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ABSTRACT

This thesis aims to study the intonation of Welsh in terms of the functions it fulfills within discourse. The analysis is corpus based, and the dialect studied is that of the Amman Valley/Llanelli area of Dyfed.

Intonation is seen as fulfilling a communicative function within the discourse, and analysis is based initially on a Hallidayan model. Two major analytic levels are proposed for this approach:

1. An informational level, where the systems of information distribution and information focus operate;
2. A phonological level, where the four systems of tonality, tonicity, tone and key operate.

The way an utterance is divided into intonation units (tone-groups) makes up the system of tonality; the location within the tone-group of its most prominent syllable constitutes the system of tonicity; choice of a specifiable pitch direction within the tone-group makes up the system of tone; choice of one of three analytically separate pitch ranges within which each tone-group is uttered constitutes the system of key.

Certain relations of a non-biunique nature exist between corresponding systems of each level. Tonality is taken to be the phonological exponent of information distribution, which involves the division of a message into information units. Tonicity is taken to be the phonological exponent of information focus, which concerns the location within the information unit of its most informationally
prominent constituent. Focus may be unmarked or marked, and marked focus generally indicates that information has preceded or is to follow in the discourse. A similar function is fulfilled by one of the terms from the tonal system, whilst choice of the relevant key can signal the beginning or continuation of a message unit.

Tonality and key can therefore be said to fulfill demarcative functions within the discourse, whilst tonicity and tone fulfil a cohesive function.
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INTRODUCTION

0.1. Background

This study of Welsh intonation was prompted mainly by the author's interest as a native speaker in making a contribution to the study of the Welsh language. Being also interested in intonation, an early decision was made to combine the two, and work on some aspect of Welsh intonation, this especially in view of the fact that very little had hitherto been done in that field.¹

Within intonation, the author's primary interest was with the location of the most prominent syllables in various utterances (tonic syllables) and the effect that different locations produced. It was found that the best overall description/explanation was obtained when tonic syllable location was examined from the point of view of the (cohesive) function it displayed within the discourse (see 0.2.1.). Two features of the thesis resulted from this:

(a) The bulk of the work (Part II) is concerned with the location of the tonic syllable and the discoursal functions associated with it;

(b) Other aspects of Welsh intonation were mainly viewed in a similar light, though in not so detailed a fashion vis. in what way, if any, did they affect the structure of the discourse?

¹ I know of only one such study vis. a paper by Cainwen Thomas in Studia Celtica 2 (1967): "Welsh Intonation - A Preliminary Study." Pp.8-28.
The suggestions put forward in this thesis are based on the analysis of a fairly large corpus of tape-recorded material. The material consisted of four extended conversations between family and/or friends of the author. The conversations were all in Welsh, or more precisely, the type of Welsh spoken in the Llanelli/Amman Valley area of Dyfed.

It was decided to work very broadly within a Hallidayan framework (Halliday 1967, 1967a, 1970), whereby the phonology of intonation is characterized in terms of three systems: tonality, tonicity and tone. The way an utterance is divided into intonation units or tone-groups makes up the system of tonality. It is a feature of the tone-group that one syllable (two, in the case of a compound

---

2 Available on request to Dr. J. Laver, Department of Linguistics, University of Edinburgh, as is a copy of the electrokymogram, the results of which form part of 1.2.2.1.

3 Halliday’s terminology is largely made use of, though sometimes not in the same way as Halliday used it. Divergence may be basically theoretical or merely a matter of convenience. This should become clear upon definition of the terms. Immediately below, for example, we define the system of tonicity as choice of location of the tonic syllable, this tonic syllable forming an element of the structure of the tone-group, with anything following that tonic syllable up to the end of the tone-group comprising a different element (v.s. the posttonic, see 2.3.). Halliday’s system of tonicity, on the other hand, concerns the location of the element tonic, that element comprising the tonic syllable plus all that follows it up to the end of the tone-group. The reason for this divergence is explained briefly in the early part of 1.1.
tone-group, see 6.0 - 6.1.2) stands out as being more prominent than the others. This syllable is known as the tonic syllable. The location of the tonic syllable within the tone-group constitutes the system of tonicity. The tonic syllable is the point of origin for a specifiable pitch direction which continues to the end of the tone-group. These pitch directions make up the system of tone.

To these three systems a fourth is added. Each tone-group is uttered on one of three separate pitch levels; high, mid or low. These pitch levels make up the system of key.

Each system gets fuller treatment in the thesis itself, a section being devoted to each. Thus Part I of this work deals with tonality, Part II with tonicity, Part III with tone, and Part IV with key. Our main interest here lies in the implications these systems have for the discourse; in other words, what discoursal function is fulfilled by each of the four phonological systems.

0.2.1. The Discourse

Two different levels of communication are involved in any discourse. At the "deep" informational level we have the message - the totality of the communication from speaker to listener. The message is expounded or realized by the text. The text comprises the linguistic and paralinguistic features of communication. Though paralinguistic features (following Laver (1976) in the use of this term) are mentioned from time to time in the course of this thesis, our main interest is obviously with the linguistic part of the text, and, narrowing it still further, since we are concerned with intonation, with the phonological aspects of the linguistic part of the text. Phonologically, the text is made up of a series
of utterances, an utterance being the uninterrupted contribution by one interactant. 4

Diagrammatically, our position is as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{TEXT} \\
(\text{linguistic and paralinguistic}) \\
\downarrow \\
\text{MESSAGE} \\
(\text{informational}) \\
\end{array}
\]

or alternatively by the equation:

\[
\text{Discourse} = \text{Message (linguistic and paralinguistic text)}
\]

where parentheses mean "signified by".

Message and text are not, however, in a biunique relationship. If we were to ask what the listener needs in order to understand the message, text would not be enough. We then need to ask what the listener needs to know in order to decode the text into the message. For this he needs a background of situational context and shared experience. Whilst the text, then, is a linguistic and paralinguistic representation of the message, the message is not understood solely in terms of the text. Rather, the listener decodes the message via the text against the background of situational context and shared experience. (Situational context and shared experience will henceforward be included in and understood by the term 'context'.)

---

4 A text may of course consist of only one utterance: for instance, if Bill meets Jack walking along the street and says "Hello" but gets no reply, this would constitute both an utterance and a text.
0.2.2. The Role of Intonation within the Discourse

Tonality and key can be said to fulfil basically demarcative functions in the discourse, whilst a mainly cohesive function is attributed to toxicity and tone.

The way an utterance is divided into tone-groups constitutes the phonological system of tonality. This represents the informational level in which the message (or the parts of the message which are represented by the utterance) is divided into information units. Each utterance is divided thus, which is to say that the whole (phonological) text is divided into tone-groups, which feature signals on the informational level the division of the message into information units. Tone-group boundaries are signalled by one or more than one of three phonetic cues (see 1.2.2), and are procedurally marked by the double bar // . This symbol will also be adopted, where necessary, to mark the division of the message into information units, since tone-group and information unit are co-terminous.

---

5 This is not to say that we entirely accept Halliday's suggestion that "connected speech can ... be analysed into an unbroken succession of tone-groups". (Halliday (1967) p.9). False starts, for instance, are excluded on phonological and informational grounds. Phonologically, they frequently upset a well established pretonic which they are obviously not a part of; informationally, they contribute nothing to the message except to indicate to the listener that they are not to be included in the message.

6 This is another deviation from Halliday's theory in which tone-group and information unit are frequently not co-extensive. There is a more detailed discussion on this point in 1.2.2.1.
Each tone-group has one main point of phonological prominence, known as the tonic syllable: the location of the tonic syllable within the tone-group makes up the phonological system of tonicity. At the informational level this represents the location of the informationally most prominent constituent of the information unit (see 4.1), this comprising the system of information focus.

Focus may be marked or unmarked: when marked (see most of Part II esp. 4.2, 5-5.3.4), it involves what will be called a discoursal presupposition (not to be confused with a semantic presupposition) which indicates generally that certain information is "given" (see 4.2.1) or derivable by the listener from the discourse. The way in which marked focus signals information as given depends to a very large extent upon the linguistic status of the focal item - whether it is lexical or non-lexical. If the focal item is lexical but not the final lexical item in the information unit, this signals all that follows the focal item within that information unit as given. (If the focal item is the final lexical item in the information unit, focus is generally unmarked i.e. there is no discoursal presupposition involved). An example of marked focus:

"/...symo ti 'n /nabod /Nigel //"

You don't know Nigel.

In this tone-group/information unit, the tonic syllable (underlined) is "na", and the focal item is "nabod" (know), which is a lexical item but not the final one in the information unit. This signals that the information following "nabod" in that information unit viz. "Nigel" (Nigel) is derivable by the listener. In this
particular case (see 3.3 example (4)), it had been previously mentioned.

If on the other hand the focal item is non-lexical, this generally involves a contrastive presupposition whereby the existence of another element in the discourse is implied, that element being derivable by contrast with the focal item, e.g.

A: //.. des ti / lan trwy "New Road"
    came you up through New Road
    You came up through New Road,
    // 'na sfordd/ des ti //.. a / troi lan / yna //
    that way came you and turn up here
    that's the way you came, and turned up here.

B: //.. end /dim 'na'r / sfordd i / nhw ch'wel //
    but not that the way to them you see
    But that's not the way for them, you see.

Here the focal pronominal "nhw" (them) refers to two hitch-hikers which the speaker had picked up and dropped off somewhere in the town. The contrast can be glossed: "Coming up New Road was the right way for me, but it wasn't for them."

It is the signalling of information as derivable from other parts of the discourse which gives focus - phonologically expounded by tonicity - its cohesive function.

The tonic syllable is the point of origin for a specifiable choice of pitch direction, which is in fact the way in which the tonic syllable achieves prominence. This choice of pitch direction constitutes the system of tones. The tonal system of Welsh is taken here at the primary degree of delicacy to consist of two terms, to
be called tone 1 and tone 2. Phonetically speaking, pitch directions in Welsh fall into four categories - rising, falling, rising-falling and level. For the purposes of this analysis, tone 1 comprises the falling and rising-falling directions, while tone 2 comprises the rising and level directions. Our interest in this work is confined to tone 1, where at the secondary degree of delicacy we recognize a marked and an unmarked form. Marked tone 1 comprises the rise-fall and a fall from a high pitch level, whilst anything else (viz. any fall which does not have a high starting point) is taken to be a form of unmarked tone 1. Marked tone 1 is seen as having a cohesive function in the discourse similar to that fulfilled by marked non-lexical focus (and it frequently works in combination with the latter) i.e. it generally involves a contrastive presupposition.

Each tone-group has a certain pitch-range, characterized by the pitch level of the first salient syllable in the tone-group, which in this analysis must be one of three terms (high, mid, or low) which make up the system of key. The main function fulfilled by key within the discourse with which we concern ourselves in this work regards the signalling of the beginning or continuation of certain message units (referred to elsewhere - see Rees and Urquhart (1976) - as conceptual paragraphs). The beginning of such a unit is usually signalled by high key, whilst low key signals that the speaker wishes to continue with a unit which has already commenced. Like the system of tonality, then, which signals the division of the message into information units, key can be said to have a demarcative function within the discourse.
0.2.3. Key to symbols

// : tone-group boundary.

- // // - : "embedded" tone-group i.e. a tone-group placed inside another tone-group.

/ : foot boundary (where intralinear pitch transcription is necessary, the tone-group and foot boundaries sometimes appear as vertical strokes - || and | respectively - for practical purposes. This is the case throughout the appendix).

//. . : the dots following the tone-group boundary show that this tone-group has a proclitic element; that the following syllable is non-salient. Absence of dots mean that the syllable following the tone-group boundary is salient (no proclitic element).

- - : part of text omitted from example as irrelevant.

--- : tonic syllable (underlined syllable).

" " : inside a Welsh example denotes an English word. Sometimes the English word (especially if a verb) will have a Welsh inflection, joined to it by a hyphen and outside the inverted commas e.g. "enjoy"-o (enjoying).

(aux.) : auxiliary.

(asp.) : aspect marker.

(neg.) : negative particle.
(hes.) : hesitation.
(excl.) : exclamation.

FP (in appendix) : filled pause.
// 1+ : marked tone 1 - (high) fall.
// +1 : marked tone 1 - rise-fall.
// L : low key.
// M : mid key.
// H : high key.

(In the Appendix at the end of the thesis, both tone and key symbols are used, including:

1 : unmarked tone 1 - (mid or low) fall.
2 : tone 2 - rise.

Thus: // 1M.. //2L.. etc.)

For ease of typing, orthographic symbols are used in the representation of Welsh examples, except where it is necessary in certain cases to make a phonetic point. This does present problems, for the Welsh of the data differs, at times quite considerably, from the more literary Welsh of "eisteddfodau" and B.B.C. Wales. I have attempted to show major differences of this sort wherever possible, by appropriate modifications, using orthographic symbols throughout. Where the differences are not so great, the literary version of the word is allowed to stand.

Fortunately the consonant system of the dialect of Welsh described here displays a one to one orthographic/phonemic correspondence, and can be tabulated as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orthographic symbol</th>
<th>Phonemic symbol</th>
<th>Usual phonetic representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>/p/</td>
<td>[p]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>/t/</td>
<td>[t]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>/k/</td>
<td>[k]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>/b/</td>
<td>[b]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>/d/</td>
<td>[d]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>/s/</td>
<td>[s]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ff</td>
<td>/ʃ/</td>
<td>[ʃ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ph</td>
<td>/f/</td>
<td>[f]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>/v/</td>
<td>[v]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>th</td>
<td>/θ/</td>
<td>[θ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dd</td>
<td>/ð/</td>
<td>[ð]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>/s/</td>
<td>[s]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>si</td>
<td>/ʃ/</td>
<td>[ʃ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ts (word initial)</td>
<td>/tʃ/</td>
<td>[tʃ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ch</td>
<td>/x/</td>
<td>[x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>/l/</td>
<td>[l]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ll</td>
<td>/ɬ/</td>
<td>[ɬ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>/r/</td>
<td>[r]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>/m/</td>
<td>[m]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>/n/</td>
<td>[n]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ng</td>
<td>/ŋ/</td>
<td>[ŋ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following clusters need mention:

## gwl  V  -  [g>V] with a lip-rounding prosody (where
V = vowel and ## = word boundary)

## gvr  V  -  [g>V] or [g>] with a lip-rounding prosody.
The remaining consonant retains the prosody if the word initial 'g' is lost through mutation - wiV, wrV, wnV.

The situation is more complicated with the vowel system:

i /i/ or /i/ \[i\] or \[i\]

u /u/ or /u/ \[u\] or \[u\]

y /i/ or /i/ or /o/ \[i\] or \[\text{diaeresis}\ i\] or \[\text{diaeresis}\ 3\]

o /o/ or /o/ \[o\] or \[o\]

e /e/ or /e/ \[e\] or \[e\]

w /u/ or /u/ \[u\] or \[u\]  
(or semi vowel /u/).
0.2.4. **A note on the appendix**

At the end of the thesis appears an appendix of some fifty pages taken from a section of the data. Each numbered "line" in fact refers to four separate lines. The top line constitutes the Welsh utterance; the following line carries an intralinear transcription of the pitch level or direction of each syllable; the third line is an English word to word translation of the Welsh in the top line; the fourth line carries an appropriate English translation. Foot boundaries and tone-group boundaries are drawn vertically in order to traverse the intralinear pitch diagrams beneath the Welsh. Tone and key are indicated at the beginning of each tone-group (following tone-group boundaries).
PART ONE

TONALITY

1.1. **General**

This thesis is concerned with both the phonological/phonetic description of Welsh intonation in terms of the four phonological systems of tonality, tonicity, tone and key, and the functions each system fulfils within the discourse. As stated in the introduction, the discourse is seen here as comprising two related aspects: the text and the message. The message is on the informational level of discourse, being expounded by the text on linguistic (mainly phonological and syntactic) and paralinguistic levels. The relationship between text and message is not bi-unique, for whereas the text expounds the message, the message is understood not solely in terms of the text, but in terms of the text against a background of situational context and shared experience (both these latter background features being henceforward collectively known as 'context').

Our concern with the textual component of the discourse will, obviously in view of the subject matter, centre around phonology. In this light we can say that a text is made up on the phonological level of a series of utterances, an utterance being the uninterrupted contribution of a speaker (but see note 4).

As a text is divided into a series of utterances, so is an utterance divided into a series of intonational units or tone-groups. We take the tone-group to be the basic structural unit of intonation in Welsh. The way in which an utterance is divided into tone-groups makes up the system of tonality.
Tonality on the phonological level expounds the system of information distribution on the informational level, which comprises the division of the message into information units. For instance, the utterance in (1) is made up of one tone-group, whilst that in (2) is made up of two tone-groups:

(1) //.. mae e'n / chwaras /erisad i Ry/daman //
(aux) he(as) play cricket to Ammanford
He plays (is playing) cricket for Ammanford.

(2) //.. mae e'n / chwaras /erisad /// i Ry/daman //
This represents the message being made up of one information unit and two information units respectively. In (1), there is one piece of information, viz. that he plays cricket for Ammanford, whilst in (2) there are two pieces of information, firstly that he plays cricket, and secondly, who he plays for. Similarly in (3) and (4), where we have one tone-group and two tone-groups respectively at the phonological level, and correspondingly one information unit (IU) and two IUs on the informational level.

(3) //.. allid di / brynu un yn y / farcnaad //
Can you buy one in the market
You can buy one in the market.

(4) //.. allid di / brynu un /// yn y /farcnaad //
(3) gives us one piece of information (IU), that we can buy one at the market, whilst (4) divides the message into two pieces of information: firstly that we can buy one, and secondly where we can buy it.

Each tone-group has one syllable phonologically more prominent than the others. This syllable is known as the tonic syllable, and
the location of the tonic syllable within the tone-group constitutes
the system of tonicity.

The tonic syllable is an obligatory constituent of the tone-
group. A tone-group may frequently consist of the tonic syllable
alone e.g.

(5) // na //
no
(6) // wel //
well
No.
Well!

or the tonic syllable may be preceded by a pretonic and/or pro-
clitic element, and optionally followed by a posttonic element. The
internal structure of a tone-group may be diagrammatically represen-
ted thus:

(proclitic) (pretonic) tonic syllable (posttonic)

with elements in parentheses optional.

These elements of tone-group structure may be defined as
follows:

**tonic syllable**: the point of main phonological prominence in the
tone-group. This is a variation in terminological usage from
Halliday, for, whilst the tonic syllable essentially refers to the
same entity in both Halliday's system and mine, it is here granted
the status of element of tone-group structure, whereas in Halliday's
system it is regarded as merely a constituent of the element of
tone-group structure known as 'tonic':

"'tonic': element of tone-group structure comprising one
or more complete foot.

'tonic foot': first (complete) foot in tonic.

'tonic syllable': first (salient) syllable in tonic foot."

(Halliday 1967 p.13)
pretone: the element of tone-group structure preceding the tonic syllable which comprises the first salient syllable in the tone-group up to but not including the tonic syllable e.g.

pretone

(7) // mae'r / gwynt yn / chwythu //

(aux) the wind (asp) blow

The wind is blowing

pretone

(8) // bath wyt ti'n / meddwl o'i / record/ newyd o'//

what (aux) you (asp) think of his record new him

What do you think of his new record?

(In (8) the pretone begins at the tone-group boundary, and procedurally there is no need to signal this since the tone-group boundary is also a foot boundary (see 1.2.2.1). In (7), however, the pretone element is preceded by a non-salient syllable (the proclitic - see below), and this fact is signalled by the dots immediately following the tone-group boundary. In short, then, when a tone-group boundary is followed by dots, the following syllables (up to the next foot boundary) are non-salient; when there are no dots, the first syllable of the tone-group is salient.)

proclitic: the element of tone-group structure which comprises any non-salient syllables in the tone-group which appear before the pretone, or, if there is no pretone, before the tonic syllable e.g.

proclitic

(9) // mae'r / gwynt yn / chwythu //

(see (3) for translation)
proclitic

(10) // .. oen nhw / eisiau / paincio eu / ty //
(aux) they want paint their house

They wanted to paint their house.

proclitic

(11) // .. cedd yr / athro 'na //

was the teacher there

The teacher was there.

posttonic: the element of tone-group structure which comprises any syllable in the tone-group which follows the tonic syllable e.g.

posttonic

(12) // .. wel mae hi'n / melod yn/ Bethel / Tymbl //

well she (asp) member in Bethel Tumble

Well she's a member in Bethel Tumble.

posttonic

(13) // .. achos mae be'n / cael ei ddef/ nyddio yn Gym/raeg//

cause (aux) it (asp) get its use in Welsh

Because it gets used in Welsh.

Whilst making use of the term, Halliday denies posttonic the status of element of tone-group structure, on the phonological grounds that once a term (pitch direction) has been chosen from the tone system, having its point of origin at the tonic syllable, no further changes of tone may occur at posttonic. This thesis is in full agreement with such a statement on phonological grounds: the decision to employ the posttonic as an element of structure was made on grounds of convenience at the informational level where the signalling of information as 'given' needs to be taken into account (see 3.3).
These elements are described in more detail in 1.3.

1.2. Features of tone-group boundary division

1.2.1. A brief note on rhythm.

The unit of rhythm in the analysis offered here is the foot. The foot is made up of one obligatory element and one optional element, which, following Halliday (1967), we shall call the "ictus" and "remit" respectively. The ictus is realized by a salient syllable; the remiss, if present, is realized by one or more non-salient syllables. Thus each foot consists of one salient syllable, either alone or followed by one or more non-salient syllables (but see 1.2.2.1).

Salience is a property of the utterance, seen as one type of secondary phonological prominence (see 6.2.2) and a feature of the rhythmic system of the language. There will be no attempt here to describe the phonetic correlates of salience (a phonological value). It is merely taken as a feature of the rhythm of the language which is perceived by native speakers. The task of exploring phonetic correlates for salience (sometimes called "stress", "accent" etc.) in English has been frequently undertaken, by Fry (1955, 1958a, 1958b, 1965), Lieberman (1957, 1967), Ladefoged (1961), Ladefoged, Draper and Whitteridge (1958), Ladefoged (1967) and many others. Despite the amount of work, however, it could hardly be said that scholars are in general agreement over the physical or acoustic correlates of salience in English. It is possible that the task in Welsh would be even more difficult, due to certain historical facts, mainly the "Accent-Shift" of the eleventh century. (For a brief description of the Accent-Shift, see below 1.3.2 - for
I references leading to a fuller description, see note 22).
Features like duration and pitch, for instance, which are frequently nominated as salience correlates in English, do not work in very many cases in Welsh. It may even be that salience in Welsh can best be phonetically defined in a negative way e.g. non-duration, non-pitch, non-intensity etc.

One feature which presents itself as a phonetic cue for salience in Welsh is not, strictly speaking, a property of the salient syllable at all. This is the 'pitch peak', which occurs on any non-salient syllables which follow the salient syllable. In other words, a salient syllable is possibly perceived as such in terms of its position of occurrence i.e. before a pitch peak.\footnote{Some support for this view arises from some informal experiments tried with English-speaking (i.e. non-Welsh-speaking) staff and students at the Linguistics Department at Edinburgh University. When asked to nominate the salient syllables in a Welsh utterance, they would constantly choose the non-salient syllable which immediately followed the salient syllable. Presumably this was because that syllable carried a pitch peak, and they were seeking clues for salience in Welsh similar to those they would expect in English, viz. pitch. After a short period of tuition as to the identity of the salient syllable, the same people were consistently able to choose correctly, by their own admission, by choosing the syllable before the one they would normally choose.}

(For a fuller description of the pitch peak, see 1.3.2). It may be possible that other phonetic cues are at work also, but these I have hitherto been unable to find. Salience will be taken as a perceptually valid feature of Welsh rhythm in this work.
1.2.2. **Tone-group boundaries**

Each tone-group provides certain phonetic cues as to the location of its boundaries. Analysis of the data showed that these cues fall into three separate but potentially combinatorial categories:

1. **Pause-marker** (to be read as the phonetic category of 'pause' which demarcates the boundary of a certain tone-group and not as the phonetic cue which marks a category 'pause'. 2-3 are to be read likewise).

2. **Length-marker**.

3. **Pitch-marker**

The pause-marker normally co-occurs with the boundaries of large syntactic units, such as the sentence or the clause.

The length-marker on its own denotes cases where the final syllable of the tone-group is lengthened, so that there is no pause between posttonic and following proclitic/pretonic, such a potential pause having been filled (substituted) by the final lengthened syllable.

Both these boundary markers (pause and length) are well-documented features in other (English) intonation studies, and there is no need to go into them in detail here. The same is not true of the pitch-marker, however, which bears a crucial relevance to the theory outlined in this section.

1.2.2.1. **The pitch-marker**

The pitch-marker entails a difference in pitch level between the end of one tone-group and the beginning of another. The change in pitch can occur on a salient syllable i.e. at the beginning of a
foot, or on a non-salient syllable. If a salient syllable begins a foot which immediately follows the 'tonic foot' (i.e. the foot which has the tonic syllable at initial position), then the question is whether that foot constitutes part of the posttonic or the beginning of a new pretonic. For it to be part of the posttonic it must fulfill one of two conditions:

(a) it must continue at the pitch level reached by the last syllable in the tonic foot e.g.

\[ \text{Tonic ft.} \quad \text{Tonic ft.} \]

or (b) it must carry on the pitch direction displayed in the tonic foot in a smooth flow e.g.

\[ \text{Tonic ft.} \quad \text{Tonic ft.} \]

If it violates these conditions by being too great a step in the same direction (i.e. no longer smooth), or a step in the opposite direction, then it forms the first foot of the pretonic of the following tone-group e.g.

\[ \text{Tonic ft.} \quad \text{Tonic ft.} \]

The pitch-marker operates in the same way when it occurs on a non-salient syllable. In violating (a) or (b) above, the relevant non-salient syllable is taken as (part of) the proclitic of the following tone-group.
Whilst the occurrence of the pitch-marker alone i.e. not in combination with pause-or length-marker, on salient and non-salient syllables is acceptable (and frequently observed) within the framework adopted here, such would not be the case within Halliday's system. The occurrence of a pitch-marker on - and hence the location of a tone-group boundary before - a non-salient syllable would be at odds with his theory, for, according to that theory, a tone-group boundary must also be a foot boundary (Halliday, 1967, p. 19), which means that following the tone-group boundary we must have the element ictus which may be realized in terms of two possibilities:

(a) a salient syllable

(b) a silent stress

A silent stress (otherwise known as a "silent ictus", or a "rhythmic pause") is defined by Abercrombie (1968) as "a pause which fills a gap which would otherwise be filled by a stressed syllable" (p. 1) ("stressed" = "salient" in our terms). The silent stress is therefore a silent "beat", rather similar to the "rest" in music. One expects this beat, because, writes Abercrombie, "English, like most Germanic languages, is a language with ... a 'stressed-timed' rhythm - in nearly all its forms, at least .... In utterances in a language with stress-timed rhythm, the stresses tend to recur at approximately equal intervals of time - they are isochronous, provided that nothing extra-linguistic occurs to prevent this (such as forgetting what one is going to say next). A strong rhythmic beat is thus established, for both the speaker and those listening to him." (p. 1).

Welsh, as well as English, is a stress-timed language, and as such subject to this statement made by Abercrombie (and followed by Halliday - see below). It will be argued below, however, that Abercrombie's statement does not deal satisfactorily with the
In the case under consideration viz. the occurrence of a pitch-marker on, and the location of a tone-group boundary before, a non-salient syllable e.g.

(14) // .. oedd / Wil a / Dai yn / chwaree/ cricred 'na //

(aux) Will and Dai (asp) play cricket there

Will and Dai were playing cricket there

.. i / ail dim Ehy/deman //

to second team Ammanford

for Ammanford's second team.

(a) above is not possible since we have already stated that following the tone-group boundary we have a non-salient syllable.

(b) would be possible if either the pause-marker or length-marker co-occurred with the pitch-marker in each case of its occurrence on a non-salient syllable, for the silent stress could occupy either the pause or the lengthened syllable. 9 But what we are concerned with here is the rhythm of Welsh, and an alternative theory of "isochrony" will be presented. I would further suggest, albeit extremely tentatively, the basis of the suggestion being in the main no more than general observation, that the isochronous aspects of English can also be dealt with in a more satisfying manner within the theory presented below. This must remain a suggestion, however, until work of a data-based nature can bear it out.

8 (contd.)

cf. Abercrombie (1968) p.8. "Silent stresses may sometimes take a form which is not, strictly speaking, silent: the final sound of the preceding syllable may be prolonged over the space they occupy. This prolongation appears to be in free variation with silence, though it is more common with some people than others."

cf. also the characterization of the length marker in 1.2.2 where it is seen as substituting for a (potential) pause.
occurrence of the pitch-marker alone as a cue for tone-group boundary division before a non-salient syllable, and to postulate a silent stress for co-occurrence with a non-salient syllable constitutes a contradiction in terms (i.e. salient and non-salient at the same time).

Rather peculiarly, perhaps, Halliday's ideas on tone-group boundary division are contained in a footnote. We can do no better than quote it: "The fact that, since a tone-group boundary must also be a foot boundary, it does not ... coincide ... with the boundary of the clause is immaterial; it is always clear whether or not there is an equivalence of clause and tone-group. In any case, it must be insisted that the location of the tone-group boundary is a theoretical decision: the best description is obtained if a new tone-group is considered to begin at the foot boundary immediately preceding the first salient syllable of its tonic or pretonic, as the case may be."

We are mainly concerned with the three sections underlined.

To take the middle one first:

(a) "the location of the tone-group boundary is a theoretical decision" - this I take to mean that Halliday finds no phonetic cues for the insertion of a tone-group boundary.

---


11 My underlining.

12 As will become clear, I am concerned with the occurrence of the pitch-marker on its own. The pause- and length-markers are relatively obvious cues, and cause none of the problems that the pitch-marker above causes for Halliday's method of tone-group boundary division, mainly because a silent stress can occur at a pause- or a length-marked boundary.
and therefore needs to make an arbitrary decision which provides the most convenient solution to the problem, and this turns out to be

(b) "a new tone-group is considered to begin at the foot boundary immediately preceding the first salient syllable of its tonic or pretonic, as the case may be."

There are two serious problems here. Firstly, statement (b) is entirely circular, for a decision on the first salient syllable of the tonic or pretonic (as the case may be) of a tone-group inevitably involves the decision of where to place the boundary between that tone-group and the preceding tone-group. How can one tell that a given salient syllable begins the tonic or pretonic of a tone-group if you haven't already made the decision that it is a new tone-group, and not merely part of the posttonic of the preceding tone-group?

Secondly, this procedure seems to me not wholly consistent with Halliday's description of the tone-group as a "unit of information" (Halliday (1970)). Such a description is supported perhaps by the work of Laver (1970) and Boomer and Laver (1968), who, from their research into tongue-slips, where it was found that segmental interference resulting in tongue-slips rarely crossed tone-group boundaries, concluded that the tone-group was the "usual unit of neurolinguistic preparation" (Laver (1970) p. 69). Segmental slips nearly always involve the tonic syllable or the posttonic and "the typical slip involves interference from the tonic word before it is uttered" (Boomer and Laver (1968) p. 8). The conclusion

\[13\] See also p.2 of this thesis.
derived from this is that "the tone-group is handled in the central nervous system as a unitary behavioural act, and the neural correlates of the separate elements are assembled ... before the performance of the utterance begins" (Boomer and Laver (1968) p.9).

So the tone-group is a "unit of information", "the usual unit of neurolinguistic preparation", and "a unitary behavioural act", the first of which is Halliday's own description. Yet, if we look at the consequences of his decision to demarcate the tone-group boundary by the criterion stated in (b) above, which is clearly demonstrated in examples from his analysis of data, it is difficult to see the connection between tone-group and information unit:

(15) // oh per /haps /so //
(16) // I /don't think it /can be come to /think of it //
(17) // there's a /mother one in the /kitchen //
(18) there's a /space which says //


The tone-group begins on the first salient syllable which begins the tonic/pronotic, therefore the tone-group begins at points which turn out to be mid-phrase and even mid-word.

It would be unfair to imply though that Halliday considered the tone-group to be co-extensive with the information unit. A statement to that effect would entail a confusion of two levels: the phonological and the informational. "Each information unit is realized as one tone-group, in the sense that the information structure specifies the boundaries of the tone-group to within certain limits, its exact location being determined by considerations of phonological structure" (Halliday (1967b) p.202). A
perfectly fair statement, and one that perhaps reflects the relationship between the phonological unit two steps down the rank scale - the syllable - and the syntactic unit we know as a morpheme. A cursory examination shows no consistent correspondence between the respective boundaries of these two units - why then should we expect any such correspondence between tone-group and information unit? The fact must not be overlooked, however, that whilst the syllable and morpheme are arguably established units within their respective areas of phonology and syntax the information unit has no such linguistic status, and furthermore, given the lack of correspondence between it and the tone-group, no further criterion is supplied by Halliday for the identification and description of the information unit.

It seems that the reason behind this treatment of tone-group boundaries by Halliday is based on section (c) of his footnote (first piece underlined) - "the tone-group boundary must also be a foot boundary" - which in turn is based on his concept of the phonological hierarchy: tone-group, foot, syllable, phoneme in descending order.

"They are related taxonomically, as are the units of the grammatical rank scale: each one consists of one or more of the one below it. This therefore specifies a set of phonological constituent types parallel to, but not in one-to-one correspondence with, those of the grammar; .. (see Halliday, 1961 - MR). Thus, each tone-group consists of one, or more than one, complete foot; and so on throughout" (1967a: p.12). By this token, a unit cannot cross the boundary of the unit on the scale above it, so
that, with relevance to the present discussion a foot may not cross, or contain, a tone-group boundary. Each tone-group boundary must therefore also be a foot boundary. But what then of the case of the pitch-marker operating alone as cue for a tone-group boundary on a non-salient syllable? If we re-iterate (14) as an example:

(14) //.. oedd / Wil a / Dai yn / chwarae /criced 'na //

(aux) Will and Dai (asp) play cricket there

Will and Dai were playing cricket there for

.. i /ail dim Rhy/daman //

to second team Ammanford

Ammanford's second team.

we see that the non-salient syllable "i" at the beginning of the second tone-group must fall between two salient syllables "cric" and "ail", so that the tone-group boundary would occur mid-foot. At least, such would be the critical viewpoint of the Hallidayan system; and for followers of that system the tone-group boundary would have to occur at one or other of the foot boundaries (i.e. before "cric" or "ail"). So in adopting the pitch-marker on the non-salient syllable as a cue for the tone-group boundary, are we in fact violating the rules of the phonological hierarchy as stated by Halliday in the extract quoted above, by having a tone-group boundary fall mid-foot? Not at all - the phonological hierarchy is here accepted as a valuable notion along with the conditions of its operation such that each unit contains one or more complete units on the level below it. So that when the pitch-marker alone operates on a non-salient syllable as a cue for tone-group boundary division,
we place a foot boundary there as well as a tone-group boundary. 14

What we seem to have then is an approach which presents an alternative system of tone-group boundary division to Halliday—perhaps with the advantage of an observably closer connection between tone-group and information unit: in the data studied, the tone-group boundary as demarcated by the pitch marker was seen in nearly all cases to coincide with the boundaries of elements of clause structure, (everyday observation suggests a similar procedure at work in English cf. the consequences of Halliday’s system, see p.14) but with no serious incompatibility as far as the basic theory goes. However, this situation of compatibility is undermined when we take into account a feature of the rhythmic system in Halliday’s theory, which follows the statement of Abercrombie’s in note 8: "The foot is characterized by phonological isochronicity" (Halliday (1967) p.12). This is to say that each foot is characterized thus throughout the utterance, provided, presumably, the tempo is constant and there is no extralinguistic interference (cf. Abercrombie (1968) in note 8). The implications of this claim of isochrony as a property of the utterance for the theory presented here and especially in respect of the operation of the pitch-marker alone on a non-salient syllable will now be examined.

14 In such cases, the foot following the tone-group boundary will differ from other feet, in that it will not have the element "ictus". It is taken to be a "defective" foot, and is signalled by the diacritic ... appearing before it, which means that the following syllable is non-salient. In the absence of this diacritic, the syllable following the tone-group boundary, which is also a foot boundary, is taken as salient.
Let us look again at (14)

(14) // oedd/ Wll a/ Dll ym/ crricd 'ns/

(aux) Will and Dai (asp) play cricket there

Will and Dai were playing cricket there for

‡ i / aill dim Ehy/daman //

to second team Ammanford

Ammanford's second team.

Since the pitch-marker (‡) entails a tone-group boundary; and since a tone-group boundary entails a foot boundary; and since that foot boundary would fall between two salient syllables, "cric" and "ail", before one of which in Halliday's system there would occur a tone-group boundary; and since there is no possibility of a silent stress between those salient syllables (the pitch-marker, we have said, is here, for the sake of argument, operating alone); since, then, the two salient syllables on either side of the pitch-marker are, according to Halliday's system, in a rhythmic relationship of isochrony with the other salient syllables in the utterance, a foot boundary occurring between them would not be tolerated as this would destroy isochrony.

We seem to be faced, then, with a number of options of the type: "take any two out of three, but not all three". These are:

(a) abandon the pitch-marker as a criterion for tone-group boundary division, and keep the notions of the phonological hierarchy and isochrony of the utterance;

(b) abandon the phonological hierarchy (or at least the idea that a unit cannot contain a boundary of the unit above),
and keep the pitch-marker and the notion of isochrony as a property of the utterance;

(c) abandon the notion of isochrony as a property of the utterance, thus keeping the pitch-marker and the phonological hierarchy.

In opting for (a), we would be ignoring a consistent phonetic occurrence which demands explanation within a linguistic system. We are left with (b) and (c). In other words, we accept the pitch-marker as a cue for tone-group boundary division, but have to abandon either the phonological hierarchy or the notion of isochrony as a property of the utterance. Our decision will be based on which option gives us the stronger phonological statement with especial reference to the relevant phonetics. There is no doubt that option (a) will satisfy us in this respect, for we account for the phonetics with the pitch-marker, whilst making a tenable phonological statement regarding foot and tone-group boundaries. What though of option (b)? Again, we account for the phonetic cue of the pitch-marker, but what of the phonetics of isochrony?

Many people have been unhappy with the notion of isochrony as a property of the utterance. Crystal (1969) states: "If one means by isochrony a direct perception of regular beats of prominence running through all the utterances of an individual, then English is not isochronous: careful measurements plus elementary statistics shows such regularity to be the exception, not the rule." (p.162). Classe (1939) and O'Connor (1965), reach similar conclusions, as had Sweet and A. J. Ellis before them. Obviously uneasy with an unqualified dismissal of isochrony, Classe argues that it does exist.
as the basis of the rhythmic system of English, "although, frequently, it only remains as an underlying tendency of which some other factor at times completely obliterates the effects" (ibid p.90).

Halliday's view of isochrony is that it is phonological; i.e. he does not claim metronome-like exactitude in the onset of salient syllables. But, what range of variation in phonetic characterization can be tolerated without invalidating phonological status?

The evidence suggests that, taken over the utterance, the notion of isochrony is not an acceptable one - certainly not phonetically, and perhaps with too many irregularities of too great a magnitude for its acceptance as a phonological process either. This has been the conclusion of many people who have studied English rhythm, and was the inescapable conclusion I reached on analysing the Welsh data.

On the basis of this evidence, we accept option (c): we abandon the notion of isochrony of the utterance, and accept the phonological hierarchy, and the pitch-marker as a cue for tone-group boundary division. However, we have a further decision to make, concerning isochrony. Do we:

(1) dismiss the notion that isochrony has any valid linguistic status

or

(2) accept isochrony as a feature of the rhythm, but place constraints on the unit within which it operates: in other words, accept isochrony, but dismiss the utterance as its domain.
(1) is rejected on the grounds that it leaves without explanation the regularities which do occur: for instance, the regularities in the onset of salient syllables over certain stretches of the utterance: the compression of varying numbers of non-salient syllables within different feet in order to preserve this, albeit inconsistent, regularity. Such rhythmic features would be difficult to account for without some notion of isochrony. We are left then with (2), which, if we opt for it, leaves us with the task of positing a unit other than the utterance which can function as the domain of isochrony. Bearing in mind the need for phonetic relevance, it was found, on close scrutiny of the data, that the best description was obtained if the tone-group was taken as the phonological unit within which isochrony operated as a feature of the rhythm. In other words, within the rhythmic system of the dialect of Welsh spoken in the Llanelli/Amman Valley district of Dyfed, the domain of isochrony is taken to be the tone-group. Support for this view was seen when an electrokymogram (see note 2) was taken of the utterance.

// ... and paid a/twli'r / buwch i ffrwdd //
but don't throw the bucket away
But don't throw away the bucket,

.. nes bo' dy / dad wedi cael/a sael arno fe //
until (aux) your father (asp) get hold on it
until your father's got hold of it.

15 I would further suggest that such an approach could be applied to other dialects of Welsh, and English also. Of course, this suggestion remains very tentative until work of a corpus-based nature justifies its usefulness. Here everyday observation is not sufficient.
The intervals between the salient syllables (i.e. the length of the feet) were measured as follows:

Tone-group 1: 'paid' + 'twli'r' = 0.38 seconds

'twli'r' + 'bwced' = 0.39 seconds

Tone-group 2: 'dad' + 'gafael' = 0.70 seconds

Between 'bwced' (final salient syllable of tone-group 1) and "dad" (first salient syllable of tone-group 2) = 1.22 seconds.

It can be seen that the intervals between the feet in the first tone-group (0.38 sec. and 0.39 sec.) differ a good deal from the interval between the feet in the second tone-group (0.70 sec.), and the interval is even greater between the adjacent salient syllables of each tone-group (1.22 secs.). Results of this/persuasive in rejecting any claim regarding isochrony of the utterance. Equally, they support the claim that isochrony operates within the tone-group.

On the other hand, it does not follow that intra-tone-group rhythmic consistencies of this nature happen all the time. What is suggested here is a perceptual isochrony, as opposed to a consistently measurable phonetic isochrony. The listener is then able to make allowances for factors such as wide variation in the number of syllables making up each foot in the tone-group, and possibly variation in syllable structure. Other eventualities for which similar allowances may need to be made would include extralinguistic phenomena such as hesitations, coughs, sneezes etc.

