7*, 8*, 9*, 10*, 10***, 11* and 11***b. In all these cases, it is context-dependent, conveying information retrievable from the immediately relevant context, verbal and situational. It performs the dynamic semantic function of expressing a Setting (cf. p. 31) and is therefore thematic and can be expected to be prosodically less prominent than any rhematic unit in the field. With the exception of *here* of 8*, this indeed applies to all the other uses of *here* in the text. The prosodic re-evaluation of *here* in 8* is in harmony with those of *we* in 6a and *we* in 6b (see also Chart O'Connor 2/2). In this way, emphasis is placed on the notions of 'we the participants' and '(standing) here in this very place'. This appears to be in harmony with another interesting fact. Comparing the fields containing the adverbial *here*, we find that the items of *here* are given greater prosodic prominence in the fields concerning the participants in the ceremonial act than in the fields concerning the brave dead. Whereas in the latter group, *here* bears accented stress in 4**, accented stress in 7*, unaccented stress in 9* and unaccented stress in 10*** (note the absence of nuclear stress), in the former it bears nuclear stress in 8*, nuclear stress in 10*, accented stress in 11* and nuclear stress in 11***b (note the presence of three occurrences of nuclear stress, in one case even leading to re-evaluation, and absence of unaccented stress). I do not think that this difference in prosodic intensification of *here* shown by the two groups is purely coincidental. It appears that in O'Connor's transcription, the speaker wishes to heighten his appeal to those present at the ceremonial act and to underunderline the *hic et nunc* character of his references to the place where the act is in progress. On the other hand, his references predominantly linking the place with the memory of the brave dead do not lend such a degree of emphasis to the *nunc* component. One could perhaps even say that in this way the references to the place where the commemorative speech is delivered are given different prosodic treatment according to whether the place is referred to as the scene of the commemorative act now in progress or as the scene of the bravery performed in the past. In any case, the deviation from perfect distributional correspondence resulting in the re-evaluating prosodic intensification of

here in 8* lays marked stress on this adverbial of place. It must, however, be borne in mind that the re-evaluating prosodic intensification does not affect the thematic status of the subfield in regard to the entire (basic) distributional field 8, the perspective of which has not been re-evaluated. Field 8 is perspectived to the communicative unit (*nor*) *long remember*, which bears a falling nucleus. (Moreover, the adverbial *here* of 8* bears a low rise. So do the other nucleus bearing items of *here*, which do not produce a re-evaluating effect.)

As can be seen from Charts O'Connor 1/1 and 1/2, the transcription examined shows a high degree of perfect distributional correspondence in regard to the verb, finite or non-finite (in each case viewed as two communicative units) and its successful competitors. Such perfect correspondence is displayed by 33 fields out of 37. This testifies to a high degree of perfect distributional correspondence in the rheme as well as in regard to the transition-rheme relationship. Deviations from this perfect correspondence caused by re-evaluating prosodic intensification prove to be functional, adding a special emotive dimension to the message conveyed.

5 THE NON-THEME IN KINGDON'S TONETIC TRANSCRIPTION

There are also 25 fields in Kingdon's transcription in which the verb, finite or non-finite, does not complete the development of the communication because it is prevented from doing so by a successful competitor or successful competitors. In these cases the verb is not underlined on the Charts (Kingdon 1/1 and 1/2). With two exceptions (4*, 7, 10* and 11*), when it is thematic, the notional verbal component is always transitional, and the successful competitors are always rhematic, the one completing the development of the communication within the field serving as rheme proper. As for PP, the transitional notional verbal component is exceeded in PP by its rhematic successful competitors. Within the rheme, the rhematic units not completing the development of the communication are exceeded in PP by the unit serving as rheme proper. In other words, within the rheme PP reflects the degrees of CD as determined by the interplay of the non-prosodic FSP factors. All the transitional units are exceeded in PP by the rhematic units. (This applies also to the transitional units not covered by Chart Kingdon 1/1, but recorded on Chart Kingdon 2/1 and to be discussed later.) It follows that all the 25 fields concerned show perfect distributional correspondence in the rheme. They also show perfect distributional correspondence in regard to the transition-rheme relation.

