

Paul Georg Meyer et al.

Descriptive
English
Linguistics

An Introduction

4th Edition

narr studienbücher

narr studienbücher

Paul Georg Meyer

Descriptive English Linguistics

An Introduction

Fourth, completely revised, supplemented and updated edition

With contributions by Elma Kerz and Timo Lothmann

In collaboration with Judith Bündgens-Kosten, Andreas Frühwirth,
Birgit Haupt, Andreas Kohn, Peter Marsden, Paula Niemietz and
Tanja Oelkers

gnV Gunter Narr Verlag Tübingen

Prof. Dr. Paul Georg Meyer ist Inhaber des Lehrstuhls für Anglistische Sprachwissenschaft an der RWTH Aachen.

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.d-nb.de> abrufbar.

- 4., vollständig neu bearbeitete Auflage 2008
- 3., überarbeitete Auflage 2005
- 2., unveränderte Auflage 2003
- 1. Auflage 2002

Die 1.–3. Auflage ist unter dem Titel „Synchronic English Linguistics“ erschienen.

© 2008 · Narr Francke Attempto Verlag GmbH + Co. KG
Dischingerweg 5 · D-72070 Tübingen

Das Werk einschließlich aller seiner Teile ist urheberrechtlich geschützt. Jede Verwertung außerhalb der engen Grenzen des Urheberrechtsgesetzes ist ohne Zustimmung des Verlages unzulässig und strafbar. Das gilt insbesondere für Vervielfältigungen, Übersetzungen, Mikroverfilmungen und die Einspeicherung und Verarbeitung in elektronischen Systemen.

Gedruckt auf chlorfrei gebleichtem und säurefreiem Werkdruckpapier.

Internet: <http://www.narr-studienbuecher.de>
E-Mail: info@narr.de

Druck: Gulde, Tübingen
Verarbeitung: Nädele, Nehren
Printed in Germany

ISSN 0941-8105
ISBN 978-3-8233-6400-9

Preface to the fourth edition

This fourth edition of our linguistics textbook from the English Department of RWTH Aachen University, hitherto entitled *Synchronic English Linguistics*, includes many major revisions and additions.

Many disturbing factual and typographical errors could be corrected and many improvements of formulations carried out. Special thanks in this connection are owed to Judith Bündgens-Kosten, who gave innumerable valuable hints for improvement from her hands-on teaching experience.

In accordance with its new title, the book now contains a fully-fledged historical component: Not only was the chapter on language change (Ch. 3) supplemented by new subchapters (for the most part written by Timo Lothmann) on the history of the English language and linguistic changes that are still relevant for understanding the present-day language or differences between English and German. Historical remarks and cross references were added throughout the book where this seemed elucidating. In the same way, the contrastive component of the book was strengthened.

Wherever this seemed helpful, comparisons with structures in German and other languages were drawn. We hope that this helps fulfil the need for a textbook in courses covering both synchronic and diachronic linguistics and serving both bachelor and teacher training programmes.

Due these substantial additions, and in the interest of price stability, it was necessary to dispense with the former chapter on psycho-, neuro and biolinguistics in the printed version. This chapter will remain available at www.narr-studienbuecher.de.

For the first time, this book will be accompanied by an on-line component: in addition to the chapter mentioned above, an electronic glossary will be available which explains all technical terms used in the book, along with German equivalents if available and provides a wealth of additional explanations and examples. If this catches on, further components will be added.

The authorial team also wishes to thank the many users who contributed suggestions that led to improvements, and the publishing house that made this new edition possible.

Aachen, July 2008
On behalf of the authorial team
Paul Georg Meyer

0 Introduction

0.1 What is linguistics?

Linguistics (*Linguistik, Sprachwissenschaft*) can be very simply and broadly defined as the systematic study of language in all its properties and in all its interrelations with other human phenomena. People who are engaged in this kind of study usually call themselves **linguists**.

☛ Note that the word *linguist* has a completely different meaning here from its most usual everyday meaning: Ordinary educated speakers of English, on hearing the word *linguist*, will expect such a person to be able to speak many different languages. A linguist in the technical, i.e. linguistic, sense of the word, however, does not necessarily need to speak many languages. Just as mathematicians do not necessarily have to be good at doing sums, linguists don't necessarily have to be good at languages, although in both cases, it must be said, the practical skill will be helpful.

The above 'definition' of linguistics is not shared by all linguists, maybe not even by most of them. Many linguists have very specific ideas of what linguistics is, what kind of study is a 'proper' occupation for a linguist, and what kind of study isn't. This introduction deliberately takes the broadest possible view, so as not to prejudice your decision about what you find interesting about language and worth studying, no matter whether some linguists call that kind of study 'linguistics' or not.

The first chapter will deal with the uncontroversial core area of linguistics, **grammar**. This area will be familiar to some of you from your language classes at school, but you will soon notice that the way linguists do grammar is somewhat different from the way it is done there. Emphasis is not so much on established knowledge and rules that can be learnt by heart, but on interesting generalisations and theoretical problems.

From grammar we proceed in chapter 2 to another core area of linguistics, the study of the sounds of language, **phonetics** and **phonology**.

Chapter 3 deals with the **history** of the English language and with different kinds of language **change**. We will primarily discuss changes that are observable in or relevant for present-day language.

Chapter 4 is concerned with the remaining core area of linguistics, the study of linguistic meaning, in particular, word meaning. This area, known as **semantics**, having been neglected by the most influential schools of linguistics during most of the 20th century, is now gaining more and more importance, although it is one of the most difficult subfields of linguistics.

Chapter 5 addresses an area which has been very much debated in linguistics, but not only in linguistics, during the last three decades or so. This is the study of language use in contexts, or: **pragmatics**. Some linguists, mainly interested in

formal aspects of grammar, have regarded pragmatics as lying outside the domain of linguistics ‘proper’. Other linguists, however, have declared pragmatics to be the very core area of linguistics, on which the study of all other subfields should be based. Between these two extremes, many interesting observations can be made and theories have been constructed concerning the relationship between the system of language as it is laid down, e.g., in a grammar, and the use of language, as it is observed in real-life situations.

The next chapter, 6, is also concerned with language use, but concentrates on the fact that language is mainly used in texts and conversations. For the study of texts, a separate branch of linguistics has been establishing itself over the last three to four decades, **textlinguistics**, while the **analysis of conversation** has also attracted the attention of many linguists.

The last two chapters examine further aspects of language, which can only be studied on an interdisciplinary basis. Chapter 7 discusses certain phenomena and questions arising from the interaction of language and society, a branch of linguistics usually called **sociolinguistics**.

Chapter 8 is not a proper chapter in the sense that it deals comprehensively with one branch of linguistics. As it concludes the book, we call it an epilogue, and it raises the fundamental question of the species-specificity of human language.

