

**VI CONGRESO INTERNACIONAL DE LA ASOCIACIÓN ESPAÑOLA DE LINGÜÍSTICA COGNITIVA (AELCO) “Retos para Lingüística Cognitiva del siglo XXI”**

**Universitat Jaume I**

**Castelló de la Plana**

**22-24 October 2008**

**Proposal for a theme session**

**Title:** “Beyond ‘core grammar’: Bridging the gap between illocution, implicature and discourse coherence in the Lexical-Constructional Model”.

**Convenors:**

Annalisa Baicchi (University of Pavia)  
Francisco González-García (University of Almería)  
Noelia Jiménez Martínez-Losa (University of La Rioja)

**Speakers:**

**Ricardo Mairal Usón (Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia, Madrid, España).**  
“The argument structure module within the Lexical Constructional Model”.

**Francisco José Ruiz de Mendoza Ibañez (Universidad de La Rioja, España).**  
“Looking beyond argument structure constructions”.

**Pedro Santana Martínez (Universidad de La Rioja, España)**  
“On the metalanguage of semantic primitives”

**Annalisa Baicchi (Universidad de Pavía, Italia).**  
“Idealized Cognitive Models within the Lexical-Constructional Model”.

**Ignasi Navarro i Ferrando (Universidad Jaume I, Castelló de la Plana, España).**  
“Internal Constraints in the Lexical Representation of Prepositions in the LCM”.

**Noelia Jiménez Martínez-Losa (Universidad de La Rioja, España).**  
“The role of metaphor in the analysis of motion events within the Lexical Constructional Model”

**Francisco González-García (Universidad de Almería, España).**  
“*You (certainly) do know/Tú sí que sabes*: Towards a comprehensive understanding of the discourse-pragmatic facets of contrastive focus in English and Spanish”.

**Discussants:**

**Javier Valenzuela Manzanares (Universidad de Murcia, España)**

**1. Description of the workshop**

The present proposal builds on the achievements of the previous workshops of the Lexical Constructional Model (LCM henceforth) held in 2007 at the universities of Logroño (Spain), at the 40<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting of the Societas Linguistica Europaea: Functionalism in Linguistics (University of Joensuu, Finland, 29 August - 1 September 2007) and at the XXVI AESLA International

Conference: “From Applied Linguistics to the Linguistics of the Mind: Issues, practices and trends” (University of Almería, Spain, 3-5 April 2008). Moreover, two further workshops are scheduled to take place in the next few months: “Meaning construction: functionalist, cognitivist and/or constructionist approaches” (9 ESSE Conference, Aarhus, Denmark, 22-26 August 2008), and “New perspectives on Contrastive Grammar, Applied Linguistics and Teaching Methodology: the Lexical Constructional Model”, at the 41<sup>st</sup> Annual Meeting of the Societas Linguistica Europaea (SLE2008, Languages in Contrast. Grammar, Translation, Corpora, University of Forlì, Italy, 17-20 September 2008).

The LCM is at this stage emerging as a promising usage-based approach bridging the gap between moderate functional proposals, as instantiated in e.g. Van Valin’s Role and Reference Grammar, on the one hand, and cognitively-influenced strands of Construction Grammar, such as the Goldbergian one, on the other. In other words, the model aims to integrate the best of two worlds of long-standing tradition in linguistics and seeks to find robust generalizations for a number of crucial theoretical and descriptive aspects. At the same time, the LCM intends to avoid what are perceived to be important shortcomings in the models mentioned above, such as the lack of a maximized semantic component, or the absence of detailed fine-grained semantico-pragmatic constraints regulating the fusion of a given verb with a given construction, among others.

However, unlike the other workshops mentioned above, this one places added emphasis on the integration of descriptive and explanatory accounts of “core grammar” into a more comprehensive theory of meaning construction, with special focus on illocution, implicature and discourse coherence relations. In so doing, the LCM takes one step further the eclectic integration of functionalist models (now incorporating insights from Halliday’s Systemic Functional Grammar) as well as Goldberg’s Cognitive Construction Grammar and the Cognitive Theory Model. Virtually every facet of meaning construction is either implicitly or explicitly taken into account in the fully-fledged four-level architecture of the LCM outlined in Ruiz Ibáñez de Mendoza and Mairal Usón (2008), inter alios. As things stand, the LCM invokes a maximized version of the Functional Lexematic Model as the starting point for its four-level architecture in which lexical templates and constructional templates work hand in hand to yield a principled account of the intricacies of meaning construction while being amenable to a high degree of explanatory elegance. However, the LCM can also furnish a fine-grained account of pragmatic and discourse facets of meaning construction and their impact on lexical and/or constructional aspects. The result is a unified whole in which there is a smooth transition from lexical/semantic to pragmatic/discourse facets of meaning construction. It is with the different theoretical and applied facets of the above-mentioned transition that the abstracts included in this workshop proposal are concerned.