Perfect distributional correspondence is also shown by 5 fields (4***, 7*, 8*, 9* and 10***) in which the absence of successful competitors permits the notional verbal component to complete the development of the communication and to act as rheme proper. All these components are underlined on the Chart.

Perfect distributional correspondence is further shown by 3 fields (6a, 6b and 6c) in each of which *cannot* operates as rheme proper in the absence of successful competitors and is therefore underlined on the Chart. The notional verbal component is out of competition because it has been rendered context-dependent.

In 2**, as well as in 10**, we find a group made up by a context-independent adverb and a context-independent notional verbal component (*long endure* and *nobly advanced*, respectively) which bears a nucleus. The group has no successful competitor and in terms of the arguments offered above serves as rheme proper. The groups are underlined on the Chart. It follows from the arguments offered that the non-thematic sections of the two fields show perfect distributional correspondence.

Only 4 fields of Kingdon's transcription (5*, 7*, 8a and 8b) show re-evaluating prosodic intensification. In 5* it is the thematic *this* that has been re-evaluated. Though bearing only unaccented stress, it becomes the most prosodically prominent unit in the subfield. In this way, special *hic et nunc* emphasis, the motivation of which is similar to that described above, is thrown on the ceremonial act in progress. The perspective of field 5, however, is not affected by this re-evaluation, which takes place only in the subfield. PP reflects the thematicity of the subfield by placing it in the post-intonation centre prosodic shade created by the nucleus on the rhematic *proper*. As for O'Connor's transcription of 5*, it respects the context dependence of *this* and perspectives the subfield to *do*. (The low fall on *do* in O'Connor's transcription does not have a re-evaluating effect on field 5, because the configuration of a high rise on *fitting*, a high fall on *proper* and a low rise on *do* does evidently not permit the low rise to act as the intonation centre of the field. A corroboration of this statement, which represents a modification of the basic observation that the last nucleus within a field acts as the bearer of the highest degree of PP, must remain pending; cf. 1992.152 and here p. 25.)

Like O'Connor, Kingdon re-evaluates one of the eight instances of *here*. It is the *here* of 7* that has been chosen by him for re-evaluation. (The interplay of the non-prosodic FSP factors does not perspective field 7* to the thematic *here*, but to the rheme proper, *struggled*.) As has already been stated, *here* is thematic in all its eight instances in the written text. With one exception, Kingdon's as well as O'Connor's transcription renders the thematic *here*'s prosodically less prominent than the concurrent rhematic units. In doing so, both transcriptions produce perfect distributional correspondence in regard to the theme-rheme relationship. This holds good irrespective of the differences in the degrees of PP employed by the two transcriptions.

In contrast with O'Connor, Kingdon's motivation for the re-evaluation of *here* seems to be the emphasis on the *hic* component linked with the notion of 'the brave dead' (see p. 37.) It cannot, however, be said that this motivation is markedly reflected by his treatment of the other instances of *here*.

The other two fields showing re-evaluating prosodic intensification are 8a and 8b (forming the compound field 8). In terms of the interplay of the non-prosodic FSP factors, the following interpretation applies at the moment of written utterance and/or visual perception. In either case the group consisting of the adverb immediately preceding the notional verbal component (*little note* and *long remember*, respectively) has no successful competitor and acts as rheme proper. The unit *what we say here*, on the other hand, conveys context-dependent information and is thematic. This perspective is indeed reflected by O'Connor's transcription. Re-evaluating *what we say here* by placing the intonation centre of 8 on *say*, Kingdon's transcription produces a powerful contrast between *say* of 8* and *did* of 9*: *what we say here vs what they did here*. Strictly speaking, cues to this contrast are provided by the written text if the immediately following context (field 9) is taken into consideration. Seen in this light, the interpretation of giving full play to contrast is potentially present in the text, and the role of intonation would have to be interpreted as consisting in removing potentiality by offering an unequivocal interpretation of FSP (1992.181-6). But in regard to the moment of spoken utterance and/or acoustic perception, when the following context is non-existent, 8a and 8b are to be regarded as cases of re-evaluating prosodic intensification.

