

This is an offprint from:

Mike Hannay and A. Machtelt Bolkestein (eds)

Functional Grammar and Verbal Interaction

John Benjamins Publishing Company

Amsterdam/Philadelphia

1998

(Published as Vol. 44 of the series

STUDIES IN LANGUAGE COMPANION SERIES, ISSN 0165-7763)

ISBN 90 272 3047 1 (Eur.) / 1 55619 930 9 (US)

© Copyright 1998 – John Benjamins B.V.

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm or any other means, without written permission from the publisher.

Parallel Focus in English and Spanish: evidence from conversation

ELENA MARTÍNEZ CARO

Universidad Complutense de Madrid

1. Introduction¹

This paper seeks to contribute to the study of pragmatic functions in Functional Grammar (FG), in particular to the study of a subtype of Focus, namely Parallel Focus (ParFoc). Several studies within FG have concentrated on the treatment of Topic and Focus in general (e.g. Dik et al. 1981; Hannay 1983, 1990; de Jong 1981; Siewierska 1987; Stanchev 1997), but little attention has been paid to the different subtypes within Topic and Focus, as described in Dik (1989: ch.13).² Moreover, most of these studies make use of invented examples to illustrate the different functions. With this in mind, the aims of this paper are: (a) to determine the linguistic relevance of the ParFoc function in English and Spanish, (b) to investigate the linguistic strategies used in English and Spanish to express parallel focus, by studying a contrastive spoken corpus, and (c) to propose an amendment of the Focus system, by redefining ParFoc and by introducing further subcategorization. After dealing with certain methodological and theoretical issues, the study approaches each of these three aims in turn.

1.1 Methodology

The research for this study is based on an analysis of two sets of material of spoken British English and Peninsular Spanish (and more particularly, the

language spoken in the city of Madrid) respectively, describing the language of adult educated native speakers. These materials were extracted from two existing corpora: (a) ten texts from the *London-Lund Corpus of Spoken English* (henceforth LLC), and (b) ten surveys (interviews) from the CCM corpus (Esgueva and Cantarero 1981).³ The total number of words analyzed was 120,884, nearly half in each corpus (60,400 words in LLC and 60,484 in CCM).

An important disadvantage of using these materials in Spanish was that the texts were not transcribed for prosodic features, unlike the London-Lund Corpus. For my purposes, this meant that the Spanish corpus could not be analyzed in terms of the nuclear-stress position. As explained in greater detail in section 4.1, one of the most important focal strategies English uses is marked prosodic prominence. In general terms, this involves the placement of the nuclear stress (or sentence stress) in a non-final position of the sentence or tone unit, as in unmarked cases, for emphatic or focalizing purposes.

To partly compensate for this absence on the Spanish texts, I analyzed the reading by a Spanish native speaker of sections of the texts together with some other recordings of Spanish spontaneous conversations in terms of nuclear-stress position and tone units. Given the results of this analysis, together with evidence from other scholars on the position of the nuclear stress in Spanish (e.g. Hill 1985; Mott 1991; Contreras 1976), two major assumptions were made. First, the nuclear stress in Spanish declarative clauses tends to fall in the majority of cases towards the end of the tone unit; and second, although marked prosodic prominence seems to be used to some extent in Spanish, it is never used as the *single* linguistic device to express Focus.

1.2 Theoretical preliminaries

Dik (1978:130) defines Focus as the relatively most important or salient information in the predication relative to the pragmatic information shared by speaker and addressee. He assumes that Focus is probably relevant to the grammar of all languages, but that languages may differ according to the various linguistic means used to signal it. A further assumption is that any one language will normally have one primary signalling device, plus a number of other secondary devices.

Within FG, the assignment of pragmatic functions is closely related to questions of formal expression. This relation is such that only constituents that "are

singled out for special treatment with respect to form, order and prosodic properties are assigned pragmatic functions" (Dik 1989: 266).⁴ Adopting this close relationship between pragmatic functions and formal treatment as a starting point, the methodological procedure was the following. First, I analyzed the data with respect to focality and in particular the notion of parallel focus as so defined, and then I identified from these, all instances which used a special formal device to distinguish the function. As it turned out, there was no considerable difference between the total number of cases of parallel contrast and those which also involved a special formal device in the two corpora. The percentages showing this difference were 91.3% for the LLC and 97.46% for the CCM.⁵

The resulting examples of ParFoc were then grouped according to the four main focalizing devices for the different languages mentioned by Dik (1989: 278): prosodic prominence, special constituent order, special Focus markers, and special Focus constructions. In the framework of FG (cf. Dik 1989, Siewierska 1991), the function of Focus is divided according to the parameter of contrastiveness into New Focus (ie. non-contrastive) and Contrastive Focus. Within this parameter, FG makes a further distinction between *counter-presuppositional contrast* and *parallel contrast*. In the former, there is an opposition between what the speaker expresses and the information presupposed by the addressee, as perceived by the speaker. The latter is involved "when Focus is assigned to corresponding constituents in parallel constructions" (Dik 1989: 282), with no contrast in the speaker's and addressee's pragmatic informations.

To illustrate this opposition, see (1) and (2) below. In the examples, the constituent which is assigned the ParFoc function is distinguished in bold type:

(1) *Parallel contrast*

- a. A: how is your . library provision -
 B: (...) and [*@:m*] . I'd like to see a ((2 sylls)) situation where . the books that they know . are going to be needed . there are two copies of them . ^one . that :never :Iveaves the 'library# . and ^one that !can be 'taken 'out# ((on ^un))re_stricted !\oan# - (T3.3, 18-32)⁶
- b. *Bueno, la mayoría de las cosas se traducen al francés, ¿no?, al español se traduce bastante menos*, (E2, 29)
to+the Spanish IMP translate:3SG rather less
 'Well, most things are translated into French, right?, **into Spanish** people translate rather less.'

(2) *Counter-presuppositional contrast*

a. (about A's work as a stockbroker)

A: I don't see very many people of [m] - *([@:? @])*

B: *but your* customers I mean your clients ((2 sylls))

A: yes they don't not very many of them come . really .

B: you don't need very many if they've all got a hundred and fifty thousands

A: yes but it doesn't really make any difference you see what they've got - it's **^how much they 'move it** that counts# (T2.2a, 653-61)

b. (about Spanish women)

A: ¿No crees que, por ejemplo, ahora tiene o va adquiriendo una libertad excesiva?

B: No, yo creo que no; o sea que la libertad que está adquiriendo la mujer es porque se la está dando precisamente la

because REF it:ACC is giving precisely **the sociedad**, no es que ella la esté tomando, sino es **la sociedad** society but is **the society**

la que se la da. (E5, 93)

the-one that REF it:ACC gives.

'A: Don't you think that, for example, they now have or are getting too much freedom?

B: No, I don't think so. That is, the freedom that women are acquiring is granted by **society**; it is not that they are taking it; it is **society** that is giving it to her.'