## **2. Schedule**

9.00-9.25: Ricardo Mairal Usón  
9.25-9.50: Francisco José Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez  
9.50-10.15: Pedro Santana Martínez  
10.15-10.40: Annalisa Baicchi  
10.40-11.00: Coffee break  
11.00-11.25: Ignasi Navarro i Ferrando  
11.25-11.50: Noelia Martínez Jiménez-Losa  
11.50-12.15: Francisco González-García  
12.15-13.00: Discussion

## **3. Abstracts**

## The argument structure module within the Lexical Constructional Model

Ricardo MAIRAL USÓN  
UNED

[rmairal@flog.uned.es](mailto:rmairal@flog.uned.es)

The Lexical Constructional Model (LCM) formulates a usage-based comprehensive theory of meaning construction that aims to give explanations of how all aspects of meaning construction including those that go beyond so-called core grammar (e.g. traditional implicature, illocutionary force, and discourse coherence) interact among one another (cf. Ruiz de Mendoza and Mairal, 2007, 2008). Hence, a four-level catalogue of constructional types – including configurations that would be regarded by other theorists as a matter of pragmatic implicature, illocutionary force or discourse structure – is posited as part of the semantic component of the model. These four different layers are interrelated by two cognitive processes: *subsumption* and *cueing*.

This paper concentrates on the core grammar module, the *level-1* or *argument structure module*, consisting of two representational constructs: lexical and constructional templates. Lexical templates are originally a development of the logical structures (LS) postulated in Role and Reference Grammar (RRG) (cf. Van Valin, 2005) by including rich semantic encyclopaedic information thus following the tradition of frame-based approaches. The format of a lexical template consists of two parts: (i) the semantic module, and (ii) the logical representation or *Aktionsart* module, each of which is encoded differently. Here is the basic representational format for a lexical template:

**predicate:** [SEMANTIC MODULE<lexical functions>] [AKTIONSART MODULE <semantic primes>]

Recently, a new representational device has been developed by including Pustejovsky's (1995) *qualia* as part of the semantic representation. In this regard, several case studies from the domain of change of state verbs, contact-by-impact verbs, consumption verbs and cognition verbs are discussed in this presentation. Constructional templates make partial use of the same metalanguage as lexical templates since constructions capture structure that is common to a number of lexical items.

A further issue is to ascertain how the two types of representations interact. In connection with this, as advanced above we postulate two types of cognitive processes: *subsumption* and *cueing*. At the level of core grammar constructional templates "coerce" lexical templates, a process that is called *lexical-constructional subsumption* that is in turn regulated by two kinds of constraint on coercion: *internal* and *external*. The former arise from the semantic properties of the lexical and constructional templates, while the latter result from the possibility or impossibility of performing high-level metaphoric and metonymic operations on the lexical items involved in the *lexical-constructional subsumption* process.

### References

- Pustejovsky, J. 1995. *The Generative Lexicon*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Ruiz de Mendoza F. J. and R. Mairal 2007. High-level metaphor and metonymy in meaning construction. In *Aspects of Meaning Construction*. Radden, Günter, Klaus-Michael Köpcke, Thomas Berg, and Peter Siemund (eds.), 33-51. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins..
- Ruiz de Mendoza, F. J. and R. Mairal 2008. Levels of description and constraining factors in meaning construction: an introduction to the Lexical Constructional Model. *Folia Linguistica* vol. 42, forthcoming.