A note may be added here on the two adverb-notional verb combinations of 8a and 8b. It is worth noting that in each case the context-independent adverb carries a higher degree of PP than the notional verbal component. This use is not at variance with the higher degree of CD carried by the adverb, but seen in the light of the arguments adduced above it is to be interpreted as marked. Its markedness enhances the emotiveness lent to the sentence by contrast. It is, however, not a case of re-evaluating prosodic intensification, but one of selective non-reevaluating prosodic intensification. (For the distinction between non-selective and selective non-reevaluating prosodic intensification, see 1992.156-9 and 167-8, and also here pp. 46 and 48.)

Like Charts O'Connor 1/1 and 1/2, Charts Kingdon 1/1 and 1/2 testify to the transcription examined showing a high degree of perfect distributional correspondence in the rheme as well as in regard to the transition-rheme relationship. Such perfect correspondence is displayed by 33 fields out of 37. Deviations from it, though occurring in other fields than in O'Connor's transcription, are once again well motivated from the functional point of view.

6 THE THEME IN THE WRITTEN TEXT OF THE GETTYSBURG ADDRESS

Let me recall that in terms of the interplay of non-prosodic FSP factors the following communicative units qualify as thematic (i. e. as constituting the theme; 1992.66-74): context-dependent or context-independent units performing the B-function (i. e. the dynamic semantic function of

expressing a Bearer of quality), context-dependent or context-independent units performing the Set-function (i. e. the dynamic semantic function of expressing a Setting; cf. p. 31) and any other units that irrespective of sentence position or semantic character have become context-dependent. All units occurring in *The Gettysburg Address* that answer to this description are recorded on Charts O'Connor 2/1 and 2/2 and Kingdon 2/1 and 2/2.

In dealing with the thematic units I shall proceed as follows. I shall first comment on the way they operate in a thematic layer. (A thematic layer of a stretch of text, for instance a paragraph, is constituted by all the thematic units of that stretch of text; 1992.79.) Then I shall specify the functions the thematic units perform in their fields, and if necessary additionally account in notes for the specifications offered.

The thematic layer consists of context-dependent as well as context-independent units. I agree with Svoboda, who has thrown revealing light on the operation of thematic units (Svoboda 1981, 1983), that these units differ in the extent to which they are established in the thematic layer and in consequence in the extent to which they contribute towards the further development of the communication. The more firmly they are established in the thematic layer, the less they contribute towards this development. Viewed in this light, the thematic units form a scale that reflects a gradual decrease in CD of the information conveyed by them: (a) information irretrievable from the immediately relevant context, verbal or situational, and in this way entering directly into the thematic layer of the text, i. e. not via its rhematic layer, (b) information retrievable from the rhematic layer and transferred from it to the thematic layer, (c) information retrievable from the thematic layer and re-expressed in it for the first time or information retrievable from the immediately relevant situational context and referred to in the thematic layer for the first time, and (d, e. etc.) information retrievable from the thematic layer and re-expressed anew. Adopting Svoboda's terms, which felicitously capture the graded character of context dependence as just outlined, I call the (a) and (b) types of information and the elements conveying it 'diathematic', the (c) type 'theme proper', and the (d, e, etc.) types as theme proper that can be regarded as having adopted the character of 'hypertheme' (a term introduced by Daneš). In the examination of the thematic units offered below, the letters (a), (b) and (c) indicate the (a), (b) and (c) types of information as just described here. The (d), (e), etc., types are all indicated by the letter (h), standing for 'hypertheme'. If more diathematic units are present in the field, the one carrying the highest degree of CD is referred to as 'the diatheme', the others being regarded as 'diatheme oriented'. With due alterations, the same applies to items having the character of theme proper. The item carrying the lowest degree of CD is referred to as 'theme proper' and the others carrying higher degrees of CD as 'theme proper oriented'. The abbreviations used in the analyses below and in Charts O'Connor 2/1 and 2/2 and Charts Kingdon 2/1 and 2/2 are: ThPro, DTho and DTh.