Advantages of this approach can be seen in the emergence of a further criterion for the identification of tone-groups i.e. what we earlier referred to as the rhythm-marker. If we adopt the view that
the tone-group operates as the domain of isochrony, then rhythm becomes a relevant feature in distinguishing tone-groups. We apply the rhythm-marker for the purposes of a statement to the effect that a series of salient syllables whose incidence is within regular rhythmic sequence of each other (i.e. which are isochronous) will constitute (part of) a tone-group, provided that a tone-group boundary (based on other cues) does not intervene.

This statement needs amplification. The rhythm-marker is seen as a criterion for the identification of the presence of a tone-group, and obviously not as a criterion for the location of a tone-group boundary. For the actual boundary location we look to pause-, length- or pitch-markers.

Application of the rhythm-marker will obviously result in a more delicate statement than just saying there is a tone-group boundary somewhere between the tonics. If all we have in a given utterance is a couple of tonics separated by non-salient syllables or nothing, then there is not much of a problem, certainly nothing the rhythm-marker can help solve e.g.

(19) // a’th / frawd // boyd //

and your brother too

And your brother, too.

But when a pretonic enters the picture, it gets a little more difficult, and the difficulty increases as the pretonic lengthens; and if a preceding posttonic has to be taken into account as well, and that posttonic also contains salient syllables, then the statement about the boundary lying somewhere between the two tonics doesn’t really get us very far e.g.
The statement that the tone-group boundary lies somewhere between "'na" and "frawd" is not excessively helpful in (20). From a procedural point of view then, we may use the rhythm-marker as a kind of primary yardstick in distinguishing the approximate area of division. In (20), we have one series of isochronous salient syllables in 'beth', "ddi(ar)" , "'na", "cre(fydd)" , and another series of isochronous salient syllables, though not in the same rhythmic sequence as the preceding one, in "dyn", "lladd" and "frawd". On the basis of the rhythm-marker, then, we assume that between these two sets of regular beats (i.e. between "cre(fydd)" (the last of the first series) and "dyn" (the first of the second series), there is a tone-group boundary. We then look to one of the phonetic cues (pitch-, length-, pause-marker) to determine the location of the boundary.

If we accept the tone-group as the domain of isochrony, we do not necessarily preclude the possibility of two or more consecutive tone-groups (their boundaries demarcated by pitch-markers, for instance).
having their salient syllables fall at regular intervals. Investigations suggest this rarely to be the case, however, and instantiations of it are considered "accidental", so that faced with such an instantiation there is no need to posit a unit larger than the tone-group which operates as the domain of isochrony. However, the possibility of such rhythmic regularity between the constituent feet of consecutive tone-groups, although rare in occurrence, indicates the need for a careful procedural standpoint in analysis, to the effect that the search for markers must not be confined to areas of rhythmic irregularity.

In many cases, the post-tonic would seem to be immune to the internal isochrony of the tone-group. If a tone-group has a long post-tonic (which is relatively rare, inasmuch as the tonic word is the last lexical item in the tone-group 80% of the time), that post-tonic need not necessarily conform to the rhythmic regularity of the rest of the tone-group, whether it contains salient syllables or not. That is to say, if a tonic syllable is followed by a series of non-salient syllables, then that "tonic foot" may be a fair amount longer than those of the pre-tonic. This does not mean that the tonic syllable is "out of beat" with the salient syllables in the pre-tonic, but just that the length of the tonic foot may be greater than those feet in the pre-tonic. If a tonic syllable is followed by one or more salient syllables at post-tonic, these do not have to (i.e., they may or may not) conform to the rhythm set up by the pre-tonic (and tonic syllable) of that tone-group. Why this should be so need not concern us here. One could speculate that given a strong link between the phonological rhythmic system and the system of information
focus (for which there appears to be a case, considering the possibility of "secondary prominence" at pretonic with a normally non-salient syllable (e.g. pronoun, verbal auxiliary) receiving salience for informational purposes (see 6.1.2) since the posttonic consists in the main of given information (see 5.3), the constraints imposed upon it by the rhythm may be relaxed. In any case, the possible immunity of the posttonic from the isochrony of the tone-group poses no real problem for the approach outlined here, since procedurally all cues (markers) have to be considered.

2. **The internal structure of the tone-group**

We have already diagrammatically represented the structure of the simple tone-group as follows:

(Proclitic) (Pretonic) Tonic Syllable (Posttonic)

with the tonic syllable having compulsory status as a basic requirement, and the elements in parentheses optional. The tonic syllable, and its relationship with the 'deep' information focus, will be dealt with in some detail in Part II of this work. The other elements have been briefly defined above (1.1); we shall now discuss them in a little more detail.

2.1. **Proclitic**

The proclitic consists of any non-salient syllables at the beginning of a tone-group which are not preceded by a salient syllable within that tone-group. We mentioned earlier that Halliday's approach held an important restriction on the occurrence of these syllables, and although using the term proclitic in the description, does not recognize it as constituting an element of structure. This
was because, in Halliday's approach, a tone-group boundary had to be a foot boundary also, and a foot had to begin with the element ictus. Therefore, if there was no pause- or length-marker as a boundary cue thereby allowing a silent stress to realise the element ictus, the tone-group boundary went to a salient syllable, thus keeping intact the phonological hierarchy as viewed by Halliday. In the approach set out in 1.2.2 above, recognition of the pitch-marker, and the tone-group as the domain of isochrony, removed this constraint imposed by Halliday's approach, but nevertheless allowed us to keep the phonological hierarchy by positing a "defective" foot - i.e. a foot without the normally obligatory element ictus. This defective foot realizes the element of tone-group structure we call "proclitic".

The proclitic may range from one to six or seven syllables in length. Items which appear there have normally non-lexical status, such as verbal auxiliaries, pronominals, conjunctions etc. i.e. words which would not be expected to receive salience other than for some specific reason (see 6.2.2). However, an interesting aspect of this concerns what Bolinger (1972) has called (semantically) 'empty' verbs (see 5.3.2 for a fuller discussion of this feature from the point of view of focal behaviour). Certain verbs which appear at the beginning of the tone-group may be seen as semantically

---

16 Halliday's approach also made use of a defective foot, but restricted its occurrence to discourse-initial (or utterance-initial) tone-groups which did not begin with a salient syllable. The need for such a restriction disappears within the theory outlined in this work.
'empty' or not, depending on whether they occur at proclitic or protonic - whether, in fact, they receive salience or not. 17

Let us take as an instance the frequently used verb "mynd" (go), the first person plural number past tense of which is "aethon" (we went).

In (21) it is non-salient and occurs in the proclitic; in (22) it is salient, beginning the first foot of the protonic:

(21) // .. 'na / fe // .. aethon ni / lawr i'r / "Tenby" //

That's it, we went down to the Tenby.

(22) // .. oedd dy / gar / weds / torri lawr //

Your car had broken down,

.. so / aethon ni i Peny/hanc //

so went we to Peny/hanc.

As with most things semantic, the difference is very difficult to explain: what follows is an attempt at such an explanation. In (21), which is part of a reminiscent narrative, where the speaker is recalling things done and places visited on a weekend sometime previous, "aethon" (we went) occurs frequently, as would be expected in this context, but as a kind of preamble or introduction to the destination. In (22) the situation is slightly different:

---

17 This is almost a mirror image of what takes place with similar items at the other end of the tone-group i.e. at the tonic syllable and at protonic; the whole process comes under the general heading of Relative Semantic Weight.
'going' is a direct result of the car breaking down (there is a scrapyard in Penybanc), and not a predictable verb merely preceding the more significant destination. This being the case, "sethon", no longer being semantically empty, receives salience, and begins the proclitic of that tone-group.

There is normally no pitch variation within the proclitic, all syllables being more or less on the same pitch level. Pitch variation may occur, however, in one of two situations:

(a) "Emotional" speech. This approximates to the secondary prominence function expounded by the marked pitch peak at proclitic (see 4.3.2 and 6.2.1), where one or two syllables of the proclitic will be on an appreciably higher pitch level than the preceding proclitic syllables e.g.

(23)

| .. 'ruyt ti'nThe
| an esmyth u ffernol ti'n | gybod |

are you (asp) restless hellish you (asp) know

You're hellish restless, you know.

The higher pitch level of "an(esmyth)" in the proclitic, probably along with other cues like phonation type, articulatory setting, facial expression, gesture etc., betrays a certain annoyance in the speaker's attitude.18

(b) Pitch assimilation. It was suggested above that tone-group boundaries nearly always co-occur with relatively high-level syntactic boundaries, like clauses or elements

---

18 That is, it does so in this particular case, from the writer's memory of it. The 'pitch peak' at proclitic is not confined to expressing annoyance. Much depends on accompanying para-linguistic features.
of clause structure. Once this relationship between tonality and syntax is established (see further 2.1), we take another look at the pitch-marker from the point of view of what we call 'pitch assimilation', i.e. where the pitch marker seems to fail to operate. Take the following examples:

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
(24) & \text{.. oen i'n} & chwaras & criced & i Ry daman \\
\hline
& & & & \text{\textup{(aux) I (asp) play cricket to Ammanford.}} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

I was playing cricket for Ammanford.

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
(25) & \text{.. oen i'n} & chwaras & rygbi & i Ls oalli \\
\hline
& & & & \text{\textup{(aux) I (asp) play rugby to Llanelli}} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

I was playing rugby for Llanelli.

In (24) and (25) we have the same syntagma of elements of clause structure (SPOA) with the two tonics in each example going to the same elements 0 and A. Somewhere between these two tonics there must be a tone-group boundary. In (24) we have a pitch-marker on "i" (to) which as expected places the tone-group boundary between the elements of clause structure 0 and A (as opposed to placing it within an element or even within a word, as Halliday's approach frequently does):

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
(24a) & \text{.. oen i'n / chwaras / criced /.. i Ry/daman /} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

In (25), however, we have no pitch-marker in the expected place, the pitch level of "i" (to) being the same as the end of the rise on "(rug) bi" (rugby). We persist, however, in the absence of phonetic cues here and elsewhere, in placing the tone-group boundary
between the elements 0 and A, basing our decision on the consistency of co-occurrence between the boundaries of tone-groups and elements of clause structure:

(25a) // .. oen i'n / chwarse / rygbi // .. i La/nelli //

The absence of the pitch-marker is then put down to 'pitch assimilation', where the pitch level of the first syllable in the proclitic has assimilated to the pitch level of the final syllable in the preceding posttonic. This feature was found in the data to co-occur most frequently when the final syllable of the preceding tonic was open (ended in a vowel) and the first syllable of the proclitic began with a vowel. These vowels do not have to be identical for pitch assimilation to take place, although in cases where they are identical (as in (25)), pitch assimilation is very likely.

Given an example of pitch assimilation as in (25), where both syllables of the proclitic have assimilated to the pitch level of the end of the posttonic, it is nearly always noticeable that the next salient syllable (tonic or proclitic) will be on a different pitch level. It is also possible, however, and this returns to our original point, that pitch assimilation may result in pitch variation within the proclitic. In cases of pitch assimilation, the first syllable of the relevant proclitic will always assimilate; the same may not be true, however, of any syllable(s) which follow in that proclitic. They may take a different pitch level, assuming as it were the function of pitch-marker for that particular tone-group.19 It may be easier to demonstrate this in three

19 This is a phonetic, not a phonological, statement, i.e. although the difference in pitch may be on the second syllable of the proclitic, the actual tone-group boundary is still placed before the first syllable which has been assimilated.
separate steps, using different versions of (25) as our examples:

I Pitch marker as normally used:

(26a) .. oen i'n chwarae rygbi i La nelli

II Pitch marker entails tone-group boundary:

(26b) .. oen i'n chwarae rygbi ..i La nelli

III Pitch assimilation of first syllable in proclitic of second tone-group, but second proclitic syllable holding the pitch level of a pitch marker had pitch assimilation not taken place:

(26c) .. oen i'n chwarae rygbi .. i La nelli

The proclitic tends towards a pitch level around the middle of the voice range, occurring as a rule below the onset of a stepping or leval prontonic (see 1.3.2), above the onset of a rising prontonic, below the onset of a falling tonic syllable (if there is no prontonic), and above the onset of a rising tonic syllable.

It has often been questioned whether the proclitic can add anything in the way of meaning to a tone-group. Ceinwen Thomas (1967) in her preliminary study of Welsh intonation states that normal proclitic (she uses the term 'pre-head') adds no meaning, but that those on a high level can add greater emphasis to the "tune". If we take this to mean that a high level proclitic can function as a
device to help expound the speaker's attitude, then it would seem
to be true. See, for example, (23), and the following:

(27a)  

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c}
.. & y & ty & coch \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

in the house red

In the red house?

(27b)  

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c}
.. & y & ty & coch \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

As was mentioned in the discussion of (23) the type of attitude
expressed depends for its interpretation upon other features - verbal
and non-verbal. The high-level proclitic is seen merely as a
rather versatile feature amongst these other features, in the sense
of its ability to help expound any attitude suggested by them.
Inasmuch as the type of proclitic in (27b) (what we have been
calling a 'normal' proclitic) could co-occur with an attitudinally
neutral utterance, we may call it an unmarked form of the proclitic.
Against this background, the high level proclitic is seen as a
positive choice made for some specific purpose such as attitude
exponence, and will therefore be known as the marked proclitic. In
(27b), for example, the presence or absence of some such attitude
category as surprise or anger will not be signalled in any way by
the proclitic which is in this case unmarked. In (27a), however,

\footnote{Insofar as such a thing is possible - attitudinally neutral is
is here viewed in a negative way e.g. not surprise, not anger,
not irritated etc. It is realized of course that not being a
lot of things still constitutes an attitude ipso facto. Never-
theless we shall call this for convenience's sake "attitudinally
neutral".}
the proclitic is marked, signalling the presence of some emotion on
the part of the speaker which relies for its actual exponence and
interpretation on the presence of accompanying paralinguistic
features like facial set, gesture, etc. and the surrounding con-
text, both linguistic and situational.

2.2. Protonic

The protonic comprises the first salient syllable in the tone-
group and all the subsequent syllables up to but not including the
tonic syllable. Possibly the primary features of interest concern-
ing the protonic are the two ways in which items which occur there
can achieve secondary prominence:

(i) via salience - the item which receives salience
    receives secondary phonological prominence; this is
    seen as expounding secondary informational prominence
    (primary phonological prominence being equivalent to
    tonic value which expounds primary informational
    prominence - see Part II).

(ii) via the marked pitch peak.

Both these types of secondary prominence are dealt with in 6.2.
The pitch peak, however, has a strong bearing on the systemization
of the protonic and as such needs to be dealt with here.

Thomas (1967) suggests that the pretonics of Welsh (she calls
them “heads”) are of a more various nature than those of English.
An examination of the following examples would appear to bear out
her suggestion.

(28)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>train' r</th>
<th>&quot;breaks&quot; i</th>
<th>gyd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>try the breaks to all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Try all the breaks.
Speaking a foreign language.

She walked into the house.

Put your hand on the drum.

However, I would like to suggest that these tone-groups, along with the great majority of those in the data examined, can be placed into three basic categories, which may be termed, according to traditional terminology:

(a) **the stepping protonic**, where each salient syllable in the protonic (except of course the first) comes at a lower pitch level than the preceding salient syllable. 21

(b) **the level protonic**, where the salient syllables are on a level pitch. 21

(c) **the rising protonic**, where each syllable (salient and non-salient) is on a pitch level higher than the preceding one.

21 There is a possibility for variation at the first foot of the protonic, in that the first salient syllable may in fact be at a lower pitch than those following. In such a case, the stepping protonic must have the second salient syllable at a lower pitch level than the pitch peak of the first foot, and the level protonic must have the second salient syllable level with or lower than the pitch peak of the first foot.
On a re-examination of (28)-(31), we see that (28) and (29) fit category (a), (30) fits category (b), and (31) fits category (c). It is the behaviour of the non-salient syllables (at least in (28)-(30)) which seem to present the difficulty, and which possibly led Dr. Thomas to comment on the unpredictability of the pretonic in Welsh. There is an explanation, however, and it is found in diachronic terms - a historical phenomenon which has been assimilated into synchronic use. Such is the "pitch peak". The pitch peak can be summarily described as a residue, a 'leftover' on the final syllable of a polysyllabic word when stress was shifted from the final to the penultimate syllable around the eleventh century. Before this time, stress and pitch were co-occurrent on the final syllable; after the eleventh century, stress was moved to the penult, but the pitch peak remained on the final syllable. This phenomenon has been retained up to the present day and is now exploited in a modified form in a subtle interaction of stress and intonation. Although the pitch peak is explicable diachronically only in terms of its occurrence on the final syllable of polysyllabic words, its synchronic use is in no way thus confined. It

22 The hypothesis of the pitch peak as a residue of the accent-shift is put forward by Jones (1949), whilst that of the accent-shift itself and its mechanics can be found in Jackson (1953) p.265ff., p.664ff., p.682ff. There seems to be a measure of disagreement among scholars as to the actual time of the accent shift (Watkins (1972), for instance, puts it in the ninth century; Jackson's (ibid.) arguments for putting it in the eleventh century are on pp.685-7), but this need not concern us.
can, for instance, be continued from the final syllable of a poly-
syllabic word to all the non-salient syllables within that foot:

(32)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>.. no ddylywch an y</th>
<th>gwaith</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

think of the work

Think of the work!

In fact the presence of a polysyllabic word (or part of one) is not at all necessary (historically, has become unnecessary) for a pitch peak to occur:

(33)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>beth ar y</th>
<th>ddaear ydych chi'n</th>
<th>gwneud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

what on the earth (aux) you (asp) do

What on earth are you doing?

In short, the pitch peak may occur on the non-salient syllables of any foot in the pretonic. The pitch peak may now be said to be the norm, in that it is a much more frequent occurrence than having the non-salient syllable on the same pitch level as the salient syllable which begins the foot. If the pitch peak is the norm, how then can it function as a means of secondary prominence at pretonic? This it does by reaching a peak higher than usual. The normal, non-prominent pitch can be intralinearly demonstrated in (34).

(34)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>.. a oen i</th>
<th>llathen o'i</th>
<th>fiaen e'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and was I yard of his front him

And I was a yard ahead of him.
The way it occurs in the data on which this work is based, however, is somewhat different:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
(34a) & \text{a oen i} & \text{llathen o'i} \\
& \text{flaen e'} & \\
\end{array}
\]

The pitch peak here is much higher than in (34), making "llathen" (yard) more prominent, the speaker wishing to emphasize the distance by which he beat his friend in the race. This we call, following Labov and Waletzky (1967), "self-aggrandisement". For further discussion, see 6.2.

2.3. Posttonic

Possibly the main feature of the posttonic is its potential deviation in terms of rhythm from the rest of the tone-group. It is not bound by the rule of isochrony which, it was suggested, operates with the tone-group as its domain (see 1.2). A possible reason for this potential deviation was given in terms of a strong link between rhythm and information. In view of the fact that the information which appears at posttonic is frequently "given" (see 4.2.1, 5.3, 5.3.1), it was proposed that this relaxed the rhythmic constraints of isochrony which apply to the rest of the tone-group where information is rarely signalled as given.

It was on the grounds that it frequently contained given information that the posttonic was granted the status of element of tone-group structure in this work. If it were considered merely as part of an element "tonic" which comprised everything from the tonic syllable up to the end of the tone-group (as is the case with Halliday's approach), then that 'tonic' at the phonological level would at the corresponding informational level contain both given and
new information (the 'tonic word' - or more precisely the 'focal item' - always constituting new information; see 4.2.1), which fact would not ease description at the informational level.

Halliday's decision to adopt the tonic element which included what are here known as the tonic syllable and posttonic was made on phonological grounds viz. once the choice of tone has been made having its point of origin at the tonic syllable, no further selection from the tone system could be made within that tone-group. Such is the view of this thesis also - the decision to adopt the posttonic as an element of tone-group structure was made on the grounds that it would facilitate description at the informational level.

It is possible however that rather too little is made of the posttonic in terms of its role in tone exposition and identification. In the section on Tone (Part III), the phonetic description of each tone makes it clear that the posttonic plays a large part in certain expositions of at least three phonetically separate pitch movements - the rise, the fall and the rise-fall. Halliday's statement: "the pitch movement of the tone selected falls largely on the first foot syllable of the first/of the tonic (i.e. tonic syllable - MR) this syllable being almost always by itself sufficient to permit the tone to be identified correctly." (Halliday (1967) p.13) most certainly does not apply to Welsh, for in many cases the short tonic syllable is on one pitch level with no movement at all, and the tone depends for its identification on either the difference of pitch between the tonic syllable and the posttonic, or the pitch movement displayed by
a syllable or syllables in the posttonic, or both. Whether or not Halliday's claim is accurate regarding English is not strictly the business of this thesis. 23

23 I have, however, frequently heard a rise-fall in English realized as follows, (represented intralinearly):

// in the city //

where the short tonic syllable "ci" has a level pitch, and the rising-falling tone relies for its identification both on the pitch difference between the tonic syllable and the posttonic (rise), and on the pitch direction of the posttonic (fall).
PART TWO

TONICITY

3.0. General

In the last section, we dealt with the way an utterance was divided into tone-groups, which comprised the phonological system of tonality. The boundary of each tone-group was demarcated by the phonetic cues of pause and/or length and/or pitch. It was further suggested that the tone-group was, as well as being the basic unit of intonation in Welsh, also a closely bound rhythmic unit, in that the salient syllables within the tone-group were described as being perceptually isochronous. This approach gave us a further criterion for the establishment of tone-groups (though not their boundaries) in terms of the rhythm-marker. The structure of the tone-group was described in terms of an obligatory tonic syllable, optionally preceded by a pretonic and/or a proclitic, and optionally followed by a posttonic.

The obligatory tonic syllable is the point of main phonological prominence within the tone-group, and its location makes up the system of tonicity, which is the subject of Part II. The tonic syllable achieves its prominence mainly by being the point in the tone-group where the choice from the system of tone is made. Once the selection of tone has been made at the tonic syllable, no further selections may be made in the remainder of the tone-group. ¹

¹ This statement applies to simple tone-groups, which provide the bulk of this analysis. There are also compound tone-groups in Welsh which have a secondary choice of tonic syllable following the main selection. These are briefly examined in 6.1.
3.1. **Marked and unmarked tonicity**

It is useful to recognise a marked and unmarked form of tonicity. Such a distinction is made on statistical grounds, and appeal will be made to syntactic categories in this respect. Analysis of the data showed that the tonic syllable was the lexically stressed syllable\(^2\) of the last lexical item in the tone-group around 80% of the time (cf. Crystal (1975) for similar results in English). Such cases will be categorised as examples of unmarked tonicity. Marked tonicity, therefore, will comprise the following locations:

(a) where the tonic syllable is the lexically stressed syllable of a lexical item which is not the final lexical item in the tone-group (henceforward to be known as a non-final lexical item):

---

2 In any Welsh word of more than one syllable, one of the constituent syllables will have the property of *lexical stress*. This is to say that, when a word of two or more syllables is uttered in isolation, one of the syllables will stand out as being salient. That syllable is taken to be the lexically stressed syllable of that word. It follows that stress, as referred to in this thesis, is a property of the lexicon. A lexically stressed syllable may be seen as the potentially salient syllable when the item of which it forms a part is contained in the utterance; but this is not to say that only that syllable which is stressed may be realised as salient. This is the reason for its specification as a condition for unmarked tonicity.

It may be thought that the term 'lexical stress' is unnecessary, and that 'stress' alone would suffice in terms of its definition above and its use in this thesis. This may be true. However, the term 'stress' is one which has understandably suffered from over-exposure under manifold guises. For this reason, I shall continue to refer to lexical stress where necessary in the hope that it will go some way to avoid confusion.
(1) mae a'n Gymraeg // achos bod a'n is it Welsh cause it

It's Welsh because it

cael i ddefnyddio yn Gymraeg //

get its use in Welsh

gets used in Welsh.

(b) where the tonic syllable is the lexically stressed syllable of a non-lexical item:

(2) mae / Hair / yn gweithio yn y bwthyn // (aux) Mary (asp) work in the cottage

Mary does work in the cottage.

(c) where the tonic syllable is a syllable which is not lexically stressed. For instance, whilst teaching Welsh as a foreign language, the author frequently found it necessary to correct students' reading of the orthographic symbol 'u', which in South Welsh has the quality [i] or [i̯]. This resulted in inevitable exchanges such as:

(3) A: rydw i'n / mynd i'r amgueddfa //³

(aux) I (asp) go to the museum

I'm going to the museum.

B: na // rydw i'n / mynd i'r amgueddfa

no (aux) I (asp) go to the museum.

No. (No appropriate translation).

³ 'Museum' in Welsh is "amgueddfa" realized as [amĝiðevə] with [əð] as the lexically stressed syllable. Confusion over the orthographic "u" lead to English learners of Welsh pronouncing the word [amĝiðoʊvə].
In (3)A, we have an example of unmarked tonicity. The tonic syllable in B is marked as specified in (c) above. This demonstrates why it is not enough to define unmarked tonicity as the location of the tonic syllable within the last lexical item. Both A and B in (3) by this definition would be examples of unmarked tonicity. However, only A is unmarked because the tonic syllable is the lexically stressed syllable of the final lexical item in the tone-group.

In order to state what determines the location of the tonic syllable, and thereby showing its function within the discourse, we must move from the phonological level (text) to the informational level (message), and study the system of information focus.

4. Information focus

In the previous section, we saw the phonological system of tonality expounding the informational system of information distribution. The way an utterance was divided into tone-groups was taken to signal phonologically the way a message (or that part of the message which corresponded to the utterance) was divided into IUs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>System</th>
<th>Superordinate unit within which system operates</th>
<th>System concerned with division of superordinate unit into</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phonological</td>
<td>Tonality</td>
<td>Utterance</td>
<td>Tone-group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational</td>
<td>Information Distribution</td>
<td>Message</td>
<td>Information Unit (IU)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We assume a similar approach to tonicity. Tonicity is a system on the phonological level which concerns the location of the tonic
syllable - the point of main phonological prominence - within the tone-group. Tonicity is taken to realize at the informational level the system of information focus, which concerns the location within the information unit of its informationally most prominent constituent. This can be diagrammatically represented thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>System</th>
<th>System concerns location of</th>
<th>Unit system operates in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phonological</td>
<td>Tonicity</td>
<td>Tonic Syllable</td>
<td>Tone-group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational</td>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Focal Information Constituent</td>
<td>Information Unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the phonological level, then, we have the tonic syllable as that element of tone-group structure which is phonologically most prominent. Corresponding to this, and expounded by it, at the informational level we have the focal information constituent which is informationally the most prominent element within the information unit. It must be immediately stressed, however, that there is no biunique relationship between these two - that is to say, the tonic syllable will not necessarily correspond exactly to the focal information constituent. This will become clearer in the ensuing discussion of focus.

4.1. The "information constituent"

The term "information constituent" means "a constituent of the information unit", in much the same way as the tonic syllable is a constituent of the tone-group. We now have a hierarchy of units on both phonological and informational levels, the former expounding the latter, though in no case is the relationship biunique:
Informational ---> Phonological

Informational ---> Text

Informational ---> Utterance

Informational ---> Tone-group

Informational ---> Element of tone-group structure

Informational ---> Tonic Syllable

Whereas the relationship between the tone-group and its elements of structure can be displayed on phonological/phonetic grounds, no such claims can be made for the relationship between the IU and its information constituents. No claim is therefore being made at this stage for the validity of the information constituent as a psycholinguistic entity. It is put forward as a formal unit at the informational level (which is equally formal), and will be intuitively delimited *ad hoc* by means of appeal to its exponent at the syntactic level, so that the focal information constituent (to which we will confine our interest in this work) may be realized by a word, a phrase etc. The smallest syntactic unit which can act as the exponent of a focal information constituent is the word—the word which contains or comprises the tonic syllable. Hence the non-biunique relationship between tonic syllable and focal information constituent.

4.2. Marked and unmarked information focus

The distinction between marked and unmarked tonicity was based on statistical grounds, on the fact that the tonic syllable was the

---

4 Although the boundaries of tone-group and IU are co-terminous, the IU is not understood solely in terms of the tone-group, in the same way that the message is not understood solely in terms of the text.
lexically stressed syllable of the final lexical item in the tone-group 80% of the time. A selection from the system of information focus, however, is considered to be marked or unmarked according to whether or not that particular selection involves what we will call a *discoursal presupposition*. Information focus is marked if it involves a discoursal presupposition, that is if a particular selection signals that information has preceded, or is to follow, in the discourse. In this respect, it plays a similar role to syntactic cohesive devices such as pronouns, articles etc. (see Hasan (1968), Hasan and Halliday (1976)), but care must be taken not to confuse where the responsibility lies (i.e. focal or non-focal) for a particular discoursal presupposition. For instance,

(4) // ... mae e'n / meddwl / chwarae //

(aux) he (asp) think play

He's thinking of playing.

In (4), the use of the alternative pronominal 'he' suggests that its referent may be derived from what has preceded or what is to follow in the discourse. However, it is the use of the pronominal alone which suggests this - the function of signalling the presupposition in this case is not achieved by the focal information constituent. Were we to replace the pronominal with a proper noun, there would be no discoursal presupposition:

(5) // ... mae / Will yn / meddwl / chwarae //

(aux) Will (asp) think play

Will is thinking of playing.

(5) could in fact be the initial IU in a discourse, focus in such cases being characteristically unmarked, i.e. involving no discoursal presupposition.
It is important to emphasize that the type of presupposition with which we are concerned is indeed a discoursal presupposition, and that this needs to be distinguished from other presuppositions of a semantic nature. (5) does contain semantic presuppositions (e.g. for the message to be meaningful the interlocutors would have to have the shared knowledge of who Will is, for instance), but it does not contain a discoursal presupposition i.e. no information is signalled as being derivable from some other part of the discourse, as was in (4) (via use of the pronominal), and as is in (6), (7) and (8) (via marked focal selections). Henceforward, when presuppositions are mentioned in this work, they will be understood as discoursal presuppositions, unless of course it is otherwise stated.

(6) // .. mæ / Wil yn / meddwl / chwarae //
   (aux) Will (asp) think play
   Will is thinking of playing.

(7) // .. mæ / e'n meddwl / chwarae //
   (aux) he (asp) think play
   He's thinking of playing.

(8) // .. mæ e / yn meddwl / chwarae //
   (aux) he (asp) think play
   He is thinking of playing.

(6), (7) and (8) are examples of selections from the system of focus which are marked. That is to say, the focal information constituents in (6), (7) and (8) all involve discoursal presuppositions. The way in which they do so will be discussed in some detail later in this work (5 - 5.3.3). For the moment, a brief description will suffice. In (6), the focal information constituent is realized by
the non-final lexical item 'meddwl' (think), and this specifies all that follows in the IU (viz. 'chwarae' (play)) as derivable from some other part of the discourse. The focal information constituent in (7) is realised by the pronominal 'e' (he), and this signals some other element is present in the discourse which is derivable by contrast with focal 'e' (e.g. "he's thinking of playing, but his friend isn't"). In (8), the focal information constituent is realised by an aspectual auxiliary (see 5.2.4.(2)), and this signals a contrast of polarity, for instance in reply to // nad 'dy e'n / meddwl / chwarae // (= he's not thinking of playing).

In examples (4) - (8), it is noticeable that where focus is unmarked ((4) and (5)), tonicity is unmarked also, and where focus is marked ((6), (7) and (8)), so is tonicity. It is in fact generally the case that unmarked focus is phonologically expounded by unmarked tonicity, and marked focus by marked tonicity - generally, but not always (see for instance 5.3.2). It is therefore safe to say that where the focal information constituent is realised by the final lexical item in the IU (or, possibly, by a larger syntactic unit, e.g. phrase, which contains the final lexical item in the IU), focus will be unmarked. It will therefore equally be generally true that when the focal information constituent is realised by either (a) a non-final lexical item (or a larger syntactic unit which contains it) or (b) a non-lexical item, focus will be marked, involving a discoursal presupposition of the type outlined above.

4.2.1. Given and new information

The focal information constituent will always carry new information.
New information is defined here as that information which is considered by the speaker to be non-derivable for the hearer from the context. This follows the approach set out in Halliday (1967). Halliday used both the terms 'non-derivable' and 'non-recoverable' to mean the same thing. The former term is preferred here as it avoids the possibly overbalanced anaphoric connotations of the latter. New information is taken as non-derivable from what has gone before or what is to follow in the discourse.

Information is treated as given by the speaker if he considers it to be derivable for the hearer from the discourse. The ways in which information achieves the status of given are discussed in 5.3.1.

As has been frequently pointed out by Halliday and others, new information need not only concern information which is factually new. It may do so, of course, and this is largely the case where the focal information constituent is realized by a lexical item. However, we opened this subsection with the suggestion that the focal information constituent always carries new information, and where the focal information constituent is realized by non-lexical items – pronominals, for instance – such items cannot really be said to carry factually new information. In what way, then, do we classify a focal information constituent realized by a non-lexical item as carrying new information? The answer to this cannot be too generalized and will be dealt with in some detail later (5.2.1 - 5.2.10), but a short example here will suffice as an indication. In the following exchange, a fishing trip is being arranged for early the following morning:
(9) A: // oo s / "petrol" yn dy / gar di //
   is petrol in your car you
   Is there petrol in your car?

B: // oo s //
   is
   Yes

A: // oo s / "petrol" yn dy / gar / di 'ta //
   will be necessity us go in your car you then
   We'll have to go in your car then,
   ayn ta' // oo ashos oo s di m / "petrol" 'da / fi5 //
   first cause is no petrol with me
   first, because I've got no petrol
   oo ym / hon //
   in this
   in this one.

It will be noted that the NP 'dy gar di' (your car) is textually
given from A's first utterance. This is not, however, a necessary
pre-requisite for the 'givenness' of prononials. Such items are
said to be 'inherently given' (Halliday (1967a)). Chafe (1974)
points out that pronominalization is, in the case of first and

5 This is an example of a compound tone-group, which contains two
tonic syllables 'pet' and 'fi'. Compound tone-groups crop up
quite regularly in the examples. The second tonic syllable is
always the point of origin for a rising tone, whilst the first
(major) tonic syllable may be the point of origin for a fall or a
rise fall. Compound tone-groups are discussed in 6.1.
second person inherent in any speaker/hearer situation, and in the case of third person, derivable endophorically (anaphorically or cataphorically) or exophorically from the discourse. How, then, do such 'inherently given' items carry new information? In the case under consideration, the new information conveyed by the focal 'di' is not the information carried by the item itself, but that that item rather than some other is the correct choice under the circumstances. Here, for instance, it is 'your car rather than my car because I don't have any petrol in mine'. A similar procedure will be seen to underlie many, but not all, other instances of non-lexical focus. Fuller consideration is given to this important point in a later section.

Although not incompatible with it, the characterization of new information as non-derivable for the hearer is preferred here to Chafe's definition of it as considered by the speaker as not being present in the addressee's consciousness:

"At any moment in a discourse, ..... the speaker cannot be ignorant of the fact that the addressee has certain other things in his consciousness. The speaker knows he is not introducing material from his own consciousness into an empty vessel, but that his task is to introduce things into a consciousness (the addressee's) which already has some context. The trick is to arrange the new material so that it will be readily assimilated within the material the addressee's consciousness already contains. The speaker must make assumptions as to what the addressee is conscious of, and transmit his own material accordingly. Virtually every sentence a speaker utters is a mixture of what, following Halliday (1967), I will call
GIVEN material, which the speaker assumes is already in the addressee's consciousness, and NEW material, which he assumes is not. As he converts this mixture into sound, the speaker does not treat the given and new material in the same way; typically, he will attenuate the given material in one way or another, e.g. by pronouncing the items that convey such material with lower pitch and weaker stress or by the attenuated specification or pronominalization of such items" (Chafe (1974) p.112).

Pronouncing the given material with "lower pitch and weaker stress" conversely implies that the new information will carry higher pitch and stronger stress. This we will take to correspond to the tonic syllable which phonologically expounds the focal information constituent. Preference for Halliday's term, 'non-derivable' has the (overt) attraction of avoiding the question of consciousness, although, strictly speaking, the implication of 'not present in the addressee's consciousness' is present in Halliday's term also. The difference between 'considered by the speaker to be non-derivable for the hearer from the discourse' and 'considered by the speaker as not present in the addressee's consciousness' must at the end of the day be considered minimal. What we are doing, then, is not denying the...

6 It is obvious from Chafe's reasoning and examples in his paper that this assumption cannot be consistently made, due to discrepancies between the system of intonation analysis followed by him and that outlined by Halliday which is followed in this work. For instance, Chafe includes in the material pronounced with high pitch what we recognise as pretonic. This inconsistency, however, can and will be waived, as in both approaches the basic theory holds.
notion of consciousness and its importance for the subject under
discussion, but simply (overtly) ignoring it at present as
inessential for the purposes of our own description, thus hopefully
avoiding a good deal of unnecessary behaviouristic argument, which
anyway is well beyond the scope of this thesis.

5. Marked information focus

Unmarked information focus does not involve a discoursal pre-
supposition. There may well be other elements, like those for
example of a syntactic nature, which involve cohesive relationships
with the rest of the discourse, but these cannot be taken into account
in the discussion of focus. When we say that unmarked focus is
neutral as regards presupposition, that unmarked focus is typically
the sort used in discourse initial position, we are restricting our
statement to the focus alone. In the actual case of discourse
initial IUs, one would expect other elements to be neutral to pre-
supposition also e.g.

(10) // .. mae / Mair wedi / dechrau / gwaith yn y / dre //
    (aux) Mary (asp) start work in the town

Mary has started work in town.

Given a cultural setting where such an utterance could occur
along with a relationship between speaker and addressee which
involves a common knowledge of the subject matter, nothing here (on
the linguistic level) is presupposed from a discoursal point of view.
That is to say, nothing need have preceded it and nothing need follow
it in the discourse in order for (10) to be perfectly acceptable.
There are no cohesive syntactic devices and no cohesive phonological
devices. Nothing is specified or implied as derivable. Focus and
everything else is neutral to presupposition.

(11) // .. mae hi / wedi dechrwi / gwaith yn y / dre //

(aux) she (asp) start work in the town

She's started work in town.

The situation changes slightly in (11), for a syntactic cohesive device is present in the shape of the pronominal 'hi' (she). This presupposes that the pronominal's referent is derivable, from the discourse. The presupposition, however, is the responsibility of the pronominal (and therefore of the syntax) - it is detached from the information focus, which remains unmarked and neutral as to presupposition. This is, as already mentioned, normally the case when the focal information constituent is realised by the final lexical item in the IU. (For exceptions, see 5.3.2).

IUs which have marked focus on the other hand will contain or imply information which is derivable from the discourse by virtue of the focus being marked. As with unmarked focus there may or may not be other cohesive devices present, but whether or not there are, if the focus is marked, a presupposition of one sort or another is involved. Focus is marked when the focal information constituent is realised syntactically by either:

(a) a non-lexical item
(b) a non-final lexical item.

Before discussing these in turn, we first examine a type of marked focus which is not included in either (a) or (b) above. This focus is phonologically realised when the tonic syllable is a syllable which is not lexically stressed.
5.1. Focus phonologically realized by a non-lexically stressed tonic syllable

This constitutes the rarest use of marked focus and is also the most easily explained. When the tonic syllable is not the lexically stressed syllable of the item in which it appears, the focus thus expounded involves a presupposition such that the existence of another element is implied, that element being derivable by contrast with the focal information constituent. This, as we shall see, is the normal implication of the contrastive focus as it operates with certain non-lexical items. We are here dealing with a special case of that operation whose use is more or less confined to a 'metalinguistic' context, i.e. talking about language. The 'contrast element' whose existence is implied by the marked focus is normally a closely related but slightly restructured form of the focal information constituent. If we recall example (3) - and also note 3:

(3) A: // .. rydw i'n / wynd i'r amgw/edd/wa // (aux) I (asp) go to the museum
I'm going to the museum.

B: // na // .. rydw i'n / wynd i'r an/guedd/wa //
No (aux) I (asp) go to the museum
No. (No appropriate translation).

The lexically stressed syllable of the tonic word in both A and B is 'edd'. In A, focus is unmarked and there is no presupposition. In B, focus is marked with the tonic syllable being the non-lexically stressed syllable 'gu', and this presupposes the existence of another element derivable by contrast with the focal information constituent, that element being 'amgweddwa' in A, basically the same item as that
which realizes the focal information constituent but pronounced wrongly. It will be recalled that the context was a Welsh evening class and the marked focus a device for correction.

(12) A: // beth ar y / gair 'na / nawr 'auntie' / Hannah //
what of the word that now Auntie Hannah

What about that word now, Auntie Hannah?

glywoch chi'r / gair / 'na // .. Caer/edin //
heard you the word that Edinburgh

Did you hear that word? Edinburgh.

nawrte // glywoch chi / 'na // 'na Cym/raeg i chi //
now then heard you that that Welsh to you

Now then! Did you hear that? There’s Welsh for you!

B: // .. yng / Ngaeredin wedais / i //
in Edinburgh said I

(No appropriate translation)

A: // .. yng Ngaeredin // nawrte //
in Edinburgh now then

In Edinburgh. Now then!

C: // .. yng / Ngaeredin //
in Edinburgh

(No appropriate translation)

B2: // .. yng / Ngaeredin // nagife //
in Edinburgh isn't it

(No appropriate translation).

The tonic syllable in B1, C and B2 is the first syllable of "Caeredin" (mutated) which is not the lexically stressed syllable. Focus is
marked as a device in this instance to distinguish the appropriate mutated form of the word. The implied contrast elements in each case are alternative mutated forms.

This type of focus raises the question of whether the focal information constituent can be realized by an entity smaller than the word. Such a step is here considered unnecessary. It is suggested that even in marked cases of the above nature, the focal information constituent is realized by the tonic word. The contrast between the phonologically prominent syllables is seen as a restructuring of the word, such that the information constituent is focussed in a particular way which draws attention to a certain part of it - that part being the one which receives prominence on the phonological level. The focussed information constituent in (3)B is realized by the item 'amquedd' in opposition to 'amquedd', and not 'gu' in opposition to 'gu'. In (12) the focal information constituent is realized by 'Caeredin' or rather which particular mutated form of the word is the correct choice under the circumstances. In fact, 'gu' and 'gv' would be rather difficult to explain as information constituents. This difficulty evaporates if we take the tonic word as realizing the focal information constituent, this particular type of marked focus functioning toward a certain structuring or restructuring of that word in opposition to alternative forms.