Both examples in (1) involve parallel contrast. In (1a) a contrast is established between the copy of a book that never leaves the library and the one which can be taken out; in (1b) Spanish is contrasted with French. Neither of them involve a contradiction with information presupposed by the addressee, i.e. there is no sign in the text that such a contradiction or opposition exists. The function of ParFoc is expressed in (1a) by means of a marked prosodic focus and in (1b) by means of a fronting of the complement.

The examples in (2) illustrate some kind of opposition between what the speaker expresses and what the addressee presupposes (which is expressed or can be implied). Thus, on talking about the kind of clients a stockbroker has, speaker A in (2a) asserts that what is at stake is how much they move the money they

possess rather than the amount itself, as the addressee presupposes (and hence the use of the cleft sentence). Likewise, in (2b) the speaker asserts that the freedom that Spanish women now have is granted by society itself contrary to what the interviewer presupposes and in fact expresses in the question.

2. The expression of parallel contrast in English and Spanish: summary of results

As stated above, examples of focality were classified according to the special treatment used. In addition to the four focalizing devices which Dik (1989) mentions, other mechanisms have been identified, such as the parallelism of syntactic constructions. This is a syntactic device but does not imply the use of a special constituent order and, consequently, it has been considered as an independent strategy. Table 1 shows the results of the data for the different linguistic devices used to express the function of ParFoc and their distribution.

Table 1. *Expression of ParFoc in English and Spanish (excluding listing)*

Focus marking	English (LLC)	Spanish (CCM)
Marked prosodic prominence	106 (71.14%)	0 (0%)
Special constituent order	20 (13.42%)	142 (60.94%)
Parallelism of constructions	12 (8.05%)	16 (6.87%)
Special Focus constructions	9 (6.04%)	9 (3.86%)
Special Focus markers	2 (1.34%)	66 (28.33%)
Total	149 (100.00%)	233 (100.00%)

The most important conclusion emerging from this table is that each of the two languages expresses Parfoc by means of a different dominant strategy: the use of marked prosodic prominence in English (in more than 71% of the examples) and a special constituent order in Spanish (representing nearly 61% of the data). A significant difference in the two languages is that, whereas in English marked prosodic focus clearly stands out from the rest, in Spanish special Focus markers are also quite frequent (almost 30%).

Regarding the issue of marked prosodic prominence in Spanish and taking into account that stated in the Methodology section, it was considered that nowhere in the Spanish examples is this device the only special treatment used to express ParFoc (hence the figures 0/0% in Table 1). This does not imply of course that examples of ParFoc distinguished by a special constituent order or special construction in this language may not be using some kind of marked prosodic prominence *in addition to* the syntactic strategy (Hernanz & Brucart 1987: 94ff).

In the following sections I will discuss in detail each of the strategies shown in Table 1 in both languages. Sections 3 and 4 deal with the most significant of these in terms of representation, while section 5 concentrates on secondary devices.

3. Parallel Focus in Spanish

3.1 Special constituent order in Spanish

Table 2 shows the type and distribution of special constituent-order constructions for the expression of ParFoc in the CCM.

Table 2. *Constructions showing a special constituent order in the expression of ParFoc in Spanish*

Construction	Number and percentage of items
Left Dislocation	58 (40.86%)
Fronting	18 (12.68%)
VS order	25 (17.61%)
Adverbial in P1	41 (28.87%)
Total	142 (100.00%)

These constructions are basically of two types: in some of them ParFoc is assigned to a constituent which appears in either P1 or P2 position; in others, the element expressing the pragmatic function appears clause finally.

The first type includes left-dislocations (LD, Theme constructions), fronting of non-subject arguments and the use of an adverbial (satellite) in P1; the second type comprises constructions which locate the subject in postverbal position. Of all these, LDs are the most commonly used, representing 40.86% of the data. In

general, mechanisms which locate the ParFoc constituent in P1 or P2 have a higher frequency, representing more than 82% of the data, as opposed to those which place ParFoc Subject constituents in clause-final position, which account for only 17.61% of the data.⁷

In addition to the three special positions which are recognized in Dik's model (P1 as a clause-initial position and P2 and P3 as extra-clausal positions, to the immediate left or right of the clause, respectively), FG admits the possibility of individual languages having additional special positions. Thus, for example, Siewierska (1988:125ff) proposes the special position PØ as a clause-final position for Focus constituents in Polish.⁸ In this and other studies, I take the view that the recognition of such a PØ final position is also appropriate for a language as Spanish with a flexible word order. This is a postverbal position for constituents carrying typically new information (New Focus or New Topic), as in the cases of verb-subject ordering, and less frequently, in contexts of contrast. In the VS constructions in Spanish whose postverbal subject coincides with ParFoc, this constituent occupies this PØ position.

The following examples illustrate the different syntactic constructions:

(3) *Left Dislocation* (about a school where B works)

B: *el único punto que yo veo positivo es que los chiquillos empiecen a hablar francés desde que son ..., desde que tienen cuatro años.*

A: *¿Y español?*

B: *Español también, además español lo hablan en su casa*
besides **Spanish** it:ACC speak:3PL at their house

(E18, 317)

'B: the only advantage that I see is that the children start to speak French since they are ..., from the age of four.

A: And Spanish?

B: Spanish also. Besides, **Spanish** they speak at home.'

(4) *Fronting*

No te..., no tengo nada. Soy libre. (...)

o sea, cosas no tengo ninguna, y un trabajo
that is, **things** NEG have:1SG none, and **a job**
que es lo que me pueda sujetar,
that is the-thing that me:DAT can:3SG:SUB tie-down,

no tengo. (E18, 335)

NEG have:1SG

'I don't..., I don't own anything. I am free. (...) that is, **things** I don't have any, and **a post to which I could be tied** I haven't.'

- (5) *Postverbal subject* (about the wedding presents the informant has received)

cuatro bandejas de plata que no te sirven para nada;

te sirve mucho mejor el acero inoxidable, (E7, 119)

you:DAT does much better **the steel** **stainless**

'four silver trays which aren't useful at all, far more useful is **stainless steel**.'

- (6) *Adverbial in P1* (about the camps in the Military Service)

A: *¿En Lérida estáis mejor o peor que los demás campamentos; que La Granja, Monte la Reina...?*

B: *Dicen que sí, que estamos allí mejor, ya que en La Granja se está en tiendas de campaña y allí son barracones con camas con literas de los soldados* (E5,95)

'A: Are the camps in Lérida better or worse; than in La Granja, Monte la Reina...?

B: They say so, that we are better in there, because **in La Granja** you sleep in tents and **there** you have cabins with beds, with bunks for the soldiers.'

From a syntactic point of view, the elements which most frequently serve a ParFoc function in our data are subjects (48.98%), which normally occupy the first position in the Spanish sentence (cf. Delbecque 1991; Gutiérrez 1978). If they are to be formally distinguished by means of a special constituent order, they need to be dislocated by means of different strategies or occupy the postverbal position. As seen in Table 2, ParFocs mostly appear in LD constructions, whereas the postverbal position is much less common for ParFoc constituents in Spanish.

