1/ a. Ellipsis: Definition and categories thereof

 Ellipsis is the deletion of a word or phrase based on the assumption that it will easily be inferred by the interlocutor. Ex, "I'm not ready for such complex research. Are you?" (where "ready for such complex research" is ellipted).

Subcategories of ellipses:

1. Noun/NP or Pronoun

 Ellipsis of noun/NP or pronoun (very common) -- N/NP or P ellipted can function as either subject or object. Ex: "Mary came into her office and walked straight to her desk." (ellipsis of "Mary/she" before the second verb).

Ellipsis of object -- two possible facets: direct object ellipsis and prepositional object ellipsis. Ex: "Take two spoonfuls of sugar and add to the mixture, gently stirring while doing." (add what? them or it; stirring what? the mixture) - DO ellipsis. Ex of ellipsis of OP - "I can live with her but not without," where "her" is ellipted after the preposition "without."

2. Verbs

Verb ellipsis can be subclassified into 1) total or absolute ellipsis (gapping) and 2) partial ellipsis (ellipsis within the verb). Total ellipsis of verb or gapping: involves the lexical, main verb; occurs where the verb is expressed by a lexical verb only, ex., "John provided the food and Jim, the drinks." (ellipsis of "provided"); can also be seen where multiword structures are ellipted, ex., "John will be providing the food, and Jim, the drinks." (will be providing - omits the auxiliaries).

Partial verb ellipsis: where the lexical verb ellipts but the operator (the only or first auxiliary that is part of a complex, finite verb structure) remains in place -- has seen, where has is the operator; has been working, has is again the operator; it's the auxiliary associated with a finite verb structure that goes before the subject in the interrogative, ex., "He has worked a lot. Has he worked a lot? He will be working a lot. Will he be working a lot?"

3. Complex verb ellipsis

This type of ellipsis occurs when one or two auxiliaries are left out but the main verb stays. It can be subcategorized into the following:

a) Sluicing [not in book] - leaving out an entire fragment of a sentence that follows a wh- word. "She is upset, and I don't know why" (she is upset is omitted).

b) subject+operator ellipsis - involves omission of the subject and part of the verb. "I have cleaned my desk and mopped the floor," which omits "I have"

1/ b. Face Threatening Acts and strategies to mitigate them

The term ‘face’ refers to the concept that Brown and Levinson describe as the notion which consists of two specific kinds of desires, face wants, attributed by interactants to one another: the desire to be unimpeded in one’s actions (negative face), and the desire to be approved of (positive face). Face Threatening Act, on the other hand, refers to a speech action which poses a threat to the addressee’s positive or negative face.

Face threatening occurs when speech and behavior is perceived as inappropriate, odd, or rude, when, by the standard of speaker, addressee, or both, the balance is off. For example, saying “May I ask you to open the door?” rather than “Open the door” may in one context seem appropriately formal and deferential, in another context insufficiently egalitarian and hence threatening. Strangers sitting together on buses and planes have to balance their own and their neighbors’ need to be friendly with their need not to be imposed on. For example, giving one’s interlocutor options, in acknowledgement of his or her need for deference, can appear to be a sign of apathy of disinterest, as in the following interchange, in which A and B pass back and forth the option of making a decision:

A: Do you want to go to Jim’s party?

B: I don’t know, do you want to go?

A: I’m asking you. Make up your mind!

Interactions such as this, which can leave one person thinking the other one does not care, and the other person feeling frustrated at the rebuff of an attempt to be accommodating, can undermine relationships.

We need to mitigate so that we do not impose a face threatening act on the addressee. Several strategies can be implied in order to achieve this goal, which can be subcategorized into positive politeness strategies and negative politeness as follows:

- Strategies that involve positive politeness any of the following:

· Emphasizing some shared experiences. For example, the requester might claim common ground before asking for the loan of a neighbor’s garden as in the example below.

e.g. Do you see how this hedge has gotten out of control?

· Expressing sympathy or approval.

· Expressing group identity.

- Mitigating strategies involving negative politeness can be any of the following:

· Not assuming to know things about the interlocutor.

 e.g. You wouldn’t have a pencil, would you?

· Displaying desire not to impinge

 e.g. I do not want to bother you, but do you have a bicycle pump I could use?