As we have opted for the syntactic level in realizing the information constituent, the only unit we can call upon smaller than the word is the morpheme. This leads to difficulties immediately because the tonic syllable may not always be a morpheme,
Bolinger (1961) refers to the type of marked focus we have been
discussing above as "contrastive stress". This is posited in
opposition to what he calls "contrastive accent", which overlaps
largely with some of our other types of marked focus. It must be
noted that neither of the terms "contrastive stress" nor "contrastive
accent" would be permissible within the theoretical framework
of this thesis, for they are phonological terms and as such can have
no property such as "contrastiveness". It is, however, quite
obvious what Bolinger is getting at, and his reasons for setting up
separate categories for "contrastive stress" and "contrastive
accent" are that "whereas contrastive stress implies contrastive
accent, the converse is not necessarily true". In other words,
when the tonic syllable is a syllable which is not lexically stressed,
the focus thereby expounded presupposes the existence of another
element which is derivable by contrast with the focal information
constituent, that element being closely related to but possibly a
slightly reconstructed form of the information constituent in terms
of their syntactic exponence. Marked focus, however, can involve
a contrastive presupposition in other ways which do not entail
realization via a non-lexically stressed tonic syllable. So that
whereas the marked form of tonicity where the location of the tonic
syllable is a syllable which is not lexically stressed will always
involve the focus in a contrastive presupposition, a contrastive
presupposition may be implied by the focus in other ways than by a
non-lexically stressed tonic syllable.

---

8 This is obviously not a criticism of Bolinger's point which is
evidently taken from a different point of view.
5.2. Marked non-lexical focus

The distinction between lexical and non-lexical items in Welsh has received very little attention. There is no intention in this work to explore such a distinction in any detail. What we are concerned with is the behaviour of certain items when realizing the focal information constituent. A trap one must guard against under the circumstances is that of circularity: it would be of little or no value to make a distinction between lexical and non-lexical items in order to examine their behaviour from an intonational point of view if what we are in effect doing is basing our distinction on that behaviour. It has been decided, therefore, to follow a fairly traditional viewpoint as regards the distinction, but hopefully presenting a flexible framework which will be adaptable to the conclusions of any further research in the area.

The main items with which we shall be concerned in this section of the thesis can be divided as follows:

Lexical: Nouns; lexical verbs; adjectives; adverbs.
Non-lexical: Pronominals; demonstratives; conjunctions;
verbal features (aux.; aspect markers;
negative particles etc.); prepositions.

Marked focus, then, as we have said, involves a discoursal presupposition. Exactly what kind of presupposition is involved is another matter. In the case of non-final lexical focus, the matter can largely be dealt with in terms of IU structure and the specification of certain information as given. That is to say, everything following the focal information constituent will be specified as given information, i.e. it will be considered by the speaker to be
derivable by the hearer from what has preceded or is to follow in
the discourse:

(13) A: // .. ond mae // pob // gair // Saesneg //--// pob gair
but (aux) every word English every word
But each English word ... each English

/ Saesneg wyt ti'n / def/nyddio // .. yn dy
English (aux) you (asp) use in your
word that you use in your Welsh,

Gym/raeg // ddim yn // Saesneg //
Welsh (neg) (asp) English
isn't English.

B: // na // .. mae "Latin" // .. a
no is Latin and
No, there's Latin, and ...

A: // .. o / na / na / na // dim / 'na beth fi'n
oh no no no not that what I (asp)
Oh, no, no, no. That's not what I

/ meddwl / nawr // .. mae e'n Gym/raeg //
mean now is it (asp) Welsh
mean, now. It's Welsh.

B: // achos mae e'n / cael ei ddef/nyddio
cause (aux) it (asp) get its use
Because it gets used in Welsh.

yng Gym/raeg //
in Welsh
In the final IU of (13), 'Cymraeg' (Welsh-mutated) is specified as given by virtue of the fact that the focal information constituent is realized by the preceding lexical item. It is in fact derivable from the preceding IU.

What we are concerned with in this subsection is the type of presupposition involved in non-lexical focus. Our basic standpoint will be that when the focal information constituent is realized by a non-lexical item, this will generally, though certainly not always, involve a contrastive presupposition. Marked focus in such cases has the function of implying the existence of another element in the discourse, that element being derivable by contrast with the focal element. For instance, we saw in (7), repeated below,

(7) // mae / e'n meddwl / chwaræ //
(aux) he (asp) think play

He's thinking of playing.

that the contrast could be glossed "he's thinking of playing, but we/they/his brothers etc. aren't" i.e. "he" vs. "we/they/his brothers" etc., whichever would be applicable in that particular part of the discourse. It must be emphasized, however, that the contrastive presupposition is a general feature of marked non-lexical focus. It is not always the case. Focal demonstrative pronominals for instance do not often display this feature (see 5.2.2(v)).

---

9 Some writers on English intonation have attributed this (contrastive) feature to all types of focus — lexical and non-lexical, marked and unmarked e.g. Armstrong and Ward (1956), Jones (1957), Schubiger (1958), Kingdon (1958).
generalization of this focal attribute (see note 9) is possibly due to some confusion over the notion of contrast, and it would be as well to discuss this notion before moving on to an examination of different types of non-lexical focus.

5.2.1. The notion of contrast is one which has wide use at all linguistic levels:

"The entire mechanism of language ... is based on oppositions ... and on the phonic and conceptual differences that they imply."

(de Saussure (1966) p.121).

Any linguistic choice made by the speaker stands in contrast or opposition to the other candidates for selection at that particular point, and is also understood in terms of such an opposition or contrast. Such a tenet is basic linguistics.

Let us now examine some of the ways in which the notion of contrast has been used in recent intonation studies.

"... only those grammatical items which operate clearly as members of a closed system ... permit a tonic contrast: the presence of tonicity then produces a semantic contrast between the marked item and some other member(s) of the same system". (Crystal (1975) p.24).

Crystal claims that the above rule explains the unacceptability of (14).

(14) // don't up/set your/self //
- "the grammatical item (yourself - M.R.) has no contrast with other items from its system (because of the form of the verb) and tonic placement upon it is therefore impossible". (ibid. p.24).

Yet I see nothing unacceptable about (15);

(15) // Up/set / him // by / all means // but / don't up/set your/self // .
If it is agreed that (15) is acceptable, then either we fit items like "yourself" (i.e. reflexives) into the same closed system as "him" (personal pronouns) or we extend the possibility of "a semantic contrast" outside the system which contains the focal item.

Halliday's approach is similar:

"Anaphoric items are inherently given in the sense that their interpretation depends on identification within the preceding text ... Reference items can, however, be structurally new, not only in reference to the situation ... but also when used anaphorically; in the latter case, 'new' is always to be interpreted as "contrastive", as contrary to some predicted or stated alternative". (Halliday (1967a) p.206).

"Marked focus may be focus on a reference or other closed system item, whether final or not, or on a lexical item which is not final; here what is structurally new is informationally contrastive, either ... within a closed system or lexically, and what is given tends to be anaphorically recoverable." (ibid. p.208).

El-Manoufy, who in the main follows Halliday, but presents it in an eminently clearer manner, suggests that marked non-lexical focus "is presupposing in that it implies information which is derivable by contrast with the focal item itself.

"The 'contrast' element, the fact that the implied information is "contrastive", is significant here. This is because it is the one general feature characterizing all types of non-lexical focus; and also because the fact that the contrast is with reference to non-lexical items, which formed closed "finite" sets, makes it possible to state precisely the meaning of the selection i.e. to be able to
specify what the focal item may imply by contrast without necessarily referring to its particular context and even when it is the only item in the IU." (El-Menoufy (1969) p.146-7).

In most intonation studies, 'contrastiveness' has stood almost alone as the sole alternative to the unmarked form of focus, to the extent that if a focus is marked, it is 'contrastive'. (cf. Halliday's extract above). This would be fine if 'contrastive' were merely a label under which it was agreed to accommodate all instances of focus which were not unmarked. In such a situation, 'contrastive' would be nothing more than an alternative way of saying 'marked' (not unmarked). This, however, does not seem to have been the case. Although few seem to have bothered to define the notion, the use of 'contrastiveness' in most intonation studies has carried with it the implications of the semantic content of what the word implies viz. contrast, opposition. Chafe, not happy with the view that contrastive information is new information, does not really clarify the position with the statement, "By such a view (that contrastive information is new - H.R.) one must say that what is added to the addressee's consciousness by the contrastive item is not, strictly speaking, the information contained in that item itself, but rather the information that THAT item rather than some other is the correct one." (Chafe (1974) p.118).

As exemplification Chafe uses:

(16) // I killed Cock / Robin //

"This", writes Chafe, "conveys the information that the addressee is assumed to have had several people in mind as probable agents of Cock Robin's death; the speaker is declaring who he knows to be the
correct candidate, in contrast to the alternative possibilities considered by the addressee." (ibid. p.117).

Going back to the nursery rhyme, we know that (16) was uttered in response to the question "Who killed Cock Robin?" What if the answer was instead,

(17) // John killed Cock Robin //.

Surely the conditions stated by Chafe pertaining to (16) still hold for (17). That is, the addressee has in mind several potential killers and the speaker declares who he knows to be the correct candidate. But would one now wish to add "in contrast to the alternative possibilities previously considered by the addressee" in this case. Contrastiveness hitherto has mainly been the responsibility of non-lexical focus (apart from the odd statement by Halliday quoted above). (17) above could be dealt with quite easily by saying that "killed Cock Robin" is specified by the marked lexical focus as given information and that "John" is factually new, the new fact being the introduction of the much sought-after identity of Cock Robin's murderer. Such an approach gains support from the fact that the given information in (17) could be attenuated:

(18) // John did //

There is no meaning difference between (17) and (18). The difference lies in the fact that the speaker has chosen to further attenuate the "action and goal" from the status of given information to an auxiliary substitute. (18) in fact has unmarked focus, "John" being the final lexical item in the IU. One does not wish to speak of contrastiveness when dealing with unmarked focus. (17) has marked focus merely because of the positioning of new information.
The presupposition involved is the specification of post-focal information as given — it has nothing to do with contrastiveness. Why then is (16) considered to be contrastive, when it conveys exactly the same type of information as do (17) and (18)? It seems that because the focal information constituent is realized by a non-lexical item — in this case the pronominal, — it is immediately branded contrastive: "I" as opposed to "you/he/others" etc. Why not "John" as opposed to "Bill/Arthur/Wilhelmina" etc. in (17) and (18)? We will return to this very shortly, as it approaches the problem of the use of the term "contrastiveness".

First, one must discuss the new information conveyed in
(16) // I killed Cock / Robin //.

As Chafe (1974) points out, in any discourse involving speaker and addressees, the pronouns "I" and "you" are bound to be given. In Chafe's terms, they are present in the addressee's consciousness — in our terms they are derivable from the context in terms of their referents: "I" = speaker; "you" = addressee. Therefore, in (16), "I" is given information, because its referent, the speaker, is observable in the situation.

However, that is only one aspect of the matter. I would not wish to dispute the fact that "I" in (16) is given in this sense. What is new about "I" in (16) is not only that he is the speaker and therefore given as such, but also that he is the perpetrator of Cock Robin's death and in that capacity enters the situation as factually new. "I" the speaker is given, "I" the killer is new. This approach puts (16) in accordance with the treatment of (17) and (18).
We now return to the subject of contrastiveness. Why, it was asked, should "I" in (16) be opposed to "you/he/others" etc. whilst "John" in (17) and (18) is not subjected to the same procedure viz. "as opposed to Bill/Arthur etc."? Further, "I" is in opposition to "you/he/John/Bill/the sparrow/Superman etc.". But now we are back with de Saussure's principle with which we opened this subsection:

"The entire mechanism of language ... is based on oppositions ...". Any choice of item made by the speaker is in opposition to the other choices he could have made in its stead, and is in fact understood by virtue of those oppositions. This applies to items both lexical and non-lexical. In "John killed Cock Robin", irrespective of focus, "John" is chosen in opposition to other actors and "Cock Robin" is chosen in opposition to other goals. In "I killed Cock Robin" the choice of agent is "I" in opposition to "John", but why should "I" be termed contrastive and "John" not when realizing the focal information constituent? Focus makes no difference to this sort of opposition. It seems that a confusion of usage is in operation.

The semantically based notion of contrastiveness as used in "contrastive presupposition" relating to cohesive devices in the discourse has been extended to the basic linguistic theory of opposition. Such a conclusion seems inescapable when one takes account of the following quotes from El-Menoufy's work regarding the focal behaviour of demonstratives:

"When focal demonstratives are situationally referential, the facts are more complicated, for they seem to imply contrast in some cases and not in others ... There seem to be other dimensions here on which the existence of contrastive implications depend."
... where the reference is situational but not so "immediate", all instances seem to be at least potentially contrastive." (ibid. p.163). "When cataphoric, a focal demonstrative does not seem to have contrastive implications, any more than it does when it has an immediate situational reference. But again, this is not necessarily the case in all instances."

"... all demonstratives are treated in the same way" (in El-Menoufy's approach). "The main reason is that implications of contrast do exist in most instances. I do not think it is unreasonable to suggest that such implications exist even in cases where the situational reference is "immediate" since the actual pointing or demonstrating implies the selection of a particular thing, to the exclusion of all others - an element which is present in the anaphoric use of the items too." (ibid. p.164).

So, "the actual pointing or demonstrating implies the selection of a particular thing to the exclusion of all others"; just as in "Did you see the news?" the articulation of "news" involves the exclusion of selection of that particular item to all others, such as other T.V. programmes, what was happening in the street, the caterpillar outside the window, etc.; just as in "are you coming to the match?" the articulation of "match" involves its selection to the exclusion of other possibilities, like "the dance/the pub/Venezuela" etc. Working on such a principle, EVERYTHING is contrastive, i.e. chosen to the exclusion of all else. At this level, focus is irrelevant.

For the notion of contrast to be of any valid use in the study of intonation, and especially focus, we must restrict it to the discussion of semantic and discoursal implications involved with certain
items when they realize the focal information constituent. Because a closed system item realizes a focal information constituent, it is not necessarily the case that the focus is contrastive. We do not wish to make the statement that if, for example, a pronominal realizes the focal information constituent, it follows that its presence is in contrast to other members of its set. What we are concerned with is the implications involved by a particular focus for the discourse in which it appears, and the semantic characterization of that implication. If a non-lexical focus involves a contrastive presupposition, the relationship between the focal information constituent and the element whose existence is implied by virtue of the focal information constituent must be seen to be "semantically" contrastive and not merely basically linguistic, so that the implied element (the contrast element) is derivable by contrast with the focal information constituent. This is the way in which the notion of contrast will be employed in the remainder of this work.

5.2.2. Pronominals

These are taken to include:

(i) Personal Pronouns: "(f)i" (I, me); "ti" (you)\textsuperscript{10}; 
"(f)e" (he, him, it); "hi" (she, her); 
"ni" (we, us); "chi" (you); 
"nhw" (they, them).

\textsuperscript{10} The second person pronominal in Welsh takes two forms, the "ti" type and the "chi" type, and their usage is akin to the "tu/vous" forms in French. "Ti" is always singular, and is generally used by friends to each other, adults to children etc. The "chi" form is always used when the referent is plural, but may also be used when the referent is singular, as some sign of respect e.g. child to adult, between strangers, to a superior etc.
(ii) Possessive Pronouns: "fy—(Head word)—i" (my);
"dy—(H)—di" (your); 10
"ei—(H)—e" (his, its);
"ei—(H)—hi" (her);
"ein—(H)—ni" (our);
"eich—(H)—chi" (your); 10
"eu—(H)—nu" (their).

(iii) Reflexive Pronouns: "(h)unan" or "(h)unain" after first element of possessive pronoun, thus:
"fy hunan" (myself);
"dy hwan" (yourself);
"ein huan" (ourselves) etc.

(iv) Indefinite Pronouns: "rhywun" (someone);
"rhyweth" (something);
"pobun" (everyone);
"pobeth" (everything).

(v) Demonstrative Pronouns: "hwn" (masculine) "hon" (feminine)
"hyn" (neuter) (this)
"hwnna" (m) "honna" (f) (that)
"rhein" (these)
"rheins" "rheini" (those).

(i) The general characteristic appertaining to a focal information constituent which is realized by a pronominal is that the discoursal presupposition involved is the implication of another element which is derivable by contrast with the focal information constituent.

Note that this is a general characteristic and NOT a rule under which
the focal pronominal\textsuperscript{11} must operate. The characteristic does not account for examples like the English one in (16), where the focal pronominal conveys factually new information. A similar process is at work in Max Boyce's humorous account of the time he found his car had been painted green outside a pub in Rhuthin, because he had made the mistake of ordering his drink in English during Eisteddfod week, when everyone must speak Welsh. On re-entering the pub after discovering the matter, he says

\begin{verbatim}
// pwy yw'r "Pi/casso" // pwy / wnaeth e' //
who is the Picasso who did it

Who's the Picasso? Who did it?
\end{verbatim}

whereupon "a bloke stood up in the corner, eight foot six, shoulders like tallboys, and tattooed across his chest - "Cymraeg". 'Fi wnaeth e', meddai fe." We take this reply as our example:

\begin{verbatim}
(19) // fi wnaeth e' //\textsuperscript{12}
I did it
I did it.
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{11} Terms such as "focal pronominal" will be used henceforward for the sake of brevity. In each case, what is in fact focal is a particular information constituent, which is realized at the syntactic level by, say, a pronominal. Likewise if a conjunction realizes the focal information constituent, the term "focal conjunction" may appear as a matter of convenience. This of course should be read "focal information constituent realized by a conjunction".

\textsuperscript{12} To complete the story, Max Boyce's understandably timorous reply to the paint-spraying giant was "Well, it's dryin' lovely."

Max Boyce: "Live at Treorchy." E.M.I. record label, No.0U2033, stereo OC 0540 05564.
The focal pronominal in (19) has no contrastive implications. No "contrast element" is implied which can be derived by contrasting it with the focal pronominal. Rather, "fi" (I), already given as speaker of the utterance, becomes new information as perpetrator of the artistic deed. The presupposition involved is the specification of postfocal 'wmaeth' (did) as given, derivable from the discourse.

Another example, from the data:

(20) A: // .. wel / nag oen i 'di / gweld nhw er/loed //
    well (neg) (aux) I (asp) see them ever
    Well, I'd never seen them.

    B: // cwrs bo' chi wedi / gweld nhw mam/gu / fach //
    course (aux) you (asp) see them grandmother little
    Of course you've seen them, dear Gran.

    A: // pryd //
    when
    When?

    B: // .. chi'n / cofio / amser gaeth / Mari/anne //
    you (asp) remember time got Marianne
    You remember when Marianne had

    .. ei / "twenty-/first" / lawr yn Lla/nelli //
    her twenty-first down in Llanelli
    her twenty-first down in Llanelli?

    .. chi'n / cofio'r / parti 'na / gawson ni //
    you (asp) remember the party that got we
    You remember that party we had,
'a'r / ferch 'na'n / canu //
and the girl that (asp) sing
and that girl singing?
A: // o // .. y / hi oedd hi //
oh she was she
Oh! It was her?
"hi" (she) is derivable from what has preceded, in that the referent
was discussed in the role of the wife of a friend. It is focal in
the final IU because it conveys new information as "hi" in the role
of singer.

Attitude can provide another instance where a focal pronominal
need not involve a contrastive presupposition:

(21) A: // .. wyf i'n / aros i / "Katie" //
(aux) I (asp) wait to Katie
I'm waiting for Katie.

B: // "Katie" // pam ydych chi'n / aros i / hi //
Katie why (aux) you (asp) wait to her
Katie! Why are you waiting for her?

Now, whether focal "hi" in (21) involves a contrastive presuppo-
sition (i.e. whether another element is implied, derivable by
contrast with it) depends on the particular discourse. With the
appropriate paralinguistic accompaniment, and, possibly more
important in this case, the relevant extralinguistic background
(like a mutual knowledge of who Katie is, her relationship with A and
B, what's going on at the time etc. etc.) the focal pronominal could
carry a contrastive implication like "Why her of all people?" etc.
Given a different set of accompanying features (para- and extra-linguistic), the marked focus could merely register surprise, and have no contrastive implications for the rest of the discourse.

A further exception from the general characteristic of a focal pronominal involving contrastive implications may be seen in the use of what can very loosely be termed "idioms", like "// off a / ni //" ("off we go" - literally "away with us"), // 'us / fe // ("that's it" or "there we/you are"). Some more examples:

(22) // .. oedd e'n / eistedd yn / ochor // .. y / parch
(aux) he (asp) sit in side the reverend
He was sitting beside the Reverend

/ Irfon / Roberts // .. yn yr eis/teddfod
Irfon Roberts in the Eisteddfod

Irfon Roberts in the Eisteddfod

// .. dydd / Llun / diwetha' // .. ac oen nhw wedi
Monday last and(aux) they (asp)
last Monday, and they had

/ gwrando ar y / corau i / gyd // .. a beth wedodd
listen on the choirs all and what said
listened to all the choirs, and what Emrys said was

/ Emrys // .. mai / "Essex" // oedd a / hi //
Emrys that Essex was with it
that Essex had won.

// oedd a / hi // here simply means "had won" or "had got it". No contrast element is implied by the focal pronominal.
A more interesting example:

(23) A: // .. oen uhw / boun o fo'n / dodi ei / euw fe
      (aux) they bound of be (asp) put his name him
      They must have been putting his name

      / mewn t'wel //
      in you see
      in you see.

B: // .. yn / lle bod e'n dod / gartre //
      in place be he (asp) come home
      In case he come home.

A: // ie // .. a / os daeth e / gartre // wadyn
      yes and if came he home then
      Yes. And if he came home, then,

      // .. mae / gam iddo fe / t'wel //
      is game to him you see
      there's a game for him see.

B: // ie / ie // .. ydy e mor / dda a 'ny 'te //
      yes yes is he as good as that then
      Yes, yes. Is he as good as that, then?

      // .. oud / cofia / di // Ponty/felin //
      but remember you Pont-y-felin
      But mind you - Pont-y-felin.

A: // cofia / di // "London / Welsh / seconds" //
      remember you London Welsh seconds
      Mind you. London Welsh seconds.
The first instance of "cofia di" (spoken by B) is what we may call the idiomatic usage. There is no contrastive implication although the pronominal "di" (you) realizes the focal information constituent. It could as easily be said, and in fact frequently is, without the pronominal i.e. "cofia", with little or no change in meaning. What is interesting is that the second time it is used (by A), it does have contrastive implications. The contrastiveness in this case is achieved mainly by tone - a rise-fall on "di". Using "cofia di" contrastively in this way, A wishes to correct B's impression of the situation. (The nearest English equivalent, as used above, would be "mind you", which could be used in more or less the same way e.g. B: "Is he as good as that then? Mind you - Pontyfelin ..."
A: "Mind you. London Welsh Seconds"
with a Rise-fall or High fall on the second "you".
This is consistent with our treatment of the discoursal function of marked tone 1 in Part III of this thesis (see 7.2.1).

When a focal pronominal involves a contrastive presupposition, the "other element" derivable by contrast with it may or may not be a member of the same closed sat (for instance Halliday (1967a) and Crystal (1975), both of whom claim that contrast is confined to members of the same closed system). See for example the English in (14), where Crystal denies the possibility of "yourself" realizing the focal information constituent because the nature of the verb preempts a contrast between it and any other member of its own system; and (15), where it is shown that a contrast is indeed possible, between "yourself" and a member of a different closed system.
The contrast element (i.e. that which is considered derivable by contrast with the focal information constituent) may be a pronoun referent:

(24) // .. na'r / beth 'ych chi'n / meddwl // na'r
now what (aux) you (asp) think now
Now what do you think now

// .. am y / pedwar' ma mae / John / Evans wedi wedi
of the four these (aux) John Evans (asp) (asp)
of these four that John Evans

/ dwoud an dano // .. mae e' wedi / enwi //
say about it (aux) he (asp) name
has spoken about - that he's named?

.. 'na'r / pedwar byddech / chi'n meddwl //
that the four (aux) you (asp) think
Are those the four you would think?
i.e. "Are those the four you, as well as John Evans, would choose?"

The contrast element may in some cases not be readily definable.
It may not always simply be another member of the same set, or a member of a different set, or a pronoun referent. Consider the following:

(25) A: // ie // .. a mae e'n "e/ræz"-o / be' sy 'di
yes and (aux) it (asp) eraze what (aux)(asp)
Yes, and it erases what's gone
// wynd // .. beth oedd / Huw wedi / darllen //
go what (aux) Huw (asp) read
what Huw had read.

B: // .. y / na mae / hwnna "still" / mewn //
Er no is that still in
Er. No. That's still in.

A: // fel 'te //
How then
How then?

B: // .. achos oedd / hwnna // "just" cyn hwn w
cause was that just before this (excl.)
Because that was just before this.

// .. beth / wedodd / e' // .. daeth e' // "just" cyn
what said he came it just before
What he said - it came just before

// hwn //
this
this.

// beth / wedodd / e' // (what he said) is not here in contrast to
what she/they/someone else etc. said. Rather, the section of tape
containing what he said is in contrast to a different section. The
contrast is thus not limited to the focal pronominal "e'" (he) but
involves the clause "beth wedodd e'", and the contrast element is
derivable by contrast with that clause viz. another section of tape.
phoned me up this morning, now,
and asked if I was going to see
a game in Stradey this afternoon. I didn't
know there was a game on. He said:
if you go down can you call about
"If you're going down, you can call
me on the way". The next thing I
knew - Oh, he wanted to do some shopping.

(26) phoned he me up the morning this now
He phoned me up this morning, now,
and asked if I was going to see
a game in Stradey this afternoon. I didn't
know there was a game on. He said:
if you go down can you call about
"If you're going down, you can call
me on the way". The next thing I
knew - Oh, he wanted to do some shopping.

// peth / nesa' oen / i'n gwybod // (the next thing I knew) is not
in contrast to "the next thing you/others/John etc. knew". What is
contrasted is what actually happened as opposed to what was expected
to happen (i.e. "going shopping" instead of "seeing the match").
The contrast element implied by the focus in // dewch yn y / car gyda / ni // (come in the car with us) is not another pronoun or pronoun referent. That is to say, there's no question of going in the car with anyone else. Rather, the contrast lies between 'going in the car' and 'going by train'.

And Nest Jones was probably the
/ "tenor" // 'na beth wedodd e' / bore 'na
  tenor that what said he morning this
tenor. That's what he said this morning.

// .. ond i / fi // .. oen / i ddim / lico Nest /
  but to me (aux) I (neg) like Nest
But for me, I didn't like Nest

Jones / fel'ny //

Jones like that

Jones that much.

B: // na // .. oedd / person buais / i'n siarad a
  no (aux) person (aux) I (asp) speak with
No. A person I was speaking to

// .. ddim / lico hi / fel'ny //
  (neg) like her like that

didn't like her that much.

The first focal pronominal in (28) - // ond i / fi // implies a
straightforward contrast with a member of its own set or a pronoun
referent. It means "but for me" or "as far as I'm concerned" where
the implication is "I don't know about you" or "whatever others may
think". The second focal pronominal is not so straightforward:
// .. oedd / person buais / i'n siarad a //. There is certainly a
contrastive presupposition involved, but the contrast is not between
"a person I was speaking to" and "a person he/you/others were
speaking to". The contrast is in fact between the person mentioned
by B and the speaker of A, neither of whom are keen on the singer in
question. (Names have been changed to protect the innocent).

(29) // wel oen / i ddim / gwbod // bod u'n

Well (aux) i (neg) know (aux) he (asp)

Well I didn't know he

/ canu dros y / lle / ffor'na //

sing over the place way that

sang over the place like that.

The contrastive presupposition implied by the focal pronominal in (29) may be of the simple type: "Perhaps you knew, but I didn't", though it seems more likely to be "Obviously he actually does sing all over the place like that, but I didn't know." There is a certain similarity here to the type of presupposition involved in (26), where the focal pronominal serves to contrast what actually happened with what was expected to happen.

(30) A: // .. ond des i / lan // des i / lan

but came I up came I up

But I came up - I came up

// .. ar y dydd / Sadwrn // .. 'na / fo //

on the Saturday that it

on the Saturday. That's it.

"just" / cyn ti / briodi // .. a osdd /

just before you marry and was

Just before you got married and
Hari/aune // .. ddim 'da / fi // .. oedd hi yn

Harianne not with me was she in

Harianne wasn't with me - she was in

/ "Lancaster" //

Lancaster

Lancaster.

B: // .. a oedd / "Frank" isia / thre' 'da / fi //

and was Frank home with me

and Frank was at home in my case.

The contrast element implied by the first focal pronominal is made explicit in the following IU. Note that the contrast is not between two pronominals (i.e. not "she wasn't with me - she was with someone else") but between "da fi" (with me) and "yn 'Lancaster'" (in Lancaster) - two locatives. The contrastive presupposition involved in the second focal pronominal needs a little explanation. The implication is not "Frank was at home with me - not anyone else". In fact, the preposition "'da" here does not mean "(in company) with", but "in my case". 13 It is B's case (his wife being at home) which is in contrast to A's case.

(31) A: // byddwch / mwy na/turiol //

be more natural

Be more natural.

13 "in my case" is a rough, and not totally accurate, translation of the preposition "'da" as used by B in (30). Although I can convey the same meaning in my dialect of Welsh English by means of the preposition "with", this usage seems to be quite alien to speakers of other dialects of English.
B: // .. fi / yn na/turiol //
I (asp) natural
I am natural.

A: // .. dim / 'na fel chi'n siarad a / fi coch //
  neg that like you (asp) speak with me look
That's not how you speak to me.

"siarad a fi" (speaking to me) does not imply here a contrast with, say, "speaking to someone else" (i.e. it is not a straightforward contrast between pronouns), but to the way B is speaking at that moment.

The type of contrast involved, as pointed out by El-Henoufy (1969), can be of two kinds:
(a) oppositional i.e. "not this but that"
(b) additional i.e. "this as well as that".

We may now look back over some of the examples already discussed in this subsection and examine them in the light of what type of contrast they involved:

(25) was oppositional - "the section that contained what he said, as opposed to this section".
(26) was oppositional - "what actually happened as opposed to what was expected to happen".
(27) was oppositional - "the car as opposed to the train".
(28) was additional - "as well as you not liking it, a person I spoke to didn't like it either".
(29) was oppositional - "the actual situation as opposed to what I thought it was".
(31) was oppositional - "the way you speak to me as opposed to the way you're speaking now".

(24) and (30) will be discussed later.

Some further examples of oppositional and additional contrast:

(a) Oppositional

(32) A: // .. paid / di dweud dim / byd // .. 'na fascham / da //

don't you say nothing that boy good

Don't you say anything, that's a good boy.

'na pam o/fynnais i ti / ddog 'ma //

that why asked I you come here

That's why I asked you to come here,

.. i / gael ti ddim yn / dweud dim / byd //

to get you (neg)(asp) say nothing
to have you not saying anything.

B: // .. o 'na / fe 'te // 'stedda i fan/hyn yn

oh that it then shall sit I place this (asp)

Oh, there we are then. I'll sit here

/ dawel 'te //

quiet then

quietly then.

C: // gwranda // cael di / "chat" a / fi nawr //

listen get you chat with me now

Listen. You have a chat with me now.

i.e. "Don't take any notice of him."
(33) A: // .. fi'n / gwneud "T./T." / nawr / ch'wel //
I (asp) do T.T. now you see
I'm doing T.T. now, you see.

.. fi'n / gorffen / blyddyn hyn / hefyd //
I (asp) finish year this too
I'm finishing this year too.

B: ie // .. ond beth mae / hi mynd i/ wneud
yes but what (aux) she go to do
Yes, but what is she going to do

pan mae hi'n / cypla te //
when (aux) she(asp) finish then
when she finishes then?

.. bydd/hi ddim yn / gwneud "T./T." / wedyn //
(aux) she (neg) (asp) do T.T. then
She won't be doing T.T. then.
i.e. "You're doing T.T. (teacher training), but
she won't be doing it."

(34) A: // .. des / ti / lan // trwy "New f: Road" //
came you up through New Road
You came up through New Road

'ta ffodd / des ti // .. a / troi lan / yma //
that way came you and turn up here
That's how you came. And turned up here.
B: // .. ond / dim 'na'r / ffordd i / nhw / ch'wel //

but (neg) that the way to them you see
But that wasn't the way for them, see.

.. mae rhaid / nhw fynd // reit trwy'r
(aux) necessity them go right through the
They have to go right through

/ dre // .. i'r / "A /forty" //
town to the A 40
the town to the A 40.
i.e. the way for them, as opposed to my way."

(35) A: // .. oedd e'n / "excellent" ar y / "colour television"//
he (asp) excellent on the colour television
He was excellent on the colour television.

B: // oedd // welais i fa //
was saw I him
Yes. I saw him.

C: // ble 'ych / ch'n / gweld // .. te/ledu / lliw //
where (aux) you (asp) see television colour
Where do you see a colour television?
i.e. "I know the others had one, but I didn't know you did."

(36) A:// .. alla i / symud e' / 'hol a / 'mlaen / t'wel //
can I move it back and fore you see
I can move it back and fore, you see.
It’s not supposed to go

/ lan i'r / coch / 'na'r / pwynt //
up to the red that the point
up to the red. That’s the point.

B: // ble mae'r / coch 'te //
where is the red then
Where’s the red then?

A: // .. mae'r / coch / man'na / t'wel //
is the red place that you see
The red’s there, you see.

B: // .. oes / dim byd yn / digwydd //
(aux) nothing (asp) happen
Nothing’s happening.

A: // .. oes / dim byd yn / digwydd answev / fi'n
(aux) nothing (asp) happen time I (asp)
Nothing happens when I

siarad // digwydd / nawr //
speak happen now

(b) **Additional**

(37) A: // .. mae / Bedford yn / “first class” / tim 'achan //
is Bedford (asp) first class team boy
Bedford is a first class team, man.
B: // ydyn // 'na beth oen / i'n meddwl //
are that what (aux) I (asp) think
Yes. That's what I thought.
i.e. "as well as you"

(38) A: // .. a / odrych arno fe / bore 'ma //</
and look on him morning this
and looking at him this morning.

.. wel / godais i am / haner / awr wedi / un //</
well got up I at half hour after one
Well, I got up at half past one.

B: // godoch chi i / weld e' / do fe //</
got up you to see it was it
You got up to see it, did you?

A: // do / do //</.. oen i / main cael / gweld beth
did did was I want get see what
Yes, yes. I wanted to see what

oedd ei / ffordd oedd e' / mynd i
was his .. way (aux) he go to
his .. how he was going to

/ gwpla pethau //</
finish things
finish things.

B: // ia // licen / i fod -- //</.. oeni /ddim yn
yes would like I be (aux) (neg)(asp)
Yes. I'd like to have .. I didn't
I would have stayed up.

i.e. "I would stayed up as well as you."

Well the Rev. I. D. Thomas was on

morning this at twenty minute after seven

i.e. "I heard him. Did you hear him too?"

My wife and I were on the floor

like was it would be gran

as it was, Cran
ar y llawr / 'da ni / .. asa / hi wedi
on the floor with us if (aux) she (asp)
would have been on the floor with us if she'd

dod / lan / hefyd /

come up too
come up too.
i.e. "as well as my parents (who were mentioned earlier)."

(41) A: /.. a / wedodd / Irfon / .. taw / Pontardulais
and said Irfon that Pontardulais
and Irfon said that Pontardulais
oedd a hi / .. ond / "Essex" / aseth a hi /
was with it but Essex went with it
had got it, but it was Essex who took it.

'tna pam fi'n / dwedw wrtho chi /
that why I (asp) say to you
That's why I'm telling you.

B: /.. weul y / trydydd / daeth / Pontardulais /
well the third came Pontardulais
Well Pontardulais came third.

fel 'ny 'te / dylen nhw fod wedi
like that then should they (aux)(asp)
That way, they should have
/ dod yn / ail // na ddylen nhw //

come (asp) second (neg) should they

come second, shouldn't they?

C: // ie // 'na bath oen / nhw'n meddwl //
yes that what (aux) they(asp) think

Yes. That's what they thought.

i.e. "as well as you".

(42) A: // dare' / mwyn ato i / Porky // symo fe / fod i / gael un //

come smoke at me Porky (neg) he be to get one

Give me a cigarette Porky. He's not supposed to have one.

B: // na // rhoiodd e / lan / naddo fe // 'to //

no gave he up (neg) he again

No. He gave up, didn't he? Again!

C: // . . . wel / 'na bath i / usaid i fachan //

well that thing to do to boy

Well what a thing to do to a chap.

A: // diolch yn / fawr i ti / Pork //

thank (asp) big to you Pork

Thank you very much, Pork.

B: // wel // . . . fi'n / credu gaf / fi un // hefyd //

well I (asp) believe will get I one too

Well, I think I'll have one, too.

i.e. "as well as you".

So far we have taken it that the general characteristic of the

focal pronominal is that the discoursal presupposition involved
takes the form of implying another element in the discourse, that
element being derivable by contrast with the focal information constituent. The contrast may be of two kinds: oppositional or additional. It is now suggested that whether the contrast is additional or oppositional will be to a large extent discoursally determined. The same IU with the same focal information constituent can have its relationship with the contrast element of either an additional or oppositional type, depending on the particular part of the discourse in which it appears.

In that part of the discourse in which it appeared, the focal pronominal in (33) involved a contrastive presupposition of the oppositional type. It could as easily have been additional, given a different discourse, or an alternative part of the same discourse:

(43) // .. "so" ar/o l i ti / gwpl a // .. byddid di / ddim yn
    so after to you finish (aux) you (neg)(asp)
    So after you finish, you won't be

    / gwneud "T./T." // .. a bydd / hi ddim yn
    do T. T. and (aux) she (neg) (asp)
    doing T.T., and she won't be

    / gwneud "T./T." / wedyn //
    do T. T. then
    doing T.T. then.

    i.e. "She, as well as you, won't be doing T.T. then."

Two points arose from this. First, the additional contrast can be of positive or negative status - two pluses or two minuses, as is mathematically obvious. A plus and a minus would of course entail an oppositional contrast. For an additional contrast then,
the relationship is of an "as well/too" or an "either" type - thus "she'll be doing it as well/too" or "she won't be doing it either". This leads to the second point, which is that the type of contrast can be explicitly marked, for example with an adverb of the "hefyd" (as well/too) or "chwaith" (either) type. (43) could have taken "chwaith"

// .. "so" bydd / hi ddim yn / gwneud "T./T." / wedyn //
so (aux) she (neg) (asp) do T. T. then

So she won't be doing T. T. then,

chwaith //

either

either.

It is usually the case that these markers of positive/negative additional contrast take an IU on their own.

It is not always an easy matter to decide whether a contrast is in fact additional or oppositional. The distinction may sometimes be none too clear. Take (24), for example, repeated below:

(24) // .. nawr / bath 'ych chi 'n / madduw // nawr //
now what (aux) you (asp) think now

Now what do you think, now,

.. am y / pedwar 'mae mae / John / Evans
of the four this (aux) John Evans
of these four that John Evans

wedi / dweud am/dano // .. mae e' wedi / envi //
(asp) said about it (aux) he (asp) name

has spoken about - that he's named?
that the four (aux) you (asp) think

Is that the four you would think?

It is not clear whether the contrast here is additional ("Is that the four you think (as well as John Evans)?") or oppositional ("That's the four John Evans would choose, but are they the four you would choose?")

(44) // clyw // cyn i ti / fynd yn / bellach //

Listen. Before you go (asp) further

Listen. Before you go any further -

.. oes / gwaith i / fi yn / Trostre blwyddyn / nesa' //

is work to me in Trostre year next

is there work for me in Trostre next year?

Here, the implication may be oppositional ("you've already worked there (previously stated) - is there a chance for me next year?") or additional ("Is it possible for me as well as you to work there next year?")

(ii) Possessive Pronominals

These may take a number of forms. In more literary Welsh, the head of the group may be preceded by:

"fy" (my), which takes a nasal mutation (the terms nasal, soft and aspirate mutation being borrowed from traditional Welsh grammar).

e.g. "fy" + "tad" (father) + "fy nhad".
"fy" + "brawd" (brother) + "fy mrawd".
"fy" + "dant" (tooth) + "fy nant".
"dy" (your), which takes a soft mutation:

- e.g. "dy" + "tad" → "dy dad"
- "dy" + "brawd" → "dy frawd"
- "dy" + "dant" → "dy ddant"

"ei" (his), which takes a soft mutation (see "dy").

"ei" (her), which takes an aspirate mutation:

- e.g. "ei" + "tad" → "ei thad"
- "ei" + "brawd" → "ei brawd" (voiced consonants are not liable to aspirate mutation)
- "ei" + "calon" → "ei chalon" (heart)

"ein" (our), "eich" (your), "eu" (their), none of which take a mutation.

The head of the group may also optionally be followed by "i" (me), "di" (you-mutated), "e!" (him), "hi" (her), "ni" (us), "chi" (you), "nhw" (them), respectively, which would give the following paradigm:

- "fy nhad i" (my father)
- "dy dad di" (your father)
- "ei dad e!" (his father)
- "ei thad hi" (her father)
- "ein tad ni" (our father)
- "eich tad chi" (your father)
- "eu tad nhw" (their father).

It is not necessarily the case that both particles which signal the possessive will always occur. In literary Welsh (and
also in the newer 'standard' Welsh, known as "Cymraeg Byw" (living Welsh) the first particle is obligatory. This is not the case in the informal style of the dialect described here. (Also the first particle of the first person singular ("fy") (my) may be changed to "yn" - thus "yn nhad i" or even "yn dad i" (my father), the latter taking the "incorrect" mutation.) For our purposes however it is the second particle which is important. If the possessive is going to realize the focal information constituent, then the tonic syllable will fall on the second particle ("i", "di", "e" .. etc. - they are all monosyllabic):

(45) // .. dy / gi / di wnaeth e' //

your dog you did it

Your dog did it

and not:

(46) // dy / gi di / wnaeth e' //

(46) is not impossible as an utterance. It could occur in a context of correction e.g. in a Welsh learner's class:

(47) Student: // .. i / gi / di wnaeth e' //

his dog you did it

No appropriate translation.