Although Spanish, unlike English or French, does not have subject clitics, I recognize the existence of left-dislocated subjects in Spanish, following Downing (1997). These are preverbal subjects which are formally separated from the rest of the predication by means of various strategies, including "extraction" from subordinate clauses and placement in P1, inclusion of the emphatic Focus marker

sí between the subject and the rest of the predication, as well as pauses and expressions such as *es que* ('the thing is'), *pues* ('well' as discourse marker), etc. Examples are given in (7-9):

- (7) A: *¿Cómo es el aeropuerto de Moscú, así...? (...) ¿Hay un aeropuerto sólo o hay varios?*

B: *Pues no lo sé. No sé ...V... pues he visto mejores que el de Moscú, o sea... el, el de Madrid no creo que, que sea inferior al de Moscú, ni mucho menos ¿no?* (E9, 162)

inferior to-the-one in Moscow

'A: What is Moscow Airport like...? (...) Is there only one airport or several?

B: Well, I don't know. I don't know... I mean, I have seen better ones than the one in Moscow, for instance ... **the one in Madrid**, I don't think it is any worse than the one in Moscow, do you?'

- (8) *Mi marido no pisó Madrid hasta ya mayor, hasta el doctorado, pero, en cambio mis antepasados sí habían estado.* (E12, 206)

however **my ancestors** FOC-PART had:3PL been.

'My husband didn't come to Madrid until he was an adult, until he got his doctorate; **my ancestors**, however, they *had* been here indeed.'

- (9) *Y luego el ambiente romano, pues ...V... va muy bien con nuestro carácter. Sin embargo, el carácter francés, pues no, (...) además, generalmente, el francés pues... mira un poco..., (...) mira un poco por encima del hombro al español ¿no? O sea... y sin embargo, pues los italianos, no.* (E9, 164)

And then **the atmosphere Roman**, well ... goes very well with our character. On the other hand, the French character, well it doesn't, (...) moreover, **the French** generally [m]... they look down on Spaniards a bit, don't they? I mean ... and, on the contrary, Italians do not.'

3.2 *The use of special Focus markers*

Another important means of expression of parallel contrast in Spanish is the use of special Focus markers. Dik (1989: 278) defines these markers as "particles which mark off the Focus constituent from the rest of the clause". The Focus particle *sí* in Spanish, which mainly appears in contrastive contexts, is considered as a special Focus marker here, like emphatic *wel* in Dutch. This marker is used in Spanish for the expression of Focus on the (positive) polarity of the verb, as in (10), in the same way as English includes the auxiliary *do* or stresses the auxiliary if this is already present, as in (11).

- (10) *Mi marido no pisó Madrid hasta ya mayor, hasta el doctorado, pero, en cambio mis antepasados sí habían estado.* (E12, 206)
 however my ancestors **FOC-PART** had:3PL been
 'My husband didn't come to Madrid until he was an adult, until he got his doctorate; my ancestors, however, they **had** been here indeed.'
- (11) A: so *I* didn't [i:] - I mean I didn't particularly want to teach but
 B: *[mhm]*
 A: I **^did** th\ink# ((that)) I must . ^do !something about (!!finding !work))
 with!in the next !y\ear#
 B: [m] *[mhm]*
 (A: rather than sitting about *-* spending another two years for example becoming an academic (T1.5, 927-36)

Although English lacks a proper Focus marker only used in focal or emphatic contexts like *sí* in Spanish (cf. Mackenzie & Keizer 1990: 192), the inclusion of the focal auxiliary in English and the use of *sí* in Spanish have been grouped as instances of special Focus markers. Neither of these strategies is strongly represented in the respective languages (3.43% in the CCM and 1.34% in the LLC).

Much more important in terms of representation in Spanish are emphatic subject pronouns, widely used in the data (20.6% of the total number of examples of ParFoc in the CCM). In my account, the emphatic forms of both subject and object pronouns have been included within the same group of special Focus markers, because of their morphological, rather than syntactic, character. Altogether, these three mechanisms accounted for 28.33% of the total.

It is widely known that Spanish does not need to specify its pronominal subjects when the context or verb inflections prevent ambiguity. One of the most important motivations for using stressed pronominal subjects is that they are contrastive, and particularly, that they are Parallel Focus, as in (12-14):

- (12) *Entonces, después de eso, me fui a casa, él se marchó*
 Then after that me went:1SG to house, **he** left
a la suya, allí a llorar su último día de soltero y... y es, bueno, yo
 to his, well **I**
me fui a la peluquería; [E7, 111-12]
 went:1SG to the hairdresser's
 'And then, after that, I went home; **he** went to his, to enjoy his last day as a bachelor and... and, well, **I** went to the hairdresser's.'
- (13) *Oye, tú a mí, de todas formas tu cara me suena. Lo probable es que*
 The likely is that
yo, yo sí te he visto en la Facultad, mientras
I I FOC-PART you:ACC have:1SG seen at the Faculty, whereas
Te no me has visto a mí en la Facultad, (E17, 307)
You NEG me:ACC have:2PL seen to me at the Faculty
 'But, your face rings a bell, anyway. It is likely that **I** have seen you at the Faculty, whereas **you** haven't seen me at the Faculty.'
- (14) A: *lo que pasa es que yo veo, que a ti te interesa mucho más el ensayo...*
 B: *Sí, me encanta, sí.*
 A: *...que la narrativa.*
 B: *Me encanta.*
 A: *Entonces yo, lo que pasa, es que soy un apasionado de la*
 Then **I**, what happens, is that am a lover of the
narrativa ¿no? (E17, 292)
 narrative you-see?
 'A: the thing is that I see that you're much more interested in essay...
 B: Yes, I love it, yes.
 A: than in narrative...
 B: I love it.
 A: And so, the thing is that **I** am extremely fond of narrative, you see?'

The great majority of emphatic pronouns used to achieve this function in Spanish correspond to the first person singular *yo*.

To indicate the same contrastive function with objects, Spanish uses a strategy which has been called *clitic doubling* or *clitic reduplication* (Green 1988, Stanchev 1997). Pronominal objects differ from their subject counterparts in that they are not normally omitted in Spanish. Thus, in order to indicate contrastiveness, the Spanish speaker uses, in addition to an unstressed clitic object, another which is tonic or emphatic. Consider (15) and (16):

- (15) *Poco después de bautizar a Marañón se me*
 Little after baptizing:INF to Marañón IMP me:DAT
bautizó a mí. En la misma pila. (E13, 229)
 baptized:3PL to me.
 'After Marañón was baptized, I was baptized. In the same font.'

- (16) (About the informant's wedding)
y luego, pues nada, ...V... comí muchísimo, porque a mí me
 because to me me:DAT
dio por comer; A. creo que no probó bocado, porque nada, no le
 gave:3SG for eat:INF
gus... estaba nerviosísimo y todo esto; (E7, 114)
 'And then, well, I ate a lot, because I took to eating; I think A. didn't eat at all, because, he didn't like... he was very nervous and all that.'