In the appendix, you will find exercises (chapter 9), an extensive bibliography (chapter 10) and a subject and name index (chapter 11) which will help you find individual topics and technical terms.

0.2 Useful hints for the user

This textbook is intended to introduce you to English linguistics. For an introductory textbook, it contains an unusual amount of material, and we hope that doesn’t deter you. The book may thus well accompany you throughout your studies in linguistics. Our objective is to help you get growing into true professionals of the English language and linguistics who enjoy doing linguistics and reflecting about language. This involves, i.a., the use of a professional language, that is linguistic terminology, and development of a professional attitude towards language and communication. This, above all, is what will distinguish you in your later professional life. Therefore, we place great emphasis on explaining the difficult and sometimes confusing terminology of linguistics, to eventually enable you to read technical linguistic literature (which is indispensable in studying linguistics), and we argue vehemently against unprofessional views and attitudes towards linguistic problems.

We think that a fruitful occupation with linguistics cannot be restricted to learning definitions (only half understood and quickly forgotten in the worst case). We want you to understand the concepts explained in this textbook, i.e.,

VIII

develop concepts of your own of linguistic phenomena, and see their usefulness and necessity for handling language professionally. For this purpose, it is important for you to develop a network interconnecting your knowledge in different branches of linguistics and integrating it with the rest of your knowledge. That's why, i.a., we frequently refer to languages other than English, primarily German, drawing on your native language competence. That is also why this book contains a huge amount of cross references between its different sections to help you find your own way in the maze of language and linguistics. Some important concepts are taken up in several places in the book, to show that they figure in various branches of linguistics, and to have you construct your own concept.

We also use a number of logos and other graphic devices which help you decide what is important for you at the moment and know what kind of information you are dealing with. These logos are explained in the following box, beginning with typographical conventions.

☞ All important technical terms which are explained in the text are printed in **bold** face, when they appear for the first time (with alternative terms for the same phenomenon and German equivalents following in brackets), and when they are used again, to mark a new topic or to add further explanations.

Bold italics are used in examples to draw attention to the phenomena under discussion.

Italics are used for sentences and individual words given or mentioned as examples. German equivalents for English terminology, wherever they exist and have a spelling that is different from the English term are also printed in italics. They are also used to mark other non-English expressions that are used as normal words in the text.

'Single quotation marks' mark explanations of meanings, but are also used for other purposes, say, to mark expressions that we think are not quite appropriate, but that we use because we don't know a better expression or because we think that this expression is better known and more comprehensible than the 'correct' expression ('scare quotes').

"Double quotes" are used to really quote, either from other authors, or from examples given in the text. Longer quotes from other authors are not put in "quotes", however, but presented in a separate indented paragraph in smaller print.

Underlined words are meant to be read with emphasis. Underlining is occasionally used for other purposes, too.

SMALL CAPITALS mark names of linguists mentioned in the text. These are also used *ad hoc* in some cases for other purposes.

The use of **abbreviations** is kept to a minimum. Basically, we only use abbreviations that are in general use in English, e.g. *e.g.* Abbreviations used in formal linguistic descriptions are explained *ad hoc*. The more important ones are listed in the index (→ 11).

* We mostly use the asterisk as is customary in synchronic linguistics, i.e. to mark sound sequences, expressions or sentences that are not well-formed according to the rules of the language in question. The asterisk is also occasionally used for explanatory footnotes in tables. Note that in the literature on historical linguistics, the asterisk usually marks reconstructed, non-attested sounds, forms or words from extinct languages. We will also occasionally make use of this convention in this book, not without drawing attention to this fact.

? is occasionally used to indicate marginal acceptability of an expression.

Orientation aids:

Highlighted numbered boxed passages explain general theoretical concepts of linguistics whose scope goes beyond the questions discussed at the point where they are found.

→ We generally use this arrow to refer the reader to other sections of this introduction. References are to section numbers or to figure or box numbers only, not to page numbers. To find the page, please use the table of contents (p. X), the list of boxes (p. X), or the list of tables and figures (p. XVII).

☞ marks unnumbered boxes which are used to clarify points of terminology.

☞ boxes explain notations.

☞ is used to warn you against extra stupid frequently-made mistakes (FMM), folk linguistic superstitions, linguistic false friends and badly confused terminology.

☞ boxes contain suggestions for learning and practising activities you can engage in on the basis of what you've just read, on your own or in a tutorial.

➤ marks boxes and paragraphs that give historical linguistic background, with frequent cross references to Chapter 3.

● boxes contain additional information concerning a comparison with German or other languages.

△ marks boxes which deal with true or apparent exceptions to a regularity just mentioned.

☞ marks passages containing elucidating extended examples, elaborate argumentations meant to serve as didactic examples of linguistic argumentation, or little case studies.

We use the signs •, –, and - in lists to indicate different degrees of importance.

• Important terminological dichotomies and categorial distinctions are indicated by this dot.

– The long hyphen is used for lists of important theses or observations.

- The short hyphen is used for lists of examples, steps in an argumentation, and similar items.

Further notational conventions are explained in highlighted boxes marked by ☞ wherever they are used.

Table of contents

0	Introduction	VI
0.1	What is linguistics?.....	VI
0.2	Useful hints for the user.....	VII
1	The core area of linguistics: grammar	1
1.1	Grammar in general.....	1
1.1.1	What kind of thing is grammar?.....	1
1.1.1.1	Grammar as knowledge.....	1
1.1.1.2	Grammar as a societal phenomenon.....	3
1.1.1.3	Discourse as a window to grammar.....	3
1.1.1.4	Written grammars.....	6
1.1.1.5	Summary.....	9
1.1.2	Subdivisions of grammar and the notion of <i>word</i>	11
1.1.3	General concepts of grammar.....	15
1.1.3.1	Word classes.....	15
1.1.3.2	Grammatical categories of the noun.....	18
1.1.3.2.1	Number.....	18
1.1.3.2.2	Gender.....	19
1.1.3.2.3	Case.....	21
1.1.3.3	Comparison of adjectives.....	22
1.1.3.4	Verbal categories.....	23
1.1.3.4.1	Tense.....	23
1.1.3.4.2	Aspect.....	24
1.1.3.4.3	Orientation.....	26
1.1.3.4.4	Person and number.....	28
1.1.3.4.5	Voice.....	29
1.1.3.4.6	Mood and modality.....	30
1.1.3.4.7	Finiteness.....	32
1.2	Syntax.....	33
1.2.1	Traditional structural categories in the sentence.....	33
1.2.1.1	The notion of valency.....	33
1.2.1.2	Syntactic functions: subject and object, adverbial and complement.....	35
1.2.1.2.1	Subject.....	35
1.2.1.2.2	Predicate.....	37
1.2.1.2.3	Object.....	38
1.2.1.2.4	Subject predicative and object predicative.....	38
1.2.1.2.5	Adverbials and the complement – adjunct distinction.....	39
1.2.1.3	Compound and complex sentences.....	42
1.2.2	Generative Grammar: the description of constituent structure.....	45
1.2.2.1	Requirements on a syntactic description.....	45
1.2.2.2	The major constituents of an English sentence. Heuristic tests.....	48
1.2.2.3	Types of phrases in the English sentence.....	52
1.2.2.4	Structure within constituents: Head and modifier.....	55
1.2.2.5	Resolving syntactic ambiguity.....	56
1.2.2.6	Thematic roles.....	57
1.2.2.7	Formal vs. functional approaches in syntax.....	59
1.2.3	Construction Grammar.....	60
1.2.3.1	The development of Construction Grammar. Different approaches.....	60