Teacher: // nage // dy gi di / wnaeth e' //

no your dog you did it

No. Your dog did it.

This is very similar to the contrastive presupposition involved in a marked focus which is phonologically realized by a non-lexically stressed tonic syllable. On these grounds, it may then be possible to call the second particle the lexically stressed syllable of the
possessive pronominal form. A possible objection to this would be the fact that the second particle does not always occur when the possessive is used e.g.

(48) // .. 'rwy i 'n / mynd yn yng / gar i / Llundain //
(aux) I (asp) to in my car to London

I'm going in my car to London.

However, in this form (first particle alone), the possessive cannot be focal (apart from the type of usage demonstrated in (47)); neither can it be salient. The question of stress therefore does not arise when the possessive is expounded by the first particle only. Only when the second particle is used (usually along with the first, but, as stated, not necessarily so in informal speech) does the possibility of prominence arise, realised phonologically either as a tonic syllable or as a salient syllable (i.e. secondary prominence see 6.2.2). This being the case, it is considered beneficial to attribute the label of "lexically stressed syllable" to the second particle of the possessive, especially in view of the fact that alternative tonic placement (i.e. on the first particle) has the same exponentially informational function as that of the non-lexically stressed tonic syllable in polysyllabic words.

Adopting this approach, the situation is such that the lexically stressed syllable of the possessive pronominal may be realized only when informational prominence (primary or secondary) demands. That is, it may or may not be present as part of the possessive in any given utterance, but when the possessive is informationally prominent in one way or another, the second particle is compulsory as it is this particle which will comprise the tonic syllable or be salient.
A focal possessive will, taking (45) as a paradigm, be as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
// &\text{ yn } / \text{ gi } / i \ wnaeth \ e' // \text{ or } // \text{ fy } / \text{ nghi } / i \ wnaeth \ e' // \\
// &\text{ dy } / \text{ gi } / di \ wnaeth \ e' // \\
// &\text{ ei } / \text{ gi } / e \ wnaeth \ e' // \\
// &\text{ ei } / \text{ chi } / hi \ wnaeth \ e' // \\
// &\text{ ein } / \text{ ci } / ni \ wnaeth \ e' // \\
// &\text{ eich } / \text{ ci } / chi \ wnaeth \ e' // \\
// &\text{ eu } / \text{ ci } / nhw \ wnaeth \ e' // \\
\end{align*}
\]

(bearing in mind that in informal speech the first particle may be deleted. This would entail no change in meaning from an informational point of view; it merely signals a change of style).

We now turn to the type of discoursal presupposition implied by a focal possessive. Similar conditions hold for this as for the personal pronoun, so that the presupposition involved is the implication of another element, the latter being derivable by contrast with the focal pronominal. There do, however, seem to be fewer exceptions to this general characteristic of focal pronominals in the case of possessives than in the case of the personal pronouns. For instance, role-transfer is rarely applicable in the case of possessives. Whereas // fi wnaeth e' // (I did it) in answer to // pwy/wnaeth e' // (who did it?) can be explained in this way (the first person pronoun, given in the role of speaker, becomes new information in a different role), a focal possessive, as in // yn / gi / i wnaeth e' // (my dog did it), cannot.

As a response to // pwy / wnaeth e' //, more likely would be:
This is not to say that

(50) // .. yn / gi / i wnaeth e' //

would not be a possible answer also. Further, (50) as a response does not necessarily imply any contrastive element, e.g. "my dog" as opposed to "your dog". It is proposed that such (non-contrastive) cases as these are best explained by the inclusion of the head - in (52), it is "ci" (dog) - within the focal information constituent. The focal information constituent would then be realized by the phrase "yn gi i" and not merely by the possessive alone. It is suggested that the intuitive satisfactoriness of this approach derives from considerations of word-order in Welsh,¹⁴ and the tendency of the focus towards the end of the IU in the absence of requirements such as contrast (although this normally applies to lexical items only). A suitable comparison for the sake of elucidation may be made here with English, where the possessive precedes the head, whereas in Welsh the particle which receives tonic follows the head. The best English translation of (52), given that it is non-contrastive, would be // That / dog of / mine did it //, which similarly does not (in my dialect) necessarily involve a contrastive presupposition, whereas // My dog did it // would, "dog" in this case being specified as given.

¹⁴ For a similar approach to certain demonstrative adjectives, see 5.2.2(v).
Another context in which the focal possessive need not involve a contrastive presupposition is where it supplies information which is explicitly required e.g. in answer to

// ci / pwy yw / hwmna //

dog who is that

Whose dog is that?

one could reply:

// yn / gi / i yw e' //

my dog me is it

It's my dog.

where the focal possessive conveys factually new information - the information which is in fact requested in the question. No presupposition of a contrastive nature is involved. The only thing that can be said to be presupposed is the question which demanded such an answer. 15

Generally speaking, the element derivable by contrast with the focal possessive is another possessive. Contrast between members of a closed system seems a more general principle with focal possessives than with focal personal pronouns. Intra-set contrast need not always be the case, however:

(52) A: // .. pwy / grafodd y / twll 'na // .. yn y / berth //

who scratched the hole that in the hedge

Who scratched that hole in the hedge?

sivr o tod y / gath 'na drws / nesa' //

sure of be the cat that door next

Must be that cat next door.

15 This could possibly be changed to role-transfer. "My" - given as speaker - new as dog-owner.
B: // nage // .. yn / gi / i wnaeth e' //
    no  my dog me did it

    No. It was my dog that did it.

Here the contrast is not between "my dog" and anyone else's. Rather it is between "my dog" and "that cat next door".

(53) A: // .. chi'n  / gwybod fel dech/rewodd e' // .. oedd
    You (asp) know how started he was
    You know how he started. There was a

/ "group" o / "businessmen" / reit //
    group of businessmen right

    group of businessmen - right? -

dawr yn- // .. ble / oedd e'/ - "Calif/ori/a" //
    down in where was it California

daun in - where was it? - was it California?

B: // "Calif/ori/a" / io //
    California yes

California. Yes.

A: // .. oen nhw / ddim / moin y / "candidate / Demo/cratic"/
(aux) they (neg) want the candidate Democratic
They didn't want the Democratic candidate

.. i fynd / mewn // .. achos oedd ei / "principles"
    to go in because (aux) his principles
    to get in, because his principles
It would seem from the evidence in (52) and (53) that when dealing with a focal possessive, the focal information constituent may in fact be realized by the possessive plus its head, the implied element being derivable by contrast with the focal information constituent and not merely the possessive. 16 Looking again at (53), it would be interesting to make a further comparison with English. It is suggested that the best English equivalent of the relevant IU in (53) would be achieved by making the possessive salient (thus giving it secondary prominence in our terms (see 6.2.2)).

(54) // .. they / didn't / want the / Democratic/candidate //

to get / in // .. because / his / principies //
didn't / suit what / they wanted to / do //

It would, I feel, be rather irregular if "his" were to be the tonic syllable in the context of (54), as this would imply a contrast with someone else's principles. The suggestion made earlier about word-order in English and Welsh is relevant here. The salient "his", however, provides a "secondary" contrast. Note also the suggested salience of "they" in the final IU.

16 Cf. the behaviour of pronominals when realizing the secondary focal information constituent, see 6.1.2.
As with personal pronouns, the contrastive relationship may be of an additional or oppositional nature. In (52), it was oppositional - "my dog as opposed to the cat next door". (53) was also oppositional. We shall now briefly consider some further examples from the data.

(53) A: // .. oes / petrol yn dy / gar di //
    is petrol in your car you

    Is there petrol in your car?

B: //  oes  //
    is

    Yes.

A: // .. by'r rhaid ni / fynd yn dy gar / di 'te //
    will be necessity us go in your car you then

    We'll have to go in your car then,

    gynta // .. achos oes dim / petrol 'da / fi //
    first because is (neg) petrol with me

    first, because I don't have any petrol

    .. yn / hon //
    in this

    in mine.

    Oppositional: i.e. your car as opposed to mine.

(56) // .. mae / Pullin // .. "in / any case" //

    (aux) Pullin in any case

    Pullin, in any case,
"mae ei / bath ti'n / galw e' //

is his what you (asp) call him

his what d'you call it,

"mae ei / brofiad / e' // .. yn / fwy-//

is his experience him (asp) more

his experience is -

wedwn ni // .. wwy / cyfyn // .. i'r

shall say we more restricted to the

let's say - more restricted to the

"pack" // reit // .. mae / Mike / Gibson //

pack right is Mike Gibson

pack. Right? Mike Gibson's

"tu/faes y / "pack" //

outside the pack

outside the pack.

Oppositional: Pullin's experience as opposed to

someone else's viz. Gibson's.

(57) A: // .. a ti'n / priodi / wedyn 'ny // .. wyt

and you (asp) marry after that (aux)

and are you getting married afterwards?

ti'n / priodi / cyn / cwpla //

you (asp) marry before finish

Are you getting married before finishing?

B: // bath // priodi // na //

what marry no

What? Getting married? No!
C: // ... pam / 'my 'chan //
    why that boy
Why's that, man?

B: // nage / Martin / Rees ywyn enw / i t'wel //
    (neg) Martin Rees is my name me you see
Martin Rees isn't my name, see.
Oppositional contrast: "that's your name, not mine".
The implication is made explicit by A in the
utterance following (57):

A: // Martin sy'n / gweud pethau / dwl / fel'na
    Martin (aux)(asp) do things daft like that
It's Martin who does daft things like that,
    / dife //
    is it
    is it?

(58) A: // .. a oedd y / car ddim yn / gweithio erbyn / byn //
    and (aux) the car (neg)(asp) work by this
    and the car wasn't working by now.

B: // neg oedd a' //
    (neg) was it
Wasn't it?

C: // na // beth oedd hi'n / "fire"-o // .. ar
    no what (aux) she (asp) fire on
No. What was she firing?
She was only firing on two cylinders.

Now then, why? Plugs?

They were filthy.

Where did you find that out then?

Oh. Here. When we came

back here. Not five minutes

to do it.

My suggestion! That was my idea.
The context necessary for explanation of the contrastive presupposition involved by the focal possessive above is that A was known by those present to be not exactly a genius at mechanics, motor or otherwise. For him to claim the solution to the mechanical problem as his own implies a contrast with what was expected (and therefore oppositional).

\[(59) \quad \text{He's a very brave man, and he} \]

/ 'waras'n / ddewr iawn //
play (asp) brave very
plays very bravely.

--- \text{I think he's a man for the} \]

/ "job" // \text{job in my opinion} \]

It could be said that // yn ym / marn / i // approaches the borders of idiom: wherever it is used, focal behaviour is nearly always the same - the focal information constituent is realised by the possessive. // yn ym / marn i // would sound very irregular outside a context such as correction, as when the tonic syllable is not lexically stressed. However, idiom or not, there is nevertheless the implication of an oppositional contrast of the type: "I don't know about you/him/others, but in my opinion ..."
All the instances examined in the text where the focal possessive involved a contrastive presupposition have used oppositional contrasts. No attempt will be made here to make any statistical statements on this evidence. It would be a simple matter to construct different contexts for most of the relevant IU's so that the contrast would be of an additional nature, as was shown in the discussion on personal pronouns.

(iii) Reflexive Pronominals

In standard Welsh (Cymraeg Byw), the reflexives are listed as follows:

"fy hunan" (myself)
"dy hunan" (yourself)
"ei hunan" (himself)
"ei hunan" (herself)
"ein hunain" (ourselves)
"eich hunain" (yourselves)
"eu hunain" (themselves)

The only variations from the above paradigm in the dialect under consideration here is that in the first person singular "fy" goes to "yn".

As with the possessives, the focal reflexive is phonologically realized by the location of the tonic syllable on the second particle, or more accurately, on the first syllable of the second particle, since that is the lexically stressed syllable of the words "hunan" and "hunain". Using the same argument as we used in the discussion of possessives, we can nominate the first syllable of the second particle as the lexically stressed syllable, not only of
the word which contains it, but of the reflexive pronominal form, which includes the first particle.

As we saw earlier, the reflexive in English, when object of that is generally known as a reflexive verb, can stand in a contrastive relationship with an element outside its own set, such that (60), contrary to Crystal's claim, is perfectly acceptable:

(60) // .. Up/set / him // by / all means // but / make / sure you / don't up/set your/self
Oppositional contrast: "yourself" vs. "him".

Further, if (61) is considered acceptable, the reflexive, when object of a reflexive verb, can in fact contrast with a member of its own set:

(61) // Let him up/set himself then // .. but don't / you upset / yourself //
Oppositional contrast: "yourself" vs. "himself".

It will be noticed that to achieve such a contrast the tonic syllable has changed from the previous example, i.e. "your/self/ + "/yourself". It would not seem appropriate to say that in (61) the tonic syllable is not lexically stressed, mainly because the type of contrastive presupposition involved in (61) does not conform to that type involved when the tonic syllable is normally a non-lexically stressed syllable (see 5.1). It is suggested instead that a satisfactory solution would be to attribute two lexically stressed syllables to the reflexive in English, or rather, to stipulate that under certain specifiable circumstances, the second syllable is lexically stressed, whereas in other specifiable circumstances (e.g. especially when in contrast with another reflexive), the first syllable is lexically stressed.
The situation in Welsh is not the same. When a reflexive in
Welsh is object to a reflexive verb, it can contrast with a personal
pronominal or pronoun referent:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{John} & \quad \text{// } saetha fe os ti / \text{main} / \text{.. ond / paid a} \\
\text{shoot him if you want but don't}
\end{align*}
\]

However, similar tonic placement does not work when the contrast is
with another reflexive:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(63)} & \quad \text{// } gad e / \text{saathu ei huan 'te / .. ond / paid a} \\
\text{let him shoot his self then but don't}
\end{align*}
\]

(No appropriate translation)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{saathu dy / huan //} \\
\text{shoot your self}
\end{align*}
\]

This is not surprising since the second particle of the reflexive
in Welsh, which contains the lexically stressed syllable, is the
same in both cases ("huan"), thus not permitting any contrast. In
English (see for instance (60) and (61)), we saw that it was possible
for either syllable of the reflexive to be the tonic syllable
without necessarily incurring the type of contrastive implication
associated with non-lexically stressed tonic syllables. In cases
of contrast with another reflexive, the second syllable (/ morpheme)
being identical in either case, the tonic syllable becomes the
distinguishing first syllable (/ morpheme). The same device cannot
be used in Welsh. The Welsh reflexive pronounal (both particles) has only one lexically stressed syllable - the first syllable of the second particle. Location of the tonic syllable elsewhere within the reflexive would involve the type of contrastive presupposition normally associated with marked focus phonologically realized by a non-lexically stressed tonic syllable. Thus (64) and (65) would be unacceptable as implying a contrast between reflexives:

(64) /*/ gad e' / saethu ei hunan 'te // .. ond / paid a  
/ saethu dy hunan //
(see (63))

(65) /*/ gad e' / saethu ei hunan 'te // .. ond / paid a  
/ saethu dy hun/an //

(64) and (65) involve a contrast within the reflexive, as it were and would need a context, say, of correction, such as teacher to Welsh learner:

(64a) Learner: // paid a / saethu ei / hunan //
Teacher: // paid a / saethu / dy hunan //

(65a) Learner: // paid a / saethu dy / hun/an //
Teacher: // paid a / saethu dy hu/nan //

Is it possible then for a focal reflexive to contrast with members of its own set in Welsh? It seems not. To achieve the contrast we were seeking in (64) and (65), responsibility would have to be taken over by a personal pronoun:

(66) // gad e' / saethu ei hunan 'te // .. ond / paid / di a  
let him shoot his self then but don't you

Let him shoot himself then, but don't you
A focal reflexive in Welsh cannot therefore be involved in a contrastive relationship with members of its own set. This is not a very profound statement to make since in most cases the appearance of the reflexive form is syntactically determined e.g. when subject and object of the verb have the same referent:

\[ * \text{mae e'\text{n} mynd i saethu fe} \]
\[ (\text{aux})\text{he (asp) go to shoot him} \]

He’s going to shoot him

where “e” (subject) and “e” (object) refers to the same person, the object is realized by the reflexive form:

\[ \text{mae e'\text{n} mynd i saethu ei hunan} \]
\[ (\text{aux})\text{he (asp) go to shoot his self} \]

He’s going to shoot himself.

---

17 An alternative to (66) which I have heard used, albeit rarely, is to introduce the possessive pronominal (2nd particle) after the reflexive and have it as tonic syllable: // .. and / paid a / saethu dy / hunan / di //. What we are in effect doing is “strengthening” the possessive element of the reflexive (i.e. the first element), which brings us closer to the English device as portrayed in (61). However, I have not heard this form very often, and can make no statement on the frequency of its use.

18 The same device is available in English also:
// Let him / shoot himself then // but / don’t / you shoot your/self //.
(67) A: // . . . dw i ddim / gweld // . . . bod / hwnna 'n
(aux) I (neg) see be that (asp)
I don't see that that's the

/ debyg o / gwbl //
similar of all
same at all.

B: // . . . wel / 'nz beth oedd I./D. 'di / dweud //
well that what (aux) I. D. (asp) say
Well that's what I.D. had said.

. . 'na'r / teimliad oedd / yn / "A/merica"//
that the feeling was in America
That's the feeling that was in America.

C: // . . mae / pobun yn / siarad amboitu fe //
(aux) everyone (asp) speak about it
Everyone's speaking about it.

'na beth mae mhw'n / meddwl //
that what (aux) they (asp) mean
That's what they mean,

siwr o / fod // pobun yn / siarad //
sure of be everyone (asp) speaking
probably. Everyone was talking

. . yr / anser / 'ny //
the time that
at that time,
or speak of his self (aux) he perhaps
or talking about himself he was, perhaps.

The focal reflexive here is in oppositional contrast to "the American people". Its behaviour is in fact similar to that of the focal personal pronoun, which is not surprising in view of the fact that it is the syntax which demands the reflexive form in that context.

(68) A: // .. mae'r pa/purau / haddiw // .. wadi bo'n / gas
(aux) the papers today (asp) be(asp) nasty
Today's papers have been very nasty

/ iawn amboitu / Nixon //
very about Nixon

about Nixon.

B: // do // beth oedd / un / papur wedi / dweud am/boitu
yes what (aux) one paper (asp) say about
Yes. What did one paper say about

fe // galwodd / rhwun // .. mae / un / papur //
him called someone (aux) one paper
him? Someone called... One paper

.. wedi / galw / "crook" arno fe //
(asp) call crook on him
has called him a crook.

A: // .. mae nhv / gyd yn galw / "crook" arno fe //
(aux) they all(asp) call crook on him
They all call him a crook.
Before a man says himself

"I'm not a crook".

There's something in it, because he's said that himself.

This morning, hasn't he?

The focal reflexive is simply in opposition to "others". This is an interesting example, however, because it demonstrates a certain "emphatic" function of the focal reflexive. Whereas in (68) the contrastive and emphatic implications could be said to be operating together, in (69) it is suggested that the reflexive is focussed for emphatic purposes only i.e. there is no contrastive presupposition:

The prime minister himself has arrived.
(70) // .. amboitu / ugain / milltir yn / bring o Cae/redin //
about twenty miles in short of Edinburgh
About twenty miles short of Edinburgh,
.. dyna'r / bachan o-odd / 'da fi yn y / car //
here is the boy was with me in the car
the chap who was with me in the car
.. yn / tynnau / wogyn maes // .. a oedd rhaid fi
(asp) pull smoke out and was necessity me
pulls a cigarette out, and I had to
/ ofyn i fe // ddim i / smoco // .. a mae/hwnna'n
ask to him (neg) to smoke and is that (asp)
ask him not to smoke, and that's ridiculous, because I
"ri/diculous" // .. acchos fi'n / smoco'n / hunan //
ridiculous cause I (asp) smoke myself.
The contrast in (70) is additional - "I smoke, as well as him."

(iv) Indefinite Pronouns

The use of the term "indefinite pronouns" causes problems as it
is difficult to decide what comes under such a heading. Initially,
it was intended to include only the following:

"rhywun" (someone, anyone);
"rhywbeth" (something, anything);
"unrhywun" (anyone, any one);
"unrhywbath" (anything);
"pobun" (everyone);
"popath" (everything);
However, the only modern description of Welsh syntax I know of—Jones & Thomas (1974)—gives these terms no taxonomic title. Since this is not a syntactic treatise, we shall use the term "indefinite" merely as a label for those pronouns listed above, with no theoretical implications. Their negative counterparts "nab" (nobody), "dim (byd)" (nothing) are not discussed here, as their focal behaviour is more akin to that of lexical items i.e. when final in the IU, the focal negative "indefinite" does not involve any discoursal presupposition, any contrast being discoursally and/or tonally determined:

(71) // \[\text{symw} / \text{wil yn} / \text{gweld} / \text{nab} \] //
\begin{align*}
\text{(neg)(aux) Will (asp) see nobody} \\
\text{Will doesn't see anybody.}
\end{align*}

(72) // \[\text{nac w i'n} / \text{dweud dim/byd} \] //
\begin{align*}
\text{(neg)(aux) I (asp) say nothing} \\
\text{I'm not saying anything.}
\end{align*}

It seems that focal indefinites mainly involve a three-term contrast: definite, indefinite, and negative.

(73) A: // \[\text{fi / ffæflu/ credu bod / Sam neu / Wil neu / Dai} \]
\begin{align*}
\text{I can't believe (aux) Sam or Will or Dai} \\
\text{I can't believe that Sam or Will or Dai}
\end{align*}
\begin{align*}
\text{wedi / gwneud e' } // \\
\text{(asp) do it} \\
\text{has done it.}
\end{align*}
Well someone's done it.

i.e. "I don't know who in particular, but it wasn't nobody." Here the indefinite is in contrast with both the definite and the negative.

"Unrhywun" (anyone, any one) is an interesting case in that it has one lexically-stressed syllable whose location is freely variable between two possibilities. There is little or no difference in meaning, for instance, between (74)(a) and (74)(b).

(74) (a) // symo i'n / nabod / unrhywun o nhw //
(74) (b) // symo i'n / nabod / unrhywun o nhw //

I don't know any one of them.

(75) // .. wneiff / unrhywun y / tro //

will do any one the turn

Any one (of them) will do.

i.e. "not any special one".

When used as in (75) "unrhywun" tends to have a non-human referent. When the referent is human, "rhywun" is normally used:

(76) // .. wneiff / rhywun y / tro //

will do anyone the turn

Anybody'll do.
The indefinite is involved in (77) in a two-way contrast, with definite and negative i.e. "anybody - not someone in particular, but not nobody." The indefinite may be "particularized" with the addition of some such word as "arbennig" e.g.

(78) // .. mae / rhaid / fi / siarad a / rhywun ar/bennig
(aux) necessity I speak with someone special
I have to speak to someone in particular

o'r / ysgol //
from the school
from the school.
i.e. "not just anybody."

Note that in (78), "arbennig" is focal. If instead "rhywun" were the focal item, "arbennig" would change its meaning to "special" instead of "in particular" (i.e. in the English gloss). "rhywbeth" (something) and "unrhywbeth" (anything) are parallel in focal behaviour to "rhywun" and "unrhywun".

With focal "pobun" or "pawb" (everyone) and "popeth" (everything), the contrast can be with the negative, the definite (particular) and/or the partitive (viz. all, not just some).
(79) 

As: // .. mae / neb moin / dod //  
(aux) nobody want come  
Nobody wants to come.

Bi: // .. mae rhaid / pobun / dod //  
(aux) necessity everyone come  
Everyone's got to come.

(80) // .. oedd / "Eisenhower" moin / cico fe / mass //  
(aux) Eisenhower want kick him out  
Eisenhower wanted to kick him out

.. cyn /'ny // .. achos oedd / "Eisenhower" wedi  
before that cause (aux) Eisenhower (asp)  
before that, because Eisenhower had

gweld / trw\' fe'n // rhwydd / pobun yn  
see through him(asp) easy everyone (asp)  
seen through him easily. Everyone

gweld / trw\' fe //  
see through him.
saw through him.

i.e. "not just Eisenhower (in particular)" and/or  
"all, not just some (viz. Eisenhower)."

The "indefinite adverbials" "rhywle" (anywhere), "pobman"  
(everywhere) follow similar focal behaviour patterns to their  
corresponding pronominals.
(81) // .. mae e' / wedi mynd / rhywle //

(aux) he (asp) go somewhere

He's gone somewhere.

i.e. not nowhere, and possibly nowhere in particular.

The particular part of the discourse normally determines whether
either or both contrasts apply.

Focal "pobman" normally implies a contrast with "rhywle" or
"rhywle arbennig" (somewhere in particular).

(2) // .. e/drychais i ym / mhoebman //

looked I in everywhere

I looked everywhere.

i.e. "not just some places" or "not just the
particular places you mentioned."

(v) Demonstratives

Demonstrative pronominals in Welsh are:

"hwn" "hyn" (this) - masculine

"hon" (this) - feminine

"hwnna" (that) - masculine

"honna" (that) - feminine

"hynny" (that) - neuter

"rhain" "rhein" (these)

"rheina" "rheini" (those)

Demonstratives are a problematic group as regards focal behaviour.
Grammatically speaking, they form a closed system and are thus non-
lexical items. When realizing the focal information constituent,
however, they constitute an exception to the general characteristic
attributed to focal pronominals: they need not involve a discoursal
presupposition whereby another element is implied, that element being derivable by contrast with the focal information constituent. Indeed, when a focal demonstrative pronominal is final in the IU, it frequently involves no discoursal presupposition at all. Perhaps it would be worthwhile forming an intermediate group between lexical and non-lexical items, entries to that group being determined by considerations of syntactic status and focal behaviour, but this point will not be pursued here. Demonstrative pronominals will be considered non-lexical and their focal behaviour examined in that light. If that behaviour is more similar to lexical than non-lexical items, this will constitute grounds to consider them merely as exceptions from the general characteristic displayed by focal pronominals as a whole.

Demonstrative pronouns are reference items. The reference may be of two major kinds:

1. Exophoric - referring to something in the situational context, outside the text.

2. Endophoric - referring to something within the text.

Endophoric reference may be:

(a) anaphoric, referring backwards to something that has already been said;

(b) cataphoric, referring forwards to something that is about to be said.

As a reference item, a demonstrative will always involve a certain presupposition in that it must have a referent, as is the case with, say, personal pronominals. But whereas a focal personal pronominal will in the majority of instances involve a contrastive
presupposition, a focal demonstrative pronominal will not. Consider the following examples:

(83) // ble / ffeindias ti / hwnna //
    where    found    you    that
Where did you find that?

(84) // me/ddyla bod ti 'n / galw rhywun / mewn
    think (aux) you (asp) call someone in
Suppose you called someone in,

    navr i / wrando arno / hwn
    now to listen on this
now, to listen to this.

(85) // 'dw i / ddim yn / gweld / 'ny //
    (aux) I (neg) (asp) see    that
I don't see that.

(86) // symo i 'di / moddul am / hwn // trwy'r / dydd //
    (neg) I (asp) think of this through the day
I haven't thought about this all day.

(87) // os / na gaf fi / hwn // 'nol / man 'na //
    if (neg)get I this back place that
If I don't get this back there...

(88) // pryd / wnaeth e' / 'na //
    when    did he    that
When did he do that?
(89) 
walk up there to see that
(Fancy) walking up there to see that!

(90) 
is temper short with this
This one's got a short temper.

(91) 
there's boy is that
That one's a case.

(92) 
(aux) we (asp) arrange this over the summer
We'd arranged this over the summer.

In the above examples (83)-(92) the focal demonstrative pro-
nominal is in final position in the IU and carries unmarked focus.
It does not imply the existence of another element derivable by
contrast with it, neither does it specify any part of the IU as given
information (disregarding its referent). Let us see what the
situation would be if we shifted the focus in the above examples:

(93) 
(94) 
(95) 
(96) 
(97) 
(98) 
(99) 

In (93)-(102), the focus has been shifted to the information constituent realized by the last lexical item in the IU, so that focus in each case should be unmarked (see 4.2); this, however, is not the case. The final demonstrative pronoun is specified as given information when the focal information constituent precedes it in the IU, in the same way as a final lexical item would be specified as given in the face of non-final lexical focus. This does seem odd in view of the fact that a demonstrative pronoun is a reference item, and therefore, in Halliday's terms, "inherently given"; but it does not behave as an "inherently given" item from the point of view of focus. A further point arising from this is that it is unusual to find a demonstrative pronoun occurring in post-focal final position (unless realizing the minor focal information constituent (see 6.1.2)). Rather one would expect instead the appropriate personal pronoun, yielding:

(103) // .. ble / ffeindiais ti fe //
    // .. mo/ddyla bod ti'n dod / mewn a / rhywun / nawr i /
    / wrando arno fe //
etc. etc. as opposed to (93)-(102).

It would seem a generally applicable approach then to state that if a demonstrative pronoun appears final in the IU, it is likely to be focal (even if that focus is only secondary, see 6.1.2), as is neutrally the case with lexical items, and as a final lexical item
will not necessarily always be focal, neither need a final demonstrative pronoun be so. But as a non-final final lexical item will always be specified as given, so will a demonstrative pronoun, and the "givenness" in the latter case will be more than that normally associated with reference items: further constraints will apply, such as having been mentioned before etc. This is the evidence suggested by (93)-(102), each of which involve a discoursal presupposition of the kind implied by focal lexical items which are non-final in the IU (see 5.3).

The difference between demonstrative and other pronouns from the viewpoint of focal (and post-focal) behaviour can be seen in the following:

(104) (a) // .. mae / tymer / byr 'da / hon //
(b) // .. mae / tymer / byr 'da hon //
   is temper short with this
   This one's got a short temper.
(c) // .. mae / tymer / byr 'da hi //
(d) // .. mae / tymer / byr 'da / hi //
   is temper short with her
   She's got a short temper.

(104)(a) and (c) are unmarked. They do not involve any discoursal presupposition which is the responsibility of the focus. (b), which has a personal pronoun realizing the focal information constituent, does involve a presupposition - another element is implied which is derivable by contrast with the focal item e.g. "I don't know about him, but she's got a short temper", or "She's got a short temper as well as him." No such contrast is implied by the focal demonstrative
in (a). While the focal (final) lexical item in (b) specifies the following demonstrative as given in a way over and above its status as a reference item, the focal (final) lexical item in (c) implies no such thing as regards the following personal pronoun: (c) has unmarked focus, (b) marked.

The relevant IU's in (83)-(92) do not involve any presupposition. There is no implication of contrast. (83), for instance, does not imply "I know where you found the other things." (85) does not imply "I agree with your other arguments." (86) does not imply "I've been thinking about something else." etc. etc. This approach is at odds with El-Menoufy's treatment of demonstratives in English: "... all demonstratives are treated in the same way.

"The main reason is that implications of contrast do exist in most instances. I do not think it is unreasonable to suggest that such implications exist even in cases where the situational reference is "immediate", since the actual pointing or demonstrating implies the selection of a particular thing to the exclusion of all others - an element that is present in the anaphoric use of the items too." (El-Menoufy (1969) p.164).

As pointed out in 5.2.1, the objection to this approach is based on the confusion of contrast in an intonational/informational sense with contrast in a basic linguistic sense. As de Saussure pointed out, the choice of any item in language is identifiable only in terms of its opposition to other items which could have been selected in its place. This is nothing to do with information focus, merely a fundamental principle of linguistics.
It is suggested that if a focal demonstrative pronoun carries contrastive implications, this will be the responsibility of the discourse at that particular point, as is the case generally with focal lexical items (see 5.3.4), and quite likely also of the tonal selection (see 7.2.3). Consider the following examples in which the utterance is the same but the context (situational) differs:

(105)(a) I go into an art gallery with my father, and immediately upon entering our eyes fall on the first painting exhibited. My father turns to me and says:

/\ well / beth wyt ti'n / meddwl am / hwnna \/

Well what do you think of that?

After examining this particular painting and this one only we turn round and walk out of the gallery, never to enter it again.

(b) We have seen the majority of the paintings in an art gallery, and have had some heated discussions over our respective evaluations of the various paintings concerning which we were far from agreement. Neither understands the other's point of view. My father comes across a particular painting which he estimates very highly and feels sure that even his stupid son must like it too. He turns to me and says:

/\ .. wcl / beth wyt ti'n / meddwl am / hwnna \/

\/

\/
Now, the tone in (b) may be different (most likely, marked tone 1, see 7.2.1), as may the pitch-range, phonation type, articulatory setting, loudness etc. The focus, however, is constant on the final demonstrative. In (b) there is obviously a contrast - "you've been stupid about all the others I've liked, but what about that one?"

In (a), there is no such contrast. Yet in (a) and (b) focus is the same. What has changed is the context. We can therefore say that it is the discourse at that point that supplies the contrast, or, to put it another way, any contrast involved when a demonstrative pronominal which is final in the IV realizes the focal information constituent is discoursally determined. As mentioned, this is consistent with the behaviour of focal lexical items, any contrast implied being discoursally determined, e.g.

(106) At // par / ifanc oen nhw //
      pair young were they

Was it a young couple?

E: // nage // dau / fachgen //
   no two boys

No. Two boys.

The oppositional contrast between "two boys" and "young couple" is a matter of lexical choice, and not of information focus.

The above discussion concerns demonstrative pronominals only. Focal demonstrative determiners generally do involve a contrastive presupposition, whereby another element is implied which is derivable by contrast with the focal information constituent. The demonstrative determiners most widely used in the dialect under examination are as follows:
"hyn" (masculine)  "hcn" (feminine)  "'ma" - (this)
"'na" - (that)
"hyn"  "'ma" - (these)
"'na" - (those).

A possible reason for demonstrative determiners implying a contrast whilst the demonstrative pronominal does not is that when a demonstrative determiner qualifies an item it implies that there are other similar items, whilst the demonstrative pronominal need not imply any such thing. So "y car 'na" (that car), "y ci hyn" (this dog), "y ferch hon" (this girl) presuppose the existence (physically, not discoursally, speaking) of other cars, dogs, girls - a presupposition not inherent in the use of "hwn" "hon" etc. The presupposed element in cases of focal demonstrative determiners will generally be another item such as that qualified by the focal determiner but in a contrastive relationship with it, so that

(107) // .. maer / car / hon ar / werth //

is the car this on sale

This car's for sale

implies "but not that one/others etc."

(108) // .. maer / ci / 'na'm / cnoi //

(aux)the dog that(asp) bite

That dog bites

implies "but this one's quite harmless" etc.

(109) // .. maer / ferch /na'm / bert //

is the girl that (asp) pretty

That girl's pretty

implies "but I don't think much of the other one" etc.
The bulk of the examples found in the corpus were explainable in this way:

(110) // .. chi'n gwybod sut/ "holiday" oedd y ddau / hyn you(asp) know how holiday (aux) the two this

You know now what sort of holiday these two

wedi cael / nawr //

(asp) got now

had had.

The demonstrative here serves an anaphoric function. It refers to two boys with whom the speaker had been talking about their holidays, and whom he had introduced into the conversation not long before. Previous to (110), another member of the company had been speaking about a couple he had met on holiday, so that "y ddau hyn" in (110) is in oppositional contrast to that couple. It is probably not necessary for the number in each case to be constant (as it is above, viz. two) for the demonstrative determiner contrast to apply, but it does seem to have to be relatively close. For instance, one could speak of // .. y / pedwar / hyn // (these four) as opposed to // .. y / par / 'na // (that couple), but probably not so easily of // .. y / cant / hyn // (these hundred) or even // .. yr / ugain / hyn // (these twenty) as opposed to // .. y / par 'na //. More likely, focus on the number would serve the appropriate contrastive purpose e.g. // .. y / cant hyn //, // .. yr / ugain hyn //.

(111) // t'wel y / nedwydd fach / 'na //

you see the needle little that

You see that little needle?

i.e. there are other needles we're not concerned with.
(112) **// blwyddyn / dwetha' // .. oedd y**

year last were the

Last year the

"circumstances" ym hw/hanol // holol

circumstances (asp) different complete
circumstances were different - completely

hw/hanol // .. oedd y / "workshops" / 'na'n /
different were the workshops those(asp)
different. Those workshops were

lot / fwy o / seis //
lot more of size

much bigger.
i.e. Those workshops as opposed to the ones the
year before.

(113) **// os bydden i 'di / wneud e' ym yr / ysgol / byn //**

if (aux) I (asp) do it in the school this

If I'd done it in this school,

.. byddai / lot o / bethau'n / digwydd //

(aux) lot of things(asp) happen

a lot of things would happen.
i.e. as opposed to the school I used before.

(114) **As // .. wnaeth / Mari/anne // gradd yn / Saesneg //**

did Marianne degree in English

Marianne did an English degree.
right went she to ask for job

Right? She went to ask for a job

straight off in library without (neg)
straight away in a library without any

qualifications of all that why got she
qualifications at all. That's why she didn't get

but what (aux) the girl
it. But what this girl ..

this (aux) she(asp) do
She's doing...

qualify for it
Qualifying for it.

i.e. The girl you were talking about as opposed to Marianne.

this is the first run (aux) it(asp) get
This is the first run it'll be getting
'da / ti / .. ar/ol y / "run" fach / byn //
with you after the run little this
from you, after this little run

.. wyt ti 'di / cael / nawr //
(aux) you (asp) get now

you've had now.

i.e. Tomorrow's run as opposed to the one you've
just had.

Even with focal demonstrative determiners, however, there seem
to be at least two areas of possible exception to their characteris-
tic of involving a contrastive presupposition. One involves the use
of the determiner as a quantifier:

(116) // .. fi / ffaelu / cuato / "mike" // .. seis / 'na //

I cannot hide mike size that

I can't hide a mike that size.

It could of course be argued that there is an implication here that
the speaker could hide a smaller microphone, but as with focal demon-
strative pronouns, such a contrast would be in the main discoursally
determined. In the corpus where (116) occurred, no such implication
was in evidence. Further, it is doubtful whether focus could be
shifted in this IU e.g. // seis 'na // would entail a change in
function of "'na" from quantifier to plain determiner.

The other possible area of exception to the contrastive charac-
teristic is where the governing head noun is a "TIME" noun, like
"blwyddyn" (year), "wythnos" (week), "mis" (month), "noswaith"
(evening), "bora" (morning), "prynhawn" (afternoon) etc.
We describe this as a possible area of exception because in some cases a focal demonstrative in the context of "time" may or may not involve a contrastive presupposition. It depends on certain variables, not the least amongst which is the discourse at that point, but it would not be true to say that contrasts in this area were all discoursally determined. First we must examine the focal pattern when phrases of the type "Time noun and demonstrative determiner" occur in citation form i.e., how they would be read in isolation by a native speaker:

// blwyddyn / hyn // (this year)
// wythnos / hyn // (this week)
// mis / hyn // (this month)
// haf / hyn // (this summer)
// gaea' / hyn // (this winter)
// bore 'ma // (this morning)
// pryn/hawn 'ma // (this afternoon)
// noswaith ' ma // (this evening)

The above can be split into two groups: those which in citation form have the tonic syllable at the demonstrative, and those which have the tonic syllable at the 'time' noun. Now, in the case of the latter, a contrastive presupposition involving the determiner is easily implemented simply by making it the tonic syllable:

(117) // bore / 'ma // . . neu / bore / ddoe oedd hi //

Was it this morning or yesterday morning?

The process is not so easy in the other group, however, because of the simple fact that the demonstrative already comprises the tonic
sylable in citation form. That is to say, in the above list, the English equivalent of // blwyddyn / hyd // etc. was "this year" and not "this year". In other words, in cases of this nature both marked and unmarked focus are phonologically expounded by marked tonicity, where the demonstrative determiner in both cases comprises the tonic syllable. (That is, of course, if the phrase appears final in the IU, which is what we are concerned with here). The discourse normally makes it clear whether a contrast is involved, as there obviously is in (118).

(118) // blwyddyn / hyd // .. new / blwyddyn / divatha oedd e //
year this or year last was it

Was it this year or last year?

Choice of tone is also significant. A rise-fall or a high fall would imply contrast, for example (see 7.2.3). We are able to talk of marked and unmarked focus in this case by positing what is included in the focal information constituent in any given instance, as we did with the focal possessive (5.2.2(b) - see also note 14). When a contrast is implied, we assume that the focal information constituent is realized by the demonstrative alone, thus putting such cases in line with the general characteristic attributed to demonstrative determiners viz. marked focus involving a contrastive presupposition. When there is no contrast and focus is unmarked, we assume that the focal information constituent is realized by the phrase such that the "time" noun is included. To say that the discourse makes the identity of the focal information constituent relatively unambiguous (i.e. makes it clear whether it is contrastive or not) does not weaken this proposition in any way, since it
is surely the discourse which makes such cohesive devices as marked focus necessary in the first place. It is interesting to note, however, that in cases where the focal information constituent is realized by the group ('time' noun and demonstrative determiner) appearing in final position in the IU, we have unmarked focus being expounded at the phonological level by marked tonicity.

The following examples from the corpus, without considerations of context and tone, may or may not involve contrasts:

(119) // .. aethon ni / lawr y / Bont // wythnos / hyn //
went we down the Bont week this
We went down the Bont this week.

(120) // dylai fe / fod // .. yn / cupla / blwyddyn / hyn //
should he be (asp) finish year this
He should be finishing this year.

(121) // dorra i / ddim yng / galon //
shall break I (neg) my heart
I won't break my heart

.. os / na gaf i / "job" haf / hyn //
if (neg)will get I job summer this
if I don’t get a job this summer.

We assume a similar approach when the determiner is "'ny" or "'na" (that) instead of "hyn" (this). That is // y / flwyddyn / 'ny // can mean "that year" or "that year". What is interesting here though is that this seems to apply to the other group of "time" nouns as well e.g.
(122) // gas e' / "outing" // .. yn mynd / 'nol noswaith / 'ny //

That was an outing he had, going back that evening.

In the context in which it occurred, (122) implied no contrast. The English equivalent is "that evening" and not "that evening".

**Demonstrative Adverbs**

These include:

"'na", "man'yn" (here); "'na", "man'na" (there);

"man'co" (over there).