Clitic doubling is much less used in the CCM than are emphatic pronominal subjects (representing only 4.29% of the total number of examples of ParFoc in Spanish).

4. Parallel Focus in English

4.1 Marked prosodic prominence

As shown in Table 1 above, English uses marked prosodic prominence as the main linguistic device to indicate a parallel contrast. This mechanism has to do, in general terms, with the movement of the *nuclear-stress* (NS) position in the tone

unit. Examples using this device in English exhibit a marked position or fronting of the NS –what has been called *marked prosodic focus*– by which the placement of the NS does not coincide, as in the unmarked cases, with the last lexical element of the tone unit (Halliday 1967; Crystal 1969; Cruttenden 1986).⁹

In the examples where ParFoc is expressed intonationally, the NS tends to be situated in the second element of the opposition and the subject is the functional category which is most often stressed in more than 50% of these occurrences.

Examples (17-19) illustrate the use of this device in English:

- (17) A: it's really was Beryl ((that)) did it I think ((Beryl Martin)) -
 B: but surely I mean they *((can't 4 to 5 sylls))*
 A: *and I ^think **Marilyn's*** 'changed it a b/it# (T1.5, 401-405)¹⁰
- (18) A: Lloyd George . was the Minister and that was all *there was
 B: *[m] . yes . ((that's right))*
 (A: just ((the odd)) Minister-* and he entertained [[:] . Colonel House or whoever the American [aembaes @:] representative was and he said I've got one chair and one table ^VI'll sit on the 'table# and ^you sit _on the *!ch\air#.* (T2.3, 558-68)
- (19) A: I don't have to I eighty per cent of my time I spend doing as I like last year there wasn't time in Anorexia College *-* with Kennedy and
 B: *[m]*
 (A: I spen((d)) ^s**ome of my _time**# - in the ^Insti'tute of Neur:ology# . ^w=orking on# . patho^logical con_ditions of sp\eech#
 B: [m]
 A: and ^**only a !b/it of my 'time**# ^working _on my !\African 'languages# (T2.4a, 297-309)

Whereas (17) and (18) establish a parallel contrast between human referents (*Beryl* and *Marilyn*, and *I* and *you*, respectively) distinguishing only one element of the opposition by a fronting of the NS, in example (19) two circumstantial elements are opposed, both of them receiving marked prosodic prominence. In all three examples, the ParFoc constituent appears towards the beginning of the tone unit.

4.2 Constituent order variation in English

In addition to the use of a marked prosodic focus, the second most significant strategy for the expression of a parallel contrast in English is constituent ordering variation, representing 13.42% of the data. The tendency here is the same as in Spanish: in 75% of the examples ParFoc appears in P1 or in P2 either as a P1 satellite, a fronted element or a dislocated element. Less frequent constructions such as right-dislocations (Tail constructions) or VS ordering present the ParFoc constituent towards the end of the predication. Consider examples (20-23):

(20) *Left dislocation*

A: well there is an awful *lot of* routine

B: *((2 sylls))* **yes**

(A: simply because **they're** doing such a big survey

B: yes [m] [m]

A: ^whereas P*Vickering*# and the lin^*guistics 'group*# *.* ^they just !set
!out#

B: *[m]*

(A: to do ^purely 'scien'tific t\exts# and they had a ^three year pr\oject# and
^that was th\at# (T1.5, 577-89)

(21) *Fronting*

A: I want what I want and must find out ((is about)) those seminars that
Millicent was talking about are they in fact conducted by him .

B: he does this five fifteen on a Wednesday one this is *his* postgraduate
seminar which

A: *((oh I see))*

(B: is held across [dhi] corridor there in FC three - - [@m] - he gives some
of them in this room - his ^\under'graduate 'ones#

(car noise)

B: he ^gives in this r\oom# (T1.5, 879-91)

(22) *Adverbial in P1*

But [@] really I've got about . three weeks less than that of hardish work
spread over those two months you *see* . the " ^rest of the t=ime# ^I'll
have !pl\enty of time {to ((^d\eal with them#)#) (T1.1, 155-61)

(23) *VS ordering*

A: I think . probably there might be lots of copies of texts

B: [m] *[m] [m] *

A: ^but *. !very 'rarely is there 'more* than one 'copy of cr'iticism#

(T3.3, 298-302)

5. Other means of distinguishing Parallel Focus in English and Spanish

As secondary devices of expression of ParFoc in both languages, we can distinguish the use of parallel syntactic constructions and special Focus constructions. Their occurrence in both corpora is much smaller than strategies previously mentioned, the former having a somehow larger representation than the latter in both languages (cf. Table 1 in section 2). Cleft and pseudo-cleft sentences are included within what Dik has called special Focus constructions, constructions "which intrinsically define a specific constituent as having the Focus function" (Dik 1989: 278). Consider (24) and (25) which exemplify the use of clefts (25) and pseudo-clefts (24) in the LLC:

(24) Because I think that some people . do want companionship and and and
((syll)) . and and although the Union can offer this . ^what it !c\an't
/offer# ^[ii] ^neces_s=arily is# . [?@] to be ^able to !t\alk to# - [?@]
^people in your !own /age# and your ^own y\ear# a^bout your
!w\ork# . (T3.3, 1236-44)

(25) (About the English language exam proposed by a University department)
And in any case of course now . they're still according to their syllabus .
committed to the function . of courses - whereas now of course with the
new theories [i] it ^may not be f\unction# it ^may be s!\ignalling {that
^we *shall t=ake#}# as ^our ^you kn\ow#* . ^\analysing# (T3.3, 1149-
54)

The empirical analysis indicates that, in both cleft and pseudo-cleft sentences, the contrast implies a strict opposition between two alternatives and never a comparison (cf. section 6 below). All the clefts found in the English data present an

explicit contrast, with the presence in the discourse of the two elements in contrast. These had a smaller representation in the data than pseudo-cleft constructions. Both clefts and pseudo-clefts divide the sentence into two sections assigning the constituent in Focus a prominent place: between the copular verb and the relative pronoun (usually *that*) in clefts and at the very end of the sentence in pseudo-clefts.

Spanish, being a flexible word-order language, presents more syntactic variation in its special Focus constructions. Taking this characteristic of Spanish into consideration and following Moreno Cabrera (1987) and Barcelona Sánchez (1983), I argue that Spanish has a pseudo-cleft construction but not a cleft. Forms such as *Es Juan el que vino*, superficially identical to the clefts in languages such as English ('It is Juan that came') or French ('C'est Jean qui est venu') do of course occur, but these are mere ordering variations of their pseudo-cleft counterparts. Thus, they lack the neuter pronoun which is characteristic of other languages (*it* in English and *ce* in French, for instance) and they do not use the invariable verbal form in the third person singular of the clefts in other languages (cf. **es/fue Juan y María quienes vinieron*).