1.2.3.2	The notion of construction	62
1.2.3.3	Examples of constructions	66
1.2.3.4	The figure / ground alignment	70
1.2.3.5	Further properties of constructions	70
1.2.3.6	Generative vs. Construction Grammar.....	72
1.3	Morphology	73
1.3.1	Why morphology?	73
1.3.2	Morphemes.....	74
1.3.3	Allomorphs and morphological processes.....	77
1.3.4	Inflection vs. derivation.....	80
1.3.5	Further strategies of word-formation.....	82
1.3.5.1	Conversion.....	82
1.3.5.2	Compounding	83
1.3.5.3	Blending, secretion and neoclassical compounding.....	86
1.3.5.4	Reduplication.....	89
1.3.5.5	Abbreviations.....	90
1.3.6	Productivity in morphology.....	91
1.3.7	Summary	93
1.4	Language typology and linguistic universals.....	94
1.4.1	Parameters of typological comparison.....	95
1.4.2	Traditional morphological language typology.....	96
2	Phonetics and Phonology	99
2.0	A brief note on phonetic transcription	99
2.1	Phonetics.....	99
2.1.1	Articulatory phonetics	100
2.1.1.1	Vowels	101
2.1.1.1.1	Parameters of vowel description. Kinds of vowels	101
2.1.1.1.2	The vowels of English	103
2.1.1.1.3	Contrastive observations on the monophthongs	105
2.1.1.1.4	Observations on the English diphthongs	108
2.1.1.1.5	Observations on the English vowel system	109
2.1.1.2	Consonants.....	110
2.1.1.3	Approximants / Glides / Semi-vowels. The sonority continuum	115
2.1.2	Acoustic phonetics.....	116
2.1.3	Auditory phonetics	119
2.2	Segmental phonology.....	120
2.2.1	Phonetics vs. phonology. The phoneme	120
2.2.2	Phonemic and phonetic transcription.....	122
2.2.3	Phoneme vs. allophone.....	124
2.2.4	Neutralisation	132
2.2.5	Morphophonology	133
2.3	Suprasegmental phonology.....	135
2.3.1	Phonotactics.....	135
2.3.2	Syllables	136
2.3.3	Word stress.....	138
2.3.4	Intonation	140
2.3.4.1	Theoretical preliminaries: What is special about intonation?	140
2.3.4.2	The function of intonation in language systems	145
2.4	The phonetics and phonology of connected speech.....	148
2.4.1	Weak forms	148
2.4.2	Assimilation.....	151

2.4.3	Linking /r/ and intrusive /r/.....	152
2.5	Writing.....	153
2.5.1	Graphemics and spelling.....	153
2.5.2	English spelling.....	155
2.5.3	Non-alphabetic writing systems.....	157
3	The history of English.....	158
3.1	External history.....	158
3.1.1	The onset: the formation of Old English.....	159
3.1.2	The transformation: Middle English.....	161
3.1.3	The eve of modernity: Early Modern English.....	162
3.1.4	Becoming global: Late Modern English.....	163
3.1.5	New communicative modes: Present-Day English.....	164
3.2	Internal history and types of language change.....	165
3.2.1	Sound change.....	166
3.2.1.0	Comparative reconstruction. The Indo-European language family	166
3.2.1.1	What Grimm's Laws tell us.....	167
3.2.1.2	Internal reconstruction of a phoneme split.....	170
3.2.1.3	Umlaut.....	171
3.2.1.4	Ablaut.....	172
3.2.1.5	The Great Vowel Shift.....	174
3.2.1.6	Phoneme merger.....	175
3.2.1.7	Phoneme loss.....	176
3.2.1.8	Phonetic attrition.....	177
3.2.2	Morphological change.....	178
3.2.2.0	Mechanisms of morphological change.....	178
3.2.2.1	Declension of nouns.....	179
3.2.2.2	Declension of adjectives.....	180
3.2.2.3	The pronoun system.....	180
3.2.2.4	Verb inflection.....	182
3.2.2.5	Changes in word formation.....	183
3.2.3	Syntactic change.....	185
3.2.3.1	Word order changes.....	185
3.2.3.2	Developments in the verbal syntagm.....	185
3.2.3.3	Grammaticalisation.....	189
3.2.4	Semantic change.....	194
3.2.5	Lexical change.....	197
3.2.5.1	Borrowing.....	198
3.2.5.2	Neologisms.....	203
3.2.5.3	Lexicalisation.....	204
3.2.5.4	Other lexical changes.....	205
3.3	Why do languages change?.....	206
4	Semantics.....	209
4.0	What is semantics?.....	209
4.1	General key concepts of semantics.....	210
4.1.1	Reference vs. sense and related dichotomies.....	210
4.1.2	Ambiguity, homonymy and polysemy; metonymy and metaphor; vagueness.....	212
4.1.2.1	Two kinds of ambiguity: homonymy and polysemy.....	212
4.1.2.2	Metonymy and metaphor.....	215
4.1.2.3	Vagueness.....	216