Van Valin, R. D. Jr. 2005. *The Syntax-Semantics-Pragmatics Interface: An Introduction to Role and Reference Grammar*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

### **“Looking beyond argument structure constructions”**

Francisco José RUIZ DE MENDOZA IBÁÑEZ  
University of La Rioja  
[francisco.ruizdemendoza@unirioja.es](mailto:francisco.ruizdemendoza@unirioja.es)

The Lexical Constructional Model posits a four level catalogue of constructional types – including configurations that would be regarded by other theorists as a matter of pragmatic implicature, illocutionary force or discourse structure – as part of the semantic component of the model. The following constructional levels are posited:

- Level 1: constructions producing core grammar characterizations.
- Level 2: constructions accounting for heavily conventionalized situation-based low-level meaning implications.
- Level 3: constructions that account for conventionalized illocutionary meaning (situation-based high-level implications).
- Level 4: constructions based on very schematic discourse structures.

This presentation discusses the format of levels 2, 3 and 4 constructions. The LCM features a *level 2 or implicational module* that accounts for aspects of linguistic communication that have traditionally been handled in connection with implicature theory. There is a *level 3 or illocutionary module* dealing with traditional illocutionary force. Finally, a *level 4 or discourse module* addresses the discourse aspects of the LCM, with particular emphasis on cohesion and coherence phenomena. Each level is either subsumed into a higher-level constructional configuration or acts as a cue for the activation of relevant conceptual structure that yields an implicit meaning derivation. Each constructional level is interrelated by two cognitive processes: *subsumption* and *cueing*. At the pragmatic and discourse levels, *subsumption* takes the form of parametrization processes of the variable elements of non-argumental constructions, which differ from level-1 constructions in that they are essentially *idiomatic* in nature, i.e. they consist of a combination of fixed and variable elements. A case in point is the level-2 *What's X Doing Y?* configuration (cf. Kay and Fillmore, 1999), which conveys the idea that the state of affairs denoted by the non-interrogative content of the sentence is either incongruent or bothers the speaker (e.g. *What's the child doing in the swimming pool?*). The construction has fixed elements that cannot be changed without altering its meaning implications (e.g. verb tense; cf. *What will the child do in the swimming pool?*) and variable elements that can be parametrized in constrained way. For example, the X variable in the level-3 requestive *Can You X?* construction must contain a predicate that expresses the addressee's control of the state of affairs (cf. *Can you close the window?* vs. *Can you see the window?*). In a similar way, the level-4 construction *Just Because X Doesn't Mean Y* (e.g. *Just because we live in Berkeley doesn't mean we're left wing radicals*), is used to indicate that the content of Y does not necessarily follow from X (Holmes and Hudson, 2000). Finally, *cueing* or *cued inferencing* is a form of constraining non-explicit meaning on the basis of lexical and constructional clues. It takes places at all levels of meaning construction as an alternative to subsumption. Thus, at the level of argument structure, it accounts for inferences obtained by making contextual adjustments on the meaning of some predicates (e.g. *He drinks [alcohol]; She's ready [for the party]*). At other levels it accounts for meaning implications based on potential conceptual connections between propositions (the case of discourse), or on metonymic activations or high-level (for illocution), and low-level (for

implicature) situational models or scenarios. For example, the discourse connection between *It can't sound good; it's not digital*, which is one of conclusion-evidence, differs from the connection between *It doesn't sound good; it's not digital*, which is simply of cause-effect. The difference lies in the use of "can't" indicating (i.e. cueing) a deduced impossibility in the case of the conclusion-evidence pattern.

## REFERENCES

- Holmes, Jasper, and Richard Hudson (2000) "Just Because X Doesn't Mean Y". Paper delivered at the Linguistics Association of Great Britain, Spring Meeting. University College London.
- Kay, Paul and Charles J. Fillmore. 1999. Grammatical constructions and linguistic generalizations: The 'What's X doing Y' construction. *Language* 75: 1-33.
- Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez, Francisco José, and Ricardo Mairal Usón. 2007. High-level metaphor and metonymy in meaning construction. In *Aspects of Meaning Construction*. Radden, Günter, Klaus-Michael Köpcke, Thomas Berg, and Peter Siemund (eds.), 33-51. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins..
- Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez, Francisco José, and Ricardo Mairal Usón. 2008. Levels of description and constraining factors in meaning construction: an introduction to the Lexical Constructional Model. *Folia Linguistica* vol. 42, forthcoming

### **"Some notes for the analysis of the Lexical Constructional Model (LCM): a metatheoretical perspective"**

[pedro.santana@unirioja.es](mailto:pedro.santana@unirioja.es)

This paper offers the preliminary steps of an analysis of the LCM with the tools provided by the theory of science known as Teoría del Cierre Categorial (Categorical Closure Theory, CCT). The theory was created in the seventies by Spanish philosopher Gustavo Bueno, and is still under development. Since it is not possible to give a minimally adequate view of the CCT within the limits of these pages, we will proceed by introducing some key concepts at the same time that some linguistic questions are discussed.