Consequently, a wide range of different pseudo-clefts have been found. The majority place the ParFoc in P1, following the general tendency, but others have been found which place the Focus constituent in PØ or in the middle position of the construction, as in English clefts. This is illustrated below:

- (26) (B comments that he plays tennis in a small town called Aldea del Fresno, where his parents have an apartment)

A: *Sí, bueno, yo... es en Colmenar, donde estoy. Y allí también*

Yes, well, I is in Colmenar, where am.

tenemos pistas de unos apartamentos que hay donde nosotros tenemos una casa. (E17, 311)

'Yes, well, it is in Colmenar where I am. And there we have some tennis courts in a complex where we have a house.'

- (27) A: *¿A que no sabes lo que he hecho esta noche? La primera vez en mi vida. Levantarme a las cinco de la mañana y ponerme a comer chocolate y galletas. (...)*

B: *No, yo lo que, lo que me ha pasado estos días de atrás*
I what what me:DAT has happened these days last

ha sido que no me dormía; (E18, 338-39)

has been that NEG slept:1SG;

'A: Do you know what I did last night? The first time in my life. Get up at five in the morning and start eating chocolate and biscuits.

B: No, what has happened to me lately is that I couldn't sleep.'

I would like to complete this account of the secondary devices for signalling a parallel contrast in both languages by mentioning syntactic parallelism. Consider the following examples in English and Spanish:

- (28) a. And I suspected always that De[^]laney would be l/ate# . that
^Chomley would be on t/ime# and that this would . produce a nice
!staggering of . of their arrival on your desk *-* (T1.1, 125-30)
- b. Because - this goes on in the men's colleges but one ((I)) think one
has to bear in mind the :men's colleges have been going on (([f]))
since the Middle :\Ages# - - the ^women's colleges were -
:founded at the end of the last :\century# (T1.3, 940-42)

- (29) A: *¿Y estaban sus padres en esas reuniones?*

B: *Sí, sí, sí, sí. Solas no. Ahora, mis padres estaban en una habitación*

But, my parents were in one room

y la gente joven estábamos en otra, pero eran habitaciones

and the people young were:1PL in another

que se comunicaban, ¿verdad? (E15, 245)

'A: And were your parents in these get-togethers?

B: Yes, yes, yes, yes. We were not alone. But, my parents were in one room and the young people were in another, but they were connected rooms, you see?'

Using this strategy, the speaker expresses a strict opposition where more than one pair of elements is normally distinguished in Focus. Thus, in (28b) we have a contrast between the men's and women's colleges on the one hand, and between the Middle Ages and the end of the last century on the other. Then in (29) there is a contrast between *mis padres* ('my parents') and *la gente joven* ('the young people') on the one hand, and between *en una habitación* ('in one room') and *en otra* ('in another') on the other. The contrast is in all cases explicit, and elements

which under normal circumstances would be omitted as they express given information are repeated in the parallel construction; an example of this is (28a), where there is a repetition of both the relative pronoun *that* and the whole verb phrase *would be*.

6. Pragmatic aspects of the notion of parallel contrast

Although the analysis carried out in this study stems from the notion of ParFoc as conceived in FG, the empirical analysis has suggested certain pragmatic aspects related to the notion of parallel contrast, most of which are not mentioned by Dik (1989) and I feel the notion of ParFoc could benefit from them in an attempt to make the concept more explicit.

First of all, the notion of contrast involved in ParFoc is a contrast between two, and only two, elements. Dik does not explicitly mention this condition; he rather talks of contrastiveness between the constituent which receives the Focus function and "alternative pieces of information which may be explicitly presented or presupposed" (Dik 1989: 282). The results of the corpus analysis have shown that the contrast is a binary contrast, a conclusion which is corroborated in Geluykens (1992) and Taglicht (1984). Although a few instances in the data appear to involve a non-binary contrast, a closer examination reveals that one element is contrasted with a series of alternatives, presented as a whole or a single body of elements in opposition to the Focus constituent. Therefore, we would still be talking of a binary opposition.¹¹ An example of this is the following:

- (30) A: do you in fact usually bother to eat at *all*
 B: *no* - I mean at lunch yes ^what \forall d/o# is [:@:m] ^go out and 'buy a s\andwich# at the ^Pride of Coc:k\ayne# and an ^\apple# - and *bring* it back. (T1.5, 1143-50)

In the discourse which contains (30), the speakers are secretaries at a university, and so *I* can be interpreted here as being contrasted with the rest of secretaries in the department, which is implicit or presupposed.

Another important aspect of contrastiveness is that it can be explicit or implicit, a characteristic of contrast which is specifically mentioned by Dik (1989: 282). In the case of explicit contrast both elements in contrast are present in the

utterance or stretch of discourse; in the case of implicit contrast, only one of the elements is present, while the other may be presupposed.¹² In examples (1a) and (1b) presented in section 1.2 above, for instance, the contrast was explicit.

A third important feature of contrastiveness which arises from the corpus study is the fact that the relation established between the two elements in contrast may be a strict opposition between two alternatives or a comparison in the sense of a parallelism. Although Dik (1989: 282) explicitly states that all types of Focus different from New Focus imply some sort of contrast, the definition of ParFoc that he gives does not seem to include in a clear way the notion of contrast as an opposition of alternatives: Dik (1989: 282) states that 'Parallel Focus' is involved when Focus is assigned to corresponding constituents in parallel constructions. The distinction between the strict opposition and the parallelism is illustrated in examples (31) and (32), respectively:

- (31) (About the reputation of Americans in the world)
 Creo que consigue muchas cosas por su inteligencia y
Otras muchas cosas lo consigue por su dinero.(E5, 97)
other many things it:ACC gets by hismoney
 'I think that he gets many things using his intelligence, and **many other things** he gets using his money.'
- (32) (About the growth of Madrid)
Puesto que no nos debemos asustar de Madrid cuando tenemos unas capitales que son muchísimo más grandes y tienen solucionados todos sus problemas. Luego por lo tanto, Madrid pues se le
Madrid well REF it:DAT
solucionará lo mismo ¿no? (E5, 91)
 solve:3SG:FUT the same
 'Therefore we shouldn't be alarmed by Madrid as there are other capitals which are much bigger and they have solved all their problems. So in the same way, **Madrid** will be able to solve its problems too, won't it?'

The most important difference between strict opposition and parallelism concerns the nature of the relationship between the two contrasted elements. This relationship includes the feature [+negative] in the strict opposition, whereas it implies a positive comparison in the case of parallelism. (31) involves a strict opposition:

Americans get many things using their intelligence, whereas they get other things not through their intelligence, but through their money. Thus there is a double contrast: *muchas cosas* ('many things') is contrasted with *otras muchas cosas* ('many other things') and the intelligence of Americans is contrasted with their money. In (32) Madrid is compared to other capitals: in the same way as the latter have solved their problems as big cities, Madrid will also be able to solve them.