4.2	Structural semantics: semantic fields, sense relations and componential analysis.....	216
4.2.1	Semantic fields	217
4.2.2	Sense relations.....	220
4.2.2.1	Synonymy.....	220
4.2.2.2	Hyponymy.....	221
4.2.2.3	Partitive relations.....	222
4.2.2.4	Antonymy.....	222
4.2.3	Componential analysis: the semantic feature approach.....	224
4.3	Cognitive semantics.....	225
4.3.1	Central tenets of cognitive semantics.....	225
4.3.2	Prototypes. Metaphors.....	228
4.3.3	Frames.....	230
4.4	Formal semantics.....	233
4.4.1	Truth values and truth conditions.....	233
4.4.2	Logical connectives.....	234
4.4.3	Logical relations between propositions.....	237
4.4.3.1	Entailment.....	237
4.4.3.2	Paraphrase.....	238
4.4.3.3	Presupposition.....	238
4.4.4	Logical properties of propositions.....	241
4.4.4.1	Contradiction.....	241
4.4.4.2	Tautology.....	241
4.4.4.3	Anomaly.....	241
4.4.5	Predicate logic.....	242
4.4.5.1	Simple statements.....	242
4.4.5.2	Quantification.....	243
5	Pragmatics: the context of language use.....	245
5.0	What is pragmatics?.....	245
5.1	Illocution.....	247
5.2	Conversational maxims.....	251
5.2.1	Speakers' maxims: GRICE.....	251
5.2.2	Hearers' heuristics: LEVINSON.....	253
5.3	Relevance theory.....	255
5.4	Pragmatic inferencing and language change.....	256
5.5	The notion of context.....	258
6	Textlinguistics. Conversation analysis. Discourse analysis.....	261
6.1	Textlinguistic approaches to text analysis.....	261
6.1.1	Grammar beyond the sentence: cohesion phenomena.....	262
6.1.2	Cohesion as text constitution.....	264
6.1.3	Thematic progression.....	266
6.1.4	Coherence relations.....	269
6.2	The analysis of conversation.....	272
6.3	Discourse in the technical age.....	273
6.3.1	The oral – written dichotomy.....	273
6.3.2	Media discourse.....	278
7	Sociolinguistics.....	280
7.0	The realm of sociolinguistics.....	280
7.1	Dialect, sociolect, and the standard.....	281
7.1.1	Dialect vs. language vs. accent.....	281
7.1.2	Sociolect.....	288

7.1.3	The standard	291
7.2	Languages in contact.....	294
7.2.1	Minority vs. majority.....	294
7.2.2	Bi- and multilingualism.....	295
7.2.3	Language policy	298
7.3	English as a world language.....	300
7.4	Pidgins and creoles	305
7.4.1	Pidgins	305
7.4.2	Creoles	307
7.5	Language and gender	309
7.6	On variation and conditioning factors of its use	313
8	Epilogue: Specific characteristics of human languages vs. animal communication	317
8.1	Arbitrariness.....	317
8.2	Duality / double articulation	318
8.3	Displacement.....	319
8.4	Creativity / productivity and recursiveness	319
8.5	Can animals learn human language?.....	320
9	Exercises	322
9.1	Exercises relating to chapter 1	322
9.1.1	Grammar in general	322
9.1.2	Syntax	322
9.1.3	Morphology	323
9.2	Exercises relating to chapter 2	324
9.3	Exercises relating to chapter 3	325
9.4	Exercises relating to chapter 4	326
9.5	Exercises relating to chapter 5	327
9.6	Exercises relating to chapter 6	328
9.7	Exercises relating to chapter 7	330
9.8	Exercises relating to chapter 8	331
10	Bibliographical section	332
10.1	Some useful links for linguists.....	332
10.1.1	General sources	332
10.1.2	Grammar	332
10.1.3	Phonetics and phonology.....	333
10.1.4	Lexicology and semantics	333
10.1.5	Sociolinguistics.....	333
10.1.6	Psycholinguistics	333
10.1.7	Corpus linguistics	333
10.2	Important basic literature	333
10.2.0	General literature	333
10.2.0.1	Bibliographies.....	333
10.2.0.2	General readers	333
10.2.0.3	Reference works	334
10.2.0.4	Basic theoretical literature / Classics of linguistics.....	335
10.2.0.5	General introductions.....	335
10.2.0.6	Schools of linguistics	336
10.2.0.7	Exercises	337
10.2.1	Grammar	337
10.2.1.1	Grammars of Modern English.....	337
10.2.1.2	Syntax	337

10.2.1.3 Morphology	338
10.2.1.3.1 Theory. General	338
10.2.1.3.2 Word-formation	339
10.2.1.4 Typology and universals	339
10.2.2 Phonetics and phonology. Graphemics.....	339
10.2.3 The history of English	340
10.2.3.0 Introductions to historical linguistics.....	340
10.2.3.1 History of the English language.....	341
10.2.3.1.0 Language histories. Historical grammars. Historical and etymological dictionaries	341
10.2.3.1.1 Old English	341
10.2.3.1.2 Middle English	342
10.2.3.1.3 Early and Late Modern English	342
10.2.3.2 Language change	342
10.2.3.2.1 General	342
10.2.3.2.2 Grammaticalisation	343
10.2.4 Lexicology and semantics	343
10.2.4.0 Dictionaries. Lexicography.....	343
10.2.4.1 Introductions to semantics	343
10.2.4.2 Structural semantics.....	344
10.2.4.3 Cognitive semantics.....	344
10.2.4.4 Formal semantics	345
10.2.5 Pragmatics	345
10.2.5.0 Theory / Introductions	345
10.2.5.1 Speech act theory	345
10.2.5.2 Conversational maxims.....	346
10.2.5.3 Relevance theory	346
10.2.6 Textlinguistics. Conversation analysis. Discourse analysis.....	346
10.2.6.1 Textlinguistics.....	346
10.2.6.2 Analysis of conversation:.....	347
10.2.6.3 Discourse in the technical age.....	347
10.2.6.3.1 Orality / literacy	347
10.2.6.3.2 Media language	348
10.2.7 Sociolinguistics and dialectology	348
10.2.7.0 General	348
10.2.7.1 Dialects, accents and the standard	349
10.2.7.2 Bilingualism.....	349
10.2.7.3 Varieties around the world.....	349
10.2.7.4 Pidgins and creoles	350
10.2.7.5 Language and gender.....	350
10.2.8 Psycholinguistics. Neurolinguistics. Biolinguistics.....	351
10.2.8.1 Psycholinguistics	351
10.2.8.2 Neurolinguistics	352
10.2.8.3 Biolinguistics	352
10.3 Literature mentioned in the text	352
11 Index.....	361