According to the CCT, every science is centered on a field which contains the elements with which it works. These components are arranged along three axes: syntactic –related to the formal structure of the theory–, semantic –which discusses what the theory is about–, and pragmatic –which treats matters concerning the way in which scientists interact among them and with the objects, tools, and concepts they use.

Scientists –ideally the so called gnoseological subject (GS)- operate with the elements belonging to the field and construct other new elements. A science –or a particular scientific theory– gets properly structured when it achieves the closure of the operations, in the sense that, once the closure has taken place, these only include terms of the field and give place to other terms of the field.

The idea of closure has been taken from algebra by analogy: the basic ideas are that every science develops a special type of totality called category (a term that belongs to a long philosophical tradition), and that a closed theory operates in such a way that their result is always an object of the theory.

In a science like linguistics, in human sciences in general, the gnoseological subject faces a situation in which the operational subject (the speaker, the hearer, OS from now on) is a part of the field. According to the CCT, human sciences must also progress towards the categorical closure of the field. However, two situations are possible: either the OS is neutralized –it disappears from the field, or, in other words, the operations carried out by the OS are cancelled–, or it remains as an essential part of the closed theory. The former case is known as an alpha closure, and the latter as a beta closure.

Some schools of linguistics offer good examples of the first possibility: the Prague school of phonology, structural semantics, and –paradoxically and against the first positions maintained by the creator of the CCT– Chomsky’s Standard Theory and all the subsequent models developed by him and his followers. Chomsky’s emphasis on the competence as the object of linguistics can be reinterpreted as a neutralization or cancellation of the OS’s operations.

Other schools (from rhetoric to the *linguistique de la parole*, pragmatics,...) present theories and models in which the OS must play an essential role, the crucial point being whether the theory requires from the operations of the speaker at some moment or not.

So, while –roughly speaking– formal linguistics is alpha-closed, the classification of functional and cognitive schools of linguistics gets complicated for different reasons, although a first exam would point at an ample variety of situations with, probably, a majority of beta closures. It is essential to differentiate between linguistic theory as such and the framework formed with other kinds of knowledge on which the theory is grounded: general philosophical background, psychology, available technologies, etc. In this sense, it may be the case that this context or framework includes the OS as a central component; however, according to the CCT, it is the theory itself which must be examined in order to classify the closure that has constituted it as a scientific theory.

The LCM, although still in development, is a challenge for the CCT for it combines a formal treatment of syntax and semantics –which goes from lexical pieces to the sentence– with the integration of pragmatics and the dynamical view of semantics that characterizes cognitive approaches.

As a preliminary conclusion, it may be the case that any integrated model of linguistic phenomena necessarily oscillates between one and another kind of closure, which means that the development of the model may emphasize either the intrinsic properties of operations like subsumption and cueing or the role played the OS. Whereas it is obvious that the reality of language cannot be separated from the subject, theories about it may constitute systems that somehow replace it by a combinatorics of operations that represent the speaker’s capacity and performance.

### **“Idealized Cognitive Models within the Lexical Constructional Model”**

Annalisa BAICCHI

University of Pavia

[annalisa.baicchi@unipv.it](mailto:annalisa.baicchi@unipv.it)

Stemming from the assumption that constructions play a central role in semantic interpretation, the present study sets out to investigate the conceptual motivation of some instances of the caused-motion construction. My research draws insights from functional theories like *Role and Reference Grammar* (Van Valin 2005) and from specific strands of *Construction Grammar* (Goldberg 1995; Boas 2002), and builds on the *Lexical Constructional Model* (Ruiz de Mendoza & Mairal 2006; Mairal & Ruiz de Mendoza 2007, 2008; Baicchi 2007; Ruiz de Mendoza & Baicchi 2007; González-García 2008). More specifically, it will investigate the role that Force-Dynamics categories and correlated image schemas play in licensing instances of the caused-motion construction, and different types and degrees of force ruling different realizations of this construction will be envisaged. The following aspects will receive special attention: (1) the need for lexical and constructional templates that not only form a continuum (Langacker 2005) but also interact in a constrained way, thus allowing for a powerful representational system for verbs in their constructional use without linking algorithmic rules; (2) many aspects of transitivity in grammar are conceptually grounded either in high-level metaphor or in high-level metonymy; (3) the change-of-state force-dynamics pattern licenses both concrete and metaphorical motion: exertion of force can be physical (“She knocked him into the thorny bed of roses”), psychological (“He stared me into a

half-confusion”), and intra-psychological (“I duped myself into thinking I could be part of the crew team”).