· Apologizing: where one expresses the intent to help but lack of means.

 e.g. I would like to help you, but I do not have time.

· Other strategies include being indirect, minimizing the imposition, being overtly deferential (by using a formal address form, for example), and phrasing things as questions rather than as statements.

 e.g. Could you open the door?

1/ c. Gender as a factor in determining discourse strategies adopted by humans

Because features of discourse can be correlated in so many ways with social facts about speakers, audiences, and other participants, it is sometimes tempting to talk as if such facts determined what discourse is like. It is tempting, in other words, to suppose that people talk, sign, write, and interpret in the ways they do because they are authors or audiences; because they are identified as male or female; because of features of ethnicity, region, class; because of the need for linguistic politeness and audience accommodation. Although doing this might confuse correlation with causation, and no matter how much we know about the social context of discourse, we cannot predict what a particular person will say in a given instance, or how it will be interpreted by another person, research by discourse analysts has shown that gender-marked ways of talking and talk that reflects stereotypes about gender are as prevalent in cyberspace as elsewhere, as people express gendered identities and orient to gender in the ways they interact with others. In studies of the discourse of the electronic discussion groups, Herring (1993) has shown that messages by female participants tend to be more aligned and supportive, men’s more oppositional, and that men sometimes objects to women’s styles of participation. Rodino (1997) summarizes many other studies that explore how conventional ways of indexing gender are drawn on and manipulated in online interaction, as interactants create identities that draw on gender stereotype in complex ways.

Studies investigating gender-based discourse differences show that there are several gender-specific characteristics that determine the discourse; hence, act as factors influencing its features. For example, Herring (1992, 2003) studies aimed at finding such differences revealed some interesting results. First, While males’ contributions consisted of absolute statements of certainty, females’ contributions often contained hedges and qualifiers (perhaps, maybe, somewhat). Second, messages written by males were more impersonal, while the ones written by females were more likely to talk about their feelings. Third, Males asked rhetorical questions that did not lead to further discussions, whereas females often apologized for their actions or statements and asked questions in order to get a response. Fourth, while males often contradicted or disagreed with other participants, females seemed to be more polite and agreed with the statements of others. Fifth, unlike men who were more likely to use profanity, sexual references, sarcasm, and insults, females talked more about their feelings of others and evidenced appreciation and support to others. Although these studies were done using data from online communication, many of the findings concerning online communication are consistent with research dealing with gender.

According to Tannen, discourse is a matter of social construction; hence, language production differs according to the gender that produces it. For example, discourse produced by women seems to express a need for involvement, whereas discourse produced by men expresses a need for independence. Furthermore, while men have a tendency to be direct in their discourse, women tend to agree more. Men reach agreement by power. In addition, women tend to use meta-messages to establish relationships, express desire to talk to their partners, and tend to have lots of faith in the kind of relationship where things can be talked out.

1/ d. Persuasive strategies and categories thereof

1. Logic - formal reasoning, oftentimes assuming the shape of logical syllogism (a sequence of utterances necessarily built in the pattern of, "All x are y. Z is an x; therefore, z is a y." (p. 240) Logical syllogism presupposes a premise (x=y) and a minor premise (z=x), and then a conclusion (x=y=z).

2. Presentational strategy - present a claim and try to push the claim and make it acceptable by repetition and over-repetition, paraphrasing, calling the audience aesthetic attention to it; characteristics: (1) rhythm involved to make it flow better, (2) parallelism of structure or clauses involved, (3) visual metaphors used, (4) rhetoric deixis involved (use of deitics: here, there, yonder, by the door, etc.) [Example of Marc Antony's speech from Shakespeare's play Julius Caesar about "honorable man" when referring to Brutus after he killed JC].

3. Analogical rhetoric - usage of analogies (stories, parables, etc.) between a current situation and a prior situation that in very many of its facets is similar to the current situation; e.g., "When I was your age..." or "I knew a person once who was in the same situation." These are ways of introducing the parable or analogy.