7. Listing

In his study of left dislocation in English, Geluykens (1992) introduces the function of Listing as a subtype within the dimension of contrastiveness. This function applies to certain referents which cannot be considered contrastive in the strict sense (that is, in the sense of a binary contrast) because they involve opposition between *more than two* elements. Their referent forms part of a longer, but limited set under discussion in the discourse. The notion of contrast involved here is "a weakened form of contrast (...) since selection of one item on the list implies 'contrasting' it with the other items on the list" (Geluykens 1992: 89).

As mentioned in the previous section, contrastiveness in a strict sense implies the opposition or parallelism between two elements (cf. Taglicht 1984: 46). With this in mind and given that a number of examples of ParFoc from the corpora have this listing interpretation, I propose that a pragmatic function of Listing should be recognized within the same dimension of contrastiveness, as a subtype of ParFoc. This function is mainly expressed in both languages by means of syntactic devices. English, for instance, makes considerable use of parallel constructions which are sometimes reinforced by prosodic prominence, as in (33-34), and there is also a single instance of variation in constituent ordering in the English data, as in (35).

- (33) Everybody made their contribution from all over the senior common-room . about their point of view about eggs they ((were)) **^some would rather have them !m=uch too _soft# than ^much too h=ard#** and **^some people would !rather not have an egg at :\all#** and - **^s\ome _people# . [:@:m] . ^thought ((the !th\ing to do# was)) just "**^put them in the water and take them :\out again# ((and)) ^th\en let them go on _cooking# with^out cracking their h\eads#** (T1.3, 810-820)**

- (34) A: but I mean at !B!\C# **^under'graduates +are+ al'lowed to**
B: +(. clears throat)+ *[mhm]*
(A: **'stay until !t\en# *-.* ^post'graduates when'ever they :\ike#** and **^staff have !!k\ey#**
B: I never knew this of Umist . (T2.4a, 451-56)
- (35) A: I find this group's pretty dedicated and they sort of work all *day*
B: *yes*
(A: and work all evening ((well)) I can't stand that
?: [m] - - -
A: and **^Hart** you've 'got to 'stand \up to# ((^h\aven't you#)).
B: yes (T1.5, 112-19)

In (35) speaker A is discussing a series of inconveniences relating to one of the linguistics seminars taught in her department. She has already referred to the late time at which it is taught, and now adds the amount of hard work needed plus the teacher's demanding character. This last element is distinguished by the fronting of the term *Hart*, which refers to the teacher. Spanish again tends to use marked constituent-ordering patterns to express this kind of focality, but there are also examples in which Listing is expressed by parallelism of constructions (cf. (38)):

- (36) *Left Dislocation*
Y así he hecho... así hice hasta cuarto y después
And thus have:1SG done thus did:1SG until fourth and then
ya **quinto y sexto** lo hice en un... en otro colegio,
already **fifth and sixth** it:ACC did:1SG in a... in another school
un colegio normal, (...) Y lo... me examiné así e... a... o sea, me examiné si...
siempre libre hasta sex... hasta sexto y luego **Preu**
and then **the-Preparatory-Course**
lo hice oficial. (E18, 323-24)
it:ACC did:1SG official.
'And thus I have studied... I studied until fourth year and after that **fifth and sixth forms** I did in... in another school, in an ordinary school, (...) And... I passed my exams in this way... I mean, I passed my exams... always as an external student until six... until my sixth form and then **the Preparatory Course (for University)** I studied as a formal student.'

- (37)
- Fronting*
- (about some extraterrestrials who have visited Earth)

porque ellos también tienen vista y oído, no tienen
 because they also have:3PL sight and hearing, NEG have:3PL
olfato y... creo que sí que tienen tacto, y
 smell and... think:1SG that FOC-PART that have:3PL touch and
gusto no sé si tendrán porque no sé siquiera
 taste NEG know:1SG whether have:FUT:3PL
si comen, a lo mejor. (E3, 56)

'because they also have sight and hearing, they don't have smell and... I think they do have touch, and **taste** I don't know if they will have because I don't even know whether they eat or not, may be.'

- (38)
- Parallel constructions*
- (about the institution where the speaker works)

claro que tengo que decirte que somos nada más que dos personas y
éramos cinco, o sea, que te puedes imaginar... pues porque una señora
 well because **one woman**
está enferma, otra se ha casado y otra se ha
is ill, another has married and another has (been)
dado de baja. (E7, 127)
given leave.

'but of course I have to tell you that we are only two people and we used to be five, so you can imagine... because one of the ladies is ill, another has got married and another is on leave.'

Examples (36) and (37) distinguish this function by means of special constituent-order constructions. In example (36), the speaker is enumerating her school years: fourth, fifth and sixth years and *Preu* (the old preparatory year before entering University). *Quinto y sexto* ('fifth and sixth'), on the one hand, and *Preu*, on the other, are left-dislocated. In (37), there is a discussion about the physical senses that some extraterrestrials who have, presumably, visited the Earth, might have. Of all the senses mentioned by the speaker (sight, hearing, smell, touch and taste), it is the last one on the list, *gusto*, that gets emphasized by a fronting.

In (38), the list consists of three propositions (clauses) which are contrasted by the use of parallel constructions. In this case, we have a double contrast of NP subjects (*una señora, otra* and *otra*), on one side, and predications (*está enferma, se ha casado* and *se ha dado de baja*), on the other.

8. Conclusions

The following main conclusions emerge from the empirical analysis undertaken in this study:

- (a) The investigation of the spoken corpora has revealed that the notion of parallel focus is linguistically relevant in English and Spanish, and that various formal mechanisms are employed to express this kind of contrast.
- (b) Dik states that Focus is probably relevant to all natural languages but that languages differ as for the different strategies they use to express this function. This is indeed applicable to the pragmatic function of ParFoc and its special treatment in the two languages studied. The dominant strategy found for English was the use of marked prosodic prominence, which involves early placement of the NS in the tone unit, and for Spanish the use of a special constituent order where the most frequent position of the ParFoc constituent was towards the beginning of the utterance. Other significant mechanisms are the use of emphatic pronominal subjects in Spanish and a variation in the constituent order in English.
- (c) Adopting the notion of parallel focus in Dik (1989) as my starting point, certain pragmatic aspects arising from the corpus analysis were discussed in an attempt to make the concept more explicit and applicable. First, the notion of contrast underlying ParFoc is almost always a binary contrast; second, the contrast may be explicit or implicit; and third, the type of relation established between the two elements in ParFoc may be a strict opposition between two alternatives or a comparison in the sense of a parallelism. Of these pragmatic features only the second is explicitly mentioned by Dik (1989).
- (d) Assuming the notion of the binary contrast, I have argued the need to recognize another function, as a subtype of ParFoc within the dimension of contrastiveness, called Listing, for those referents which involve opposition of more than two elements included in a limited set.