## REFERENCES

- Baicchi, A. (2007). “The subsumption process of the intransitive-transitive migration”. In M. Dossena et al. (eds.), *Migrations of Forms, Forms of Migration*, Bari.
- Boas, H.C. (2002). “On constructional polysemy and verbal polysemy in Construction Grammar,” in: Samiian, V. (ed.), *Proceedings of the 2000 Western Conference on Linguistics. Vol. 12*. 126-139.
- Butler, C. & F. González-García (2005). Situating FDG in Functional-Cognitive Space. In Mackenzie L. & Gomez-Gonzalez M.L.A: (eds). *Studies in Functional Discourse Grammar*. Bern. Peter Lang: 109-158
- Goldberg, A. (1995). *A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- González-García, F. & C. Butler (2006). Mapping Functional-Cognitive Space. In *Annual Review of Cognitive Linguistics 4*. Amsterdam: Benjamins: 39-96
- González-García, F. 2008. The family of object-related depictives in English and Spanish: Towards a usage-based, constructionist analysis.” *Language Sciences* [Available online from <[www.science-direct.com](http://www.science-direct.com)>].
- Langacker, R. (2005) “Construction Grammars: cognitive, radical, and less so.” In F. Ruiz de Mendoza and S. Peña (eds.), *Cognitive Linguistics. Internal Dynamics and Interdisciplinary Interaction*. Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter: 101-159.
- Mairal, R. and F. Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez. (2008 fc.). “Levels of description and explanation in meaning construction”. In Ch. Butler & J. Martín Arista (eds.) *Deconstructing Constructions*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. Volume in preparation.
- Ruiz de Mendoza, F. José & A. Baicchi (2007) Illocutionary Constructions: Cognitive Motivation and Linguistic Realization. In Kecskes I & Horn L. (eds). *Explorations in Pragmatics. Linguistic, Cognitive and Intercultural Aspects..* Amsterdam: Benjamins: 95-127.
- Van Valin, R..D. Jr. (2005). *The Syntax-Semantics-Pragmatics Interface*, Cambridge: CUP

### “Internal Constraints in the Lexical Representation of Prepositions in the LCM”

Ignasi NAVARRO I FERRANDO  
University of Castelló  
[ignasi.navarro@ang.uji.es](mailto:ignasi.navarro@ang.uji.es)

The Lexical Constructional Model (Ruiz de Mendoza & Mairal, 2007a, b; in press) provides a semantico-centric perspective to the issue of what kind and amount of information should be included in lexical representations. In LCM, Lexical Templates constitute complex matrices based on a set of parameters such as a typologically based metalanguage à la NSM (Wierzbicka, 1996), *Aktionsart* distinctions as those proposed in RRG (Van Valin, 2005), and lexical functions (Mel’cuk *et al.*, 1995). Here is the basic representational format for a lexical template:

**predicate:** [SEMANTIC MODULE<lexical functions>] [AKTIONSART MODULE <semantic primes>]

The LCM develops at present an enriched formalism for the lexical representation of verbal predicates. For predicates, like prepositions, other Functional Models like RRG provide simpler representations as LOC, or LOC-AT. However, the Cognitive Linguistics tradition in prepositional polysemy, allows for an enrichment in the characterization of Lexical representations of

prepositions and other spatial particles. On the one hand, the argument structure of a spatial relation concept entails two arguments –Trajector and Landmark. On the other hand, the relationship may be characterized in terms of topology, (force-)dynamics and function. From this standpoint, a particle lexical template might add information on image-schemas, but also on topological, functional, and dynamic relational patterns. A lexical template of a spatial relation concept constitutes its protoconcept, and semantic extensions could be described in terms of external constraints. The protoconcept might be formalized as:

**predicate:** [IMAGE-SCHEMATIC MODULE <topology, dynamics, function>] [PARTICIPANT STRUCTURE <TR LM, semantic primes>]

The image schematic module for each lexical template includes one or more specifications for each one of the three parameters, which in turn can work as a family resemblance set (or a fuzzy set) in order to determine the polysemy of a preposition. The polysemy map of a preposition can be related to a ‘conceptual map’ that makes a predicate fit in different ‘contexts’ (in terms of Guest & Mairal, 2007). In this line, a predicate can fit into syntactic templates defined by other lexical entries – verb-particle constructions, for instance, cf. Silvestre-López, 2008).