In terms of the interplay of the non-prosodic FSP factors, I interpret the thematic elements occurring in *The Gettysburg Address* in the following way. (The letter 'N' indicates that an explanatory note has been added to the interpretation. The notes are to be found after the interpretation below.)

(1)	Four score and seven years ago (Set, DTh) our fathers (B, DTho)	(a)N
(1*)	all men (B, DTli)	(a)
(2)	Now (Set, DTh) we (ThPr)	(a) (c) N
(2*)	that any nation or any nation so conceived and so dedicated (DTh)	(a)N
(3)	We (B, ThPr)	(li)
(4)	We (B, ThPr)	(li)
(4*)	to dedicate (ThPr)	(c)
(4**)	who (B, DTli) here (Set, ThPr)	(b) (c)N
(4***)	that nation (ThPr)	(c)
(5)	It (B, ThPr) that we should do this (B, DTli)	(c)N (a)N
(5*)	we (B, ThPr) this (Set, DTh)	(li) (b)N
(6a)	in a larger sense (Set, DTh) we (B, ThPr)	(a) (li)
	dedicate (Set, ThPro)	(b)
(6b)	we (B, ThPr) consecrate (Set, ThPro)	(li) (b)
(6c)	we (B, ThPr) hallow (Set, ThPro) this ground (Set, ThPro)	(li) (li) (li)
(7)	The brave men, living and dead who struggled here (B, DTh) it (Set, ThPr)	(b) (li)
(7*)	who (B, ThPr) here (Set, ThPro)	(c) (li)
(8)	The world (B, DTh) what we say here (Set, DTho)	(a) (b)
(8*)	what (Set, DTli) we (B, ThPr) here (Set, ThPro)	(b)N (li) (li)
(9)	it (B, ThPr)	(c)
(9*)	what (Set, DTh) they (B, ThPr) here (Set, ThPro)	(b) (li) (li)
(10)	It (B, ThPr) rather to be dedicated here (Set, DTh)	(c) (a)N
(10*)	dedicated (Set, ThPro) here (Set, ThPr)	(li) (li)
(10**)	which (Set, DTli) they who fought here (ThPr)	(b) (li)
(10***)	who (B, ThPr) here (Set, ThPro)	(li) (li)
(11)	It (B, ThPr)	(c)

(11*)	to be here dedicated (Set, ThPr)	(h)
(11***a)	from these honoured dead (Set, ThPro)	(h)
	we (ThPr)	(h)
(11***a*)	for which (Set, DTh)	(b)
	they (B, ThPr)	(h)
(11***b)	we (B, ThPr)	(h)
	here (Set, ThPro)	(h)
(11***b*)	these dead (B, ThPr)	(h)
(11***c)	this nation (B, DTh)	(a)N
	under God (Set, DTh)	(a)
(11***d)	government of the people, by the people, for the people (B, DTh)	(a)

(1) Field 1 is provided by the opening sentence. It conveys information that is retrievable neither from the verbal context (there is no such context) nor from the immediately relevant situational context. It is important to note that the written text permits one to take the immediately following context into consideration and to interpret the adverbial *Now* of 2 as standing in contrast to the adverbial *Four score and seven years ago* of 1. This contrast raises the degree of CD carried by the adverbial of 1, inducing it to act as diatheme and rendering the subject of 1, *our fathers*, diatheme oriented. In not taking the cue offered by 2 into consideration, the interpreter would be led to view the communicative units of 1 as showing a gradual rise in CD. This is because the dynamic semantic function performed by the context-independent units of (1) are Set, B, Q, and Sp (in that order). Seen in this light, *Four score and seven years ago* is considered to be diatheme oriented and *our fathers* to serve as diatheme.