The disyllabic words in the above list originate from, or are a contraction of, two words, or more accurately, a prepositional phrase:

"man/'yn" < / yn y man hyn /
in the place this
  in this place

"/man'na" < / yn y fan yna /
in the place that
  in that place

"/man'co" < / yn y fan acw /
in the place that
  in that place

Note the way in which these words, obviously from the same contractional origins, vary in their lexical stress. The full phrase, as it would be found in literary Welsh but rarely in conversation, would, if neutrally focussed, have the tonic value on the (lexically stressed syllable of the) demonstrative determiner. Yet
this pattern is retained only by "ma/n'yn" (here). The others have as their lexically stressed syllable the "fan" (place) part of the original phrase.

The demonstrative adverbials are obviously not pronominal, but are included here for convenience with the other demonstratives. Their focal behaviour is similar to that of demonstrative pronouns, which is to say that when realizing the focal information constituent in final position in the IU they do not involve any discoursal presupposition and therefore carry unmarked focus:

(123) A: // .. "en/joy"-aist ti'r / "match" pwrn/hawn 'ma //

enjoyed you the match afternoon this

You enjoyed the match this afternoon.

B: // .. a / ti'n / mwgu wrth yn / ochr i / wam'na //

and you (asp) smoke by my side me there

and you smoking there beside me.

(124) // symo i / moin chi / siarad yn o/falus //

(neg) I want you speak (asp) careful

I don't want you to speak carefully.

.. fi moin chi / siarad yn na/turiol //

I want you speak (asp) natural

I want you to speak naturally,

.. a fel 'sa / bwma // ddim / 'ma //

and like (aux) that (neg) here

and as if that wasn't here.
(125) At // .. ble / ffindiais'ti 'na / maes 'te //

where found you that out then

Where did you find that out then?

B: // o mə'n'ym // .. pryd / daethon ni / 'nol mə'n'yn //

oh here when came we back here

Oh, here. When we came back here.

(126) At // .. ble / aethoch chi //

where went you

Where did you go?

B: // .. "Ma/deira" //

Madeira

Madeira.

A: // ffaelu / dal a / samun // .. maes / man'na //

can't catch salmon out there

They can't catch salmon out there.

(127) // .. ond waethon nhw eu / moddwl / lan i ddod

but made they their mind up to come

But they made up their minds to come

/ wythnos fi'n / credu // .. yn / gynt //

week I(asp) think (asp) earlier

a week - I think - earlier,

.. a / wrth / hynny // .. fe a/chybon nhw'r

and by that (pt) escaped they the

and by that they escaped
It is interesting to note that, as with the demonstrative pronouns, a leftward shift of focus above would involve a presupposition of the same type as when a final lexical item is not focussed i.e. it
is specified as given. (125), for instance, with the tonic syllable
"'nol" (back), would specify "madyn" as given over and above its
deictic reference e.g. "not when we came here first, but when we
came back here."

Focal demonstrative adverbials may be involved in a contrastive
relationship, but this again, in the way of demonstrative pro-
nominals and lexical items, is discursively determined, e.g.

(132) // .. ydch / chi'n / gwybod // ... bod / gwaniaeth
(aux) you (asp) know be different

Do you know that people

"into/nation" 'da bobl / "Newport" // ... a
intonation with people Newport and
from Newport and all

/ "Monmouthshire" i/gyd // ... na sy 'da / ni
Monmouthshire all than be with us
Monmouthshire have a different intonation to us

lawr ma/n'yn //
down here

down here?

(133) // .. go/beithio "en/joy"-id di dy hunan //...yn yr
hope enjoy you your self in the
I hope you enjoy yourself in

/ Alban // .. byddwn / ni // lan ma/n'yn
Scotland will be we up here
Scotland. We'll be up here
yn yr / Almaen //
in the Germany
in Germany.

(Note in (133) how "Alban" (Scotland) and "Almaen" (Germany) are discoursally manoeuvred into contrast as well.)

5.2.3. Prepositions

The focal behaviour of prepositions is a very difficult area of study. There has been much argument as to their syntactic status (lexical or non-lexical), and their focal behaviour seems to justify the controversy. Their inclusion in this section means they are here considered non-lexical, but as has been mentioned before, no theoretical implications of a syntactic nature are to be read into what is basically a decision of convenience.

The question with which we are concerned is whether a focal preposition involves a discoursal presupposition, and if so, of what nature. For the purposes of this work, only two fundamental types of presupposition are taken into account.

1. When a focal information constituent specifies some part of its IU as given information. Such is generally the case when a non-final lexical item realizes the focal information constituent - information following it is specified as given (see 5.3) e.g.

(134) // .. mae hi’n / aelod ym / Bethel / Tymbl //
is she (asp)member in Bethel Tumble

She’s a member in Bethel Tumble.

The focal non-final lexical item "aelod" (member) specifies what follows it is the IU - "Bethel Tymbl" (Bethel Tumble) -
as given information, derivable from the discourse.

2. When a focal information constituent implies the existence of another element, that element being derivable by contrast with the focal information constituent. Focal personal pronouns generally entail such a presupposition e.g.

(135) // ti / wedi / gweed y / stuff 'yn / ni mynd a //
you (asp) see the stuff (aux) we go with

You've seen the stuff we're taking.

i.e. "just imagine what you'll have to take"

It is suggested that a focal preposition can involve a presupposition of either type.

(i) The signalling of given information

A focal preposition can specify a part of the IU as given information. It may be thought therefore that a preposition behaves like a lexical item when realizing the focal information constituent. But this does not follow, for the way in which it specifies given information may differ from the way in which a focal lexical item does so. A lexical item specifies as given only that information which follows it in the IU, therefore a focal lexical item which is final in the IU does not specify any information as given. It does not involve any presupposition at all and is therefore unmarked as regards focus. A focal preposition, on the other hand, can specify information as given when it appears final in the IU:

(136) // so ti'n / gweithio dan / ddaear o / achos e //
so you(asp) work under ground of cause it

So you're working underground because of it.
"gweithio dan ddaear" (working underground) is specified as given information by the focal preposition.
So that whereas a focal lexical item can specify information as given only when it is non-final in the IU (i.e. followed by another lexical item or demonstrative pronoun or adverb), that information being what follows the lexical item only, a focal preposition can specify information as given when it is final in the IU, that information consequently being able to precede it. Further, it can specify preceding information in the IU as given when non-final in the IU:

(137) // so ti'n / gweithio dan / ddaear o / arian yr / arian //
So you (asp) work underground of cause the money.

What precedes the focal preposition "gweithio dan ddaear" is specified as given in addition to what follows it "arian" (money).

(ii) **Contrastive presupposition**

"In the most general terms, a preposition expresses a relation between two entities, one being represented by the prepositional complement" (Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech and Svartik (1972) p.306). Any contrast will be in the type of relation, or between a relation and its absence. To state that a preposition will form a contrastive presupposition among
members of its own set (assuming we have a set which we can call prepositions), though, is too broad a statement, for the system of prepositions can be further classified into semantically based subsets according to the type of relation they express. It is normally within these subsets that a contrast will operate:

(138)  //  pryd oen nhw wedi / dala fe // .. oen i / moin
when (aux) they (asp) catch it (aux) I want

When had they caught it? I wanted to

/ sowybod // .. oedd / bachan / wedi bod / maes //
know (aux) boy (asp) be out

know. A chap had been out

.. y / nos / cyn 'ny // .. a dod/ mewn //
the night before that and come in
the night before and had come in

.. a / ywerthu / sewin i nhw // .. yn y / bore //
and sell sew in to them in the morning
and sold them a sew in the morning.

(139)  //  pwy byddai wor / ddul // .. a dod / 'nol ar
who would be so daft as come back on
who would be so daft as come back on
to

/ beic mewn / canol / gaaen' // .. a cael / wech
bike in middle winter and get six
bike in middle of winter and have six
neu saeth / peint // .. newn / clwb Pantyffynnon //
or seven pint in club Pantyffynnon
or seven pints in Pantyffynnon Club,

.. a / wedyn / chwarae i nhw // .. y / bore
and then play to them the morning
and then play for them the morning

/ 'rol 'ny //
after that
after?

(140) // .. oen i / wedi / cwrdd a / Milo // .. y / "weekend"
(aux) I (asp) meet with Milo the weekend
I'd met Milo the weekend

/ cyn 'ny // .. yn y / "Royal / Oak" /
before that in the Royal Oak
before in the Royal Oak.

(141) // .. wyt ti'n / priodi / cyn / cupla //
(aux) you(asp) marry before finish
Are you getting married before finishing?

(138)-(141) all involve focal prepositions which belong to the
subset of "time". In (138), // y / nos / cyn 'ny // (the
night before) contrasts with the "base" point of time reference
when what was said actually took place, in other words "time
when". Similarly in (139) and (140). In (141) the contrast
could be between "before" and "time when" (i.e. when the
addresses finishes) or "after".
We have a situation then where if a focal preposition involves a contrastive presupposition, the contrast will be between it and one or more members of its subset. The term subset has admittedly been used rather glibly. Thus far we have been dealing with a subset based on the notion of time relations, but obviously such a subset can be further categorized. I do not know of any work done in this area on Welsh, but the treatment of English prepositions by Quirk et al (1972 p.297-337) can usefully be borrowed for this purpose:

(a) Time "when": 'at', 'on', 'in', or absence of preposition.
Welsh: / am / / ar / / yn / e.g. "am un o'r gloch"
(at 1 o'clock); "ar ddydd Sul" (on Sunday); "yn y nos"
in the night).

(b) Duration: 'for' etc.
Welsh: "am" "yn ystod" "trwy" "dros" e.g.
"am yr haf" (for the summer); "yn ystod yr haf" (during the summer); "trwy'r haf" (through the summer); "dros yr haf" (over the summer).

(c) 'before' 'after' 'since' and 'until'
Welsh: "cyn" "ar ol" "ddar" "tan" "nesbo'" e.g.
"cyn nadolig" (before Christmas); "ar ol nadolig" (after Christmas); ddar nadolig" (since Christmas); "tan nadolig" (till Christmas); "nesbo' nadolig" (till Christmas).

(d) 'between' 'by' and 'up to'
Welsh: "rhwng" "erbyn" "lan i" e.g.
"rhwng un a dau o'r gloch" (between 1 and 2 o'clock);
"erbyn un o'r gloch" (by 1 o'clock); "lan i un o'r gloch" (up to 1 o'clock).
Now, we have a syntactic class: *preposition*. This class is divided into broad semantic categories, one of which is "time". The category "time" is further subdivided on the basis of more delicate semantic considerations. What concerns us is the level of delicacy needed to provide a suitable set within which contrasts are operable from a focal viewpoint. Possibly the most frequent contrasts are found within the more delicate subsets above e.g. between "cyn" (before) and "ar ol" (after); "ddar" (since) and "nesbo" (till). The "duration" subset would most likely appear in contrast with "non-duration" or "part-duration" e.g.

(142) A: // .. wyt ti'n / gweithio / dros yr haf //
(aux) you(asp) work over the summer
Are you working over (all) the summer?
B: // na // ond am dwy / fis //
no but for two months
No. Only for two months.

Contrasts can, however, operate on an inter-subset basis.

(143) A: // .. ddwedodd e' am / un o'r / gloch //
said he at one of the bell
Did he say at one o'clock
.. neu am / ddau o'r / gloch //
or at two of the bell
or at two o'clock?
B: // ddwedodd e' / rhwng un a / dau //
said he between one and two
He said between one and two.
(144) // fydd / o' ma an / un // ... a fydd ei
will be he here at one and will be his
He'll be here at one, and his wife'll be

/ wraig 'ma / erbyn un //
wife here by one
here by one.

(145) // .. fuais i'n / chwarae rhwng / Medi a
(aux) I (asp) play between September and
I played between September and

na/dolig // .. ond / dim / ddar na/dolig //
Christmas but not since Christmas
Christmas, but not since Christmas.

The best solution is to opt for the broad semantic category of
time as the set in which contrasts such as the above operate, as
anything more delicate is likely to be too restrictive. We can
then use the same approach with prepositions of "place".

(146) // .. mae rhaid nhw fynd / lan i / "Brecon" //
(aux) necessity them go up to Brecon
They have to go up to Brecon,

"trwy" "Brecon // lan yr / "A four six / five"//
through Brecon up the A 465,
through Brecon, up the A 465.
"trwy" (through) is in additional contrast to
"lan i" (up to).
(147) As // .. des ti / lan i / heol Cryn/hwyl // do fe // 
came you up to road Crynhwyl was it 
You came up Crynhwyl Road, did you?

des ti / ddim trwy'r / dre // 
came you (neg) through the town 
You didn't come through town.

Bt // .. des ti / trwy Llan/dover bach // 
came you through Llandovery, little 
Did you come through Llandovery, bach?

"trwy" is in potential contrast with "lan i" (up to), "heibio" 
(past), "round" (around) etc., or just "not through" i.e. relation 
vs. lack of relation.

(148) // .. mae / "Pullin" // .. mae ei / brofiad / e // 
(aux) Pullin is his experience him 
Pullin .. his experience is more -

.. yn / fwy- // wedwn ni // - mwy / cyfyng //—// 
(asp) more say we more restricted 
let's say - more restricted

.. i r / "pack" / reit // .. mae / "Hike 
to the pack right is Hike 
to the pack. Right? Mike 
/
Gibson" // .. tu/faes y / "pack" // .. mae 
Gibson outside the pack is 
Gibson is outside the pack.
e'n / well i / gapten // .. i fod tu/faes y
he(asp)better to captain to be outside the
It's better for a captain to be outside the

/ "pack" // .. na tu/fewn y / "pack" //
pack than inside the pack
pack than inside the pack.

Here we have an oppositional contrast between "tu faes" (outside) and "tu fewn" (inside). Potentially (though not in (148) where the contrast is explicit) a preposition like "tu fewn" could also contrast with "tu ol" (behind), "wrt[h] ochr" (beside), "ar y dde o" (on the right of), "ar ben" (on top of), "o dan" (below) etc. In other words, its most likely contrastive subset is, following Quirk et al (1972), that of "relative position", but as with "time" prepositions, we do not wish to restrict the area of potential contrast to within these more delicate subsets.

Whereas "time" and "place" prepositions and the relations they express have been relatively clearly defined, such is unfortunately not the case with other categories, e.g. cause, motive, target, destination, manner, stimulus etc. etc.. To state the contrastive implications appertaining to these prepositions when focal, if indeed there are any, is an extremely difficult task and will not be attempted here. Further research into the semantics of the relations expressed by these prepositions is necessary before the theory can be extended to absorb them.

Certain prepositions would be very unlikely to receive focus, especially those classified as "agentive", "instrument", "means" etc. e.g.
Apart from the obvious possible occurrence of (149) and (150) in a context of correction (where the contrast is similar to that involved by a non-lexically stressed tonic syllable), the above examples can also be used for a polarity contrast, as shown in the following contexts:

(149) (a) As: // .. pam ddef/nyddion nhw / gyllell i / ladd e\' //

why used they knife to kill him

Why did they use a knife to kill him?

.. dylon nhw fod / wedi ddef/nyddio / dryl //

should they (aux) (asp) use gun

They should have used a gun.

Bs: // .. gas e ei / ladd / gyda / dryll //

got he his kill with gun

He got killed with a gun.

(150) (a) As: // .. dylai fod / cwilydd arnat ti //

should be shame on you

You should be ashamed

.. am / wneud siwd / bath //

for do such thing

for doing such a thing.
The type of meaning which it is suggested could be involved here is "He did get killed by a gun" and "I am ashamed". An alternative and much more frequently used method of employing the same contrast is for the auxiliary features to be focal:

(151) // gas e' ei / ladd gyda / dryll //

(152) // mae / cwilydd arna i //

This is dealt with in the next section.

"gyda", "'da"

Probably the most difficult of the prepositions because of the variety of relations it can express, e.g.

"agentive" - "gas e ei ladd 'da Wil"
    got he his kill by Will
    He was killed by Will.

"instrument" - "gas e ei ladd 'da dryll"
    got he his kill by gun
    He was killed with a gun.

"accompaniment" - "wyt ti'n mynd 'da Wil"
    (aux) you(asp) go with Will
    Are you going with Will?

"support" - "wyt ti 'da fi"
    are you with me
    Are you with me?
"possession" - "mae cot newydd 'da Hair"
  is coat new with Hair
  Hair has a new coat.

"referential" - "'na pwy sy 'da ti"
  that who is with you
  That's who you mean

certain idiomatic expressions e.g. "fi 'da ti"
  I with you
  I'm with you/I understand.

We shall now briefly discuss the presuppositions (if any) involved in the different relations expressed by "'da" when focal.

Focal 'instrument' "'da" was described above in terms of involving a polarity contrast. Focal 'agentive' "'da", albeit extremely unlikely to be focal, can be treated in the same way. Idiomatic expressions such as // fi / 'da ti // (I understand/I'm with you), have neutral focus on the preposition and are therefore unmarked.

When displaying "support", focal "'da", unless followed by a lexical item, is neutral as regards presupposition:

(153) // .. mae'r / teulu i / gyd / 'da ti //
  is the family to all with you

The whole family is with you.

/y teulu i gyd/ is unspecified as to its informational status, "'da" in this case being uncharacteristic of focal prepositions generally which specify what precedes them in the IU as given information also. Anything following focal 'supportive' "'da" is of course specified as given, which likens the focal behaviour of "'da" in this case to that of lexical items:
The whole family's with your father.

Focal "'da" in its function of conveying a relation of "accompaniment" is almost inherently additional though not in the sense of involving a contrastive presupposition. That is, it does not imply the existence of another element derivable by additional contrast with it - it is the relation it expresses which is additional. The presupposition it involves is consistent with other prepositions assumed not to be contrastive; it signals as derivable at least one of the elements between which it expresses a relation:

(155) A: // ... aethon ni / laur i'r / Tenby //
    went we down to the Tenby
    We went down to the Tenby.

B: // Tenby // ... a / wedyn i'r / club //
    Tenby and then to the club
    Tenby. And then to the club.

A: // ... a / 'na pryd gas / Ronald ti //
    and that when got Ronald me
    And that was when Ronald got me

... ar y / "whisky" // ... a / wedyn //
    on the whisky and then
    on the whisky. And then,
.. o'r / Tenby / lan i'r / club //
from the Tenby up to the club
from the Tenby up to the club,

.. a daeth / Ronald / 'da ni //
and came Ronald with us
and Ronald came with us.

Although "Ronald" is given here, what is specified as derivable by
the focal preposition is the prepositional complement i.e. "we were/
went somewhere".

(156) As // .. mae rhaid ti / "load"-o'r / fan / lan //
(aux) necessity you load the van up
You have to load up the van.

.. gy/meriff / hwnna / oriau i ti // t'wel //
will take that hours to you you see
That'll take you hours, see.

B: // .. gel / di dddod / 'da fi //
will get you come with me
You can come with me.

(157) // .. oedd / fi a'n / wraig ar y / llavr //
was I and my wife on the floor
My wife and I were on the floor

.. fel / oedd hi // .. byddai mam/gu
as was it would be gran
as it was. Mamgu would have
ar y / llawr / 'da ni // .. 'asai / hi wedi
on the floor with us if(aux) she (asp)
on the floor with us if she'd
dod / ian // hefyd //
come up too
come up too.

(158) // .. a oech chi'n / para/toi i fynd / gartre //
and (aux) you(asp) prepare to go home
And you were preparing to go home,

.. a oech chi'n / mynd ar y / tren //
and (aux) you(asp) go on the train
and you were going by train

.. a / Martin / 'da chi //
and Martin with you
and Martin with you.

Focal "'da" as possession marker signals as given both items related by the preposition i.e. possessor and possessed. There is no implication of contrast.

(159) // .. 'sdim / celfi / 'da hi //
(aux)(neg) furniture with her
She doesn't have any furniture

(160) // .. maes / gerdd / 'da'r / dyn drws / nesa' //
is garden with the man door next
The man next door has a garden.
There seem to be severe constraints on the occurrence of "'da" in its referential use. It nearly always occurs in a relative clause, immediately following the relative particle "sy" with which it frequently joins to form "s'da", and followed by a pronoun:

(161) // nawr fi'n / gwybod pwy / s'da ti //
now I (asp) know who (ref-+t) with you

Now I know who you mean.

In this environment, focal "'da" is unmarked. A change of environment would probably entail a different construction:

(162) * // nawr fi'n / gwybod pwy sy / 'da Will //
(163) // nawr fi'n / gwybod pwy mae / Will yn / meddwl //
now I (asp) know who (aux) Will (asp) mean

Now I know who Will means.

Displaced Prepositions

These follow the general characteristic of focal prepositions as a whole, but in a modified way. As they normally occur in final position, they cannot signal a following complement as derivable. Indeed, in some cases it is difficult to talk of a prepositional complement at all:

(164) // pwy vyt ti'n / gwneud e' / i //
who (aux) you (asp) do it to

Who are you doing it for?

The type of information signalled as derivable here is "I know you're doing it (but who are you doing it for?)". If a displaced preposition does have a complement, that complement will be signalled as given e.g.
(165) // .. pwy / bart o / "Cyprus" oen mhw / mewn //
    what part of Cyprus were they in
What part of Cyprus were they in?

The speaker knows and signals as derivable, that they were in Cyprus.

5.2.4. Verbal auxiliaries

We shall confine our interest in this subsection to three types of verbal auxiliary.

1. Auxiliary features. These take the form of three paradigms:
   (a) the "-iff" paradigm ("-ith" in Jones & Thomas 1974);
   (b) the "-ai" paradigm; (c) the "-odd" paradigm. Structurally, they are to be found at the sentence element Auxiliary, and, following what Jones & Thomas propose as the Auxiliary Carrier Transformation, are responsible for any verbal inflections. To demonstrate: the deep structure of a simple Welsh sentence posited by Jones & Thomas can be portrayed thus:

   pt. + Aux. + NP + VP.

This produces a sentence such as "dorrodd Wil y ffenest"

broke Will the window

Will broke the window

as follows:

pt. + Aux. + NP + VP
pt. Aux. NP V NP
∅ -odd Wil torri y ffenest

Auxiliary Carrier transformation takes V. to Aux.

"dorrodd Wil y ffenest"

19 pt. = Pre-sentential particle, which rarely occurs in the dialect described here. The particle does however cause the following verb to mutate. The mutation has remained even though the particle has been elided.
It is possible for the auxiliary feature to carry focus. Were it to do so in the above example, location of the tonic syllable would be as follows:

(166) // dorrodd / Wil y / ffenest //

which means that if focus is assigned to an auxiliary feature, it is phonologically expounded by the location of the tonic syllable on the lexically stressed syllable of the main (lexical) verb which carries the feature by virtue of the transformation. There is no surface (phonological) distinction then between the focal lexical verb and the focal auxiliary feature.

The surface form

(167) // dorrodd e'r / ffenest //

broke he the window
He broke the window

is ambiguous as to the identity of the focal information constituent. It could be realised by the lexical verb "torri" or by the auxiliary feature "-odd". The tonic syllable is the same in either case. One generally relies on that part of the discourse to clarify the issue. Consider (167) in the following contexts:

(167)(a) // beintodd e'r / ffenest yn y / bore //
painted he the window in the morning
He painted the window in the morning.

.. aeth e an / vac ar o1/ cino //
went he for walk after dinner
He went for a walk after dinner.
Then he came back and broke the window.

The focal information constituent here is realized by the lexical verb “torri”. Focus is marked, the presupposition being the signalling of “ffenest” as given.

(167)(b) A: // .. mae / Wil yn / gwely // .. achos bod e' is Will in bed cause (aux) he Will's in bed, because he's / wedi / torri'r / ffenest // (asp) break the window broken the window.

B: // dorrodd e'r / ffenest // broke he the window

Did he break the window?

The focal information constituent in (167)(b) is realized by the auxiliary feature “-odd” — “Did he break the window?" Focus is marked, but the presupposition in this case is the implication of a polarity contrast. This polarity contrast is characteristic of the focal auxiliary feature.

(168) A: // .. dylan nhw fod / wedi ei / ladd e should they (aux) (asp) his kill him

They should have killed him
am / 'na //
for that
for that.

B: // laddon nhw fe //
killed they him
They did kill him.

"They should have killed him" implies that they didn't.
"They did kill him" thus involves a polarity contrast.
The "-iff" and "-ai" paradigms can involve a modality contrast
when the auxiliary feature is focal:

(169) A: // dylet ti / ladd e //
should you kill it
You should kill it.

B: // ladden i fe // ... oond mae'n
would kill I it but (aux) my
I would kill it, but my
/
/ wraig ddím / eisiau i ti //
wife (neg) want to me
wife doesn't want me to.

i.e. "I would ..., but ...

(170) A: // ... mae / eisiau i ti / spaddu'r / gath 'na //
is need to you castrate cat that
You want to castrate that cat.
Bt // spadda // i fe // paid a wynd / 'wlaen //
will castrate I it don't go on
I will castrate him. Don't go on!
i.e. "I will ..."

Note that where the auxiliary feature realizes the focal information constituent, the lexical verb which carries it is always given.

2. Aspectual Auxiliaries

These take a form of "bod" (be) plus an aspect marker. "bod" carries the auxiliary feature, and, in the dialect under discussion, can occur in the following forms:

"mae" (generally "is")
"oedd" ("was")
"bydd" ("will be")
"byddai" ("would be")

The only aspect markers with which we are concerned are "yn" and "wedi".

Any combination of a "bod" form plus aspect marker is possible. In order to avoid argument over tense depiction etc. examples of various combinations will be explained only by their English equivalents:

"mae e'n dod"20 = "he is coming"

20 "mae e'n dod" is a contraction of the more literary "mae ef yn dod". The "f" is elided from the pronominal "ef" (he), followed by elision of the "y" from the aspect marker "yn" in the environment of the preceding vowel, giving "mae e'n dod". The aspect marker "yn" always retains its full form when focal. (wedi" does not necessarily do so).
"oedd e'n dod" = "he was coming"
"bydd e'n dod" = "he will be coming"
"byddai fa'n dod" = "he would be coming"
"mae e wedi dod" = "he has come"
"oedd e wedi dod" = "he had come"
"bydd e wedi dod" = "he will have come"
"byddai fa wedi dod" = "he would have come"

When the aspectual auxiliary is focal, the tonic syllable can be either the aspect marker or the form of "bod" without any difference to the presupposition involved. Two kinds of focal implication may be involved when the aspectual auxiliary realizes the focal information constituent. Which particular one is applicable in a given instance is discoursally determined, though the distinction between the two is not always clear, as will be shown below. The two types of implication are contrast and emphasis. The contrast is generally one of polarity, though considerations of tense can enter into it also. Emphasis can be regarded as a separate type of presupposition peculiar in the main to focal aspectual auxiliaries. It plays a "supporting" role to something that has gone before, emphasizing a piece of given information. In this role, it can only be seen as reiterating more strongly something which has preceded, and it is this that makes it presupposing.

(171) // .. mae e' / fod i / symud // .. mae yw e (aux) it be to move (neg)(aux) it It's supposed to move. It isn't.
The focal aspectual auxiliary in (171) involves a polarity contrast.

(172) A: // .. oedd hi'n / grac //
was she (asp) angry

She was angry.

B: // .. amboitu / beth //
about what

About what?

A: // .. bod hi / hab dod / lan i / "Edinburgh" //
be she without come up to Edinburgh

That she hadn't come up to Edinburgh.

de oedd hi'n / dweud hi //
(excl)(aux) she (asp) say it

Oh she was saying it.

C: // beth mae e'n / dweud // nawr //
what (aux) he (asp) say now

What's he saying now?

B: //.. bod / ti ddim mynd / lan i / "Edinburgh" //
be you (neg) go up to Edinburgh

That you weren't going up to Edinburgh.
D: // nac oech chi am / fwyd 'te "Auntie / Katy"//
(neg)(aux) you for go then Auntie Katie
Didn't you want to go then Auntie Katie?

B: // .. yn / grwc oedd hi // .. bod hi ddim
(asp) angry was she be she (neg)
Angry she was, (that) she wasn't

/ yn mynd //

(asp) go going.

i.e. "She was angry because she wasn't going, not because she was going."

(173) A: // byddwch / mwy na/turiol nawr // .. dim
be more natural now no
Be more natural now. Doesn't

/ ots am/boitu -
odds about
matter about ...

B: // .. fi / yn na/turiol //

I (asp) natural
I am natural.

The imperative "Be more natural" implies "You're not being natural at the moment." The reply "I am natural" thus involves a polarity contrast.
(174) A: // .. by'n / dawel / "Pork" achan //
be (asp) quiet Pork boy
Be quiet, Pork man.

B: // .. fi / yn / dawel // .. fi heb / dweud
I (asp) quiet I without say
I am quiet. I haven't said

dim / byd / 'to //
nothing yet

anything yet.

As in (173), "Be quiet" implies "you're not quiet". "I am quiet" contradicts this, involving a polarity contrast.

(175) // .. fi / wedi bod yn / dawel yn / drifo //
I (asp) be (asp) sick (asp) drive
I have been sick whilst driving.

Polarity contrast. The conversation is about the way driving takes one's mind off travel-sickness.

(176) A: // .. wel os wyt / ti moin / dysgu'r / iaith
well if (aux) you want learn the language
Well if you want to learn the Welsh language,

Gym/vaeg // .. mae / rhaid i / ti //
Welsh i.e. necessity to you
you'll have to

.. ddod / mewn i'r / pethau / 'na //
come in to the things that come into those things.
"If you want to learn the Welsh language" entails "you haven't learnt it yet". The comment "he has learnt it" contradicts this (polarity contrast). This example is interesting, however, in that there is a tense contrast superimposed on the polarity contrast in the "hasn't yet/already has" opposition.

(177) A: // .. oedd e'n / dda // .. oedd e'n / dda //
  was he (asp) good   was he (asp) good
He was good. He was good.

B: // .. oedd e / yn dda //
  was he (asp) good
He was good.

The focal aspectual auxiliary in B reiterates more forcibly the sentiment expressed by A, i.e. "he was good". Note how the aspect marker takes its full form when realizing the tonic syllable, as opposed to having its vowel elided in A's utterance.

(178) A: // .. mae e'n / chwysu / nawr // — // .. a
  (aux) he (asp) sweat now and
He's sweating now. And

/ hasyd oen nhw'n / meddwl //
  too (aux) they (asp) think
they also thought that there
.. byddai / rhywbeth yn y / "tapes" amboitu
would be something in the tapes about
would be something in the tapes about

/ "Kennedy" 'n cael ei / saethu //
Kennedy(asp) get his shot
Kennedy getting shot.

B: // .. mae nhw / yn / ofni //
(aux) they (asp) fear
They are afraid. 21

(179) A: // ferch / neiə ydy hi //
girl nice is she
She's a nice girl.

B: // .. mae hi / yn ferch / neiə lawn //
is she (asp) girl nice very
She is a very nice girl.

(180) // .. mae nhw'n "professionals" //
are they(asp) professionals
They're professionals.

.. mae nhw / yn proffeisiynol //
are they (asp) professional
They're professionals. They are professional.

(181) A: // beth yw / amw'r / cor 'na o'r / gogledd//
what is name the choir that from the north
What's the name of that choir from the North?

21 Although the word "ofni" (fear) is not explicitly mentioned, the idea is conveyed by "chwysu" (sweat). This method of acquiring the status of given information is discussed in 5.3.1.
There's a very good choir from the North.

B: // cor / Rhos // .. mae / lot o / gorau
choir Rhos are lot of choirs
Rhos choir. There are a lot of choirs

yn y / gogledd //
in the north
in the North.

A: // ia // Rhos // .. ond / Rhos / bath yw e //
yes Rhos but Rhos what is it
Yes. Rhos. But Rhos what is it?

B: // Rhos / Llanerch/grugog //
Rhos Llanerchgrugog

Rhos Llanerchgrugog.

A: // Llanerch/grugog // glywaie / i nhw //
Llanerchgrugog heard I them
Llanerchgrugog. I heard them.

B: // .. wedi / clywed nhw / laver gwraith //
(asp) hear them many time
I've heard them many times.

A: // o // .. mae nhw / yn dda //
oh. (aux) they (asp) good

Oh. They are good.
(182) A: // .. oedd dy / dad  yn / llawn //
was your father (asp) full
Your father was full.

B: // .. maen' / dad  yn / wastad  yn / llawn //
is my father (asp) always (asp) full
My father's always full.

A: // .. oedd e'n  / llawn pryd / 'ny //
was be(asp) full time that
He was full then.

.. oedd e / yn  llawn // .. y pryndaw // 'ny //
was he (asp) full the afternoon that
He was full that afternoon.

(177) - (182) display the emphatic function of this type of focus, where something which has preceded is reiterated more forcibly. It is this piece of given information derivable from the emphatic form, which provides the presupposition.

It was suggested above that the distinction between the contrastive and emphatic function of the focal aspectual auxiliary was not always clear. Such is the case in the following examples:

(183) A: // wedodd e / 'na // .. achos bod / Mam wedi
said he that cause (aux) Mam (asp)
He said that because Mam

/ dweud 'tho fe oedd e'n / yfed //
say to him (aux) he(asp) drink
told him he drank
said Ham to him (aux) he (asp)

Mam told him he

/ yfed yn / wael //

drink (asp) bad

drank badly.

B: // wel mae e / yn //

well (aux) he (asp)

Well he does.

The focal implication here could be emphatic, reiterating more
forcibly the fact that the subject does drink heavily; or it
could be contrastive - if A's statement was taken to imply that
the subject did not really drink heavily, B's focal aspectual
auxiliary would contradict it, thus involving a polarity con-
trast. The discourse does not make it clear which particular
implication the focus carries here. There is no theoretical
constraint which prevents it from carrying both.

All the examples of focal aspectual auxiliaries cited
hitherto have been phonologically expounded by the location of
the tonic syllable on the aspect marker, and this does seem the
most frequent form of exposition. The tonic syllable can,
however, also go to the form of / bod /, with similar pre-
suppositions to those seen above, e.g.

(184) A: // ... mae nhw'n / par yn / weddol / ifanc

are they(asp) pair(asp) fairly young

They're quite a young couple,
This shows the emphatic function of the aspectual auxiliary, with the "mae" form of "bod" as tonic syllable. Note how the aspect marker is left out here together with the derivable information which is emphasized.

(185) A: // .. mae rhaid c / weithio'n / galed //
(aux) necessity he work(asp) hard
He's got to work hard

.. os mae a / moin dod / 'mlaen //
if (aux) he want come on
if he wants to get on.

B: // mae fo'n / gweithio'n / galed //
(aux) he (asp) work hard
He is working hard.

The focal aspectual auxiliary contradicts the possible implication that he is not working hard, thus involving a polarity contrast.

Not many examples occurred in the data of tonic syllable location being on the form of "bod". When the aspectual auxiliary is focal, it seems the most usual phonological
exponence is the location of the tonic syllable on the aspect marker. The important point is, however, that generally speaking there is no difference in focal implication whether the tonic syllable goes to the aspect marker or the form of "bod", thus supporting the statement that it is the aspectual auxiliary which realizes the focal information constituent, whilst the tonic syllable can be either of the constituent elements. This can be further supported by the fact that the tonic syllable could go to the form of "bod" where applicable in (171) - (183) without charge of focal implication. It must be added, however, that when the tonic syllable is a form of "bod" other than "mae", it will generally involve a tense contrast also, e.g.

// oedd e'n / gryf // (he was strong)
// bydd e'n / gryf // (he will be strong)
// byddai fe'n / gryf // (he would be strong)

can all imply something like "he's not strong now".

Having discussed forms of "bod" as part of the aspectual auxiliary, it will be convenient to say a very few words about focal lexical "bod". Consider the following examples:

(186) // symo i'n / gwybod pwy / yw e //
(neg) I (asp) know who is he
I don't know who he is.

(187) // .. a oen nhw / ddim yn / deall ble
and(aux)they (neg) (asp) understand where
And they didn't understand where
/ oedd e //
was it
it was.

(188) // .. beth / oen nhw 'te // .. beth / oen nhw o
what were they then what were they of
What were they then? What were they as

/ rhan / gwaith //
part work
regards work?

(186) = (188) are unmarked as regards focus. Were a lexical item to follow focal "bod" in any of the above, that lexical item would be specified as given, thus involving the same type of presupposition as a focal lexical item. Note that the frame where focal "bod" is unmarked or involves a "lexical presupposition" consists of a preceding interrogative word (either as part of a relative clause or introducing an interrogative clause). If we change this frame, other considerations arise:

(189) // .. fi / heb / bo'n / bell ar yr / heol
I without be(asp) far on the road
I haven't been far on that road

/ 'na // .. o / gwbl //
that of all
at all.
It wasn't W. Harris was it? 

... was / Wynford / Harris 'na //

is Wynford Harris there

There's a Wynford Harris there,

.. ti'n / gwybod //

I (asp) know

I know.

B: // na // H. / Harris //

no H. Harris

No. H. Harris.

A: // wellai / taw e / oedd e 'ts //

perhaps that he was it then

Perhaps it was him then.

(191) // .. "I'm / not a / crook" wedodd e' //

said he

"I'm not a crook", he said.

.. ond 'dy / ni'n / gwybod //

but (aux) we (asp) know

But we know

.. taw / "real / crook" / yw e //

that real crook is he

he is a real crook.
(192) // dylan ni / gael yr / wythnos / byn wedodd e // should we get the week this said he
"This week should be

.. yn / ffain // .. a go/beithio / bydd hi //
(asp) fine and hope will be it
fine for us" he said; "and let's hope it will be,

hefyd wedodd e //
too said he
too", he said.

(193) // wel / fi ddim gwybod / beth oedd / hwn //
well I (neg) know what was this
Well, I don't know what this was,

.. ond / "smoked / salmon" / oedd e //
but smoked salmon was it
but it was smoked salmon.

.. "up/set"odd e / fi // .. buais i'n / dost //
upset it me was I(asp) ill
It upset me. I was ill.

(194) A: // .. gath / Jean / Evans rhywbeth //
got Jean Evans something
Did Jean Evans get anything?
B: // na //
no
No.
In (189) - (194), focal "bod" is more akin to marked non-lexical focus, in that the presuppositions involved are contrasting. The type of contrast implied is one of polarity and/or tense:

(189) - polarity and tense
(190) - polarity
(191) - polarity
(192) - polarity and tense
(193) - polarity
(194) - tense.

Three particular aspects of focal "bod" which have not been discussed so far are worthy of mention:

1. Cataphoric use of "bod" in introducing something e.g.
   (195) // .. ond y / path / ye //
   but the thing is
   But the thing is ....
   This cataphoric use of focal "bod" is presupposing in that it marks as derivable something which is to follow.

2. This does not strictly speaking concern focal "bod" but rather a focal possessive functioning as "bod" for emphatic purposes:
(196) At // .. ond / dyna ei / fywyd e / ch'wel Gwyneth //
    but that his life him you see Gwyneth

But that's his life, you see, Gwyneth,

    dife // .. 'na ei / fywyd / e //
    (tag) that his life him

isn't it? That's his life.

B: // .. 'na i / waith e //
    that his work him

That's his work.

C: // ie // .. 'na / ei waith e //
    yes that his work him

Yes. That is his work.

i.e. "That to his work." Here the speaker
    uses this device as a more forcible reiteration
    of what someone else has said. Under different
    circumstances it could also be used for contras-
    tive purposes, though no such example was found
    in the text.

3. Note the potentially dual function of polarity contrast of
    focal "bod " in instances like:

(197) // .. 'na beth / oedd / gem //
    that what was game

This can mean (a) "that really was a (good) game as
    opposed to the other rubbish we've seen this season". This
is how one would expect it to operate with the implication of a polarity contrast. However, it can also mean (b) "What a load of rubbish that was", where the expected meaning is "turned on its head" as a stylistic device. Which particular implication is in operation in any given instance is normally determinable by consideration of the paralinguistic component of the text, e.g. raised eyebrows, facial expression, gesture, etc.

3. **Negative auxiliary**

This may be realized by the forms "na", "nac", "ddim", "hab".

A focal negative auxiliary is quite straightforward in that it generally involves a polarity contrast.

(198) // "so" / dylai fe / fod // .. yn / cwpla
so should he be (asp) finish
So he should be finishing

/ blwyddyn / hyn // na ddylai // .. byddai
year this (neg) should (aux)
this year. No he shouldn't.

fe wedi / cwpla blwyddyn di/wetha' //
he (asp) finish year last
He would have finished last year.

(199) // wnaeth e / tair mlynedd yng Nghaer/dydd //
did he three years in Cardiff
Did he do three years in Cardiff?
He didn't do three years in Cardiff.

(200) //... wedais i ti'n / dod am / pint fach

I said, 'Are you coming for a pint little

/ naur // na // dim / amser 'da fi //

now no no time with me

now? 'No, got no time'.

.. a oedd e / yn // nec oedd e'n

and (aux) be (asp) (neg) (aux) be (asp)

And he was... he didn't

/ edrych yn / dda //

look (asp) good

look well.

(201) //... ond y / path / yw // ... by'r rhaid

but the thing is will be necessity

But the thing is you'll have to

ti / bigo'r / fan / ian // byth cyn

you pick the van up never before

pick the van up - never before
nine of the bell in the morning
nine o'clock in the morning,

cause (neg)(aux) they on open
because they're not open.

and if (neg)(aux) you can go with it
And if you can't take it back

back before five of the bell in the
before five at

night

night ...

I am teaching

next year, anyway, if I don't

will get I job teach in
get a job - teaching in
/ "night school" //
night school
night school.

(203) // .. ti'n cael / "jokers" lawr / man'na t'wel //
you(asp) get jokers down there see
You get jokers down there, you see,
gallid di / ddim a cael // unman / arall //
can you (neg) get anywhere else
that you can't get anywhere else.

(204) As // .. mae'r / un "into/nation" yn mynd / 'mlaen //
(aux)the one intonation (asp) go on
The same intonation's going on.

B: // .. "o/kay" // gwrandwch nawr 'te
okay listen now then
O.K., listen now then.

As // .. 'na'r / pwnt fi'n trial / gwneud i ti //
that the point I(asp) try make to you
That's the point I'm trying to make to you.

B: // na 'dy'r / un "into/nation" yn mynd
(neg)(aux) the one intonation (asp) go
The same intonation isn't going

/ 'mlaen dad // dim o / gybl //
on Dad not of all
on Dad, not at all.
5.2.5. **Conjunctions**

Subordinating: "os" (if); "o achos", "cherwydd" (because); "pan", "pryd" (when); "cyn" (before); "ddar" (since) etc. etc.