## REFERENCES

- Guest, E. and R. Mairal Usón. 2007. “Building a computational lexicon for automatic translation: a preliminary discussion”. In Fuertes, Pedro (ed.). *Problemas lingüísticos de la traducción especializada*. Valladolid: Universidad de Valladolid, 197-226.
- Mairal, R. and P. Faber. 2007. “Lexical templates within a functional cognitive theory of meaning”. *Annual Review of Cognitive Linguistics* 5: 137-172.
- Mel’cuk I., A. Clas and A. Polguère. 1995. *Introduction à la lexicologie explicative et combinatoire*, Louvain-la-Neuve (Belgique), Duculot / Aupelf-UREF.
- Ruiz de Mendoza, F. & R. Mairal (in press) “Levels of description and constraining factors in meaning construction: an introduction to the Lexical Constructional Model”. In M. Brdar and M. Zic Fuchs (eds.) *Converging and Diverging Tendencies in Cognitive Linguistics*. Amsterdam /Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Ruiz de Mendoza, F. and R. Mairal 2007a. “Challenging systems of lexical representation”. *Journal of English Studies* 4; University of La Rioja; vol. In honor of Carmelo Cunchillos.
- Ruiz de Mendoza, F. and R. Mairal 2007b. “Levels of semantic representation: where lexicon and grammar meet.” *Interlingüística* 17: 26-47.
- Silvestre-López, A. J. 2008 PhD dissertation , UJI.
- Van Valin, R.D. Jr. 2005. *The Syntax-Semantics-Pragmatics Interface: An Introduction to Role and Reference Grammar*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Wierzbicka, A. 1996. *Semantics: Primes and Universals*. Oxford: OUP.

### **“The role of metaphor in the analysis of motion events within the Lexical Constructional Model”**

Noelia JIMÉNEZ MARTÍNEZ-LOSA  
University of La Rioja

[noelia.jimenez@unirioja.es](mailto:noelia.jimenez@unirioja.es)

The Lexical Constructional Model (LCM; Ruiz de Mendoza and Mairal, 2007ab), unlike projectionist models, and in consonance with the basic assumptions of Cognitive Linguistics, makes use of all kinds of cognitive model in order to account for the complex semantic structure associated

with lexical items and their ability to occur in certain linguistic and situational contexts. The LCM places special emphasis on the organization of lexical items into predicate classes associated with a semantic domain (e.g. motion, existence, cognition) and it makes us of a decompositional system to capture syntactically relevant semantic meaning. However, it departs from more traditional decompositional systems since it includes encyclopaedic information, which is relevant for semantic interpretation, to the extent that it can be bound to logical form variables ready for syntactic projection. The present paper shows how the LCM is applied to the study of the conceptual domain of motion in English, with special attention to the role of conceptual metaphor. On the basis of data extracted from several corpora, the paper analyses the semantic and constructional basis of English motion verbs, such as *lumber*, *slow*, *speed*, or *hurry*, among others. It proposes, for each lexical item, a rich semantic description in terms of semantic primes (primitives) modified by lexical functions. For example, "speed" would be characterized as:

[MagnFast(1)] do' (x, [move] (x); x = 1

In its turn, "race" would have the same representation basically (since both items belong to the same level in the lexematic hierarchy) but with one difference, reflected by the lexical function "Culm", which captures the highest possible degree in the speed of motion, as motivated by the metaphoric-metonymic combination expounded above:

[CulmFast(1)] do' (x, [move] (x); x = 1

It is this difference that does not allow the verb "race" to appear in expressions where "speed" is possible, although there are other expressions where the substitution can be made (with the consequent change in meaning):

- (1) She raced/sped out of the room
- (2) The driver sped/\*raced to 50 miles an hour
- (3) How come time speeds/\*races up and slows down all at once?