Symbols and abbreviations used in the corpora

English Corpus (LLC):

-tone unit:	#	end of tone unit (TU)
	^yes	onset
	{yes}	subordinate TU
-nucleus:	y/es	fall
	y/es	rise
	yVes	(rise-)fall-rise
	y^es	(fall-)rise-fall
	y=es	level
-booster:	:yes	higher than preceding syllable
	!yes	higher than preceding pitch-prominent syllable
	!!yes	very high
	_yes	continuance
-stress:	'yes	normal
	"yes	heavy
-pause:	yes . yes	brief pause
	yes - yes	unit pause
-other:	* yes *	simultaneous talk
	+ yes +	simultaneous talk
	(laughs)	contextual comment
	((yes))	incomprehensible words
	(...)	section of example omitted

Spanish corpus (CCM):

...V...	hesitation
e...	speaker wishes to continue where he left off
(...)	section of example omitted

Notes

1. I am indebted to Mike Hannay and Machtelt Bolkestein, whose insightful comments and suggestions enabled me to clarify the ideas expressed in this article and structure it in its present form. I would also like to express my gratitude to the Spanish Ministry of Education and Culture who partly funded the research undertaken for this study, within the framework of the project on Topic Management in English and Spanish (DGICYT - PB94-0256), headed by Angela Downing, who also revised the English version.
2. A notable exception is Mackenzie & Keizer (1990).

3. Most of the English texts were surreptitiously recorded and comprised 44 informants (31 men and 13 women) with ages ranging from 20 to 60. The Spanish texts are non-surreptitious and included 12 informants (7 men and 5 women) with ages ranging from 16 to 76.
4. However, as Bolkestein (this vol.) states, in Dik (1989) the notion Focus is in fact defined in discourse terms rather than in terms of the systematic coding it may receive. This leaves room for different interpretations of this notion in the work by linguists working within FG and contributes to the confusing relationship between focality and the Focus function. In Bolkestein's opinion, the systematic coding requirement to assign the labels Topic and Focus "tends to obscure the much more widely observable relevance of the language independent discourse-based notions of topicality and focality".
5. The exact absolute figures are the following:

	LLC	CCM
Total number of cases showing some parallel contrast (incl. Listing)	184	276
Total number of cases which also receive formal treatment	168	269

6. In the examples in English, the prosodic notation has been reduced to a minimum, for the sake of clarity. Consequently, only symbols of pauses and overlapping speech appear in the examples, except in those examples in which the prosodic information is relevant, and in those, only in the utterance where the Focus constituent appears.
7. As for LDs and their relation to special sentence positions, I have considered left-dislocated constituents which express a parallel contrast as being assigned the function of ParFoc. This seems to be in contradiction with the FG conception of pragmatic functions, and particularly, the fact that, in this model, Topic and Focus are assigned to intra-clausal constituents, whereas Theme and Tail are assigned to extra-clausal constituents (which appear to the left or right of the predication, respectively. See Dik 1980: 15-16). Furthermore, FG posits the existence of special sentence positions which are typically aligned with these pragmatic functions: P1 with the functions of Topic and Focus, and P2 and P3 with the functions of Theme and Tail, respectively (Siewierska 1991: 150). In this respect, two types of LD were found in the Spanish data. The largest group included LDs which functioned as a grammaticalised construction in this language. In these, I postulate the placement of the dislocated constituent in the special position P1, given its similar function with other fronted intra-clausal constituents (fronted arguments and satellites) which are indeed placed in this position in Spanish. In the less common type of LD, the coreferential clitic of the ordinary type is replaced by another type of element such as an emphatic deictic or a repetition of the full dislocated term, and the dislocand is placed in P2. Given these facts, a revision of both the notion of left-dislocation in Spanish and the function of Focus as applicable also to extra-clausal constituents seems necessary. (For a further account of this, see Martínez Caro 1995.)
8. Other studies which have recently postulated a PØ clause-final position are Stanchev (1997) and Vismans (1997).
9. This has been the traditional rule but, as pointed out by Cruttenden (1986: 82ff), there are many exceptions such as vocatives, direct speech markers of the type of *you see*, *I think*, etc. and nouns of low semantic content as *thing*, *people*, etc. which, in the tone-unit final position, are

normally unstressed. Another type of exception to this rule are presentational sentences which tend to stress their preverbal subject in English (such as *The milkman called*).

10. English has two tones, called *compound* tones (Crystal 1969: 218), which present two NS in a single tone unit, contrary to what happens with the rest of tones, as in (17). These are the rise+fall and the fall+rise, in which the two tone elements "have in effect been separated to allow a larger stretch of utterance to fall under the semantic range of the nucleus" (Crystal 1969: 218). Quirk et al. (1972: 1046) point out in this regard that we have not one but two peaks of information interest and they are related, allowing the speaker to express a double contrast. Moreover, one of the two stresses is held to be more prominent than the other, since, otherwise, we could always see the utterance as involving two different tone units. Normally, the phonetically dominant element is the first one (Crystal 1969: 219; Quirk et al. 1972: 1046).

11. The existence of double contrasts between two pairs of elements does not threaten the notion of binary contrast and is explained by Taglicht (1984: 46) with the distinction between primary and secondary oppositeness: "Primary opposites are opposed to one another only by virtue of their meaning in the context of use (...). Secondary opposites are opposed to one another only by virtue of their relationship with primary opposites".

12. According to Enríquez (1984: 167-68) in a comprehensive study of Subject personal pronouns in the Spanish language of Madrid, one of the contexts in which this implicit contrast appears most frequently is that which makes reference to social topics - actions or attitudes conventionally established - like in the following example from the CCM:

(i) *reconozco que soy poco madrileña, porque todos los niños que nacen en Madrid de familias madrileñas los llevan a presentar a la... a la Paloma, a la Virgen de la Paloma. Yo no he ido nunca;* (E12, 206)

'I must admit that I'm not very Madrilenian, because all babies born in Madrid into Madrilenian families are taken to be introduced to *la Paloma*, to the *Virgen de la Paloma*. And I have never been there'

In this example, there is an opposition between what the tradition is concerning children born in Madrid, namely taking them to be introduced to the *Virgen de la Paloma* ('our Lady of the Dove'), and the fact that the speaker has not followed that tradition. The function of ParFoc is expressed in this case by the presence of the Subject personal pronoun *yo* ('I').

References

- Barcelona Sánchez, Antonio. 1983. *El orden de los constituyentes en Inglés y en Español*. PhD Thesis, Universidad de Granada.
- Connolly, John H., Roel M. Vismans, Christopher S. Butler and Richard A. Gatward (eds) 1997. *Discourse and pragmatics in Functional Grammar*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Contreras, Heles. 1976. *A theory of word order with reference to Spanish*. Amsterdam:

North-Holland Publishing Company.