List of boxes

Box 1:	Mentalism vs. empiricism in linguistics	2
Box 2:	Object language vs. metalanguage	4
Box 3:	Corpus linguistics	5
Box 4:	Competence vs. performance. <i>Langue vs. parole</i>	6
Box 5:	Scope	8
Box 6:	Core vs. periphery in language	11
Box 7:	Agreement	19
Box 8:	Natural and grammatical gender	19
Box 9:	Perfective vs. imperfective	24
Box 10:	Markedness	28
Box 11:	Adjunct vs. complement	40
Box 12:	Sentence vs. clause	42
Box 13:	Descriptive vs. prescriptive	46
Box 14:	Transformations in transformational grammar	47
Box 15:	Recursiveness	55
Box 16:	Compositionality	60
Box 17:	Cognitive Linguistics	61
Box 18:	Fuzziness	62
Box 19:	Arbitrariness and PEIRCE's concept of 'symbol'	63
Box 20:	Lexicalist vs. derivationalist	74
Box 21:	Compound or noun phrase?	85
Box 22:	Comparative vs. contrastive linguistics	94
Box 23:	The notion of 'opposition' or 'contrast' in modern linguistics	121
Box 24:	Content vs. expression, form vs. substance	130
Box 25:	Discreteness	141
Box 26:	Iconicity	142
Box 27:	Indexicality	144
Box 28:	Tone languages	146
Box 29:	Diachrony vs. synchrony. Historical linguistics	158
Box 30:	Etymology	167
Box 31:	Areal typology: Sprachbünde	172
Box 32:	Analogy	178
Box 33:	Free variation	186
Box 34:	Metaphor	196
Box 35:	Etymological doublets	200
Box 36:	Structuralism in 20 th century linguistics	216
Box 37:	Trajector vs. landmark	226
Box 38:	Pragmatics vs. semantics, competence vs. performance, <i>langue vs. parole</i>	246
Box 39:	Theme vs. rheme / topic vs. comment	267
Box 40:	Modality, medium, channel	274

List of tables and figures

Fig. 1:	Different aspects of grammar	10
Fig. 2:	Differences between morphology and syntax	15
Fig. 3:	Minor word classes in English	17
Fig. 4:	An example of different word classes in a complex English sentence	18
Fig. 5:	Natural and grammatical gender in German	20
Fig. 6:	Gender and number agreement in English pronouns	21
Fig. 7:	The two aspects of English	25
Fig. 8:	English tense and aspect combined	25
Fig. 9:	Examples of complex verbal syntagms in English	27
Fig. 10:	Personal pronouns of Present-Day English, subject case	28
Fig. 11:	Objects, complements, adjuncts: diverging terminologies	41
Fig. 12:	Tree diagram: <i>She served them there</i>	51
Fig. 13:	Tree diagram: <i>The distressed waitress solemnly ...</i>	54
Fig. 14:	Tree diagram: <i>He saw the boy with the telescope</i> , first reading: 'He used the telescope to see the boy.'	56
Fig. 15:	Tree diagram: <i>He saw the boy with the telescope</i> , second reading: 'He saw the boy who had a telescope.'	57
Fig. 16:	The symbolic nature of a construction	65
Fig. 17:	Examples of constructions	67
Fig. 18:	An example of a hierarchical network of constructions	71
Fig. 19:	Lexical vs. grammatical morphemes	75
Fig. 20:	Tree diagram <i>Second language acquisition conference</i> , reading I	85
Fig. 21:	Tree diagram <i>Second language acquisition conference</i> , reading II	86
Fig. 22:	Kinds of morphemes	94
Fig. 23:	Anatomy of the vocal tract	100
Fig. 24:	Short (lax) vowels of English (phonetic descriptions)	103
Fig. 25:	Long (tense) vowels of British English (Received Pronunciation) (phonetic description)	104
Fig. 26:	Vowels of English (Received Pronunciation)	104
Fig. 27:	Vowels of English (General American)	105
Fig. 28:	Transcription of sounds by place and manner of articulation in IPA	111
Fig. 29:	Examples for English obstruent consonants	112
Fig. 30:	Examples for English sonorants	112
Fig. 31:	Examples for the use of some variants	112
Fig. 32:	Examples of consonants not used in English	113
Fig. 33:	Terminology for places of articulation	115
Fig. 34:	Spectrogram I	117
Fig. 35:	Spectrogram II	118
Fig. 36:	Spectrogram III	118
Fig. 37:	The major allophones of English /k/ and their complementary distribution	126
Fig. 38:	Content / expression vs. form / substance (table)	131
Fig. 39:	Content / expression vs. form / substance (graph)	131
Fig. 40:	Allomorphs of plural -s in English	134
Fig. 41:	Examples of morphophonological alternations in English*	134
Fig. 42:	Syllable structure	137
Fig. 43:	Words with several syllables	137

XVIII

Fig. 44:	Examples of stress patterns	139
Fig. 45:	Weak forms (clitics) in British English	149
Fig. 46:	Examples of linking /r/ and 'intrusive' /r/	152
Fig. 47:	'Silent letters' in English	156
Fig. 48:	Dialects of Old English	160
Fig. 49:	The family tree of English	167
Fig. 50:	Cognates in Old English and Old High German	168
Fig. 51:	Some fricative phonemes and their allophones in Old English	170
Fig. 52:	The Old English umlaut pattern	171
Fig. 53:	Old English ablauting verbs	173
Fig. 54:	The Great Vowel Shift	175
Fig. 55:	The Great Vowel Shift ff.: examples	175
Fig. 56:	Old English noun declension: examples	179
Fig. 57:	Old English personal pronouns (nominative forms)	181
Fig. 58:	The fate of English verbal inflection, present tense	182
Fig. 59:	Examples of broadening and narrowing	195
Fig. 60:	Meaning development of verbs of perception	197
Fig. 61:	Celtic and early Latin loans in English	200
Fig. 62:	Norman French loans	201
Fig. 63:	Loans from all over the world	203
Fig. 64:	Examples of homonymy	213
Fig. 65:	Example of homophony	213
Fig. 66:	Example of homography	213
Fig. 67:	English and Welsh colour adjectives	218
Fig. 68:	'cousin' in English and German	218
Fig. 69:	<i>neck</i> in English and <i>Hals</i> in German	219
Fig. 70:	English loans in German and their synonyms	221
Fig. 71:	Hyponymy / hyperonymy	221
Fig. 72:	Meronymy	222
Fig. 73:	Contradictory contrast	223
Fig. 74:	Polarity	223
Fig. 75:	Converses	223
Fig. 76:	Semantic feature analysis	224
Fig. 77:	The extension of English <i>boy</i> as intersection of three sets	225
Fig. 78:	Image schema for <i>through</i>	226
Fig. 79:	The commercial transaction frame with its lexical realisations	231
Fig. 80:	Logical connectives and their names	234
Fig. 81:	Truth table for '&'	235
Fig. 82:	Examples of presuppositions	239
Fig. 83:	Examples of selection restrictions in English	242
Fig. 84:	The domains of semantics and pragmatics: some antitheses	246
Fig. 85:	Illocutions	247
Fig. 86:	Performative utterances and their illocutionary force	250
Fig. 87:	Conversational maxims	251
Fig. 88:	The three spheres of the context of an utterance	259
Fig. 89:	Situation elements, speech events and text types	277
Fig. 90:	BIBER's factor one: interactive vs. edited	278
Fig. 91:	Approaches to language and society	280
Fig. 92:	Lexical differences between English dialects	283
Fig. 93:	Grammatical differences between English dialects	283
Fig. 94:	Traditional vs. modern dialects	285
Fig. 95:	Pronunciation differences between English dialects	288