1/ e. Reference: Definition and categorization thereof

Reference (p. 118) is one of the several grammatical and lexical strategies by means of which relationships of elements in different sentences can be indicated. More specifically, reference is the relationship between an entity in a sentence and some other mention of that entity, whether in the same sentence or another sentence. This relationship is also referred to as co-reference, which is typically achieved by using pronouns. Pronouns can be subcategorized in three ways:

· Anaphoric –is the process by which backward-pointing is made to a referent in prior discourse, e.g., prior sentence. "Since the guy hit you from behind, his insurance will have to cover the costs of repair." his = the guy = anaphoric. "I saw that guy the other day. He seemed to be looking for something." he = that guy = anaphoric Tendency in written narratives is for pronouns to be used as many as four sentences or four instances after the mention of the entity. By the fourth reference, the cohesion is weak so the speaker will use the name or that noun to name the referent again to strengthen the connection. (Oral discourse is different, of course.)

· Cataphoric – is the process by which forwards-pointing in made in the text, i.e., they point to a referent in the forthcoming discourse, either the same sentence or the next. "They are good, these peaches.”,"He who laughs last, laughs best." "I cannot believe it. They have accepted our proposal." (it = the fact that they have accepted our proposal).

· Exophoric – is the process by which the reference points outside the text, also called situational pronouns, refer to an entity not mentioned in the discourse but easy to infer from the context of the discourse.

S1: "Oh, she's already gone for the day?"

S2: "Yeah. She left five minutes ago."

"She" refers to someone outside of the discourse; we don't know who "she" is, but it's obvious that they do.

1/f. Social roles vs. discourse roles: Definitions and categorizations, similarities and dissimilarities

Too long too much information in page 139, I’m not answering it anyways

2/a. Austin’s ideas as to classes of (a) utterances and (b) verbs

John Austin - British philosopher of language - refers to speech acts in his analysis of the relationship between utterances and performances. In most of the instances, speech acts involve first-person sentences and simple present verb tense forms. Austin clearly differentiated between two kinds of utterances. (p. 233)

1. Constatives - statements; main attribute is that they can be either true or false; e.g., "It's hot in this room." My sentence is a constative utterance because it's a statement that can be either true or false. It is either hot or it's not.

2. Performative - utterance that is neither true nor false; the sole function of a performative is to indicate, to emphasize the fact that the speaker is performing an action; e.g., "I declare you husband and wife," "I apologize for John's behavior." Not only is the speaker saying something, but he/she is actually doing that action. In most instances, performatives go along with a particular type of behavior. E.g., the teacher has complained about John's behavior, and the parent goes to a teacher and apologizes sincerely.

Austin differentiated 5 subcategories of performatives; critics said the different categories were too vague.

1. verdictives - verbs that gives a verdict

2. exertatives - verbs used when exercising a right or a power

3. commissives - verbs that commits the speaker to do an action

4. behavatives - verbs expressing attitudes vis a vis social behavior (in regards to social behavior)

5. expositives - verbs used when you are trying to fit utterances into conversations

Classification not very well received by scholars in the field because the distinctions between the categories were fuzzy/hazy; people felt like there is need for clearer boundaries separating verb categories.

2/b. Face and face wants

2/c. Lexical cohesion: Definition and categorization thereof

Lexical cohesion (p. 120) -- two ways to ensure this:

\* repetition - repeated use of a word or phrase. For an example, cf. Figure 3.3 on p. 120. Not typically recommended as a strategy since it sounds odd.

\* use of words or phrases which in some way or another evoke each other - synonyms

- antonyms

- metonymy (two or more words closely associated with each other, e.g., "The president sent an envoy to Russia, but we haven't heard back from the Kremlin yet," where "Russia" and "the Kremlin" are metonyms

- meronyms (where one of the words refers to the whole and the other to a part thereof), e.g., tree, branch.

- hyponomy (where one word refers to a class of items and the other refers to a type of that class) e.g., meat is the class, lamb is a type of meat

2/d. Prince’s taxonomy for sentence parts

Prince, 1981 used a large variety of labels for the specific ways in which reference can be identified. One way is by putting already given reference at the beginning of a sentence, and then followed by the new information that we want the hearer to know about. The reason of doing so, is the hearers always miss hearing the first sentence in a discourse, there fore, we tend to move the new information further a bit in a conversation to give the hearer a gest of the information we want them to know about. In other words, we need to get the hearers attention first by introducing old information then we reveal our new information. There fore, taxonomy of sentence parts are to start with given information that is much shorter, less complex NP; then come up with the new information, which can be more complex and tend to have more words to express. Some terminologies used in describing such incidences are:

Terminology differences

1. given vs. new info

2. theme vs. rheme

3. topic vs. comment

4. discourse-old information vs. discourse-new information (used by Ellen Prince, functional linguist, p. 115)

discourse-old information (DO) -- refers to some entity evoked in prior discourse given that said entity does not need being expressed by complex phrases (NPs, e.g.)

 discourse-new information (DN) -- refers to some entity not evoked in prior discourse; hence, typically but not necessarily requiring expression by means of longer, more complex NPs (p. 115)

2/e. Schiffrin’s study of and, but, so, and well and main findings thereof

Discourse markers are contextualization cues that give us an opportunity to build coherence by locating ourselves in the process of constructive discourse (well, oh, so, uhmm, uh huh)

At the same time, the function of discourse marker is carried out by coordinating conjunctions and subordinating conjunctions.

Schiffrin - one of the pioneers when it comes to tackling discourse markers - contrastive study/analysis of four discourse markers: and, so, but, well (p. 238-239)

1. "and" and "so" - continuatives - They mark continuation and development in discourse. Both can appear at potential completion points, which means they can occur at points in the discourse where a lack of "and" or "so" may mean, "I'm done talking." They are often dragged out in speech (drawled) as a means of giving the speaker a little extra time to collect his/her thoughts (to maintain the conversational floor). Each of these occurs at points in the discourse that might signal the speaker is finished (cf. long story example p. 240-242 at bottom).
2. "but" - marker of contrast initiating disagreement with what has been said, predictor of disagreement

3. "well" - mitigator of confrontation, usage of it is most common where the speaker is rejecting a request or declining an offer. Schiffrin found that well is far less confrontational than "but." Use of "but" is like a signal that disagreement is coming; "well" does not suggest anything negative like that. (p. 242 discusses "well," p. 243 discusses "and")

2/f. Searle’s taxonomy in terms of verb classes

John Searle - offered the solution of an alternative taxonomy - Searle's taxonomy has the following categories of verbs:

1. assertives - verbs use of which commits speaker to truth value of a proposition (same as Austin's constatives) e.g., "He left his arrogance at the door." Either true or false statement
2. directives - verbs that indicate an attempt made by the speaker to get the addressee to do something, e.g., "I want you to leave your arrogance at the door."
3. commissives - commits the speaker to some future course of action (cf. Austin above), e.g., "I promise to leave my arrogance at the door next time."
4. expressives - verbs expressing a psychological state, namely, the psychological state specified in the proposition, e.g., "I'm sorry to hear about his arrogance." vp = be sorry
5. declaratives - verbs whose successful performance represents a guarantee that the propositional content and reality match, e.g. "I declare you husband and wife."

2/g. Utterance producing: Definition and potential roles

Utterances oftentimes carry out multiple concurrent functions. One act oftentimes is carried out, performed, by way of another. Such utterances where by means of performing one act we automatically perform another function are called indirect speech acts. E.g., "Can you speak a little louder?" Two functions: a question about your ability, and a request for you to speak louder. (question and a polite request all in one) e.g., "I hope you'll write a good letter of recommendation for me." request + indirect question (Will you write one?)

e.g., "Good news, John. You have twins!"

Why are indirect speech acts used?

1. They assist the addressee with face-saving.

2. They help the speaker in terms of politeness.

2/h. Verbal art and main characteristics thereof

verbal art - mainly uses foregrounding of poetic functions.

Characteristics of verbal art:

- Crucial to the correct interpretation of verbal art: Speaker must indicate this speech is verbal art, must indicate this is the feature of the language about to be produced. E.g., back to the example of "Their point guard killed us." But in war, it would be awkward for a military officer to use this form of "kill." They wouldn't say, "The soldiers died because their tanks killed us." That's inappropriate and would be taken literally, not metaphorically. The circumstances have to allow for poetic language; it's not always appropriate. Where the use of metaphor is allowed, there will be some contextual cues present. E.g., use of special codes (words or phrases that are obvious poetic in nature, often archaic but can be novel creations or new meanings of existing words)

- syntactic parallelism is another marker of poetic language.

- special paralinguistic features can also be markers of poetic discourse (louder voice, higher pitch, lower voice, slower pace, etc.)

- some phrases or formulae can be used (Eminescu - Hyperion poem - Romanian Romantic)

- appeals to tradition

- performance disclaimers