(2) *We* has no predecessor in the preceding verbal context and yet is interpreted as theme proper. The very fact that the notion of the speaker, or in this case the notion of the group to which the speaker considers himself to belong, can be introduced into the flow of communication by a pronoun and in the absence of a non-pronominal predecessor be immediately identified by the addressee is due to the referent of the notion of the speaker/writer always being present in any immediately relevant situational context (1992.24).

(2*) With the exception of *any*, the rest of the subject conveys context-dependent information. The subject is therefore heterogeneous in regard to context dependence/independence. But the context independence and the quantifying force of *any* predominates, so that the subject is regarded as predominantly context-independent (1992.36-7) and in its entirety serves as diatheme. The other communicative units of the subfield provided by the subject noun phrase are not discussed. As has been pointed out, subfields provided by noun phrases are discussed only exceptionally in the present paper.

(4**) The adverbial *here* has two predecessors in the immediately relevant context: *a great battlefield* in 3 and *a portion of that field* in 4.

(5) It cataphorically points to a piece of information that is to be mentioned later. In this way it participates in the development of the communication, but on account of its very small contribution towards this development cannot but be assessed as theme proper. The information to be conveyed later is expressed by the unit *that we should do this*, which is diathematic and provides the subfield 5*.

(5*) Within this subfield *we* and *this* are context-dependent. On account of the context-independent *should do*, however, the unit is predominantly context-independent. The subject of 2* (see note) and the subfield 5* are not the only units that are heterogeneous in regard to context dependence/independence, I do not consider it necessary to comment on every unit of this type in these notes.

(8*) In its entirety, the unit *what we say here* refers to the address just delivered and in this sense conveys retrievable information. Nevertheless, the subfield 8* provided by this unit has its perspective. It is perspectived towards *say*, which under the circumstances asserts itself on account of its semantic weight. But let me recall that the immediately following context yields a cue which if taken into account puts *say* in contrast with *did* of 9* (cf. p. 40). In that case *say* is induced to convey additional context-independent information. Of the three other units of 8*, *what* exceeds in CD both *we* and *here*. It has been interpreted as a diathematic element *sui generis* (cf. the interpretation of the FSP function of *wh*-words in 1992.100).

(10) On account of the notion of 'preference' conveyed by *rather*, the unit is predominantly context-independent.

(11***c) *This nation* is interpreted as conveying information irretrievable from the immediately relevant preceding context. The retrievability span (1992.25 ff.) opened by *this nation* of 1 and its re-expression of 2 is considered to have been obliterated.

We can now turn our attention to the tonetic implementations.

7 THE THEME IN O'CONNOR'S TONETIC TRANSCRIPTION

As has already been pointed out, Charts O'Connor 2/1 and 2/2 and Kingdon 2/1 and 2/2 list all the thematic units in the fields examined. In addition, they list all the non-thematic units that deviate from perfect distributional correspondence. These units are placed within square brackets, []. Non-thematic units that do not deviate from perfect distributional correspondence are represented by three dots (...). Units affected by re-evaluating prosodic intensification are followed by the re-evaluation sign, >, and enclosed in virgules, //. Outside the virgules, they are restated and provided with the tonetic marks reflecting the outcome of the re-evaluation. An underline within the virgules indicates original rhematicity; one outside the virgules indicates rhematicity resulting from re-evaluation. Units occurring in the virgules without being under-

lined are originally thematic. Reversed virgules are not employed in the Charts covering the thematic elements.

The number of fields listed on Charts O'Connor 2/1 and 2/2 and Kingdon 2/1 and 2/2 is lower than the number of those listed on Charts O'Connor 1/1 and 1/2 and Kingdon 1/1 and 1/2. This is because Charts 2/1 and 2/2 do not record fields opening with non-finite verb forms (see *conceived* of 1*a, *dedicated* of 1*b, *testing* of 2* and *remaining* of 11*) and containing no thematic units, nor do they treat the co-ordinate *little note* and *long remember* of 8 in two fields.