Co-ordinating: "ond" (but); "a" (and); "na" (nor); "neu" (or).

The focal behaviour of conjunctions is very difficult to describe. They do not frequently realize the focal information constituent and when they do, the implications they entail are not easy to characterize. It seems the subordinating conjunctions which introduce what is traditionally known as the "subordinate clause of time" generally involve the same sort of contrastive presupposition as do their corresponding prepositions:

(205) // ... os / na e/drychid di ar y / car 'na //

if (neg) will look you on the car that

If you don't look at that car

cyn i ti fynd / ian i Caerfyrddin //

before to you go up to Edinburgh

before you go up to Edinburgh,

.. fyddid / di yw / trwbl //

will be you in trouble

you'll be in trouble.

Here, the conjunction "cyn" (before) is in potential contrast to "ar ol" (after), "tra" (while) etc.

(206) // ... fi / heb bo'n / gwaithio / ddar fi

I without (aux)(asp) work since I

I haven't been working since I
/ dorri'n / goes //
break my leg
broke my leg.

i.e. "I was working before/until I broke it."

Other conjunctions present problems, however, as do their prepositional counterparts. It seems that, as El-Menoufy (1969) suggests, the only contrast in their case is between the relation expressed by the conjunction and the lack of such a relation, such as the causal relation in (207):

(207) // .. mae a'n / gwerthu'r / car o / achos bod e
(aux) he(asp) sell the car cause (aux) he
He's selling the car because he's

/ ddim yn / gweithio //
(neg)(asp) work
not working.

"o achos" here could in fact be in contrast to "er gwaethaf" (in spite of), but such a contrast would be discoursally determined and as such cannot be proposed as a general characteristic.

The same seems to apply for co-ordinating conjunctions. "ond" (but) can only appear alone as an IU in itself when focal, and need not concern us here. The relations expressed by the others are those of addition ("a" - positive; "na" - negative) and opposition ("neu" (or)). Any contrast in evidence seems to be between the particular relation and the lack of it, as opposed to between the relation and some other relations:
(208) // .. mae / hwn rhy / "delicate" //
    is   this too   delicate

This is too delicate,

    a   mae   a rhy / fawr //
    and it's   too big

and it's too big.

Note that the information following the focal conjunction "mae a rhy fawr" (it's too big) is not specified as given. That is to say, it may or may not be, but the focal conjunction does not signal its status. In (209), we see from the text that what follows the focal conjunction is given, but this is not the responsibility of the focus. A different context could be constructed where it is not given:

(209) A: // beth mae hi'n cy/meryd //
    what (aux) she(asp) take

What is she taking?

B: // hanes //

history

History.

C: // .. "li/librarianship" wedaist / ti'r / glwddgi //
    librarianship said you the liar

You said librarianship, you liar.

B: // a / hanes //

and history

And history.
(210) A: "auntie"/Hannah//cwydd arno chi//
  aunt Hannah shame on you

  Aunt Hannah! Shame on you!

cerdded lan//man'na i weld//hwnna//
  walk up there to see that

  Walking up there to see that.

B: do//a gerddwn i/'to//
  yes and would walk I again

  Yes, and I'd walk again,

  hefyd//nawr'te//
  too now then

too. Now then!

(211) .. wnes i/ddim o fe/blwyddyn/hyn/cofia//
  did I (neg) of it year this remember

  I didn't do it this year, mind.

  na blwyddyn/dwetha'//
  nor year last

  Nor last year.

(212) allid di/ fynd 'da dy/dad//
  can you go with your father

  You can go with your father,

  neu allid di/sefyll fan/hyn//
  or can you stay place this
  or you can stay here.
We have dealt so far in this section with the main instances of non-lexical focus (i.e. where the focal information constituent is realized by a non-lexical item) in a reasonably systematic way. Before moving on to a study of marked lexical focus, we will examine in a very brief and largely ad hoc manner some of the more interesting cases of marked non-lexical focus which appeared in the data and which have not already been dealt with above.

3.2.6. "heblaw" (not to mention, let alone, except for, besides).

"Y Ceiriadur Hwyr" (Evans and Thomas 1973) lists "heblaw" as having solely the English equivalent "besides". In the dialect of Welsh described here, however, it can also mean "except for" and "not to mention/let alone". Despite its syntactic status as a preposition/conjunction, both of which categories have been dealt with above, "heblaw" is considered here to be worthy of particular mention in view of the fact that the relation it expresses is intricately entwined with its focal behaviour (along with considerations of syntax).

(213) // .. oedd / dim / "bloody" / amser 'da / fi / siarad
was no bloody time with me speak
I didn't have bloody time to speak

iddo fe // .. hab/law rhoi / arian iddo fe //
to him let alone give money to him
let alone to give him money.

In (213) "heblaw" means "let alone". This is characteristic of "heblaw" in focal position. One can go further: in order to express this relation, "heblaw" typically has a falling or rising-
falling tone, followed in the same (compound) tone-group by a rising
tone which has its point of origin at a specifiable minor tonic
syllable (see 6.1). The same pattern is evident in (214):

\[(214) \quad / \text{.. oedd / heb } 'na \text{ am / dri o'r / gloch /} \]
\[\text{was nobody there at three of the bell} \]
\[\text{There was nobody there at three o'clock,} \]
\[\text{.. heb/law'r fren/hines /} \]
\[\text{let alone the queen} \]
\[\text{let alone the queen.} \]

On the basis of this evidence, we can make a statement to the effect
that where

(a) "heblaw" is preceded by a negative element of some nature, 
and

(b) the lexically stressed syllable of "heblaw" is the location
of the tonic syllable (typically a fall or rise fall
followed by a rise on a minor tonic syllable)
"heblaw" will express the relation conveyed by the English
"let alone".

If, in (213) and (214), "heblaw" were not focal, it would mean
"except":

\[(215) \quad / \text{.. oedd / dim / } "\text{bloody" / amser } 'da / fi / siarad} \]
\[\text{was no bloody time with me talk} \]
\[\text{I didn't have bloody time to talk} \]
\[\text{iddo fe heb/law rhoi / arian iddo fe /} \]
\[\text{to him except give money to him} \]
\[\text{to him except to give him money.} \]
was nobody there at three of the bell
There was nobody there at three o'clock

heb/law'r fren/hines //
except the queen
except for the queen.

When there is no preceding negative element, "heblaw" can express the relations "besides" or "not to mention" whether focal or not:

was two Welshman there besides the official
There were two Welshmen there besides the official.

Yes, but she wants to sing,

not to mention dance
not to mention dancing.

Yes, but she wants to sing besides (as well as) dancing.

Non-focal "heblaw" can also mean "unless":

Although (215) and (216) are depicted as compound tone-groups/IU's, this is not essential to the meaning of "heblaw" as "except (for)". They could equally well be simple tone-groups (with optional focus) or made up of more than one tone-group. What is important is that "heblaw" is not focal.
(220) // .. gei di / ddim dy / dro heb/law bod

will get you (neg) your turn unless (aux)

You won't get your turn

ti'n / siapo hi //
you(asp) shape it

unless you shape it.

5.2.7. "arall" (other); "y nall" (the other (one)).

When focal, these items are "inherently contrastive". The existence of another element in the discourse is implied which is derivable by contrast with the focal item. The contrast may be additional or oppositional:

(221) // rhoiodd e / dau/dro // i- // beth yw / enw fe //
gave he two turns to what is name his

He gave two turns to - what's his name? -

-hwnna'r / nall o "A/merica" // "Bob / Hope"//

that the other from America Bob Hope

that other one from America. Bob Hope.

- oppositional contrast. The implication as found in the data was "Goodness knows how many turns Nixon would have" (on "This is Your Life").

(222) //.. beth / arall mae hi'n / deall //

what else (aux) she(asp) understand

What else does she understand?

- additional. i.e. "in addition to what you've already told me".
At Harris was playing trwy'r amser through the time all the time. It wasn't him?

B: na a mae un no is one other

No, no. There's another one.

The type of contrast is not too clear here. It could be "there's another one as well as him" or "there's another one apart from him". Note that the type of contrast was not always clear in the discussion of focal pronouns (see 5.2.2).

Over last year, he had wins over New Zealand, over the Australians,  

Over the - where else did he go? -

Oh. I don't remember. He had three
"international" // .. a en/nillodd a bob internationals and won he each internationals, and he won every

/ un o nhw //

one of them

one of them.

- additional. "Where else in addition to these places"

(225) // 'na be' sy'n bra/dychu dyn //

that what (aux)(asp) betray man

That's what gives a man away,

.. yw ei / "into/nation" e // .. a / dim byd / arall //

is his intonation him and nothing else

is his intonation and nothing else.

- oppositional. "Nothing other than his intonation".

5.2.8. Interrogative words

These include "ble" (where), "bath" (what), "pwy" (who), "p'un" (which) (contraction of "pa un" (which one)), "pam" (why).

Interrogative words rarely realize the focal information constituent, except in echo questions:

(226) // bath mae e'n / gwaed //

what (aux)he(asp) do

What's he doing?

(227) // ble aethon nhw //

where went they

Where did they go?
or questions requiring further information about a given element:

(228) At: // beth yw'r / cor 'na o'r / gogledd //
what is the choir that from the North
What's that choir from the North?

.. mae / rhyw / gor o'r //
is some choir from the North
There's some choir from the North.

.. mae / cor da / iawn o'r //
is choir good very from the North
There's a very good choir from the North.

B: // cor / Rhos // .. mae / lot o / gorsau
choir Rhos are lot of choirs
Rhos choir? There are a lot of choirs

yn y / gogledd //
in the North
in the North.

A: // ia // Rhos // .. ond / Rhos / beth yw e //
yes Rhos but Rhos what is it
Yes. Rhos. But Rhos what is it?

(229) A: // pwy yw'r gweinidog / nawr yu Ebeneser //
who is the minister now in Ebeneser
Who's the minister in Ebeneser now?

B: // Ebeneser / ble mae nhw'n / siarad amboitu //
Ebeneser where (aux)they(asp) talk about
Ebeneser where are they talking about?
The item qualified by the interrogative word is always specified as given.

The focal interrogative word also presents itself as a device to the addressee if something is wrongly presented to him by the speaker as given information (i.e., attenuated in some way). We earlier defined given information as that which was considered by the speaker to be derivable for the addressee from the discourse. It is obviously possible for the speaker to make an error in this respect. That is to say, he may present a piece of information as given which the addressee considers non-derivable. In such a case, the options open to the addressee as regards clarification include the use of a focal interrogative word, e.g.

(230) A: // gwrandwch / navr 'te // ffordd chi / ffaindio
    listen now then way you find
    Listen, now then. How do you find

    nhw / maes //
    them out

    them out?

B: // ffordd chi / ffaindio maes / bath //
    way you find out what

    How do you find out what?

In (230), the object of the phrasal verb "ffaindio maes" (find out) is considered by A to be derivable by the addressee from the context. As a result it is attenuated to the pronominal form "nhw" (then). The addressee B, on the other hand, does not consider the
referent of "uhw" to be derivable, and substitutes the interrogative word which takes focal position.

If a question of the syntagmatic form:

Interrogative word + VP (e.g. "beth sy'n bod" (What's the matter?))
is answered by the surface form:

(neg) + NP + (asp) + V + S

where S is the original question repeated, the tonic syllable in the answer will be to the left (linearly speaking) of where it appeared in the question. If focus in the question is unmarked, one of the more likely candidates for focus in the answer would be the interrogative word, e.g.

(231) Ai: // beth sy'n / bod //
   Bi: // symo i'n / gwybod / beth sy'n bod //
   (neg)I (asp) know what (aux)(asp) be
   I don't know what's the matter.

(232) Ai: // pwy sy'n / chwarae //
   who (aux)(asp) play
   Who's playing?
   Bi: // symo i'n / gwybod / pwy sy'n / chwarae //
   (neg) I (asp) know who (aux)(asp) play
   I don't know who's playing.

(233) Ai: // ble ddig/wyddodd y / ddamwain //
   where happened the accident
   Where did the accident happen?
It would be unacceptable to have the focal information constituent realized by the last lexical item in the answers in (231) - (233). This is not to say that focus is restricted to the interrogative word in these examples, merely that it is one of the likelier choices. The presupposition involved is the specification of what follows the interrogative word as given.

3.2.9. "cvrs" (course), "siwr" (sure), "bwn" (bound).

These items can be said to be "inherently emphatic" though they can involve a contrast as well depending on that part of the discourse in which they appear. Normally they appear in their respective idiomatic phrases, e.g. "wrth cvrs" (of course), "siwr o fod" (sure to be, probably), "bwn o fod" (bound to be), but our interest lies in their focal behaviour when independent of their idioms.

(234) At // .. oes dim / un / nofel / ffor'na yng Ngymraeg //

is (neg) one novel like that in Welsh

There isn't one novel like that in Welsh.

-- // .. es i / lan i / Llyfray'r / Dryw 'achan//

went I up to books the Wren boy

I went up to Wren Books man.
They were sure to have made one!

The emphatic use of focal "siwr" here is used as a stylistic device for the purposes of sarcasm.

(235) // .. oech chi'n / meddwl am/dano fe o / hyd //

(aux) you (asp) think about it all the time

You were thinking about it all the time.

.. oech chi / bown o fod yn / hala'ch hunan

(aux) you bound of (aux)(asp) send yourself

You were bound to be making yourself

yn / dost //

(asp) ill

ill.

The conversation is about the psychology of travel sickness.

(236) A: // .. symo / "Porky" / gallu / siarad Cymraeg //

(neg) Porky can speak Welsh

Porky can't speak Welsh.

B: // cwrw bod e'n / siarad Cymraeg //

course (aux) he (asp) speak Welsh

(OF) course he can speak Welsh.

(237) A: // .. 'dy e / ddim gwneud dim / gwaniaeth o / gybl //

(aux)it (neg) make no difference at all

It doesn't make any difference at all.
Note in (236) and (237) we have a contrastive use of "cwrs", contradicting the previous statement which is derivable by contrast with it. Under different circumstances, of course, the function of focal "cwrs" could be emphatic, e.g.

(238) A: // .. mae e'n / gwneud / guaniaeth //  
(aux) it (asp) make difference  
It makes a difference.

B: //  
cwrs bod e'n gwneud / guaniaeth //  
(course (aux) it (asp) make difference  
(Of) course it makes a difference.

The focussing of "cwrs" along with its positioning in front of the statement constitutes a stronger reiteration of some given information. Anything following "cwrs" in the IU is of course given.

5.2.10. Partitive and Quantitative items

These include "rhai" (some), "peth" (some), "llaver" (lot, many), "lot" (lot), "digon" (plenty/enough), "gormod" (too much), "tipyn" (a bit), "i gyd" (all) etc.

When realizing the focal information constituent, these items normally involve a contrast amongst themselves, e.g.

(239) // .. 's dim / llaver o / waith i fi //  
is not much of work to me  
There's not much work for me.

i.e. "there is some", or "there is work, but not much"
The trouble is, there's too much fighting going on. I.e. "there's nothing wrong with a moderate amount of fighting".

If they've been able to clear some of them, why haven't they cleared all the others?

It doesn't matter about this, now. It does matter a lot.

One exception to the general characteristic of these items when focal is "i gyd" when appearing final in the IU:
Focus in (243) is unmarked. There is no contrastive presupposition. The English equivalent as regards focal placement would be "They'd listen to all those choirs", and not "They'd listen to all those choirs." This is not to say that "i gyd" cannot be in a contrastive relationship when focal (see (241) for instance), merely that if it were so, other factors would be necessary to convey that contrast, e.g. tone (see 7.2.3).

5.3. Marked Lexical Focus

Marked focus has been defined as involving a discoursal presupposition. In the cases of marked non-lexical focus which were described in the previous subsection, the general (though by no means universal) feature in this respect was the implication of another element derivable by contrast with the focal item. With marked lexical focus, the situation is rather different. Generally speaking, the presupposition involved by marked lexical focus is the specification of a particular part of the IU as given or derivable.

Focus is on the whole unmarked if the focal information constituent is realized by the final lexical item in the IU. Marked lexical focus, then, operates when the focal information constituent is realized by a lexical item which is not final in the IU.
final lexical item is to be understood as a lexical item which is followed by one or more other lexical items in the IU. It is these lexical items which follow the focal item which are generally specified as given information (but see 5.3.2).

5.3.1. Given information has been defined as that information which the speaker considers to be derivable for the addressee from the discourse. It is interesting to examine the reasons for treating information as given. As a basis for this discussion it may be helpful to look briefly at the work of Wallace Chafe, with special reference to his article "Language and Consciousness" (1974). It was explained above that Halliday's characterization of new information as "non-derivable" was preferred to Chafe's description of it as "(considered by the speaker as) not present in the addressee's consciousness". It was also suggested that the difference between the two definitions was at the end of the day minimal, and preference for Halliday's definition does not detract from the value of Chafe's description.

Chafe has basically three categories through which information can acquire the status "given".

1. Information which is integral to the ORIENTATION of the utterance. This includes cultural context, interactional relationships (social, status, etc.); the temporal and spatial co-ordinates of speech, e.g. certain deictic items like "na" (now), "ma" (here) etc.; speaker and addressee - "fi" (I, me), "ti", "chi" (you).
2. **Situational context**: that which is assumed by the speaker to be derivable by the addressee from the common extra-linguistic situation which they share in the space/time continuum. For example, I can open a discourse whilst walking down the street with a friend by asking:

\[(244) \quad \text{\v{y}wyr / yw'r / forch 'na} //
\]

who is the girl that

Who is that girl?

I treat "y forch 'na" as given information (see focal "bod" - 5.2.4) on the assumption that she is derivable from my interactant from the situational context which is common to us both.

3. **Text**

Whilst information considered to be derivable from the situational context is exophorically referential, that which is derivable from the text (the linguistic interaction - what is said) is endophorically referential. Endophoric reference may be of two kinds:

(a) anaphoric - referring backwards to something which has already been said. This constitutes the bulk of endophorically derivable information.

(b) cataphoric - referring forwards to something about to be said.

Our main interest lies in this field of endophorically derivable information. Obviously the most easily detectable reason for the treatment of some piece of information as given is the fact that it has already been explicitly mentioned:
(245) // 'na beth ni / mynd i / wneud / nawr 'te //
that what we go to do now then
That's what we're going to do, now then.

reit // wythnos / nesa' // .. fi 'n mynd
right week next I (asp) go
Right. Next week I'm going

i gael / "Porky" ian 'ma // reit // .. a
to get Porky up here right and
to get Porky up here. Right? And

/ wellai / rhywun / arall // .. os / ala i
perhaps someone other if can I
perhaps someone else, if I can

/ ffendidio rhywun / arall //
find someone other
find someone else.

(246) // .. ie ond / fel mae John / Evans yn / dweud //
yes but like (aux) John Evans (asp) say
Yes but as John Evans says,

.. mae e'n mae e'n un / dawr iawn //
is he(asp) is he(asp) one brave very
he's .. he's very brave,

.. a mae e'n / chwarae'n / ddawr / iawn //
and (aux) he(asp) play (asp) brave very
and he plays very bravely.
(247) A: // wedodd / Mam wrtho fe // .. bod e'n
said Mam to him (aux) he (asp)
Mammy told him that he

/ yfed yn / wasel //
drink (asp) bad
that he drank heavily.

B: // .. wel mae e / yn //
well (aux) he (asp)
Well he does.

A: // "Nigel" //
Nigel
Nigel?

B: // ydi //
(aux)
Yes.

A: // sym i ti'n /nabod / "Nigel" //
(neg) you(asp) know Nigel
You don't know Nigel.

(248) // .. mae e'n gwneud / 'r un / path a mae
(aux) he(asp) do the one thing as (aux)
He's doing the same thing as

/ "Mari/anne" yu gwneud //
Marianna (asp) do
Marianna's doing?
(249) A: // licen i gal / "job" cyn cyn / dysgu //
would like I get job before before teach
I'd like to get a job before teaching

"anyway" // .. ond os deiff ddim byd / I am //
anyway but if will come nothing up
anyway. But if nothing comes up,

.. by' / rhaid fi // by' / rhaid fi wneud
be necessity me be necessity me do
I'll have to .. I'll have to do

/ rhywbath //
something

something.

B: // bath // .. cael / "job" //
what get job

What? Get a job?

A: // ie //
yes

Yes.

B: // .. cyn / bath //
before what
Before what?

A: // wel // cyn mynd i / "teach"-o //
well before go to teach
Well, before going to teach.
nad w'i / eisias / "teach"-o //
(neg)(aux) I want teach
I don't want to teach.

(250) // 'na beth / oedd / gem // .. oem / ni'n
that what was game (aux) ve(asp)
What a game! We

/ credu // .. tav / "Welsh / Secondary / Schools"
believe that Welsh secondary schools
thought it was Welsh secondary schools,
oedd e // .. a / ffeindion ni / maes //
was it and found we out
and we found out,

.. ar ol ar ol ni / gerdded / maes // cyn e
after after we walk out before it
after we walked out before it

/ gwpla // maes yn "dis/gust" // ffeindion ni tav
finish out in disgust found we that
finished - out in disgust - we found it was

/ "West Wales / Secondary / Schools" oedd e //
West Wales secondary schools was it
West Wales secondary schools.

Note here the double occurrence of "maes" (out), both times as
tonic syllable. There is of course nothing to prevent a speaker
treating as new something he has already said, but "maes" here
carries a different meaning in each occurrence. Firstly it co-
occurs with "ffeindio" (find) as part of the phrasal verb "ffeindio
mas" (find out); the focal information constituent is realized by
the phrasal verb; secondly it functions as an adverb denoting
movement out. This is an alternative explanation of its treatment
as new information in its second occurrence - alternative, that is,
to the idiosyncratic habits of the speaker.

(251) A: // .. byddai fa'n / gwybod taw / Cymry 'dyn ni //
(aux) he (asp) know that Welshmen are we
He'd know that we were Welshmen.

B: // na // byddai / un neu / ddau wellau'n / gwybod //
o (aux) one or two perhaps(asp) know
No. One or two would know perhaps.

(252) A: // nid ond / "into/nation" // .. ond / ffordd o
not only intonation but way of
Not only intonation, but a way of

/ ddweud / "certain / vowels" // .. yn en/wedig //
say certain vowels (asp) special
saying certain vowels, especially.

B: // .. 's 'da / 'na ddim / byd i / wneud a "into/nation"//
(aux) with that nothing to do with intonation.
That's got nothing to do with intonation.

A: // o // .. 'dy e / lot i / wneud a fe 'achan //
oh is it lot to do with it boy
Oh, it's got a lot to do with, man.
(253) // allen i weld // te/ledu // lliw 'ma
could I see television colour here

I could see colour T.V. here

/ hefyd // — // fi 'dl bod / lan 'da
too I (asp) be up with
as well. I've been up with

/ "Mrs. / Job" // gwelais i'r // briodas ar
Mrs. Job saw I the wedding on
Mrs. Job. I saw the wedding on

te/ledu // lliw //
television colour
colour T.V.

(254) A: // .. mas ain / teulu / ni'n // "royalties" / mawr //
(aux) our family us(asp) royalties big

Our family are big royalties,

.. on/'dyn nhw //
aren't they
aren't they?

B: // ydyn // .. ni'n // "big / royalists" //
(aux) we(asp) big royalists

Yes, we're big royalists.

(254) provides an interesting and rather amusing example. Although
"royalists" (what was actually meant in both cases!) was given in B's
utterance - derivable from A's - there is also a sociolinguistic
"politeness" factor involved in the marking of the focus. B realizes that A (her husband) has made a mistake in the word "royalist", and she attempts to correct it without drawing attention to the fact - without focussing it, in effect. Unfortunately, she gets it wrong as well!

(255) At // .. oedd e yn yr / undeb yn / Bethel / Tymb l nawr // was he in the union in Bethel Tumble now

He was in the union in Bethel Tumble now

.. a ei / 'waer e // oedd ei / 'waer e / 'na // and his sister him was his sister him there

and his sister - his sister was there,

ed //

too

too.

B: // .. wel mae / hi'n / aelod yn / Bethel / Tymb l //

well is she(asp) member in Bethel Tumble

Well she's a member in Bethel Tumble.

(256) // .. a / siwr o / fod taw / Gwyn / Jones oedd y

and sure of be that Gwyn Jones was the

And it must have been Gwyn Jones that was the

/ tenor // 'na beth / wedodd e / bore 'ma //

tenor that what said it morning this

tenor. That's what it said this morning.
.. and i // fl // .. oen // i ddim // lico
but to me (aux) I (neg) like
But for me, I didn't like

Gwyn / Jones // fal 'ny //
Gwyn Jones like that
Gwyn Jones that much.

(257) // .. mae / rhyw / gor o'r / gogledd //
is some choir from the North
There's some choir from the North.

.. mae / cor da / iawn o'r / gogledd //
is choir good very from the North
There's a very good choir from the North.

(258) At // .. dim / 'na beth fl'n / maddwl / nawr //
not that what I(asp) mean now
That's not what I mean, now.

.. mae e'n Cym/raeg //
is it(asp) Welsh
It's Welsh.

Bi // achos mae e'n / cael ei ddef/nyddio
cause (aux) it(asp) get its use
Because it gets used

yng Cym/raeg //
in Welsh
in Welsh.
It was a pretty good team for a second team.

Fifty six.

Thirty six.

Fifty six. Twenty eight.

Forty six.

(260) points to an interesting feature of counting. Take, for example, the number 25. If counting in ones say from 21 to 30, "pump" is tonic syllable - // dàuddeg / pump //. If counting in fives, say from 20 to 60, "dàuddeg" contains the tonic syllable // dàuddeg pump //. This is because, when counting in ones, the "ten" set is given (at least for nine numbers, when it changes), and the unit is new, whilst when counting in fives, the 'five' is always given, and it is the "ten" set which is new.

The circumstances were different -
(262) A: // cwypodd y // "bloody" a/dailad 'na yn yn yn fell the bloody building that in in in That bloody building in

/ "Baglan / Bay" arnnot ti // Baglan Bay on you
Baglan Bay fall on you.

B: // cwypodd e ddim / arno i 'achan // fell it (neg) on me boy
It didn't fall on me man.

At: // na // buodd e / bron a "though" // no (aux) it near though
No, but it nearly did though.

.. ar / Dai / Wog / gwypodd e // on Dai Wog fell it
It fall on Dai Wog.

(263) // gwmys 'run / peth yn / Trostre // exactly the one thing in Trostre
Exactly the same thing in Trostre.

beth oen i'n / gwneud // .. 'na / fe // what (aux) I (esp) do that it
What was I doing? That's it,
was I in the stores in Trostre. That's it. I was in the stores in Trostre.

Half past eight - breakfast. And I was staying at breakfast.

In (243) - (264), the given information following the focal lexical item in the relevant IUs is explicitly mentioned only just previously. This need not always be the case. The information specified as given may have been mentioned a fair amount of time previously. There seems no particular limit one can impose before information ceases to be treated as given, except to state the obvious fact that in most cases the greater the time lapse from its being mentioned, the less likelihood of its being treated as given. Any observations on this point would be purely statistical, as the treatment of information as given is a feature of the speaker's choice.

Apart from the time factor, there are other features in the treatment of information as given which deserve mention in that they differ from that mentioned above. Consider the following examples:

(265) A: // dylen ni / gael yr / wythnos / hyn wedodd e // should we get the week this said he

We should get this week.
(asp) fine
fine", he said.

(Intervention of 24 IUs, discussing the weather)

not but the week last of month
It's only the last week of this month

that they're giving as sunny.

(266) A: //.. o uffern / symo i moin / "job" / ffwr'na 'achan //
o hell (neg) I want job like that boy
Oh hell. I don't want a job like that, man.

B: // na // .. te / faint yw'r / arian //
no that how much is the money
No. However much the money.

A: // ie // nad yw e / llawer // ed //
yes (neg) is it much too
Yes. It isn't much either,

and you(asp) work for it

and you work for it.

B: // .. ti / wastad yw / gweithio am e //
you always (asp) work for it
You always work for it,
.. ta' beth / uffern ti'n / ennill //
that what hell you(asp) win
whatever the hell you earn.

(267) A: // faint o / "tax" mae nhw'n cy/maryd
how much of tax (aux) they(asp) take
How much tax do they take

o / ti //
from you

off you?

B: // "third" //
third
A third.

A: // amser ti'n / briod // .. o mae
time you(asp) married oh (aux)
Whilst you're married? Oh,

/ "Frankie"'n / gweithio //
Frankie (asp) work
Frankie's working.

(268) A: // allid di / rhento / "Ford / Transit" //
can you rent Ford Transit
You can rent a Ford Transit

.. neu / rhywbeth / fel'na //
or something like that
or something like that.
B: // "Rentavan" // siwr byddai fe'n //
Rentavan. I'm sure it would be

tsiopach // ti'n / gwybod // lot lla o
cheaper you know lot less of
cheaper, you know. Lot less

/ amser //
time

time.

A: // siwr o fod / mwy o / le // ed //
sure of be more of room too
Probably. More room, too.

B: // is / is // .. fi'n / siwr // allid di
Yes yes I (asp) sure can you
Yes, yes. I'm sure you can

/ gael y / lot mevn / "Bedford" //
get the lot in Bedford
get the lot into a Bedford.

(269) A: // mynd a / stuff i / gyd yn y / car //
to with stuff all in the car
Taking all your stuff in the car?

B: // .. 'th / gywa // .. 's dim / llawer / 'da fi/ cofis//
of course (aux) not much with me mind
Of course. I don't have much, mind.
A: // ras oes e //

isn't it

Don't you?

B: // na // "furnished / flat" oedd e / t'wel //

no furnished flat was it you see

No. It was a furnished flat, you see.

A: // le // .. fi'n / gwybod // .. mae / hwn yn

yes I(asp) know is this (asp)

Yes, I know. This is

/ "furnished" // ed // .. ond ti wedi / gwald y

furnished too but you (asp) see the furnished, too, but you've seen the

/ stuff 'dyn / ni wynd a // "watch"-a / di nawr //

stuff (aux) we go with watch you now stuff we're taking. You watch now,

answer / by' / di'n / pack //

time (aux) you(asp) pack

when you'll be packing.

B: // .. by' / tair //"journey" 'na // siwr o fod //

will be three journey there sure of be

There'll be three journeys there, surely.

(270) A: // .. sut / seic oedd e //

how bike was it

What sort of bike was it?
B: // "great" 'achan //
great boy
Great, man.

A: // .. fi'n / cofio fe'n dod / 'mol 'achan //
I(asp) remember him (asp) come back boy
I remember him coming back, man.

.. ar ol / cael y / beic // .. 'na / gyd oedd
after get the bike that all (aux)
after the getting the bike, that's all

a'n / cael // .. oedd / "accidents" ar y
he(asp) get was accidents on the
he was having was accidents on the

/ "bloody / thing" 'achan //
bloody thing boy
bloody thing, man.

(271) // .. bath / dylen ni fod wedi / gwnaud //
what should we (aux) (asp) do
What we should have done:

.. dylen ni fod wedi / cael / Eamon / Andrews //
should we (aux) (asp) got Eamon Andrews
we should have got Eamon Andrews

.. yn gwnaud / "This is your / Life" // nage
(asp) do This is your Life (neg)
doing a "This is your Life".

That won't be half an hour's programme.

He was very sentimental

wasn't he this afternoon, Daddy.

He was very sentimental this afternoon.

He'd been reading, and I was thinking -

that you can read the last evening

you're in the White House.

Did you hear the speech, Auntie Hannah?
As cymerodd / Gwyneth "day / off" / faint
took Gwyneth day off How many
Gwyneth took a day off. How many

oedd / mewn // .. oedd / again 'da hi yn
were in were twenty with her (asp)
were in? She had twenty

/ eistedd yn y / "room" //
sit in the room
sitting in the room.

B: // oedd // gynta' //
was first
Yes, I can believe it.

C: // .. oedd / pobun yn mwyn/hau a //
(aux) everyone (asp) enjoy it
Everyone was enjoying it.

.. y / manywod yn en/wedig //
the women (asp) special
Especially the women.

B: // oh // .. oedd e'n / naes //
oh was it(asp) nice
Oh. It was nice.

A: // .. oedd y / bwyd // "sandwiches" // .. a'r / "coffee //
was the food sandwiches and the coffee
There was the food - sandwiches, and the coffee.
In (265) – (274), information is treated as given (that information realized by post-focal lexical items) when it has not been explicitly mentioned previously. It is suggested however that a similar procedure is at stake in the way this information acquires the status
given as we saw in (245) - (264), where the post-focal lexical items have already appeared in the discourse.

Chafe's explanation for such examples (in English) is in line with his general "consciousness" type of argument: "When we assume that something is in the addressee's consciousness, what sort of thing is the 'something'? I will claim it is what I would like to term a CONCEPT, although I will not be able to give any adequate characterization of concepts here. Sometimes they are what is conveyed by surface structure WORDS, but I don't mean at all to limit them to items of that size or kind." Chafe then demonstrates how a concept can, via pronominal attenuation, be conveyed by a sentence:

(a) Barry almost ran over me.
(b) It scared me half to death.

where (a) becomes "it" in (b).

Another of his examples, which is closer to our interest here, goes:

(275) (a) When Columbus returned from America, he was much honoured by the King and Queen.
(b) One evening the explorer was invited to dinner by the royal couple.

(275) (a) and (b) are assumed to be in sequence, as, say, the first two sentences of a story or report. That being the case, tonality and tonicity would probably operate as follows:

(276) (a) // When Columbus returned from America // he was much honored by the King and Queen //
(b) // One evening // the explorer was invited to dinner by the royal couple //

In (276)(b), "the royal couple" (post-focal lexical items) is treated as given, because, suggests Chafe, it conveys the same "concept" as "King and Queen", which has been explicitly mentioned in (276)(a).

Whilst not disagreeing with Chafe's explanation, it was resolved earlier to steer as clear as possible of controversial issues in the concept/consciousness field. This was the reason for preferring Halliday's term "non-derivable" to Chafe's "not present in the addressee's consciousness" in the definition of given information. It is also the reason for a rather wary reluctance to adopt Chafe's use of "concept". We are in fact fortunate in that our theory as it presently stands possesses a unit by means of which we can deal with examples like (265) – (276) along the same lines as those suggested by Chafe, though once more overtly avoiding rather delicate questions of consciousness and such like. This unit is the information constituent. The information constituent, it will be recalled, is a unit at the informational level (a constituent of the IU) which is realized at the syntactic level by a specifiable syntactic unit. Whilst the information constituent is in effect no less vague a unit than Chafe's "concept", it is at least necessary for the general theory outlined here, and as such presents itself as a candidate for the explanation of examples such as (265) – (273), which would otherwise be problematic.

It is suggested that the information constituent at the informational level (in the message) may be realized at the syntactic
level (in the text) in any number of ways, that the same information constituent may be realized by different syntactic units. If we take it that what is conveyed as part of an IU in such and such an instance in the message is the information constituent, then obviously that information constituent may reappear as given information elsewhere in the discourse but realized in the text in a different way, so that a syntactic unit which is treated as given (which appears in post-focal position) need not necessarily have been mentioned previously. What is given in any instance is the information constituent, and the information constituent realized by the post-focal lexical item may have been realized previously by some other syntactic constituent. In fact, it may not always be possible to link the information constituent concerned to any particular syntactic unit. Its status as given information may be acquired merely by its being "present" or "in the air" in the conversation without being realized in a syntactically identifiable fashion. That is, it is present in the message by virtue of the speaker's interpretation of the text filtered, as it were, through the context of situation and shared experience. The proposition of the information constituent as that which ultimately constitutes given information (as well as new information, of course), realizable at the syntactic level in a non-biunique manner, takes care, in a way which is intuitively satisfactory, of examples such as (265) - (274), which we shall now briefly examine in the light of the above proposition.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of example</th>
<th>Syntactic unit realizing given information constituent:</th>
<th>Given information constituent previously realized by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(265)</td>
<td>&quot;heulog&quot; (sunny)</td>
<td>&quot;ffein&quot; (fine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(266)</td>
<td>&quot;ennill&quot; (earn)</td>
<td>&quot;arian&quot; (money - for the job)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(267)</td>
<td>&quot;gweithio&quot; (work)</td>
<td>in the air - that the addressee was being taxed presupposed (in that part of the discourse) that he was working.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(268)</td>
<td>&quot;Bedford&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;fan&quot; (van) and/or &quot;Ford Transit&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(269)</td>
<td>&quot;journey&quot;</td>
<td>'mynd a stuff yn y car&quot; (taking stuff in the car).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(270)</td>
<td>&quot;y 'bloody thing'&quot; (the bloody thing)</td>
<td>&quot;beic&quot; (bike).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(271)</td>
<td>&quot;program&quot; (programme)</td>
<td>This is your Life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(272)</td>
<td>&quot;speech&quot;</td>
<td>in the air - what is in fact being spoken about by the speaker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(273)(a)</td>
<td>&quot;yn eistedd yn y 'room'&quot; (sitting in the room)</td>
<td>&quot;mewn&quot; (in).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(273)(b)</td>
<td>&quot;croeso&quot; (welcome)</td>
<td>in the air, if not in fact realized by &quot;bwyd, 'sandwiches' a'r 'coffee'&quot; (food, sandwiches and the coffee).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(274)</td>
<td>&quot;yn mynd i wneud&quot; (going to do)</td>
<td>&quot;'job'&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another interesting feature pointed out by Chafe was the semantic relationship between certain syntactic units realizing focal information constituents which prompted treatment as given information, with especial reference to the "particular/generic relationship" e.g.
"Television" in (277) may be seen as a "generic" noun, a "particular" instance of which is a "colour television". Although it is the generic which is focal in the first IU, the "particular" is treated as given in the second IU. The procedure can work in reverse, i.e. particular > generic e.g. 

(278) // glywoch chi'n gweinidog ni ar y "colour tele/vision"//
heard you our minister us on the colour television
Did you hear our minister on the colour television?
.. oedd e'n / "excellent" ar y "tele/vision" //
was he(asp) excellent on the television
He was excellent on the television.

23 There are possible sociolinguistic factors to consider here, for instance the "playing down" of the fact that it's a colour television for prestige or even embarrassment. This is of course a feature of this particular example, and as such need not be considered. The conclusions drawn from the particular/generic relationship applies to other examples which need not carry sociolinguistic overtones.
Just before leaving last night,

got my pint poured over me by a Swansea boy. I'm beginning to get tired

In the second IU in (279), the focal information constituent is taken to be realized by the NP "bachan o Abertawe". This is a "particular" NP, the generic equivalent of which is "bois Abertawe", which is treated as given in the second IU.24

Chafe further suggests that the higher we go along the taxonomic hierarchy, the distance between one item and another is a determining factor in whether the second item is treated as given. His own English example demonstrates this point best:

24 "bois Abertawe" is considered given even though it is focal. This type of focus is known as secondary focus (the tone having its point of origin at the expounding tonic syllable being a low rise), and can be recognized as given information. For a brief description of secondary focus, see 6.1.
(280)(a) Yesterday I had my class disrupted by a bulldog.
(b) I'm beginning to dislike bulldogs. 25

In (280)(b), claims Chafe, generic "bulldogs" is treated as given because of the preceding particular "bulldog". If we substitute "dogs" for "bulldogs" in (280)(b), we have moved a step up the taxonomic hierarchy (particular \rightarrow classificatory) (Chafe 1970: 116-118), and it is the speaker's choice, suggests Chafe, whether "dogs" is treated as given or not, whereas there was not much question about the treatment of generic "bulldogs" in (280), Chafe proceeds with the claim that if "animals" (a step or two higher again along the hierarchy) is substituted for "bulldogs" in (280), then "animals" will almost certainly not be treated as given, the "distance" along the taxonomic hierarchy between it and the preceding particular "bulldog" being too great. Now, Chafe is of course describing English intonation, and American English at that, so there seems no point in discussing the validity of his claim. From the standpoint of my own dialect of English, it seems that whether to treat "animals" as given or not in the above context is still a matter of choice for the speaker in the same way as "dogs" was, possibly with the balance slightly in favour of treating it as given. This seems to be the case also if we translate loosely into Welsh:

(281) bore / ddoi / geis i'n / nosbarth wedi ei

morning yesterday got I my class (asp) its

Yesterday morning, I got my class

25 Firstly we are interested in focal bulldog in (a). No comment is made on tonality or any other possible focus. The broken line beneath "bull" in (b) indicates the probability of "bulldogs" realizing the minor focal information constituent (see 6.1).
disrupted with greyhound
disrupted by a greyhound.

(282)(a) // .. fi'n / dechrau ca/sau / milgwn //
I (asp) begin dislike greyhounds
I'm beginning to dislike greyhounds.

(282)(b) // .. fi'n / dechrau ca/sau / milgwn //

(283)(a) // .. fi'n / dechrau ca/sau / cvn //
(283)(b) // .. fi'n / dechrau ca/sau / cvn //
I'm beginning to dislike dogs.

(284)(a) // .. fi'n / dechrau ca/sau ani/feiliaid //
(284)(b) // .. fi'n / dechrau ca/sau ani/feiliaid //
I'm beginning to dislike animals.

(284)(a) or (284)(b) seems to me as plausible a choice as (283)(a)
or (283)(b), in the context following (281). There were no examples
in the corpus of this nature, however, and further work needs to be
done before either choice can properly be said to be more probable
than the other.

The reciprocal relationship between particular and its immediate
generic term (see (277), (278), (279)) points to another interesting
feature in the treatment of information as given. In the following
example, both particular "milg" and its immediate generic term
"milgwn" are treated as given:

(285)(a) // .. fi'n / dechrau / blino o / filgwn // (see note 25)
I (asp) begin tire of greyhounds
I'm beginning to get tired of greyhounds.
Yesterday I had my class disrupted by a greyhound. In (285)(b), particular "milgi" is given by virtue of the preceding mention of its generic "milgwn". We cannot, however, say the same for "milgwn" (mutated) in (285)(a). It is suggested that (285)(a) could well be the opening utterance of a discourse. How, then, can "milgwn" be treated as given, seeing that no IU precedes it and supposing there is nothing in the situational context which could lead to "milgwn" being given? I would suggest that the treatment of "milgwn" as given in (285)(a) is a stylistic device denoting that something is to follow concerning the given information, designed to stir interest in the addressee, as it were. If one were to speculate on the psycholinguistic factors underlying such a procedure, a mechanism such as the following could be postulated:

1. Addresser perceives the treatment of such and such an item as given.
2. Addresser has no means of deriving this information from what has preceded in the text or from the situational context.
3. Addresser perceives an irregularity in this treatment of information as derivable, and
4. Awaits the next part of the speaker's message as a means of clarification.
In short, this infrequent stylistic device comes under the heading of cataphorically derivable information.