Fig. 96: Grammatical differences between American and British English	292
Fig. 97: Different degrees of formality	293
Fig. 98: The spread of English	301
Fig. 99: English as a world language	304
Fig. 100: An example from Tok Pisin	306
Fig. 101: An example from Hawaiian Pidgin	308
Fig. 102: Prominent conditioning factors of language use	314

1 The core area of linguistics: grammar

1.1 Grammar in general

1.1.1 What kind of thing is grammar?

We will start out by explaining what we mean by the word *grammar*. For most of you, this word will probably refer to a kind of book, which you used when you learnt English at school, and which you will (hopefully) have on your bookshelves at home. Now you will have noticed that there are many such books, small ones, for use at schools, and large ones, for use at universities, and many different sizes in between. So it seems there is no one such thing as ‘grammar’. Instead, we find many kinds of grammars. It seems that ‘grammar’ in the singular is something beyond the different books that you may have on your shelves. It is something that the different books try to describe.

So we must say that the word *grammar* has at least two different meanings: In the sense you are most acquainted with, it means a kind of book which describes ‘rules of grammar’. In the second sense, in which linguists usually use the word *grammar*, it means just these ‘rules’. In this second sense, a **grammar** (*Grammatik*) is not something that you can touch or look at, but an abstract system that can be viewed from different angles: It can, among other things, be viewed as a psychological phenomenon: It can be said that a grammar is something that people have in their heads.

1.1.1.1 Grammar as knowledge

People know their grammar, even if they’ve never gone to school. The vast majority of the roughly 6,000 languages that are spoken in the world have never been written, and the vast majority of unwritten languages have never been described in a grammar book. Nevertheless all speakers of each of these languages have a grammar of that language in their heads. They simply know how to use their language. They automatically use the right word order, use the correct forms of words. Even if they make mistakes, they will know they’ve made a mistake when it is pointed out to them. And the grammar rules which they follow may be much more complicated than any rules of a language that any of us may know. So the first important thing we have to learn about ‘grammar’ is: A grammar of a language exists independently of its description in a grammar book.

It exists, first of all, in people’s heads as a kind of **knowledge** as to how to use their own language. This is a very special kind of knowledge: a kind of knowledge which is usually not learnt at school, but in life. It is knowing how to do things. Just as you know how to walk, how to swim, how to drive, how to open a milk bottle (this may turn out to be the most difficult of all these), you also know how to speak, how to use your own language. So all this is knowing how to, not knowing that. Knowing that something is the case is typical of the kind of

knowledge that you learn at school or from books. You learn and then know that Goethe died in 1832 (or was it 1838?). You know that the present Queen of England is named Elizabeth and that Paris is the capital of France.



Find other examples of things that you know-how-to and that you know-that!

In this sense of ‘knowing that’, you may also know a lot of things about English grammar: You may know, e.g., that subject, verb, object (SVO) is the normal word order in an English sentence. This means, in very simple terms, in a normal English sentence like:

The linguist shot the albatross

the doer of an action, normally expressed by the subject of a sentence (“*the linguist*”), is mentioned before the action, normally expressed by the verb (“*shot*”), followed by the undergoer of an action, normally expressed by the object of a sentence (“*the albatross*”). (More on the notions of subject and object will be said in section → 1.2.1.2.) And yet, though you may have known this for a long time, you may have made mistakes, because of course you know that English word order is SVO, but sometimes forget how to implement this knowledge.

Linguists are primarily interested in people’s knowing how to, not in people’s knowing that. Grammar is knowledge of language in the sense of knowing how to use a language.

There is an important school of linguistics that particularly emphasises this basic idea that the object of linguistics is grammar in this sense, as knowledge in the sense of knowing how, as knowledge of native speakers of their language. This theory was first formulated by the famous linguist Noam CHOMSKY (1957) and has become known under the name **Generative Grammar** (*Generative Grammatik*). CHOMSKY says that it is the task of a grammatical description to describe “what the speaker of a language knows implicitly” (1972, 9) (→ Box 4; 1.2.2). Grammar as knowledge, however, is also invoked by **Construction Grammar**, a major alternative approach to Generative Grammar, that will also be presented in this introduction (→ 1.2.3).

Box 1: Mentalism vs. empiricism in linguistics

Approaches which concentrate on structures in the human mind as the primary object of linguistics are often called **mentalist** approaches. Opposed to this would be an **empiricist** view which maintains that empirically gained linguistic data should be the object of linguistics. This view, e.g., is subscribed by many sociolinguists (→ chapter 7) and also by most corpus linguists (→ Box 3).

1.1.1.2 Grammar as a societal phenomenon

But grammar is not just individual knowledge. Grammars are also a societal phenomenon. Grammars can define **speech communities** (*Sprachgemeinschaften*).

☞ A speech community is a group of people sharing a certain amount of linguistic norms, such as in grammar, phonology, lexicon, etc., no matter whether they are laid down anywhere in writing or not, and using them in regular mutual interactions.

If language was just an individual phenomenon, it would be possible for individuals to have a private language not shared by anybody else. But what use could such a private language have? Everybody could use it to write their own private diaries, or to indulge in soliloquy. But language could not fulfil one of its most important functions, that is, communication. To fulfil this function, languages have to have grammars and vocabularies that are more than individual. Individual grammars in a speech community must be similar enough to make individual languages a tool for communication with others in that speech community. We shall return to speech communities and the social relevance of language in section → 7.1.1.

1.1.1.3 Discourse as a window to grammar

There is yet a third angle from which you can look at grammar in the linguistic sense. Discourse is the process in which language is used. We will come back to this in Chapter → 6. Grammar may be seen as an abstraction from people's linguistic behaviour in **discourse**. This is an important aspect of grammar that is often overlooked. The problem with grammar as a psychological phenomenon and grammar as a societal phenomenon is that it is not directly accessible. For all the progress made in psychological and neurological research in recent years, it is still very difficult to look into people's heads. You may ask people questions about what they think the rules of their language are, but the answers you get will often be very unsatisfactory. People's intuitions, people's true knowledge of language is not directly accessible to introspection and questioning. In the same way, grammar rules as a societal phenomenon are difficult to assess in their own right. Again, inculcated norms and attitudes may weigh more heavily than people's intuitions if you ask them what the rules of grammar in a certain community are. To put it briefly: People are not very reliable when asked to make **metalinguistic** statements and assessments, that is, statements about their language. The best you can get from ordinary native speakers of a language is statements or other language behaviour in their language. This is difficult enough to accomplish.