I can now resume the assessment of distributional correspondence. With the exception of 4 fields (6a, 6b, 6c, 8*) that show re-evaluating intensification and have already been discussed in the comments on Charts O'Connor 1/1 and 1/2, all the fields (27 in number) listed by Charts O'Connor 2/1 and 2/2 show perfect distributional correspondence in two respects. They do so both in regard to the transition-rheme relation (as has already been established by Charts O'Connor 1/1 and 1/2) and in regard to the theme-rheme relation (as is now evidenced by Charts O'Connor 2/1 and 2/2). Perfect distributional correspondence in all respects is shown by 5 fields (1, 3, 4, 7* and 10***). This means that out of the 27 fields under discussion 23 show deviations that occur within the non-rhematic sphere, and appear primarily to concern the theme-transition relationship. But as the following analysis shows, these deviations have a wider functional significance.

In an overwhelming majority of cases (22 out of 23), these deviations are of one type: they involve prosodic intensification of thematic units at the expense of transitional units. Under the heading of the latter come the TMEs, which invariably serve as transition proper, conjunctions (1992.93), which are transition-proper oriented, and the notional verbal components if constituting the rest of transition. (Within the square brackets, a single '+' sign indicates TMEs implemented by auxiliaries and the 'N' sign indicates a notional verbal component, the ligature '+N' being used when the TMEs are implemented by verbal affixes and merge with the notional verbal component. The '+o' sign stands for transition proper oriented units.) It is significant that the prosodic weakening of the transitional units takes place at a point where, in terms of the interpretative arrangement (1992.12-3), the boundary/link between the theme and the non-theme is situated. This is certainly not at variance with the TMEs invariably performing this boundary/link role, and the notional verbal component showing a strong tendency to act as transition between the theme and the rheme. The prosodic weakening of the transition permits the prosodic intensification of the unit carrying the highest degree of CD within the theme (which usually acts as diatheme) and in this way puts it in a kind of opposition to the unit carrying the highest degree of CD within the non-theme (which acts as rheme proper).

As the prosodic intensification discussed does not affect the theme-rheme relation, it is non-reevaluating. As in deviating from perfect distributional correspondence it prosodically intensifies a thematic unit

at the expense of a transitional unit or transitional units, it is selective. It is therefore to be described as selective non-reevaluating prosodic intensification. As for non-selective non-reevaluating prosodic intensification (1992.154-9), it intensifies without affecting perfect distributional correspondence. This will be touched upon in Chapter 8. The Charts list only cases of the selective type. They are accompanied with the label 'N. -R. INT.'

For the sake of completeness, let me add two notes. The first concerns the only field (4**) that out of the 23 fields affected by selective non-reevaluating prosodic intensification does not show a prosodically weakened transition. The prosodic intensification takes place within its theme. The second note concerns two fields (10** and 11**a*) in which such intensification occurs simultaneously with the selective intensification of a thematic unit at the expense of the transition. (Fields showing selective non-reevaluating intensification within the theme are accompanied in the Charts with a pair of empty square brackets.)

8 THE THEME IN KINGDON'S TONETIC TRANSCRIPTION

Charts Kingdon 2/1 and 2/2 offer a picture identical in character with that offered by Charts O'Connor 2/1 and 2/2.

With the exception of 3 fields (5*, 7* and 8 [listed as 8a and 8b on Kingdon 1/1]) that show re-evaluating prosodic intensification and have already been discussed in the comments on Charts Kingdon 1/1 and 1/2, all the fields (29 in number) listed by Charts Kingdon 2/1 and 2/2 show perfect distributional correspondence in two respects. They do so both in regard to the transition-rheme relation (as has already been established by Charts Kingdon 1/1 and 1/2) and in regard to the theme-relation (as is now evidenced by Charts Kingdon 2/1 and 2/2). Perfect distributional correspondence in all respects is shown by 5 fields (3, 4, 6b, 6c and 10***). This means that out of the 29 fields under discussion, 24 show deviations that occur within the non-rhematic sphere, and appear primarily to concern the theme-transition relationship. But like the preceding analysis of O'Connor 2/1 and 2/2, the following analysis bears out the wider significance of the deviations.