As well as the three basic categories of Orientation, Situational Context, and Text regarding the treatment of information as given, Chafe introduces the notion of EGOCENTRISM of the speaker. It was noted under Orientation that the pronoun "fi" (I) was always given (but see role-transfer 5.2.2), as the speaker is invariably present at the time of an utterance - derivable from the orientation. An extension of this feature goes some way towards handling examples like the following in terms of explaining why post-focal lexical items are treated as given:

(286) // beth ar y / ddaear wyt ti'n / gwnued meddai ei
what on the earth (aux) you(asp) do says his
"What on earth are you doing?" says his
/ fam //
mother
mother.

(287) // .. cer / maes o'r / ffordd / agrechtodd y / drifwr //
go out of the way screamed the driver
"Get out of the way", screamed the driver.

(288) // .. mae fy / ngwr a / minnau / woddd y fren/hines //
(aux) my husband and I said the queen
"My husband and I", said the queen.

(289) // chwaer "Miss" / Morgan woddd e //
sister Miss Morgan said he
"Miss Morgan's sister", he said.
In (286) - (291), we have verbs like "meddai" (said), "agrechen" (scream), "dweud" (say), "galw" (call), as well as nouns like "mam" (mother), "drifer" (driver), "brenhines" (queen), in post-focal position. Taking it that these items have not been previously mentioned, nor than an information constituent with previous alternative realization need be considered, nor that these items are present in the situational context, then the post-focal occurrence of these lexical items is not explicable in terms of anything discussed so far. Chafe's suggestion, followed here, is the notion of egocentrism on the part of the speaker, transferring the givenness, via orientation, of himself to the speaker of whose words he is quoting or relating. Assuming that he is to be regarded as derivable, the speaker further assumes that any role he adopts is also derivable. Chafe characterizes this as "egocentrism" because he considers the assumption to be essentially not a fair one. Because the information conveyed by "mam" etc. is obviously derivable to the speaker who is adopting the role of "mam" etc., he assumes in such cases that it is also derivable to the hearer. A principle of the following sort is in operation:

"Whenever a speaker's knowledge is such that, for him, consciousness of X necessarily entails consciousness of Y, he will assume that the
addressee's consciousness of X entails consciousness of Y also."
(Chafe (1974) p.130 - there is no need to reiterate the point about consciousness). The fairness of the assumption need not concern us. What is important is the validity of the suggestion of treating an item of information as given through an operation of role-transfer which acts as an extension of the orientation feature which specifies the speaker of an utterance as given information.26

Note also that the verb in (286) - (291) is treated as given. This, if we accept the egocentrism feature, is only to be expected, as it is in essence merely a verbal reiteration of what has been done or demonstrated in the quotation or report. For instance, the most common verb denoting reported speech is "meddai"or "dweud"; if, however, we have instead a verb like "sgrechen" as in (287), the manner of uttering the quoted words would probably correspond to the semantics of the verb i.e. they would be screamed, or at least there would be a number of accompanying paralinguistic features involving articulatory setting, phonation type, facial expression etc. purporting to simulate a scream.

(290) and (291) are not direct quotes, yet the egocentrism factor is at work here as well. The role of speaker not so much transfers to as incorporates the role of appellation.

26 Note the essential difference between the 'role-transfer' described here and that discussed in relation to focal personal pronouns (5.2.2) is that they work in opposite directions. Whereas 'pronominal role transfer' acquired for a focal pro-nominal the status of factually new material, here it functions to relegate what is essentially new information to given, via the feature of orientation.
The notion of egocentrism is also interesting in that it may be overridden for purposes of contrast. This is especially prominent where pronominals are involved (e.g. (249)); in fact, expectedly so, since the general characteristic of focal pronominals is to imply the existence of another element in the discourse derivable by contrast with it. If in (292) the pronominal were focal instead of (or along with, see 6.1.2) "Morgan", this would imply something like: "that's what he said, but someone else said ....", or, "but I'm not so sure".

It is possible that a similar process would be in evidence if the final lexical item were focal in (286) - (288), but this will not be discussed here due to the difficulty of specifying contrastive relationships between lexical items. Suffice it to say that a discoursal presupposition of some nature would be involved.

The verb may also be focal in the above examples, e.g.

(292) // chwaer "Hiss" / Morgan / wedodd e //

(293) // "Jumbo" oen nhw'n / galw fe //

but a statement in terms of presupposition and implied meaning is not easy. It seems there are three main possibilities of contrastive presupposition involved:

(a) Polarity.

(b) The object of the verb.

(c) The verb itself.

(a) The polarity contrast would involve focus being assigned to the auxiliary features. Emphasis is a possibility here as well (see 5.2.4).
(b) The object of the verb, i.e. what is "said" or what is "being called", e.g. in (292) "Miss Horgan's sister, he said, but it was really Mr. Davies's aunt", and in (293) "Jumbo they called him, but his name was Sam Kelly".

(c) The verb itself. Any contrast would be within a relatively small semantic subset of verbs, like "dweud" (say), "meddwl" (mean, think), "credu" (believe), "teimlo" (feel), e.g. "He said 'Miss Morgan's sister', but he thought/felt/believed ..."

What we have in (286) - (291) is in effect unmarked focus. Focus does not involve a presupposition in any of these examples. Rather the situation is that a presupposition would be involved if any of the post-focal items were instead focal (as well as the pre-focal items, of course). Summing up, we can say that the egocentrism feature of focus allows a non-final lexical item to receive unmarked focus. The post-focal items are of course given, but not in the way we saw them to be in (245) - (285), where they were specified as such by the focus; rather they are given by virtue of the egocentrism factor in much the same way as a feature of the orientation of the utterance. And as orientational features are generally focal only if contrastive, so it is with the post-focal items in (286) - (291).

5.3.2. This subsection opened with the statement that in the case of focal non-final lexical items, the presupposition generally involved was the specification of post-focal lexical items as given information. Above we have seen an exception to this statement in
the shape of the egocentrism factor. We now examine some more examples which appear to be exceptional. Consider the following:

(294) // sut mae'r / car yn / mynd //
     how (aux) the car (asp) go
     How's the car going?

(295) // cwpl o / "jobs" / da'n mynd //
     couple of jobs good (asp) go
     Couple of good jobs going.

(296) // .. 'adim eisiau / gwaeddu at y "boy" //
     (aux) (neg) need shout at the boy
     There's no need to shout at the boy.

(297) // .. wel / 'na beth oedd "I. / D." 'di dweud //
     well that what (aux) I. D. (asp) say
     Well that's I. D. had said.

(298) // beth oedd e wedi / dweud am/bolit / bobl //
     what (aux) he (asp) say about people
     What he'd said about people.

(299) // .. mae hi / sut un / dda 'da / plant a / pethau //
     is she how one good with children and things
     She's so good with children and things.

(300) // .. oech / chi'n / credu // .. oen i / ddim yn
     (aux) you (asp) think (aux) I (neg) (asp)
     You thought I didn't
     / gwybod beth oedd Man/ceinion yn / maddwl //
     know what (aux) Manchester (asp) mean
     know what Manchester meant.
(301) // .. chi'n / cofio'r / parti 'na / geson ni //
    you(asp) remember party that got we
You remember that party we had?

(302) //   trydydd / daethon nhw //
third came they
Third they came.

(303) //   oedd / lot o far/volaeth // .. ar y / job 'na //
    was lot of death on the job that
There was a lot of death on that job.
  oen i'n / gweithio // .. ti'n / gwybod //
(saux) I (asp) work you(asp) know
I'd be working, you know,
  a / gweled / ambivlans yn dod / mewn //
and see ambulance (asp) come in
and would see this ambulance come in.

It is suggested that the presupposition normally associated
with focal non-final lexical items is not present in the above
examples. Rather, what is at issue is what Bolinger (1974) has
called "Relative Semantic Weight". Bolinger's paper was in the main
a reply to generative phonologists (especially Bresnan 1972) who
claimed that tonicity was syntactically predictable. Bolinger cites
some examples where Bresnan's modification of Chomsky and Halle's
(1968) Nuclear Stress Rule ought to eliminate tonic assignment to
the final verb, but doesn't:
(304)(a) The end of the chapter is reserved for various problems to computerize.

(304)(b) I have a point to emphasize.

(304)(c) I can't finish in an hour — there are simply too many topics to elucidate.

He then compares these with examples where Bresnan's rule operates successfully:

(305)(a) The end of the chapter is reserved for various problems to solve

(305)(b) I have a point to make.

(305)(c) I can't finish in an hour — there are simply too many topics to cover.

The crux of the matter, viz. why the verb has the tonic syllable (focus) in (304) and not in (305) is not a matter of syntax, claims Bolinger, but is concerned with the semantic status of the verbs involved in the context in which they appear. Some further examples:

(306)(a) Those are crawling things.

(306)(b) Those are crawling insects.

(307)(a) I've got to see a guy.

(307)(b) I've got to see a friend.

(308)(a) He was arrested because he killed a man.

(308)(b) He was arrested because he killed a policeman.

Bresnan, having excluded pronouns from the ranks of those words which could contain the tonic syllable under normal circumstances
(meaning presumably the unmarked form), further invokes a category of "semi-pronouns like people, things" (p.271) to take care of examples such as (306) - (308). Bolinger rejects this approach on the following grounds:

"... where the accentual behaviour with true pronouns is predictable, that of empty nouns is only highly probable. A semantic theory assumes that they are not entirely empty, and predicts that under some conditions they may therefore be accented without any special requirement such as contrast." (p.632).

"... the only way I know to identify such nouns (i.e. semi-pronouns - H.R.) is by their behaviour under accent, and this assumes what is to be proved." (p.637).

The focal behaviour of these words must be consistent to warrant the special treatment of reclassification, and this they are not. Further, words following the focal behaviour of "semi-pronouns" in certain contexts would seem to have no option but to join the category, and in many cases this would seem intuitively unsatisfactory. Both these points can be seen from an example of Susan Schmerling's (1974):

(309) This is the man I was telling you about.

(310) This is the doctor I was telling you about.

In a normal, everyday context (309) and (310) would involve no presupposition, (309) carrying unmarked focus, and "doctor" in (310) being focal through considerations of Relative Semantic Weight. To be consistent, Bresnan's theory would have to account for "tell" in the same way as "people, things" - it would become, say, a "pro-verb". The problem is however that in (309) the "pro-verb" receives unmarked focus. We see the same happening if we were to change the contexts
of (309) and (310). Suppose, for instance, we were somewhere where
men are very rare. (309) would become:

(309)(a) This is the man I was telling you about.

Suppose again that the context was a hospital. (310) would become:

(310)(a) This is the doctor I was telling you about.

Taking the contexts for (309) and (310), there would probably be no
objection to including "man" in the category of "semi-pronouns":

(311) I shan't be a minute - I have to phone a man.

The context for (309(a), however, would surely lead to inconsistency
in this classification:

(311)(a) I shan't be a minute - I've got to phone a man.

Bolinger's approach does not encounter these problems, as the
notion of Relative Semantic Weight is one factor in the speaker's
choice of information focus. It concerns the semantic status of
items in relation to other items, not syntactic categories, and that
relative status is fluid, according to that part of the discourse in
which it appears.

To return to our Welsh examples, we see the effect of Relative
Semantic Weight if we compare (294) - (303) with the following:

(312)(a) // sut mae'r / car yn cor/na\ //

how (aux)the car (asp) corner

How does the car corner?

(312)(b) // sut mae'r / path yn / wynd //

how (aux)the thing (asp) go

How's the thing going?
(313)(a) // cwpl o / "jobs" / da'n / cwpla //
couple of jobs good(asp) finish
Couple of good jobs finishing.

(313)(b) // cwpl o / bethau’n / wnyd //
couple of things (asp) go
Couple of things going.

(314)(a) // 'sdim eisiau / gwaeddu at yr / athro //
(aux)(neg) need shout at the teacher
There's no need to shout at the teacher.

(314)(b) // 'sdim eisiau / dod a'r / "boy" //
(aux)(neg) need come with the boy
There's no need to bring the boy.

(315)(a) // .. wel / 'na beth oedd "I./D." 'di ar/gymell //
well that what (aux) I. D. (asp) urge
Well that's what I.D. had urged.

(315)(b) // .. wel / 'na beth oedd / bobl 'di / dwaud //
well that what (aux) people (asp) say
Well that's what people had said.

(316) // .. beth oedd a wedi / dwaud am/boitu'r / llywydd //
what (aux) he (asp) say about the president
What he'd said about the president.
The focussing of "pethau" in (317) changes its meaning from what it was in (299). In (299) it meant "children and things like that", whereas in (322) the meaning is "good with children and good with things". A similar feature is observable with the item "bach", which can be used in three ways: (a) as a vocative (term of endearment); (b) as an empty adjective; (c) as an adjective meaning "little". The vocative does not concern us as it is never focal (unless alone in the IU). The difference between (b) and (c), however, is perceived through focal behaviour. If "bach" realizes the focal information constituent, it is (obviously) not taking the part of the frequently used empty adjective, but has its full semantic content of "small, little". Compare the following:

X. // .. chin / cofio'r / "speech" 'na / wnaeth e

You remember that speech he made

am/boitu'r ci / bach //

about the dog little

about the little dog?

Y. // .. chin / cofio'r / "speech" 'na / wnaeth e am/boitu'r / ci bach //

Focus is unmarked in both cases, no presupposition being involved. "bach" in Y is empty and the meaning would hardly change if it were dropped, whereas in X the fact that the dog concerned was small is important. Likewise in the following pair:

X. // .. mae e'n go/lygu / lot o / waith chin / / gwal //

(aux) it(asp) means lot of work you(asp) see

It means a lot of work, you see,

(contd. on following page)
(318)(a) // .. oech / chi'n / credu // .. oen i / ddim yn
(aux) you(asp) think (aux) I (neg)(asp)
You thought I didn't know

/ gwybod beth oedd y / gair yn / meddwl //
know what(aux) the word (asp) mean
what the word meant.

(318)(b) // .. oech / chi'n / credu // .. oen i / ddim yn
(aux) you (asp) think (aux) I (neg)(asp)
You thought I didn't know

/ gwybod beth oedd Man/ceinion yn / safyll am //
know what (aux) Manchester (asp) stand for
what Manchester stood for.

(319) // .. chi'n / cofio'r / parti 'na ddis/trwyn ni //
you(asp) remember party that ruined we
You remember that party we ruined?

(320)(a) // .. a / gweld / ambiwlan yn / ll osgi //
and see ambulance (asp) burn
And see an ambulance burning.

(320)(b) // .. a / gweld / dyn yn dod / mewn //
and see a man (asp) come in
And see a man coming.

27 (contd.)

.. bo / babi / bach 'da nhw //
be baby little with them
them having a small baby.

Y. // mae e'n go/lygu / lot o / waith chi'n / gweld/..bo / babi
bach 'da nhw //
i.e. in X the fact that its a small baby means a lot of work.
If we look again at (294), which as it stands could (and probably frequently does) occur initial in a discourse, we see that if focus was in fact transferred to the final lexical item in the IU, a presupposition would arise:

(294)(a) // sut mae'r / car yn / wynd //

namely, the signalling of "car" as given information. It is very dubious whether (294)(a) could occur if the topic of conversation was not that particular car or at least cars in general, or possibly if the car concerned was not present in the situational context. We can handle examples like this within the general notion of Relative Semantic Weight by saying that where a relatively empty item takes focal precedence over a semantically much fuller item, this may signal the latter as derivable. Note that it may signal so—it need not necessarily. As Bolinger pointed out, it is not sensible to make predictions about empty nouns—one can only state probabilities.

Using the notion of Relative Semantic Weight, then, we can handle (284) - (292) by describing the final lexical item in the relevant IUs as being semantically relatively empty. The relativity concerned is with what co-occurs with them in the IU within that particular discourse. Note that in some of the examples (e.g. (294), (295), (301)), the final lexical item could be omitted without changing the meaning:

(294)(b) // sut mae'r / car // (How's the car?)
(295)(b) // cwpl o / "jobs" / da // (A couple of good jobs)
(301)(b) // .. chi'n / cofio'r / parti 'na // (You remember that party?)
When two relatively empty lexical items co-occur in the same IU (e.g. (312)(b), (313)(b), (314)(b), (315)(b), (320)(b)), focus will tend to adopt its normal trend (in the absence of any special requirements to the contrary, like the specification of given information) of being realized phonologically by unmarked tonicity. Compare the following:

(321)(a) // 'sdim sut / gymaint o / bethau’n / mynd //
(aux)(neg) how as much of things(asp) go
There aren't so many things going.

(321)(b) // 'sdim sut / gymaint o / waith yn mynd //
(aux)(neg) how as much of work (asp) go
There's not so much work going.

(321)(c) // 'sdim sut / gymaint o / waith yn / para //
(aux)(neg) how as much of work (asp) last
There's not so much work lasting.

In (321)(a), both "pethau" (things) and "mynd" (go) are relatively empty, and focus goes to the one in final position ("mynd"). In (321)(b), the fuller semantic content of "gwaith" (work) relative to "mynd" attracts the focus. (Note that if focus had instead gone to "mynd", "gwaith" would have tended to be signalled as given.) In (321)(c) neither "gwaith" nor "para" (last) are semantically empty relative to each other, and focus assumes its unmarked form.

5.3.3. Names of people and places, whilst considered lexical items, offer a scope for contrast which is similar to that conveyed by a non-lexically stressed tonic syllable (see 5.1). We are not concerned here with examples like // Llewelyn // or // Aberystwyth //
which are straightforward instances of non-lexically stressed tonic syllables with accompanying focal implications, but with names consisting of more than one "word". Each "word" which comprises the name has its own lexically stressed syllable as was defined in Note 3, but this does not prohibit the contrast. If, for example, Christian name and surname appear final in the IU, or form an IU of their own, unmarked focus would be phonologically expounded by unmarked tonicity i.e. the tonic syllable would be the lexically stressed syllable of the surname. If the location of the tonic syllable were to move to the Christian name, even its stressed syllable, then this would involve a contrast:

(322) A: // mwy o / "sense" / rygbi 'da fe na / "Pullin" //
more of sense rugby with him than Pullin
He's got more rugby sense than Pullin.

B: // .. o / laver / mwy //
oh much more
Oh, much more.

C: // .. ydy / a'n / perthyn i / "Albert / Pullin" //
(aux) he(asp) belong to Albert Pullin
Is he related to Albert Pullin?

The contrast is similar to that expounded by a non-lexically stressed tonic syllable - intra-item, as it were. We therefore take the whole name as being one lexical item, and redefine its lexically stressed syllable as that which would become the tonic syllable in the case of exponence of unmarked focus. Another example:
A similar approach may be adopted to place-names of more than one "word".

5.3.4. Contrast has been mentioned above with regard to proper nouns and certain verbs in the egocentrism feature. It must be stated
that these are regarded as exceptions. While it is necessary to
involve contrast in dealing with the presuppositions incurred by
certain non-lexical foci, to speak of contrast with regard to lexical
focus is generally considered undesirable. The main reason for
this is that "contrastiveness" with lexical focus mainly depends on
the part of the discourse in which it appears, be it a matter of
syntax or lexical choice, and not the responsibility of the focus,
which brings us back dangerously close to a confusion in terminology
(see 5.2.1). Consider the following example:

(324) A: // \textit{par} / \textit{ifanc oen nhw} //

pair young were they

Were they a young couple?

B: // \textit{na} // \textit{dau} / fachgen //

no two boys

No. Two boys.

Here "par" (couple) contrasts with "dau fachgen" (two boys), so that
if we did want to implement the notion of contrast in cases such as
these, unmarked focus would be contrastive also. This is not a very
sensible approach, in view of the fact that the contrast could dis-
appear with a change in context:

(325) A: // \textit{pwy sy'n} / rhedeg / laur yr / heol //

who (aux)(asp) run down the road

Who's running down the road?

B: // dau / fachgen //

two boys

Two boys.
The following, which we have characterized as examples of unmarked focus, all appear in "contrast" by virtue of that part of the discourse in which they occur:

(326) // ... mae / dau / wanol / "system" o "intonation" is two different systems of intonation

The two languages have two different systems

yn raith // ... gyda'r / dau / iasith // right with the two languages of intonation, right.

... fel mae / dau / "system" o / eiriau 'da nhw // like in two system of words with them like they have two systems of words.

"intonation" vs. "words".

(327) // ... mae e'n gwneud / 'r un peth a mae (aux) bo(asp) do the one thing as (aux)
He's doing the same thing as

"Marianne yn gwneud // ... ond mae Marianne (asp) do but (aux)
Marianne's doing, but

/ e'n gwneud e yn / Aber // ha(asp) do it in Aber
he's doing it in Aber.

"Aber" vs. "somewhere else".
(328) A: // .. fi / ffaelu "en/joy"-o dim / byd //
I can't enjoy nothing
I can't enjoy anything.

B: // .. "en/joy"-aist ti'r / "match" //
enjoyed you the match
You enjoyed the match.

"nothing" vs. "the match"

(329) A: // bachan sia / "Aberdeen" // reit //
boy from Aberdeen right
A boy from Aberdeen, right.

.. yn / siarad / Saesneg // .. byddech chi'n
(asp) speak English (aux) you(asp)
speaking English - you'd

/ gywbod // .. taw / "Scots" fyddai fe //
know that Scot would be he
know he'd be Scottish.

B: // .. o / "straight a/way" // hyd yn oed 'sa fe'n
oh straight away even if he (asp)
Oh, straight away, even if he

/ siarad / "Caelic" //
speak Caelic
spoke Gaelic.

"English" vs. "Caelic"
Cymro yw'r un / gorau sy'n gallu / gwneud//

Welshman is the one best (aux)(asp) can do

A Welshman is the best who can do ...

.. sy'n gallu / acto / "Indian" //
(aux)(asp) can act Indian

who can act an Indian.

.. mae e'n / rhwyddach na'r / na'r / Sais //
(aux)(it) easier than the than the Englishman

It's easier for him than for the Englishman.

"Welshman" vs. "Englishman"

paidiwch a dwaud / Parch // .. ond / dwedwch
don't say Parch but say

Don't say Parch, but say

Par/chadig //
Parchadig

Parchadig.

"Parch" vs. "Parchadig".

Syntactic constructions involving "hyd yn oed" (even), "heblaw" (not to mention), "nid ond" (not only), "hefyd" (too), comparatives + "na" (than) etc. etc. etc. tend to entail a contrast, but this is not the responsibility of the focus.

Tone can also signal what could be called a contrastive implication on a focus which would otherwise be unmarked. This will be a main topic of Part III of this work (7.2.3).
6. **Secondary Informational Prominence**

The system of information focus was defined earlier (4.0) as the location within the IU of its informationally most prominent information constituent. This was phonologically expounded by the system of tonicity which concerned the location within the tone-group of its phonologically most prominent syllable (viz. the tonic syllable). We now need to take into account what we shall call *secondary informational prominence*. Secondary informational prominence will be set terminologically against "informational prominence", the latter being taken to have some such modifier as "primary" understood.

Whereas informational prominence is associated in this work only with focus or the focal information constituent, secondary informational prominence may be phonologically realized at two places:

1. following the tonic syllable,
2. at pretonic.

These will now be discussed in turn.

6.1. **The Minor Focal Information Constituent and the Minor Tonic Syllable: Compound IUs and Compound Tone-groups.**

To the definition of the system of focus hitherto in this work, we now add that it may also concern the location within the IU of a minor focal information constituent which follows the focal information constituent. That is to say, the system of focus can concern the location of two focal information constituents within the IU, one major and one minor. Where there are two such focal information constituents, the first will always be the major focal information constituent (normally known merely as "the focal information
constituent"), and the second the minor focal information constituent. This situation is mirrored at the phonological level where a tone-group may contain two tonic syllables, a (major) tonic syllable realizing the focal information constituent, followed by a minor tonic syllable, realizing the minor focal information constituent. Such a tone-group is known as a compound tone-group, and is the phonological realization of a compound IV.

Compound tone-groups are characterized by the choice of a falling or rising-falling tone (i.e. tone 1, see 7.2.) having its point of origin at the major tonic syllable (which realizes the focal information constituent), this being invariably followed by the choice of a rising tone having its point of origin at the minor tonic syllable (which realizes the minor focal information constituent). In terms of tone, then, a compound tone-group will always consist of either a fall followed by a rise, or a rise-fall followed by a rise (in fact, much the same as in English, according to Halliday 1967).

The minor tonic syllable will not be preceded by a pretonic. Instances of a low rise which do have a pretonic when following a fall or a rise-fall are considered to be sequences of separate tone-groups. Anything which occurs between the two tonic syllables in a compound tone-group does not fit into either the pretonic or posttonic category. It is merely an "intertonic" element. There is no need to grant this element any corresponding status at the informational level. The structure of a compound tone-group may be seen as follows:

(Proclitic) (Pretonic) Tonic Syllable (Intertonic) Tonic (Posttonic) Syllable

with elements in parentheses optional.
A major obstacle in the establishment of compound tone-groups/IUs is the exposition of a statement of their differences from sequences of tone-groups/IUs. Such a statement must be on two levels: the phonological and the informational. The phonological component of the statement is of necessity purely descriptive, and much of it has already been dealt with. To reiterate:

(a) A compound tone-group must consist of the choice of tones Fall/Rise-fall, followed by a Rise, and in that sequence. In other words, the tonic syllable is the point of origin for the Fall/Rise-fall, and the minor tonic syllable is the point of origin for the Rise. Any other sequence of tones (e.g. Fall + Fall; Rise + Fall; etc.) does not constitute a compound tone-group.

(b) The intertonic element of a compound tone-group must be in the form of a smooth transition between tones. That is, it must continue the fall (of the Fall or of the Rise-fall) which has its point of origin at the tonic syllable, or it must be at a low level. No pitch peak, which is characteristic of a pretonic (see 1.3.2) may occur, nor may any of the phonetic cues which signal a tone-group boundary. Diagramatically, a typical compound tone-group may be exemplified thus:

28 We exclude from this statement the rhythm-marker - which anyway does not signal a tone-group boundary - for reasons which will become clear shortly.
A pitch peak occurring at intertonic would mean that (a) is a sequence of two tone-groups, and presumably a phonetic boundary marker of some nature would be in evidence. A pretonic does not of course necessarily contain a pitch-peak, and procedurally the possible existence of a boundary marker must be investigated in any case.

One exception, as pointed out in note 28, is the rhythm-marker: it is not necessary that a compound tone-group have its salient syllables in isochronous sequence, after its tonic syllable. That is, if there is a pretonic, the salient syllables of that pretonic along with the tonic syllable will be in regular rhythmic sequence, but that rhythmic sequence may or may not be continued over the intertonic, minor tonic syllable and posttonic elements (if all are present). It will be recalled that this pattern follows the rhythmic behaviour of the posttonic element in simple tone-groups, which is a significant detail for reasons to be explained below on the informational level.

It is at the informational level that the more crucial argument for the establishment of compound tone-groups is found. What justification is there at the informational level to characterize a message with two focal points as one IU instead of two, and further, to nominate the second of these focal points as a minor focal information constituent which is "dominated" by the first? These questions are interconnected, both requiring much the same answer.

We recalled above that the rhythmic behaviour of that section of the compound tone-group which followed the tonic syllable was similar to that portrayed by the posttonic of a simple tone-group,
vis. possible inconsistency in the incidence of salient syllables in many cases. In Part I of this work, a strong link was proposed to exist between the phonological system of rhythm and the information system. This proposition was based on the rhythmic unity of the tone-group, realizing the informational unity of the IU, along with the possibility of (prefocal) secondary informational prominence at pretonic realized by a normally non-salient syllable becoming salient (see 6.2). It was further suggested that owing to the specification (in most cases, but see 5.3.2) of postfocal items as given, then allowing for this link between rhythm and information this was a possible reason for the relaxation of the rhythmic constraints at posttonic. I would now suggest that a similar reason accounts for the like pattern in the rhythmic behaviour of the compound tone-group, or at least the relevant section of it vis. that which follows the tonic syllable. In other words, the basic characteristic of the minor focal information constituent is that it contains information which is given, but nevertheless considered significant enough to be given a degree of prominence, that prominence being secondary in importance to that of the information conveyed by the (major) focal information constituent. The minor focal information constituent thus achieves a curiously ambivalent status. Its givenness accounts for the relaxation of the rhythmic constraints of isochrony, whilst its informational prominence, though secondary, accounts for the presence of a second tonic syllable.

What we have so far is a very brief and extremely general account of the phonological and informational characteristics of the compound tone-group/IU. In terms of "meaning" and "implication" it is an
extremely difficult and intricate unit to explain. It cannot be hoped, for practical reasons, to accord to it anything like the same degree of detail as was given to the examination of focus within the simple IU, even though the latter was not comprehensively dealt with. The difficulty afforded by the compound IU demands almost an equivalent amount of study as that demanded by the focus in a simple IU, which is obviously beyond the scope of this thesis. What follows then cannot but be an extremely brief and selective examination of some of the aspects of minor focus.

For the sake of convenience, we will employ the same procedure in the examination of minor focal information constituent as with the focal information constituent itself. Classification and examination will be according to the class of syntactic item which realizes the secondarily focal information constituent.

6.1.1. Minor Lexical Focus

The most general conclusion that can be reached concerning minor lexical focus is that in the main it signals that information which is given in some way has been made prominent. The ways in which an information constituent acquires the status 'given' have already been discussed in connection with the specification of postfocal information as given (5.3). Any of these ways can figure in establishing the minor focus as given also. This simple characteristic can handle the majority of compound IUs, but a great many remain which require further investigation. As admitted, only a very few such exceptions will be mentioned in this work. First, some examples of minor focal information constituents which have in some way or other acquired the status given:
1. Explicit mention of syntactic unit which realizes the minor focal information constituent:

(2) A: // .. yr // unig // werth // .. o gael // dyn yn

the only worth of get man (asp)

The only point of having a man as

/captain// .. yn y / "pack" // .. yw .. yw fod

captain in the pack is is (aux)
captain in the pack is is that

e'n / gallu−// beth yw / beth yw'r / pair // −

he(asp) can what is what is the word
he can - what's .. what's the word -

ysbry/doli // .. "inspire"−o // reit // ysbry/doli //

inspire inspire right inspire
inspire, right? Inspire.

B: // .. fi'n / deall / ysbry/doli //

I (asp) understand inspire
I understand inspire,

.. mae e'n "all/right" //
(aux) it(asp) all right
it's all right.

(3) A: // .. wyt ti'n / yfed bob /noa 'te / Huw //

(aux) you(asp) drink each night then Huw
So you drink every night then, Huw?
C: // .. fel / "tank" w //
    like tank (excl.)

Like a tank.

B: // na // a/rhosais i / mewn / neithiwr //
    no stayed I in last night

No. I stayed in last night,

"anyway" //

anyway

anyway.

C: // bachan //
    boy

Well!

A: // Duw / Duw // a // .. oen i oen i ddim
    God, God. oh (aux) I (aux) I (neg)(asp)

Well, well. Oh. I didn't

/ gwybod bo ti'n / yfed // fel'na 'achan //
    know (aux) you(asp) drink like that boy

know you drank like that, man.

As well as the last compound IU where "yfed" (drink) is the mentioned item, we have another compound IU delivered by B, which is not really explicable in terms of the given characteristic. It is noticeable, however, that temporal adjuncts frequently realize a minor focal information constituent. El-Menoufy's explanation of this feature in English seems quite plausible, and could equally well be applied to Welsh:
"... the speaker treats it (temporal adjuncts realizing a minor focal information constituent - M.R.) as 'expectable' or 'to be expected' from the conversation or situation. This suggests that time adverbs could probably be said to be items whose information content is generally expectable in any situation, since they are closely related to tense, which is an obligatory selection in the verbal group." (El-Menoufy (1969) p.298-9).

It has not been overlooked that the focussing of "neithiwr" (last night) has contrastive implications in this particular part of the discourse. The contrastiveness is not a sufficiently consistent feature in instances of this nature to be considered a significant factor in the focussing of temporal adjuncts.

(4) A: // .. o / le mae hi'n / dod nawr 'te //
from where (aux)she(asp) come now then
Where does she come from, now then?

B: // tu faes i / "Watford" //
outside to Watford
Outside Watford.

A: // "Hertfordshire" //
Hertfordshire.

B: // nawr // na //
now no
Now. No.
A: // "definitely" // .. mae / "Watford" yn / 
    definitely is Watford in
    Definitely. Watford is in
    "Hertfordshire" //
    Hertfordshire
    Hertfordshire.

C: // .. tu / faes i / "Watford" //
    outside to Watford.
    Outside Watford.

Note that the contrast in the final (compound) IU in (4) is a consequence of the focal preposition (relative position 5.2.3).

Similar characteristics seem to hold for compound IUs as for simple IUs regarding the implications of the focal item.

(5) A: // .. gas / "Mari/anne" // .. ddim / hyd yn oed
    got Marianne not even
    Marianne didn’t even get a
    / beth ti’n galw / "interview" //
    what d’you call interview
    what d’you call it interview.
    .. neu / gas hi / "interview" //
    or got she interview
    Or did she get an interview?

B: // .. beth / wnaeth "Mari/anne // .. wnaeth / "Mari/anne"//
    what did Marianne did Marianne
    What Marianne did, Marianno did
She asked for a degree in English. Right? She went to ask for a job straight away in a library, without any qualifications at all. And anyway, that's why she didn't get it. She got an interview all right.

(6) A: // wnaeth e'r / "brakes" //
    did he do the brakes?

B: // do // wnaeth e'r / "brakes" // wnaeth e'r
    yes did he the brakes did he the
    Yes. He did the brakes. He did the
    / "gearbox" // wnaeth e'r / "clutch" //
    gear-box did he the clutch
gear-box. He did the clutch.
A: // wnaeth e'r / "gearbox" // .. beth / wnaeth e

did he the gearbox what did he

He did the gear-box? What did he

i'r / "gearbox" 'te //
to the gear-box then
do to the gear-box then?

B: // symo i'n / gwybod // .. fi'n / cofio

(neg) I(asp) know I (asp) remember
I don't know. I remember

fe'n / dweud / "gearbox" // .. "so" fi'n
him(asp) say gear-box so I (asp)
him saying gear-box, so I ...

A: // .. oes din / byd yu / "wrong" ar y / "gearbox"

is nothing (asp) wrong on the gear-box
There's nothing wrong with that gear-box,

'tna 'chan //
that boy
man.

(7) // .. a mae'n / dad yu / dweud // nawr 'te //
and (aux)my father(asp) say now then
And my father says: 'Now then,

beth am/boitu / "John / Pullin" meddai fe //
what about John Pullin says he
what about John Pullin?" he says.
.. a mae'n / fam yn / dweud // .. ydy / a'n

and (aux) my mother (asp) say (aux) he (asp)

And my mother says: "Is he

/ parthyn i / "Albert / Pullin" // .. pwy ar

belong to Albert Pullin who on

related to Albert Pullin?" Who on

/ ddaear yw / "Albert / Pullin" // symo i'n / gwybod //

earth is Albert Pullin (neg) I (asp) know

earth Albert Pullin is I don't know.

(8) // .. "Miss / Rodgers" oedd hi // nad w i'n

Miss Rodgers was she (neg) (aux) I (asp)

Was it Miss Rodgers? I don't

/ cofio // na // nege "Miss / Rodgers" //

remember no not Miss Rodgers

remember. No. Not Miss Rodgers.

(9) A: // .. ydy'r / geiriau / hyn yn mynd / lawr //

(aux) the words these (asp) go down

Are these words going down?

B: // rhein yn mynd / lawr //

these (asp) go down

These are going down.

2. Minor focal information constituent previously alternatively

realized:

(10) A: // .. oen i / wedi / darllen / pisyn o'r / Cymro //

(aux) I (asp) read piece of the Welshman

I'd read a bit of the "Cymro".
E: // nad w / i'n // darllen / hunna // ffaelu / (neg)(aux) I (asp) read that can't
I don't read that. I can't

/ darllen Cym/raeg / t'wel //
read Welsh you see
read Welsh, you see.

"Cymraeg" (Welsh) is the medium of "y Cymro" (The
Welshman" - a newspaper).

(11) A: // .. ydy'r / geiriau / hyn yn mynd / lawr // (aux) the words these (asp) go down
Are these words going down?

B: // rhein yn mynd / lawr // popeth sy yn
darllen Welsh these (asp) go down everything (aux) in
These are going down. Everything that's in

Gym/raeg // .. yn "all / right" / t'wel //
Welsh (asp) all right you see
Welsh is all right, you see.

"Cymraeg" (Welsh) is the language being used, hence
"Cymraeg" = y geiriau hyn" (these words), "rhein" (these).

(12) A: // .. a mae o'n "a/raza"-obeth sy 'di / mynd //
and(aux) it(asp) erases what (aux)(asp) go
And it erases what's gone,

beth oedd oedd / Huw wedi / darllen //
what (aux)(aux) Huw (asp) read
what Huw had read,
beth dar/llenodd / Huw //
what read Huw
what Huw read.

B: // na mae / hwnna "still" / mewn //
no is that still in
No, that's still in.

"'still' mewn" (still in) = "not erased".

(13) // .. daeth e / 'nol o / "Bedford" // un di/wrnod //
came he back from Bedford one day
He came back from Bedford one day.

.. daeth e / lawr yr / "A / forty" / t’wel //
came he down the A 40 you see
He came down the A40, you see,

trwyddo / "Brecon" // .. a / "Senny/bridge" //
through Brecon and Sennybridge
through Brecon and Sennybridge.

.. "en/joy"-odd e’r / "spin" weddai fe //
enjoyed he the spin says he
He enjoyed the spin, he said.

"spin" = "down the A40 through Brecon etc."

3. **Egocentrism**

We here extend Chafe’s notion of egocentrism outside the reported speech area (see 5.3.1). The speaker assumes that what he is about to say is known to the addressee, though the "extent to which it is
known" may not be very great. These examples are normally introduced by "ges ti wybod" (you were informed), "ti'n gwybod" (you know), "glywais ti" (you heard) etc. e.g.

(14) // wedais I / wrtho ti bo' fi'n / gwneud y
    said I to you (aux) I (asp) do the
    I told you I was doing this

/ "ten week / course" hyn //

    ten week course this

    ten week course.

No previous mention (in this discourse) has been made of the "ten week course", nor is the context one which makes its occurrence predictable. The introductory "wedais i wrtho ti" however makes it clear that the speaker assumes that the information has at some time or other been passed to the addressee.

(15) // .. ti'n / gwybod bo' / "grants" yn mynd / lan //
    you(asp) know (aux) grants (asp) go up

You know that grants are going up.

"ti'n gwybod" (you know) in (15) fulfils a similar function to "wedais i wrtho ti" in (14) - an almost explicit marker to the effect that the speaker assumes - unfairly or otherwise - that the information he is about to convey is derivable for the addressee.

Considerations of Relative Semantic Weight

Instead of receiving no prominence at all, the final empty item may sometimes realize the minor focal information constituent:
(16) // faint sy ar / ol ar y / tep hyn //
how much is after on the tape this
How much is left on this tape?

coiled wedi / wynd //
load (asp) go
There's a load gone.

(17) A: // .. a ti'n / meddwl mynd / gartre //
and you(asp) think go home
And you're thinking of going home.

.. oes / "date" 'da ti te //
is date with you then
Do you have a date, then?

B: // na dim / heno //
no not tonight
No, not tonight.

C: // Llundain mae hi'n / dod o //
London (aux) she(asp) come from
She comes from London/It's London she comes from.

(18) // .. mae nhw / gyd yn / dweud bo' / Martin //
(aux) they all (asp) say (aux) Martin
They all say that Martin

.. yn / gallu / yfed // .. wedodd / "Nigel"
(asp) can drink said Nigel
can drink. Nigel said
'r un / path //
the one thing
same thing.

(In the first IU, "Martin" is already given from a previous utterance).

(19) // .. bydden nhw'n / cwympo dros y / lle yn
(aux) they(asp) fall over the place (asp)
They'd be falling about the place

/ chwerthin sto chi // .. achos chi'n / siarad
laugh at you cause you (asp) talk
laughing at you, because you're talking

/ "absolute / rot" // wir i chi / nawr //
absolute rot truth to you now
absolute rot, really now.

.. chi'n / siarad amboitu / pathau //
you (asp) talk about things
You're talking about things,

.. a mae hi'n / eglur / iawn // .. bod chi
and is it(asp) clear very (aux) you
and it's very clear that you

/ ddim yn / gwybod / beth chi'n / siarad amboitu //
(neg) (asp) know what you (asp) talk about
don't know what you're talking about.
Proper Nouns

A similar procedure is in evidence as was discussed under marked focus in simple IUs where proper nouns were considered (5.3.3). That is, if we take for example Christian name and surname as a single lexical item which has one lexically stressed syllable (redefined for this purpose as that syllable which would receive the tonic syllable under conditions of unmarked tonicity), then location of the tonic syllable elsewhere implies the expected (non-lexically stressed) type of contrast. The only difference is that the lexically stressed syllable may become the minor tonic syllable, with little or no difference in meaning e.g.

(20) // .. oedd / "H" / Harris yn / chwarae //
(aux)   H. Harris (asp) play

H. Harris was playing

.. trwy'r  / amser // .. dim / fa oedd e //
through the time not him was it

all the time. It wasn't him?

B: // na / na // .. mae un / arall //

no no is one other

No, no. There's another one.

A: // o // oes e //

oh is it

Oh. Is there?

B: // nage / "W" / Harris oedd e / ife //

not W. Harris was it (tag)

It wasn't W. Harris, was it?
As mae Wynford Harris 'na // .. fi'n / gwybod //

is Wynford Harris there I (asp) know

There's a Wynford Harris there, I know.

A: // na // "H." / Harris //

no H. Harris

No, H. Harris.

(21) A: // .. pwy / oedd hi // man / Nia / Harris // "Mrs."/ Harris//

who was she mother Nia Harris Mrs. Harris

Who was it? Nia Harris's mother, Mrs. Harris?