- Cruttenden, Alan. 1986. *Intonation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, David. 1969. *Prosodic systems and intonation in English*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Delbecque, Nicole. 1991. *El orden de los sintagmas. La posición del regente. (Gramática Española: enseñanza e investigación. II)*. Salamanca: Universidad.
- Dik, Simon C. 1978. *Functional Grammar*. London: Academic Press.
- Dik, Simon C. 1980. *Studies in Functional Grammar*. London: Academic Press.
- Dik, Simon C. 1989. *The theory of Functional Grammar. Part I: The structure of the clause*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Dik, Simon, Maria E. Hoffmann, Jan R. de Jong, Sie Ing Djiang, Harry Stroomer and Lourens de Vries. 1981. "On the typology of Focus phenomena". In Hoekstra et al. (eds), 41-74.
- Downing, Angela. 1997. "Discourse pragmatic functions of the Theme constituent in Spoken European Spanish". In Connolly et al. (eds), 137-161.
- Enríquez, Emilia V. 1984. *El pronombre personal sujeto en la lengua Española hablada en Madrid*. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.
- Esgueva, Manuel and Margarita Cantarero (eds). 1981. *El habla de la ciudad de Madrid. Materiales para su estudio*. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.
- Geluykens, Ronald. 1992. *From discourse process to grammatical construction. On left-dislocation in English*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Green, John. 1988. "Spanish". In Márton Harris and Nigel Vincent (eds.) *The Romance Languages*. London: Croom Helm, 78-130.
- Gutiérrez, María Luz. 1978. *Estructuras sintácticas del Español actual*. Madrid: Sociedad General Española de Librería.
- Halliday, M.A.K. 1967. *Intonation and grammar in British English*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Hannay, Mike. 1983. "The Focus function in Functional Grammar: questions of contrast and context". In Simon C. Dik (ed.) *Advances in Functional Grammar*. Dordrecht: Foris, 207-223.
- Hannay, Mike. 1990. "Pragmatic function assignment and word order variation in a Functional Grammar of English". *Working Papers in Functional Grammar* 38: 1-23.
- Hernanz, Ma. Lluïsa and José Ma. Brucart. 1987. *La sintaxis. (Principios teóricos. La oración simple)*. Barcelona: Editorial Crítica.
- Hill, Sam. 1985. *Contrastive English-Spanish grammatical structures*. University Press of America.
- Hoekstra, Teun, Harry van der Hulst and Michael Moortgat (eds) 1981. *Perspectives on Functional Grammar*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Jong, Jan R. de 1981. "On the treatment of Focus phenomena in Functional Grammar". In Teun Hoekstra et al. (eds.), 89-115.

- Mackenzie, J. Lachlan and M. Evelien Keizer. 1990. "On Assigning pragmatic functions in English". *Pragmatics* 1.2: 169-215.
- Martínez Caro, Elena. 1995. *Funciones pragmáticas, orden de constituyentes y acentuación en Inglés y en Español. Estudio de corpus*. Unpublished PhD thesis, Universidad Complutense de Madrid.
- Moreno Cabrera, Juan Carlos. 1987. *Fundamentos de sintaxis general*. Madrid: Síntesis.
- Mott, Brian. 1991. "The intonation of English and Spanish: contrastive analysis". *Actas del XV Congreso de AEDEAN*. Colegio Universitario de la Rioja, 621-632.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, George Leech and Jan Svartvik. 1972. *A grammar of Contemporary English*. Harlow: Longman.
- Siewierska, Anna. 1987. "Postverbal subject pronouns in Polish in the light of topic continuity and the Topic/Focus distinction". In Jan Nuyts and Georges de Schutter (eds) *Getting one's words into line. On word order and Functional Grammar*. Dordrecht: Foris, 147-161.
- Siewierska, Anna. 1988. *Word order rules*. London: Croom Helm.
- Siewierska, Anna. 1991. *Functional Grammar*. London: Routledge.
- Stanchev, Svillen B. 1997. "Pragmatic functions and special sentence positions in Bulgarian". In Connolly et al. (eds), 121-135.
- Taglicht, Josef. 1984. *Message and emphasis. On focus and scope in English*. London: Longman.
- Vismans, Roel M. 1997. "Pragmatic functions, special positions and accent in Dutch". In Connolly et al. (eds), 109-119.

In the STUDIES IN LANGUAGE COMPANION SERIES (SLCS) the following volumes have been published or are scheduled for publication:

27. ABRAHAM, Werner, T. GIVÓN and Sandra A. THOMPSON (eds): *Discourse Grammar and Typology*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1995.
28. HERMAN, József: *Linguistic Studies on Latin: Selected papers from the 6th international colloquium on Latin linguistics, Budapest, 2-27 March, 1991*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1994.
29. ENGBERG-PEDERSEN, Elisabeth et al. (eds): *Content, Expression and Structure. Studies in Danish functional grammar*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1996.
30. HUFFMAN, Alan: *The Categories of Grammar. French lui and le*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1997.
31. WANNER, Leo (ed.): *Lexical Functions in Lexicography and Natural Language Processing*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1996.
32. FRAJZYNGIER, Zygmunt: *Grammaticalization of the Complex Sentence. A case study in Chadic*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1996.
33. VELAZQUEZ-CASTILLO, Maura: *The Grammar of Possession. Inalienability, incorporation and possessor ascension in Guaraní*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1996.
34. HATAV, Galia: *The Semantics of Aspect and Modality. Evidence from English and Biblical Hebrew*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1997.
35. MATSUMOTO, Yoshiko: *Noun-Modifying Constructions in Japanese. A frame semantic approach*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1997.
36. KAMIO, Akio (ed.): *Directions in Functional Linguistics*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1997.
37. HARVEY, Mark and Nicholas REID (eds): *Nominal Classification in Aboriginal Australia*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1997.
38. HACKING, Jane F.: *Coding the Hypothetical. A Comparative Typology of Conditionals in Russian and Macedonian*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1998.
39. WANNER, Leo (ed.): *Recent Trends in Meaning-Text Theory*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1997.
40. BIRNER, Betty and Gregory WARD: *Information Status and Noncanonical Word Order in English*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1998.
41. DARNELL, Michael, Edith MORAVSČIK, Michael NOONAN, Frederick NEUMEYER and Kathleen WHEATLY (eds): *Functionalism and Formalism in Linguistics. Volume I: General papers*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, n.y.p.
42. DARNELL, Michael, Edith MORAVSČIK, Michael NOONAN, Frederick NEUMEYER and Kathleen WHEATLY (eds): *Functionalism and Formalism in Linguistics. Volume II: Case studies*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, n.y.p.
43. OLBERTZ, Hella, Kees HENGEVELD and Jesús Sánchez GARCÍA (eds): *The Structure of the Lexicon in Functional Grammar*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1998.
44. HANNAY, Mike and A. Machtelt BOLKESTEIN (eds): *Functional Grammar and Verbal Interaction*. 1998.
45. COLLINS, Peter and David LEE (eds): *The Clause in English. In honour of Rodney Huddleston*. n.y.p.
46. YAMAMOTO, Mutsumi: *Animacy and Reference. With case studies on English and Japanese corpora*. n.y.p.

A full list of titles published in this series is available from the publisher.