In an overwhelming majority of cases (22 out of 24), these deviations are of one type: they involve prosodic intensification of thematic units at the expense of transitional units. (Their characters are indicated in the square brackets.) The interpretation of this phenomenon offered above in the comments on O'Connor 2/1 and 2/2 applies here in full and could be repeated here. Let me just recall that the prosodic weakening of the transitional units takes place at a point where in terms of the interpretative arrangement (1992.12-3) the boundary/link between the theme and the non-theme is situated, and that it enables the diatheme to stand in a kind of opposition to rheme proper.

Out of the 24 fields affected by selective non-reevaluating intensification, two (8* and 9*) do not show such intensification within the transition, but within the theme. In two other cases (fields 10** and 11**a*) intensification within the theme accompanies the intensification of a thematic unit at the expense of a transitional unit.

This brings me to the end of the analysis of the written form and two tonetic transcriptions of *The Gettysburg Address*, carried out from the point of view of FSP. Its results corroborate the conclusion that FSP is a system accountable for by an interplay of FSP factors. The possible objection that the text analysed is too short to permit of such a conclusion cannot hold, for the results of the analysis are in harmony with those offered by previous analyses carried out on similar lines; see, for instance, Firbas 1989, analysing the tonetic implementation of a piece of narrative prose, and Firbas 1987 and 1992, analysing tonetic implementations of dialogues. This series of analyses, of which the present analysis dealing with a piece of oratory forms part, testifies to the applicability of the theory of FSP here presented to different functional styles.

9 SUMMING UP THE ANSWER TO THE QUESTION POSED

Two speakers reading aloud one and the same text will differ in the distribution of degrees of PP. They can hardly be expected to use intonational (prosodic) means in exactly the same way and to produce exactly the same attitudinal commentary on what is conveyed by the non-intonational (non-prosodic) means. Nevertheless, they cannot distribute the degrees of PP just at will. In distributing them, they are bound to observe what may be termed laws of distributional correspondence, in other words, laws of relationship between the distribution of degrees of CD as determined by the non-prosodic factors of FSP on the one hand, and the distribution of degrees of PP on the other. Different attitudinal comment is conveyed through prosodic intensification, which either continues to reflect perfect distributional correspondence, or deviates from it. If deviating, it either (a) affects the theme-rheme relationship within a given distributional field, or (b) leaves it unaffected. In the latter case (b), it affects the non-rhematic sphere of the field, prosodically intensifying one or more of its units at the expense of the others. In the former case (a), it re-perspectives the field, adding a new emotive dimension to the message conveyed by it. The distribution of degrees of CD as determined by the non-prosodic FSP factors is not obliterated by prosodic intensification. On the contrary, prosodic intensification takes place against the background of perfect distributional correspondence. As prosodic intensification is a vehicle of the speaker's adding attitudinal comment on the message conveyed by the non-prosodic means and as such contributes information and participates in the further development of the communication, it raises degrees of CD.

In comparing O'Connor's and Kingdon's tonetic transcriptions, I concentrated on prosodic intensification deviating from perfect distributional correspondence. I did not pay special attention to prosodic intensification not deviating from such correspondence, i. e. to non-selective non-reevaluating prosodic intensification. I am, of course, aware that such intensification can effectively participate in increasing the difference between two prosodic implementations of a text. (For instance, the choice of tune types may play a significant role in this connection; cf. 1992.155-6.)

As to the difference between O'Connor's and Kingdon's implementations let me just add the following observation. It concerns the total number of tone units not affected by re-evaluating prosodic intensification. Whereas Kingdon's transcription has only 45 such tone units, O'Connor's has as many as 64. This consequently increases the number of nuclei, serving as constitutive features of tone units, in O'Connor's transcription. The greater number of tone units entails a greater number of pauses and slows down the tempo of the address as transcribed by O'Connor. These features testify to the pronounced oratorical character of O'Connor's implementation. This is further enhanced through non-intonational means such as the use of the glottal stop (see, e. g., *our* and *are* of 1, and *any* of 2, in O'Connor's transcription) and the use of the strong forms of short structure words (see, e. g. the auxiliaries *are* of 1, *can* of 2, and *have* of 4; the prepositions *of* of 3, *for* of 4 and *for* of 10; in the original source, O'Connor 1971.1, phonetically transcribing also vowels and consonants). Reflecting the attitude of the speaker, all these features duly raise the degrees of CD.