In (1) the linguistic context is so broad that it can easily accommodate either operator (Magn/Culm). But this is not possible in (2) where 50 miles an hour is not likely to be the highest speed rate for a modern car. In (3) the TIME IS SPACE metaphor can only work with "speed" since it is used in combination with "up" which cues for the incremental interpretation of "speed". Since "race" contains the lexical function "Culm", expressing the highest possible degree, there is no room for an incremental interpretation. This kind of analysis is extended to several classes of verbs in the domain of motion with a view to accounting for (i) the compatibility between the internal make-up of motion predicates and the constructional configurations in which they can potentially take part, and (ii) making generalizations, where possible, about the potential of the various classes and subclasses of motion predicates to instantiate the caused-motion construction.

**“You (certainly) do know/Tú sí que sabes: Towards a comprehensive understanding of the discourse-pragmatic facets of contrastive focus in English and Spanish”**

Francisco GONZÁLVEZ-GARCÍA  
University of Almería  
[fgonza@ual.es](mailto:fgonza@ual.es)

This paper is concerned with contrastive focus configurations of the type exemplified in (1)-(2) below in English and Spanish:

- (1) Oh Sir Salman, you CERTAINLY know how to charm a gal (The Sunday Times, June 1 2008)  
(<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/comment/columnists/article4040060.ece>)
- (2) TÚ sí que sabes, Woody  
([http://cine.linkara.com/pelicula/annie\\_hall/critica/150360/tu\\_si\\_que\\_sabes\\_woody/](http://cine.linkara.com/pelicula/annie_hall/critica/150360/tu_si_que_sabes_woody/))

In the light of naturally-occurring data from corpora such as the *Corpus de Referencia del Español Actual*, the *British National Corpus*, implemented with tokens extracted from Google as well as with data elicited from educated native speakers of English and Spanish, a number of generalizations can be observed to emerge. First, the configurations above pick out different constituents as marked foci (i.e. as items signalling prominent new information) in English and Spanish, namely, the preverbal material (usually emphatic “do” alone or in conjunction with adverbials such as “certainly” in English) and the nominal expression occupying the subject position in Spanish. Second, these configurations can be used in English and Spanish to encode the speaker’s assumption that the hearer will not consider the content of the marked focus constituent or the speech act containing the constituent(s) in question likely to be(come) common ground (Zimmermann 2007). It must also be emphasized that the states of affairs/events predicated of the subject can be axiologically positive (see (2) above) or negative, as in (3) below:

(3) **TÚ sí que me produces urticaria**

**Y mucha además**, pero no sólo tú, sino todos los de “tu especie”. **Francisco Vázquez**, socialista – o mejor dicho “**socialista**” –, nos deleita con las siguientes declaraciones  
Francisco Vázquez, en presencia de Bono, dice que el Estatuto catalán “le produce urticaria” (emphasis in original)

(<http://respuestadigital.blogspot.com/2005/10/t-si-que-me-produces-urticaria.html>)

I concur with Zimmermann (2007) that what motivates the choice of the marked focus is the speaker’s suspicion that the addressee will be surprised by the (resentment tone of the) speech act encoded in the headline, the marked form in question thus serving to direct the hearer’s attention, and to shift his/her common ground in accordance with the new information provided. From a methodological viewpoint, this means that marked foci cannot be adequately accounted for by simply looking at isolated sentence pairs and the logical relations between them. Rather, an adequate analysis should take on board discourse-pragmatic notions like ‘hearer expectation’ or ‘discourse expectability’ of the focused element(s) in a given discourse context (Zimmermann 2007). The overarching claim substantiated in this paper is that the Lexical Constructional Model (Ruiz de Mendoza and Mairal 2008 and references therein) and its four-level representation architecture can successfully account for the impact of information on the knowledge states of the discourse participants in meaning construction within a given discourse scenario.

## REFERENCES

- Ruiz De Mendoza Ibáñez, Francisco José and Ricardo Mairal Usón. (2008). “Levels of Description and Constraining Factors in Meaning Construction: An Introduction to the Lexical Constructional Model.” *Folia Linguistica* 42.
- Zimmermann, M. (2007). “Contrastive Focus”. *Interdisciplinary Studies on Information Structure* 6: 147–159.