Box 2: Object language vs. metalanguage

Linguists are bound to make metalinguistic statements all the time and are thus careful to distinguish between **metalanguage** and **object language** (*Metasprache*, *Objektsprache*). Metalanguage is the kind of language they use when they speak about language in contrast to the object language we all use when we speak about other things in the world. In principle, all expressions in a language can be used metalinguistically, i.e., when we speak about the linguistic expression, and not the thing it refers to. In this book, we use *italics* to indicate that an expression is used metalinguistically.

Thus, if we write “Butter melts in the sun”, this is a true statement about real butter, if, however, we chose to write “*Butter* melts in the sun”, this would be plain nonsense because the word *butter* does not melt in the sun (unless, perhaps, it is written in something that happens to melt in the sun). On the other hand, a statement such as “Butter has six letters” is plain nonsense because butter cannot have letters, whereas the sentence “*Butter* has six letters” is fine.

It can also be said that in the sentences without italics, we **use** the word *butter* to make an ordinary statement about butter, whereas in the other two cases, where *butter* is written in italics, we just **mention** the word *butter* to make a statement about that word. This is a distinction that is not always maintained in everyday discourse, but that is crucial when doing linguistics. Failure to maintain the use – mention distinction has often led to severe misunderstandings, as the distinction does not only apply to individual words, but also to sentences. Incidentally, it is, among other things, crucial for an understanding of irony and related phenomena (SPERBER / WILSON 1981).

With respect to empirical studies, the **observer’s paradox** (*Beobachterparadoxon*) is an inherent problem when collecting linguistic data, e.g. the recording of samples of spoken language. It is the recording situation itself which is paradoxical: the observer wants to observe people as to how they behave normally, i.e. when they are unobserved. A result of this is that the recorded data is not as ‘natural’ as it could have been without somebody observing. For example, a person asked to tell a certain story will do so very differently, i.e. possibly more carefully when being confronted with a microphone or camera. The problem is not solved by hiding e.g. a tape recorder somewhere in a room where it is not detected by the prospective informants so that the observer can be physically absent. On the one hand, it might be difficult to obtain precisely the kind of data the observer is interested in – what if the structures I am studying simply do not occur in the material? Thus, the body of data collected in the observer’s absence may lack representativeness and focus. On the other hand, even if the observer is present during surreptitious recording (which might ensure the right kind of output), his or her mere presence renders the communicative situation artificial and will most probably bias the output of the informant(s). What is more, there is always the possibility that the informants might – for various reasons – never have agreed to their utterances being recorded and analysed. This raises serious

ethical problems which cannot be ignored. Thus, minimising the effects of this dilemma should be a major aim of the observer who wants to collect reliable data.

Still, linguists have learnt to overcome these difficulties by employing methods of empirical research developed in the social sciences, so meanwhile we have a fair and ever-increasing amount of authentic language data available, samples of language behaviour, both spoken and written, much of it collected in huge computer-readable corpora.

Box 3: Corpus linguistics

The term *corpus* is now almost exclusively used to refer to a large and structured collection of authentic written texts or transcribed speech provided in a machine-readable form and representative of the language or language variety in question. More generally, a corpus is any large collection of texts in whatever form.

Corpus linguistics (*Korpuslinguistik*) has become an expanding and extremely fruitful field of linguistic studies. It is certainly now the dominant paradigm for empirically oriented linguists. It can be said that the use of computer corpora has largely replaced more traditional ways of data-gathering. Corpus linguistics is not to be understood as a specific linguistic theory; but certain theories have more uses for corpus linguistics than others.

Corpus studies are used as an empirical basis for a wide range of topics within linguistics, including lexicography (→ 4.0), all sorts of grammatical questions, language variation (→ 7.6), historical linguistics (→ Chapter 3), contrastive linguistics (→ 1.4), translation theory, natural language processing, etc.

There are different types of corpora, varying in size, and composition and serving different purposes, e.g. the **British National Corpus** (BNC) (a contemporary British English 100-million-word corpus), the **American National Corpus** (ANC), and the **Helsinki Corpus** (a historical corpus). Although the bulk of available corpus data is still from written sources, corpora of oral language are increasingly being built.

One of the major objectives of corpus-based studies is to reveal typical patterns of use, replacing the traditional eliciting of judgements of grammaticality from native speakers. With the help of corpora we can examine the frequency distribution of syntactic patterns, lexical association patterns, the use and function of morphological characteristics, etc.

The most commonly used tool in corpus linguistics are **concordances** (*Konkordanzen*): A software program displays all occurrences of a selected word together with their immediate contextual environment. Concordances also facilitate the study of **collocations** (*Kollokationen*) (→ 4.1.1).

But there is a problem with authentic language data. Look at the following example of a transcript of a real-life conversation (braces { } indicate breaks in the flow of speech):

The one {} one of the things I {} I'm told, {} I gather from Alec, {.} this morning, {u:m} that {uh} Oscar feels very sore about, {.} is, that he sees this {uh} as a breaking of the consortium...

When we speak and don't finish a sentence before we start a new one, as in the above example, we cannot say that this is what is stored in our heads, that is, it is not a rule of our grammar to speak with a lot of 'uhs' and 'ums' and other hesitation phenomena, or to keep leaving sentences unfinished. And it is not something that defines our speech community, either.

Box 4: Competence vs. performance. *Langue vs. parole*

The difference between edited and authentic language, or between what is accepted as flawless speech in a speech community and what is actually spoken is the difference that CHOMSKY (1972, 9) had in mind when he distinguished between

- **competence** (*Kompetenz*), that is the know-how of the speakers of a language, and
- **performance** (*Performanz*), that is the actual use of language.

This distinction is a late 20th century reformulation of a distinction made in the early 20th century by the Swiss linguist Ferdinand de SAUSSURE ([¹1916] 1965, 112), between

- *langue* and
- *parole*.

These are two terms taken over from French into international linguistic terminology which could be reformulated in English and German as the

- **system of language** (*Sprachsystem*) and the
- **use of language** (*Sprachgebrauch*).

Grammar, of course, cannot be directly read off the authentic data. But these data are our most reliable source of the grammar that people have in their heads and that is accepted in their speech communities. If we want to study grammar we want to look at competence, not performance. But performance, or discourse, is a window to competence. And discourse, as we shall see in section → 3.2, is also the most usual place where language change originates.

1.1.1.4 Written grammars

Grammars as they are written down in books may be of several kinds. Traditionally grammars were written in order to prescribe and teach the 'proper' use of a language to native and non-native speakers. Such grammars are therefore called prescriptive or pedagogical grammars. Linguists' grammars are different. Linguists are more interested in the way language is actually used and less in the way some people think they or other people should use language. Incidentally, such beliefs about language norms, often advocated by self-appointed experts

with great conviction, are often not in accordance with the same people's actual language usage (see below for examples).