I can now sum up my answer to the question posed by the title of the present paper in the following way. As a factor of FSP, intonation cannot operate independently of the outcome of the interplay of the non-prosodic FSP factors. This naturally applies even to cases in which intonation completes this interplay by disambiguating non-prosodic signals or, on the other hand, even to cases when it blurs the outcome of the interplay through automatic placement of the intonation centre on the last stressed unit of a field (not encountered in the transcriptions examined). The dependence of intonation on the other FSP factors makes it evident that to a certain extent distribution of degrees of PP over the spoken sentence can be predicted from the distribution of degrees of CD as determined by the interplay of the non-prosodic FSP factors; in other words, that to a certain extent the functional perspective of a spoken sentence can be predicted from the functional perspective of its written counterpart. The qualification 'to a certain extent' is important. It is necessitated by the following facts.

If the outcome of the interplay of the non-prosodic FSP factors is unequivocal (which is achieved in an overwhelming majority of cases), it permits us to predict the prosodically non-reevaluated functional perspective reflected by the spoken sentence. We can predict that under these circumstances, the theme will be prosodically less prominent than

the rheme; we can even predict that within the theme the most prominent element will be the diatheme, and within the rheme, the rheme proper. We cannot, however, predict the exact prosodic implementation of a sentence. We cannot always predict whether the speaker will have recourse to prosodic intensification, and if he does so, whether the intensification employed by him will be of the non-selective non-re-evaluating, selective non-re-evaluating, or re-evaluating, type. Nor can we predict in every case the exact form of the tonetic pattern (the exact form of the tune) the speaker is going to use. Prosodic intensification is a means of the spoken norm of language and therefore absent from its written norm. It is the vehicle of the speaker's, not the writer's, running attitudinal commentary on the message conveyed. Nevertheless, the analyses of the two transcriptions have corroborated that language is a system, and that prosodic intensification, which raises the degrees of CD, operates against the background of perfect correspondence between the distribution of degrees of CD as determined by the non-prosodic FSP factors on the one hand and the distribution of degrees of PP on the other.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT. Thanks are due to the publishers, Cambridge University Press and Longman, for kindly permitting to reprint the two transcriptions discussed and analysed in the present study.

REFERENCES

- Daneš, F. (1987). 'On Prague School functionalism in linguistics', in Dirven and Fried 1987:3-38.
- Dirven, R. and V. Fried, eds. (1987). *Functionalism in linguistics* (Amsterdam: Benjamins).
- Firbas, J. (1987). 'Thoughts on functional sentence perspective, intonation and emotiveness, Part Two', *Brno studies in English* 17:9-49.
- Firbas, J. (1989). 'Degrees of communicative dynamism and degrees of prosodic prominence', *Brno studies in English* 18:21-66.
- Firbas, J. (1992). *Functional sentence perspective in written and spoken communication* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Kingdon, R. (1958). *English intonation practice* (London: Longmans).
- Kopečný, F. (1962). *Základy české skladby*, 2nd ed. (Prague: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství).
- O'Connor, J. D. (1971). *Advanced phonetic reader* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- O'Connor, J. D. and G. F. Arnold (1973). *Intonation of colloquial English*, 2nd ed. (London: Longman).
- Svoboda, A. (1968). 'The hierarchy of communicative units and fields as illustrated by English attributive constructions', *Brno studies in English* 7:61-86.
- Svoboda, A. (1981). *Diatheme* (Brno: Masaryk University).
- Svoboda, A. (1983). 'Thematic elements', *Brno studies in English* 15:49-85.
- Uhlenbeck, E. M. (1983). 'Linguistics, neither psychology nor sociology', *1983 NIAS lecture* (Wassenaar: NIAS).
- Vachek, J. (1989). *Written language revisited* (Amsterdam: Benjamins).