Thus, while **prescriptive** grammars (*präskriptive Grammatiken*), and also **pedagogical** grammars (*Schulgrammatiken*) to a certain extent, lay down rules of correctness as to how language should be used, **descriptive** linguists' grammars (*deskriptive Grammatiken*) try to describe the facts of linguistic usage as they are. To give a few more concrete examples:

A prescriptive grammar might tell its users that

The man whom I saw

is correct English, while

The man who I saw

is incorrect, contrary to actual contemporary usage by the vast majority of English speakers and writers in the vast majority of cases. It is just because prescriptive grammarians of English happen to have noticed that English grammar has been changing in this point, and happen to have decided to stop this change. Descriptive grammars, on the other hand, might note that *whom* can be used in the sentence in question in formal written style, whereas informal speech prefers *who*, keeping the form *whom* only after prepositions, such as in

The man to whom I spoke,

where, however, in many cases informal speech prefers

The man I spoke to.

The latter example also raises another issue, one that prescriptive grammarians have fought a heroic battle about for centuries: so-called stranded prepositions, that is prepositions that are 'stranded' at the end of sentences or clauses, like the preposition *to* in the above example. (For more on the notion of preposition → 1.1.3.1). In this hopeless battle, prescriptive grammarians were probably influenced by the etymology (→ Box 30) of the word *preposition*: According to its Latin origin, a preposition is something that is pre-posed, that is, put before something else; so it seemed logically impossible to have a preposition alone at the end of a sentence. Descriptive linguists will only note that stranded prepositions are a very normal phenomenon not only in English, but also in other languages, including some varieties of German:

*Nachgestellte Präpositionen im Deutschen? Da will ich nichts **von** hören!*

They will then proceed to explain this phenomenon in their respective grammatical framework. In fact, stranded prepositions are so normal in English that even people fighting against them cannot help using them occasionally. It's like in the old schoolboys' joke about a teacher who used to say

"A preposition is not a proper word to end a sentence with".

Another pet issue of prescriptive grammarians is the so-called "split infinitive" (on infinitive clauses, → 1.1.3.4.7), as in the following example:

She decided to gradually get rid of the teddy-bears
(TRASK 1999, 246).

What is meant by *split infinitive* is the insertion of an adverb between *to* and the infinitival verb form. Now for various reasons, this insertion is very much within the logic of English grammar. If it wasn't, the construction would have been unlikely to arise at all. (On the notion of 'construction', see → 1.2.3.2). In the above example, there is actually no choice if you want to avoid misunderstandings:

She decided gradually to get rid of the teddy-bears

has a different meaning because the **scope** of *gradually* is different, and in

She decided to get rid of the teddy-bears gradually,

the scope of *decided* changes (see Box 5). For some inexplicable reason, prescriptivists have objected to constructions of this kind for centuries.

What is interesting to note about prescriptivism is that it seems to concentrate on banning certain ways of using language rather than actually giving advice to language users on how to use language. So, instead of being concerned with prescription, they indulge in proscription.

But to end this section on a conciliatory note: Writing prescriptive grammars can be a very useful occupation, and maybe linguists should pay more attention to the practice of writing prescriptive grammars for insecure language users and learners. But prescription should be based on description, and on a sound knowledge of grammatical facts and principles.

Box 5: Scope

Scope is an important and widely-used technical term in linguistics which is easy to comprehend but difficult to explain. Every language presumably has expressions that have, or as is often said, **take scope** (*Skopus, Reichweite*) over other expressions. Let us call such expressions **operators**. Taking scope means that other expressions, usually in the same sentence, are affected by the operation referred to by the operator. Usually the scope of an operator is the whole sentence, or what follows the operator in the sentence, or the sub-clause of which the operator is part (on *sentence* and *clause*, see Box 12).

In the above example, the critical operators are *decided* and *gradually*. The questions are: What exactly is the scope of the decision? How far does the scope of *gradually* extend? That means: What in the sentence is it that is decided, and what exactly is gradual?

In the formulation "... *to gradually get rid of ...*", *gradually* is inside the *to*-clause and can thus only take scope over this clause. So the "split" infinitive yields the intended meaning that not the decision is gradual, but the getting rid of the teddy bears. The scope of the decision is the whole *to*-clause.

If you put *gradually* outside the *to*-clause, as some prescriptivists would have it, *gradually* takes scope over the whole sentence, and so it would be the decision that is gradual. This, however, is obviously not the intended meaning.

If you put *gradually* at the end, as in the last example, which would also be acceptable to prescriptivists, it receives more weight because this is an unusual position for a small adverb. In consequence, the scope of *decided* is now the adverb *gradually* alone, which means that the decision to get rid of the teddy-bears must have been taken earlier, and that now the decision was taken to achieve this gradually. Again, this is not the intended meaning in the ‘split infinitive’ sentence.

Scope is most often discussed in connection with negation (asking: What actually is negated in the sentence?). It also plays an important role in formal logic (→ 4.4).

☛ *scope* is also often used quite untechnically in this textbook.

1.1.1.5 Summary

We can thus see that *grammar* has a variety of different senses. As an abstract system it can refer to a psychological and societal phenomenon determining the use of language in discourse. As a book, it can refer to a prescriptive (normative), pedagogical, or descriptive account of the grammar of a language.

Having thus clarified from four different angles what kinds of things grammar can be, we present a very brief summary of all this in a diagram (Fig. 1) showing the interrelatedness of these different aspects of grammar. It shows how different approaches to linguistics have different concepts, or concentrate on different aspects, of grammar, and it shows how these different aspects are interrelated.

Individual competence, grammatical norms of a speech community and discourse all shape and influence each other. By using language in discourse, individuals show their individual competence. This competence, of course, cannot remain uninfluenced by the social norms that the speaker accepts as a member of a speech community: If a speaker keeps violating the linguistic norms, this will lead to communication difficulties to the point of miscomprehension or incomprehension. The norms of the speech community are largely shaped and maintained through discourse: By using norm-conforming language, speakers rehearse their knowledge of these norms; the correction of eventual errors, of course, also takes place through discourse. To reverse the circle, discourse not only maintains the norms, but is clearly also shaped by them. The grammatical norms, in turn, are nothing but the sum of individual competences, and they cannot persist if too many or too influential individuals no longer conform to them. Individual competence, in turn, is of course influenced by the use of language in discourse: by the feedback that people get in discourse to their use of language and by how people hear other members of the speech community use language. Discourse is the basis of all empirical study in linguistics; corpus linguistics (→ Box 3) is the best example of this.