B: // "Miss" / Harris 'achan // dim ei / mam hi //

Miss Harris boy not her mother she

Miss Harris, man. Not her mother.

And with place-names:

(22) A: // .. yng Ngaes/redin wedais / I //

in Edinburgh said I

In Edinburgh, I said.

B: // .. yng / Nghae/redin //

in Edinburgh

(No appropriate translation).

The question at stake is that of the appropriate mutation.

Vocatives are frequent candidates for minor focus. The implications here could well be tonal, not focal e.g. for the sake of "politeness", "lack of abruptness" etc. Tonal implications are notoriously difficult to describe.
Of course any vocative is immediately derivable as a feature of the orientation of the discourse (the addressee), but the interest lies in comparing the difference in implication between (23) and (24), and the same IUs without the minor focal vocative i.e. with the vocative merely postfocal; or phonologically speaking, with the vocative as part of the posttonic continuing the fall (or the fall of the rise-fall) which has point of origin at the tonic syllable. It seems that the difference is attitudinal, arising from the tonal implications of the rise or lack of it. The rise seems to lessen the abruptness which would be conveyed if the tone-group were a simple one. The focal/tonal distinction, or lack of it, is one of the main problems which makes the description of compound IUs so difficult.

6.1.2. Minor Non-Lexical Focus

(a) Pronominals

When a pronominal (other than a demonstrative) realized the focal information constituent in a simple IU we were able to make a valid statement regarding the general characteristic of the discoursal presupposition which it involved viz. the implication of the existence of another element in the discourse derivable by contrast with the focal information constituent. It is doubtful whether the same
statement can be so generally applied to instances where a pronominal realizes the minor focal information constituent in a compound IU. This is not to say the contrastive presupposition is no longer in operation in cases of minor focal pronouns, merely that, statistically speaking on the basis of the data examined, it is not sufficiently widespread for it to be regarded as a general characteristic. One reason suggested for this discrepancy between focal and minor focal implications is that as regards the latter, tonal as well as focal implications have to be taken into account, and the distinction between the two is unfortunately not decisive and the problem is too great to be entered into here.

Where there are contrastive implications involved with a minor focal pronoun, these implications may or may not be the same as those involved with the majority of focal pronouns i.e. the implied element may not be derivable by contrast with the actual pronoun itself. It is more likely to be derivable by contrast with the focal information constituent, generally as well as the minor focal pronoun. In such cases then, the minor focal information constituent serves to signal a contrast, the "base" of which (i.e. that by which the implied element is derivable by contrast) it may form a part. The base can comprise any of three elements:

(i) the focal information constituent alone
(ii) the minor focal information constituent alone (pronominal)
(iii) the focal information constituent plus the minor focal information constituent.

For example:
(25) // welais i fe / unwaith // .. yn Rhy/daman //

I saw him once in Ammanford.

He said "Well, boy, how's it going with you?" You know, the way we

And he was. He didn't look well. He looked ill
(ii) Minor focal information constituent alone as contrastive base:

(26) A: // .. oes / petrol yn dy / gar / di //
    is petrol in your car you
    Is there petrol in your car?

B: // oes //
    is

Yes.

A: // .. by' rhaid ni / fynd yn dy / gar / di 'te //
    will be necessity us go in your car you then
    We'll have to go in your car then,

    gynta // .. achos oes dim / petrol 'da / fi //
    first cause is (neg) petrol with me
    first, because I don't have any petrol

    .. yn / bon //
    in this
    in this one.

    i.e. "my car" vs. "your car".

(iii) Focal information constituent plus minor focal information constituent as contrastive base:

(This was found to be the most frequent.)

(27) A: // .. oedd y / "term" heb / cwpla / cofia //
    (aux) the term without finish remember
    The term hadn't finished, mind.
No. Her term had finished, you see.

She finished on - what was it?

She finished on the end of May.

i.e. "She finished on the end of May, as opposed to someone else who finished at some other time."

(Note that where the possessive "ei" is focal in the compound IU, it carries the contrastive implications as it did when focal in the simple IU, with "cwpla" being given information.)

Half past eleven to quarter past twelve for dinner you see. Three quarters of an hour.

We were going on now - half past eleven
"half past / twelve" // "quarter to / one" oen

half past twelve quarter to one (aux)

half past twelve, quarter to one we

/ ni'n / dod / maes 'achan /

we (asp) come out boy

were coming out man.

(i.e. one was supposed to come out at quarter past
twelve, but we came out at quarter to one).

(29) // cael di / "chat" a / fi / nawr // siarad / di i

get you chat with me now speak you to

You have a chat with me, now. You speak to

/ fi / nawr // .. waeth / 'fallai / gaf i tamaid

me now because perhaps will get I bit

me now, because maybe I'll get a little bit

/ bach / myo / "sense" maes o / ti //

little more of sense out of you

more sense out of you.

(i.e. as opposed to the rubbish I've been getting
from him)

(30) A: // .. a / both mae hi'n cy/meryd //

and what (aux) she(asp) take

And what does she take?

B: // .. y / hanes //

(Hesitation) history

Er .... history.
It was librarianship you said you liar.
i.e. librarianship vs. history; you said vs. what
was just said.

A: // ydy hi / wedi / bod 'na / cymaint o / amser a / ti //
(aux) she (asp) be there as much of time as you
Has she been there as long as you?

B: // na // oedd hi / cyn / fi //
no was she before me
No. She was before me.
i.e. before vs. at the same time (= as long as);
me vs. her).

A: // ti'n / wado / 'mlaen "good/boy" bach //
you (asp) knock on good boy small
You're getting on, mate.

B: // digon o / amser 'da / fi i fynd //
plenty of time with me to go
I've got plenty of time to go
'to  "good/boy" //
yet good boy
yet, mate.
i.e. plenty of time vs. little time (= getting on);
me vs. generally others)
(33) A: // .. by'n / dawel / "Pork" 'ạchan //
be(asp)quiet Pork man

Be quiet, Pork man.

B: // .. fi / yn / dawel // .. fi / heb dweud dim / byd
I (asp) quiet I without say nothing
I am quiet. I haven't said anything

/ 'to // gwando wyf / fi //
yet listen (aux) I
yet. I'm listening.
i.e. I'm listening - you're talking.

(34) A: // beth yw'r / berf // annerch // neu an/nerchu //
what is the verb address or (No such word)

What's the verb? No appropriate translation.

B: // annerch //
address

Address.

C: // .. a/nerchiad //
address

Address.

B: // .. 'na'r / ffordd 'ych chi'n / "use"-o fe //
that the way (aux) you (asp) use it
That's the way you use it.

.. 'na'r / unig / ffordd 'ych chi'n / "use"-o fe //
that the only way (aux) you (asp) use it
That's the only way you use it.
Ci: // .. anerchiad 'yn / ni'n dweud // lawr yn y / Bont //
address (aux) ve (asp) say down in the bridge

We say address, down in the Bont.

(i.e. "anerchiad" vs. some other form; ve (in the Bont) vs. other people).

(35) A: // ble 'ych / chi'n gweld // .. te/ledu // lliv //
Where (aux) you(asp) see television colour

Where do you see colour television?

B: // welais / i ddim o fe // clywed nhw'n / dweud yn
say I (neg) of it hear them(asp) say in

I didn't see it. Heard them say in

Llan/doveri / haddiw wnes / i //
Llandovery today did I

Llandovery today is what I did.

(Both these compound IUs demonstrate the point. The first implies cataphorically derivable information by contrast i.e. "not see" vs. "hear"; "I" vs. "people in Llandovery". The focal information constituent in this IU is realized by the auxiliary features, which involves a polarity, but the inclusion of the minor focal pronominal also puts it in optional contrast to "clywed" (hear). The second compound IU constitutes an argument for the inclusion within the focal information constituent of "clywed nhw'n dweud yn Llandovery haddiw" (heard them say in Llandovery today), which would be in contrast to "seeing". The minor focal pronominal is again in contrast to the "people in Llandovery" who actually saw the television).
Indefinite Pronouns

When discussing the occurrence of indefinite pronouns at minor focal position, it is interesting to see, not so much the implication of the minor focal information constituent for the rest of the discourse - if indeed there are any - but the difference in meaning carried by a minor focal indefinite and an indefinite which is merely postfocal with no secondary informational prominence at all. We refer especially to instances where the indefinite is preceded by "neu" (or). Compare the following:

(36)(a) // allid di / brynu "Su/zuki" neu / rhywbeth //
can you buy Suzuki or something
You can buy a Suzuki or something.

(36)(b) // allid di / brynu "Su/zuki" neu / rhywbeth //
In (36)(a), the "or something" implies "something other than a Suzuki", whereas in (36)(b) the implication is "something like that - possibly something that sounds like it". Similarly with "rhywle" (somewhere) and "rhwun" (someone) e.g.

(37)(a) // ewn ni am / "spin" i "Loch/ore" neu / rhywle //
(37)(b) // ewn ni am / "spin" i "Loch/ore" neu / rhywle //
will go we for spin to Lochore or somewhere
We'll go for a spin to Lochore or somewhere.
(37)(a) - "Lochore or somewhere else".
(37)(b) - "Lochore or something like that".

(38)(a) // .. mae / wastad / "Didier" neu / rhywun //
(38)(b) // .. mae / wastad / "Didier" neu / rhywun //
is always Didier or someone
There's always Didier or someone.
(38)(a) - There's always Didier or someone else.

(38)(b) - There's always Didier – or someone with a name that sounds like that.

(b) "bod" (be)

Similar features are involved here as with the pronominals discussed above; the implications may be merely tonal, and extremely difficult to specify:

(39) A: // .. ti'n dod / mae / heno //

you come out tonight

Are you coming out tonight?

B: // bath // .. am / beint fach // "just" am / was fach //

what for pint little just for walk little

What? For a pint? Just for a walk?

A: // .. i bys/gota //

to fish

Fishing.

B: // .. i bys/gota // tamaid bach yn / oer / mae fe //

to fish bit little(asp) cold is it

Fishing? It's a little bit cold.

("Reservation" implied by the rise on "mae" (is). Less of a refusal than if it had been a simple IU with a fall on "oer" (cold).

The implication may also be focal. This would involve a polarity contrast similar to what we saw when "bod" realized the focal information constituent in simple IUs, but now including the focal information constituent in the base element:
That's why I played fly-half —

I'll tell you. No. Centre it was.

i.e. it wasn't fly-half — it was centre.

You went down with Porky somewhere.

I remember that, Porky and Sam

i.e. Just Porky, not Sam as well.

You remember when that
"bloody" a/deilai 'na yn yn / "Baglan / Bay" arno ti/
bloody building that in in Baglan Bay on you
bloody building in in Baglan Bay fell on you?

B: // cwympodd a ddim / arno ti 'achan //
fell it not on me boy
It didn't fall on me, man.

A: // na // buodd e / bron / a "though" // do fe //
no (aux) it nearly though (tag)
No. It nearly did though, didn't it?

ar / Dai / Wog / cwympodd e //
on Dai Wog fell it
On Dai Wog it fell.

B: // .. oen i wedi / cael y / "sack" erbyn / 'my //
(aux)I (asp) get the sack by that
I'd had the sack by then.

A: // oes ti //
(aux) you
Had you?

B: // tan / oedd e 'achan //
fire was it boy
A fire it was, man.
i.e. it wasn't a building collapsing - it was a fire.

(43) // .. "e/leven till / quarter / past" oedd e / fod //
eleven till quarter past was it be
Eleven till quarter past it was supposed to be.
.. oen ni'n / mynd on / "break" on / "quarter to
(aur) wo(nap) go for break at quarter to
we were going for a break at quarter to

eleven // chvarae / "cards" nes bo' / "half past
eleven play cards till half past
eleven, playing cards till half past

eleven" // tri / chvarter / aur //
eleven three quarter hour

eleven - three quarters of an hour.
i.e. it was supposed to be quarter of an hour - it
wasn't. We took three quarters of an hour.

(44) // tro / John // . neu / tro / Dai / oedd e //
turn John or turn Dai was it
John's turn - or Dai's turn it was.
i.e. Dai's turn, not John's turn.

Note that, if the relevant IUs in (37)-(41) were simple, with no
minor focus on the form of "bod", any contrast would be discoursally
conditioned or a matter of lexical choice and not a responsibility
of the focus.

(c) Tags

Tags frequently occur at minor focal position, but it is not
clear whether there are any focal implications involved, and the
question will not be entered into here. Under the term "tags" we
include not only features such as "ife" (is it), "do fe" (did it/
you/we etc.), "naddo fe" (didn't it/you etc.), but also structures
like "am un poth" (for one thing), "i ddechrau 'da" (to begin with), "ti'n gywobod" (you know), "cofi" (remember, mini), "t'wel" (you see), "ti'n credu" (I think).

(d) Negative implications

Two interesting examples were noted in the text where a positive declarative surface structure became negative when no negative particle was in evidence. In both cases the statements consisted of compound tone groups with the tone Rise-fall plus rise.

(45) A: // Cymro yu'r un / gorau sy'n gallu / gwneud

Welshman is the one best (aux)(asp) can do

A Welshman is the best one who can do ..

sy'n gallu / acto / "Indian" //

(aux)(asp) can act Indian who can act an Indian.

B: // .. 'dy / "Peter / Sellers" yn / Cymro //

(aux) Peter Sellers (asp) Welshman Peter Sellers isn't a Welshman.

A: // ia // .. ond mae / "genius" 'da ti / man'na 'achan //

yes but is genius with you there boy

Yes, but you've got a genius there, man.

A's reply makes it clear he has understood the negative import of

B's statement.

(46) // es i / reit / lan // .. heibio - // beth //

went I right up past what

I went right up past - where
There is no negative particle in // cofio / enw'r / lle //, but it is understood as a negative statement. This is reinforced by the tonal implications of the minor focal "tag" in the following IU. "Lochore I think it was, but I'm not sure."

(a) "heblaw"

It was noted earlier (5.2.6) that the preposition/conjunction "heblaw" could vary in meaning according to its focal behaviour. We saw that when the equivalent of "let alone", "heblaw" had to be focal, generally in a compound IU, with minor focus on the prepositional/conjunctonal complement:

(47) // .. oedd / dim / "bloody" / amser 'da / fi / siarad
    was no bloody time with us speak
    I didn't have bloody time to speak

    iddo fe // .. heblaw rhoi / arian iddo fe //
    to him let alone give money to him
    to him, let alone give him money.

(48) // .. oedd / heb / 'na am / dri o'r / gloch //
    was nobody there at three of the bell
    There was nobody there at three o'clock
(f) A similar situation exists when the focal element is realized by an exclamation of some sort which has an emphatic function and is followed by the reiteration of that information which is to be emphasized, in that the exclamation is generally focal in a compound IU, the minor focal information constituent being some part of the reiterated information:

(49) A: // .. oen i 'di / blino // .. dod / lan ma/n'yn //

(aux) I (asp) tire come up here

I was tired coming up here.

B: // bota i / ed // .. wyn / uffern i //

will bet I too (excl.)

I'll bet too, by hell.

pedair can / milltir / ifa // allen i / fentro //

four hundred mile (tag) could I venture

Four hundred miles, is it? I'd bet.

A: // o // bois / bach oen i 'di / blino //

oh boys small(aux) I (asp) tire

Oh! Boy, I was tired.

.. oen i / wdi / blino'n / rags //

(aux) I (asp) tire (asp) rags

I was tuck out.
(50) A: "so" es i / lan i fe // siarad i fe // de //
so went I up to him speak to him (excl)
So I went up to him to speak to him.

disgwyl yn / ddiflas //
look (asp) miserable
Boy, he looked miserable.

B: .. oedd / e'n / disgwyl yn / ddiflas //
(aux) he (asp) look (asp) miserable
He looked miserable?

A: .. bois / bach oedd e'n / disgwyl yn / ddiflas //
boys little(aux) he(asp) look (asp) miserable
Boy, he looked miserable.

oedd //
(aux)

Yes.

This concludes the extremely brief discussion on compound IUs/tone-groups and Minor Focus/Tonic. They are by no means of infrequent usage, and probably deserve a good deal more attention than they have received in this work. What have been discussed above are some of the more obviously focal implications involved (minor lexical focus, minor focal pronominals, minor focal "bod") along with certain interesting features of various compound IUs as a whole (indefinites, negative implications, "heblaw", exclamatory emphasis). We now move on to a different type of secondary informational prominence.
6.2. Secondary Prominence at Protonic

Secondary informational prominence may be realized in two ways at protonic: the first via pitch, the second via rhythm.

6.2.1. In the section on tonality, we saw how the historically derived pitch peak came to be a normal feature of non-salient syllables in the protonic of a tone-group. We described it as a normal feature both because of its frequency of occurrence and because its absence involves no difference in meaning. That is to say, no informational difference was evident whether a particular non-salient syllable or a series of them were accompanied by a pitch peak or whether they retained the pitch level of the salient syllable which preceded them. We now have to qualify this statement, for what we have been referring to is a "neutral" pitch peak. The pitch peak does offer scope for secondary informational prominence in a marked form. In defining the neutral and marked varieties of the pitch peak we are of course speaking in relative and not absolute terms. Whether a pitch peak is marked or neutral depends on its level in relation to that of the salient syllable which precedes it.

It is not necessary to describe in mels what distinguishes a neutral pitch peak from one which is marked, such that any pitch difference greater than the specified number of mels will constitute a marked pitch peak. Making use instead of musical intervals, we can say that a neutral pitch peak will normally be within or somewhat around a major third of the pitch level taken by its preceding salient syllable. The use of "somewhere around" is deliberately vague, for it is not desirable to take up the position that if, say,
the interval is slightly more than a third, then the pitch peak will
be consequently marked. When we say "within" a major third we mean
that the neutral pitch peak can occupy any point on a continuous
scale from (but not including) the pitch of the preceding salient
syllable up to a major third above it.

Choice of points along this scale of "neutrality" are seen as
being in free variation, not involving any informational significance.
The choice of pitch peak level does become significant in its marked
form, where the interval between it and the preceding salient syllable
is normally more than a fifth. The question of how to deal with a
pitch peak of between a third and a fifth from the preceding salient
syllable does not really arise, for the choice of a marked pitch
peak as expenence of secondary informational prominence is a positive
choice requiring a noticeable deviation from the norm.

To speak of the meaning associated with a marked pitch peak is
not a profitable direction to take, for according to that part of the
discourse in which it appears, its function could be linguistic or
paralinguistic. On the one hand it can be discoursally effective
signalling contrast or emphasis, whilst on the other hand and much
more frequently it may aid the signalling of a number of attitudes on
behalf of the speaker e.g. surprise, anger, etc. As in most cases
concerning attitude, there are far too many other variables to take
into account for any sort of concise statement to be made. The best
solution is obtained if we say merely that a marked pitch peak may be
used for the purposes of secondary informational prominence, any
further categorization needing to be handled on an ad hoc basis.
Following are some examples of marked pitch peaks which appeared in the data:

(51) // . . as / Ian / trwy'r / casau 'na //
    went I up through the fields those
    I went up through those fields
.. a / Ian / i'r / "main / road" //
    and up to the main road
    and up to the main road,
.. a / roundais i / fforna i / gyd //29
    and rounded I that all
    and I went all round that way.

The last IU is accompanied by a paralinguistic gesture with the arms conveying the impression of "going round". Both gesture and marked pitch peak (signalled in the example by the superscript p.p.) combine to impress upon the audience the magnitude of the journey undertaken by the speaker. This function seems akin to what Labov and Waletsky (1967) have called "self-aggrandisement", which serves to put the narrator in a favourable light.

29 Note that in the first two tone-groups in (51), and especially the second one, almost each word begins a foot. This also seems to fulfil a function similar to that noted by Crystal (1975) in English, where a stretch of speech is split into an unexpectedly large number of tone-groups e.g. // He // gave // him // a // lift // on // a // Tuesday // in the context "extreme irritation."
(52) A: // bachan sia / "Aberdeen" // reit // .. yn / siarad
   boy from Aberdeen right (asp) speak
A boy from Aberdeen - right? - speaking
/ "Saesneg" // "key" // .. byddech chi'n / gwybod //
   English okay (aux) you(asp) know
English - okay? - you'd know
   .. taw / "Scots" fyddai fe //
   that Scots would be he
   that he'd be Scottish.
B: // .. o / "straight away" // byd yn oed 'sa fe'n
   oh straight away even if(aux) he(asp)
Oh, straight away; even if he was
/ siarad / "Gaelic" // .. a bydden / i ddim / gwybod
   speak Gaelic and (aux) I (neg) know
   speaking Gaelic, and I don't
/ un / gair ohonno fe //
   one word of it
   know a word of it.
A: // .. asa fe'n / siarad / "Gaelic" // beta i
   if(aux) he(asp) speak Gaelic will bet I
   If he was speaking Gaelic, I'll bet
/ rhywbeth // .. byddech chi / ddim yn / gwybod //
   anything (aux) you (neg) (asp) know
   anything that you wouldn't know
The choice of marked pitch peak is made in the context of slightly irritated counter-argument.

(53)  // .. gas i / ras 'da fe // lawr ym / Mhanty/ffynnon
      got I race with him down in Pantyffynnon
I had a race with him, down in Pantyffynnon.

   dros - // wedwn ni // - ddeg / llathen ar /ugain //
over will say we ten yards on twenty
over - let's say - thirty yards,

   .. a oen i / llathen o'i / fiaen e //
and was I yard of his front him
and I was a yard in front of him.

Strengthening a point already made earlier about the speed (or lack of it) of a particular individual. The "self-aggrandisement" function is also in evidence.

6.2.2. As well as by means of the pitch peak (6.2.1), secondary informational prominence can be realized phonologically at pretonic by salience. Salience can therefore be seen as secondary phonological prominence (as, of course, can the (marked) pitch peak). We are concerned here with the incidence of salience at pretonic; not at posttonic, intertonic or the tonic syllable (which carries prominence of a primary order). Here again, we make use of a marked and unmarked form.
(a) **Unmarked incidence of salience**

A fundamental prerequisite of unmarked salience is that its incidence coincides with a syllable which is lexically stressed. If a non-lexically stressed syllable were salient, it would involve a secondary contrast of the same type as was earlier discussed in connection with a non-lexically stressed tonic syllable (5.1). In what follows, our concern will be solely with salient syllables which are also lexically stressed. This will enable us to use terms like "salient lexical item", "salient pronominal" etc., though of course it is the (lexically stressed) syllable, and not the syntactic item, which is in fact salient.

Our next consideration, and that with which we are mainly concerned in this subsection, is the grammatical status of the item which contains the salient syllable. We can make an initial distinction as we did for focal behaviour between lexical and non-lexical items. When the salient syllable is the lexically stressed syllable of a lexical item, then the incidence of salience is unmarked. This is a statistically valid claim on the phonological level, in the same way that we characterized unmarked tonicity. Viewed from the informational standpoint also, taking into account the proposed relationship between rhythm and information (1.3.3., 2), it seems a perfectly reasonable statement, as it is the lexical items which can be said to carry the main information load of a message. We may therefore expect that the more interesting discussion will concern the incidence of salience on (the lexically stressed syllables of) non-lexical items; where, in other words, the incidence of salience is marked.
Before moving on to this, however, we may briefly take account of a slightly different type of deviation from the unmarked form 

viz., where a lexical item does not contain a salient syllable. This can hardly be called a marked form of salience, as it is the absence of salience which is deviant, but it is nevertheless suggested that it does have a corresponding function in the informational component, namely, that it specifies that non-salient item as given. Now, we stated earlier, in the discussion of focus, that unmarked focus was unpresupposing as to the informational status of what preceded it. In other words, whereas the focal information constituent conveyed new information, what preceded it in the IU remained unspecified as to its informational status; as opposed to marked lexical focus for instance, where any lexical items following the focal one were generally specified as given. Whether information preceding the focal information constituent in an IU was given or not, it was stated, was mainly dependent on that part of the discourse. We can amend this by suggesting that salience, or rather the unexpected absence of it, affords a phonological device for the signalling of certain information as given. \(^{30}\) Compare the following:

\[(54)\text{(a)} // .. ma e'n / gwethu / moch // \]

(sux) he(asp) sell pigs

He sells pigs.

\[(54)\text{(b)} // .. ma e'n gwethu / moch // \]

Focus being unmarked in both \((54)\text{(a)}\) and \((54)\text{(b)}\), then taking nothing else into consideration in either IU, what precedes the focal information constituent is unspecified as to informational status. But

\(^{30}\text{We must be careful here. The absence of salience on a lexical item specifies it as given, but the presence of salience does not specify it as new. Rather, in the latter case, the situation is neutral i.e. specified neither as given or new.}\)
if we examine the rhythm, we see that the lexical item "gwerthu" (sell) in (54)(b), which would normally be expected to be salient, is non-salient, and it is this which signals it as given. In (54)(a) "gwerthu" remains unspecified. Finding a textual context, we could propose (54)(b) as an answer to

// beth mae e’n / gwerthu //
what (aux) he(asp) sell
What does he sell?

and (54)(a) as an answer to

// beth mae e’n / gwneud //
what (aux) he(asp) do
What does he do?

(b) Marked salience

The lack of clear distinction between lexical items and non-lexical items, especially in Welsh, has already been noted. Items such as prepositions, demonstratives, etc., which caused problems from this point of view by virtue of their focal behaviour, will not be dealt with in this section. As exemplification of marked salience and the way in which it operates we will take only personal pronouns, aspect markers, and some relatively "empty" lexical items. These items are not typically salient, so that the occasions when they are so require explanation: it is proposed that such an explanation may be found in the informational component, in such a way that a normally non-salient item which becomes salient constitutes the phonological exponence of secondary informational prominence.
(i) **Personal Pronominals**

The general characteristic of focal pronominals was that they involved a discoursal presupposition such that the existence of another element was implied, that other element being derivable by contrast with the focal information constituent. We restrict our discussion of discoursal presupposition to focus only. 31 It is too strong a claim that presuppositions are involved at prototypic as well, although such may be the case in a number of instances. We may still however talk about contrast when a pronominal is salient, or rather secondary contrast, as that contrast will not be the focal point of the IU. As with the minor focal pronominal, the salient pronominal may well involve the focal information constituent in the contrast which is implied. Consider the following examples:

(55) // .. mae / hi'n / dala / tren / lan i Gae/reduin
(aux) she (asp) catch train up to Edinburgh

She's catching a train up to Edinburgh

dydd / Llun // .. a fi / li heb gwneud yn
Monday and I I without make my

Monday, and I I haven't made my

/ feddwl lan / sto //

mind up yet

mind up yet.

i.e. What she's doing as opposed to what I haven't decided to do.

---

31 With exceptions e.g. see note 30.
A: 'na beth / wedon nhw / haddiw // .. bod y / tenor//
that what said they today (aux) the tenor
That's what they said today, that the tenor

wedi dod / lan yn / agos i Do/reen //
(asp) come up (asp) near to Doreen
had come close to Doreen,

.. ond taw Do/reen oedd yn / haeddu / gael e //
but that Doreen (aux)(asp) deserve get it
but that it was Doreen who deserved to get it;

.. a siwr o fod taw / Lyn / Rees / oedd y / tenor //
and sure of be that Lyn Rees was the tenor
and probably Lyn Rees was the tenor.

'na beth / wedodd e / bore 'ma // .. ond / i / fi//
that what said it morning this but to me
That's what it said this morning, but for me,

.. oen / i ddim / lico Lyn / Rees / fel'ny //
(aux) I (neg) like Lyn Rees like that
I didn't like Lyn Rees that much.

B: // na // .. oedd / person buais / i'n siarad a ddim
no (aux) person (aux) I(asp) speak with (neg)
No. A person I was speaking to didn't

/ lico fe / fel'ny //
like him like that
like him that much.
C: // .. wel oen / i ddim / guwbod bod e'n / cau ar hyd
well (aux) I (neg) know (aux) he(asp)sing on length
Well I didn't know he sang all over

y / lle / ffór'na //
the place like that

the place like that.

There are two instances of salient pronominals here: (a) the final
IU in A's message, where the contrast is, "they thought he came close,
but I didn't like him that much". (b) C's IU: "As for you not liking
him, I didn't even know he sang all over the place."
(Notice incidentally the occurrence of salient "bod"):

// .. a siwr o fod taw / Lyn / Rees / oedd y / tenor //,
where there is a secondary polarity contrast).

(57) A: // .. oedd e yn yr / undeb yn / Bethel / Tymbl / nawr //
was he in the union in Bethel Tumble now
He was in the union in Bethel Tumble now.

.. a'i / waer e // .. oedd ei / waer e 'na // ed //
and his sister him was his sister him there too
And his sister, his sister was there too.

B: // ydy // .. wel mae / hi'n / aelod yn /
(aux) well is she(asp) member in

Yes, well she's a member in

/ Bethel / Tymbl //

Bethel Tumble

i.e. "that's why she was there".
(58) A: // .. 'na chi / wedi / cael eich / gwyliau / nawr
    that you (asp) get your holidays now
    That's you had your holidays now, 
    mam/gu // de // .. oedd hi'n / grac //
    Grandmother (excl) was she (asp) angry
    Gran. Oh, she was angry.

B: // .. amboi tu / beth //
    about what
    About what?

A: // .. bod hi / heb dod / lan i / "Edinburgh" //
    (aux) she without come up to Edinburgh
    that she didn't come up to Edinburgh.
    de // .. oedd hi'n / dweud hi //
    (excl) (aux) she(asp) say it
    Oh, she was saying it!

C: // beth mae a'n / dweud / nawr //
    what (aux) he(asp) say now
    What's he saying now?

B: // .. bod / ti ddim mynd / lan i / "Edinburgh" //
    (aux) you (neg) go up to Edinburgh
    that you didn't go up to Edinburgh.

(It was common knowledge to all present that other members of the 
    family had gone to Edinburgh while C was not permitted to go).
(59) A: / wel oen nhv'n / gwneud / dau / "break"
    well (aux) they (asp) make two breaks

    Well they were making two breaks

    ar y / ffordd /
    on the way

    on the way.

B: / oen / .. a mae hwna'n / newid .. / meddul
   (aux) and (aux) that (asp) change mean

    Yes, and that changes .. means

   / newid / gwely / tri / gwaith /
    change bed three time

    changing beds three times.

A: / oed / newid / gwely / tri / gwaith /
   (aux) change bed three time

    Yes, changing beds three times.

C: / newid / gwely / tair / gwaith / nawr'te /
    change bed three (f) time now then

    Changing beds three times. Now then.

    dara nawr /
    come now

    Come on, now.

B: / .. on wyf / fi'n / dwed / tri / gwaith /
   if (aux) I (asp) say three time

    If I say three times,
.. a / chi\'n / gwybod // .. yn / dda / iawn //
and you(asp) know (asp) good very
and you know very well

beth wyf fi\'n / maddwl //
what (aux) I (asp) mean
what I mean...

i.e. "my saying" vs. "your understanding".

(60) // chi aeth a\'r / "towels" // chi dau aeth a\'r
you went with the towels you two went with the
You took the towels. You two took the

towels. and was I up by the door (asp)
towels, and I was up at the door

/ dawnso //
dance
dancing.

(61) // .. bydda i / 'na // .. 'abo / bore / 'fory
will be I there till morning tomorrow
I\'ll be there till tomorrow morning,

\'achan // hey // .. eiff / "Mari/anne" // gyagu
boy hey will get Marianne sleep
man. Hey! Marianne can sleep

maes / man\'na ar y / llawr // reit //
out there on the floor right
out there on the floor, right?
.. ewn / ni ddau i'r / gwey mawr //

will go we two to the bed now
We two'll go to bed now.

(62) // .. a oedd yn / fam // eistedd / laver / fan'na //

and (aux) my mother sit down there
And my mother was sitting down there

.. yn / cvrlo ei / gwallt // t'wel // .. a mae'n

(asp) curl her hair you see and (aux) my
curling her hair, you see, and my father

/ dad yn / dwaud // mawr'te // beth am/boitu

father (asp) say now then what about
says: "Now then, what about

/ "John / Pullin" meddai fe // .. a mae'n

John Pullin says he and (aux) my
John Pullin?" he says. And my mother

/ fam yn / dwaud // .. ydy / e'n / perthyn i

mother (asp) say (aux) he (asp) belong to
says: "Is he related to

/ "Albert / Pullin" //

Albert Pullin
Albert Pullin?"

Note the contrast here is intra-IU
i.e. "e" (him) vs. "Albert Pullin".
(63) // .. os bydden i 'di / gwneud e yn yr / ysgol / hyn //
    if (aux) I (asp) do it in the school this
If I'd have done it in this school,

    blwyddyn / hyn // .. neu / blwyddyn / dwetha' //
    year this or year last
this year, or last year,

    .. byddai / lot o / bethau'n / digwydd //
    (aux) lot of things(asp) happen
a lot of things would happen

    .. bydden / i ddim yn / moin / t'wel //
    (aux) I (neg) (asp) want you see
that I wouldn't want, you see.

(ii) Aspect markers "yn" "wedi"

The implications of these aspect markers when salient are

generally akin to those when they are focal viz. contrast and
emphasis, the contrast being normally one of polarity. Again it
must be remembered that both contrast and emphasis are secondary as
far as informational prominence goes:

(64) // .. oedd e'n dweud / celwydd amboitu ei / oedran hi //
    (aux) he(asp) say lies about her age her
He was telling lies about her age,

    .. achos oedd / a ddim moin e / ddisgwyl fel 'sa
    cause (aux) he (neg) want it look like be
because he didn't want it to look as if
hi mwy / hen na fe // .. a oedd hi / yn
she more old than him and was she (asp)
she was older than him, and she was a

/ flwyddyn mwy / hen na fe //
year more old than him
year older than him.

(65) A: // .. ydy hi'n / bwrw / mae //
(aux) it (asp) rain out
Is it raining out?

B: // arllwys hi // .. mae hi 'di / "stop"-o //
pouring it (aux) it (asp) stop
It's pouring. It's stopped.

A: // ydy hi // e //
(aux) it oh
Has it? Oh!

B: // na // bwrw o / hyd // .. mae hi / yn / bwrw //
no rain still (aux) it (asp) rain
No. It's still raining. It is raining -

    dim mor / drwm / nawr //
(neg) as heavy now
not so heavily now.

(66) A: // wel / dwedwch wrtho i // beth am y sy'n
    well say to me what of the (aux)(asp)
Well tell me, what about the ...
/ perthyn i "auntie" / Blod yn / "Cyprus" //
belong to aunty Blod in Cyprus
who are related to Aunty Blod in Cyprus?

B: // o // .. ma'n nhw / 'nol / garthre //
oh are they back home

Oh, they're back home.

..o'en nhw wedi dod / 'nol // —
(aux) they (asp) come back

They'd come back;

..o'en nhw / eisiau / peinto eu / ty // .. pe b'hai nhw
(aux) they want paint their house if(aux) they
they wanted to paint their house. If they'd

/wedi / aros yr / amser oen nhw wedi wedi
(asp) stay the time (aux) they (asp) (asp)
stayed the time that they'd

/trefnu'n / gynta' //
arrange(asp) first
arranged at first ..
i.e. "if they had .. but they didn't".

(67) // .. 'na chi / wedi / cael eich / gwyliau / nawr ma'n/gu//
there you (asp) get your holidays now Gran.
That's you had your holidays now, Gran.
i.e. you hadn't before.
The couple - the two that got the duet -

oh were they (asp) good

Oh, they were good.

(Emphatic use, reiterating more forcibly the information contained in A's penultimate IU).

When they are working,

they work, fair play to them,

but how much of the time are they in work

are they working?
(iii) Semantically empty lexical items

The incidence of salience on what is normally considered a semantically "empty" lexical item (see 5.3.2) differs in its implications from the cases of marked salience so far discussed, in that the notion of contrast no longer applies. Rather, it could be said that salience here has the effect of "adding weight" to the item involved - "relieving it of its emptiness", as it were. I would like to suggest, however, that it would be more accurate to state that the incidence of salience (as opposed to its absence) seems to distinguish whether a certain item is empty or not in that particular part of the discourse. We will take the verb "mynd" (go) as an example. 32

(70) // .. oedd dy / gar // .. wedi / torri / lavr //
(aux) your car (asp) break down
Your car had broken down,

.. "so" / aethon ni i Peny/banc // .. neu i
so went we to Penybanc or to
so we went to Penybanc, or to

/ Saron neu / rhydle //
Saron or somewhere
Saron or somewhere.
"aethon" (went) forms part of the pretonic here - it is salient.
I would suggest that this is because "mynd" in this case is a positive action, as it were, a direct result of the car breaking down,

32 It will be recalled (5.3.2) that "mynd" in final position in the IU was frequently postfocal.
and not just a preamble to "somewhere". If the car had not broken down, and we were going to Peny banc merely for a spin, "aethon" would probably form part of the proclitic i.e. it would be non-salient, as in the following examples:

(71) //.. aethon ni / lawr / clwb Panty(ffynn)on y y
    went we down club Pantyffynn on in the
    We went down Pantyffynn on club in the

pryn/hawn //

afternoon

afternoon.

(72) //.. aethon ni / alw Dai / Morgan //
    went we call Dai Morgan
    We went to call Dai Morgan.

where the verb "mynd" (go) is merely incidental to what follows i.e. goal, destination.
7.0. The aim of this section is to describe the phonetics and phonology of tone in Welsh, and to examine any discoursal functions which it may be seen to expound. In doing this, we recognize, though do not account for, relationships between the tonal system and other levels of language (and paralanguage).

7.1. The phonetics of tone

The phonological system of tone involves the choice of a pitch direction at the tonic syllable. In a simple tone-group, only one such selection is made (see 6.1 for a discussion of compound tone-groups, where two selections of a more limited nature are made, one at each tonic syllable).

It was mentioned in the discussion of the posttonic (2.3.) that Halliday's statement regarding the tones of English would most certainly not apply to the phonetics of Welsh tone: "... the pitch movement of the tone selected falls largely on the first syllable of the first foot of the tonic (i.e. the tonic syllable - MR), this syllable being almost always by itself sufficient to permit the tone to be identified correctly" (Halliday (1967) p.13).

The posttonic in Welsh is frequently significant in terms of the realization and identification of tone.

In terms of pitch direction, four broad phonetic categories can be seen to operate in the dialect of Welsh described here. These are:
1. Fall
2. Rise
3. Rise-fall
4. Level

We will now examine these in turn.

7.1.1. Fall

(a) Tonic syllable - no posttonic.

The falling pitch movement will take place entirely on the tonic syllable. Obviously the fall may be, within a person's physical limits, from any pitch level to any lower pitch level, so that in phonetic terms it is possible for any speaker to use an infinite number of falls. We impose a constraint on this feature which goes at least a short way towards delimiting our aims in this work. We are interested only in the pitch variation within a speaker's "tessitura". A speaker's tessitura is defined as "a characteristic range of notes, or compass, within which the pitch fluctuation of his voice falls during normal circumstances" (Abercrombie (1969) p. 99). Anything outside this normal pitch-range is considered to have a paralinguistic function (see Brown, (forthcoming), esp. Ch. 7), and will not be dealt with in this work.

(b) Tonic syllable and posttonic

The phonetic experience of a fall when the tone-group has a posttonic element may be manifested in a variety of ways. If the tonic syllable has a long vowel as syllable nucleus, a good deal of the downward pitch movement may take place on this syllable, depending to a large extent on the length of the posttonic. The falling
tone in Welsh tends to spread itself along a posttonic in a relatively gradual fashion, as opposed to certain well-documented dialects of English where the fall is largely on the tonic syllable, posttonic syllables tending to be on a low steady pitch level i.e.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Welsh</th>
<th>English (R.P.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.S.</td>
<td>T.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

where T.S. = tonic syllable.

If the tonic syllable has a short vowel (or in some cases a syllabic consonant\(^1\)), the fall will generally be realized by the following (posttonic) syllable being at a lower pitch, this trend continuing throughout the rest of the posttonic (if present) e.g.

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c}
A & B & C & D \\
\hline
\cdot \cdot \cdot & \cdot \cdot \cdot & \cdot \cdot \cdot & \cdot \cdot \cdot \\
\end{array}
\]

A = short tonic syllable
B = immediately subsequent posttonic syllable
C, D = other posttonic syllables
A-B = pitch difference between tonic syllable and following syllable realizing falling tone.

A downward glide may take place on any of the posttonic syllables (the longer ones being obviously the more likely candidates) and

\(^1\) Lexical stress in Welsh belongs in the main to the penultimate syllable of a polysyllabic word, this syllable (for historical reasons to do with the accent shift - see 4.5.2) more often than not containing a weakened vowel, so that verbs like "tasgu" (splash, spirt) or "dangos" (show) could be realized as [\text{tasgl}], [\text{dangos}], or [\text{tesgl}], [\text{dengos}] or even with a syllabic consonant: [\text{tsgl}] [\text{d\text{\-}ngos}].
especially the final syllable in the tone-group:

\[ A \]

\[ - \cdot \cdot - \]

A = tonic syllable.

It is therefore not necessarily the case that phonetic exponent of tone will be manifested at the tonic syllable. It may do so, of course, if the tonic syllable has a long vowel nucleus. Actual pitch movement, however, may occur only at some point in the posttonic, if the tonic syllable has a short vowel nucleus. In such a case the first (linear, temporal) manifestation of a fall will be in the pitch difference between the tonic syllable and the ensuing syllable. This type of pitch difference never occurs at pretonic.

7.1.2. Rise

The rising tone mirrors the falling tone and therefore needs little description. One important difference needs to be mentioned, however. Cases where the tonic vowel or syllabic consonant is short and the rise is initially manifested via the difference in pitch level between the tonic syllable and the ensuing posttonic non-salient syllable may cause potential confusion from a procedural standpoint, for a similar feature occurs with the pitch peak at pretonic (cf. 1.3.2), where the non-salient syllables in a foot

\[ ^2 \text{ i.e. non-salient syllable lower than preceding salient syllable. It will be evident that this type of pitch movement, or rather difference, takes place within the tonic foot where the tonic syllable acts as ictus. If the tonic foot is monosyllabic - ictus (tonic syllable) only - there will be a downward glide on that foot.} \]
normally take a pitch level above that of the salient syllable which acts as ictus for that foot. This difficulty is soon resolved, however, for the pitch level of the tonic syllable in such cases is lower than what would be expected from a salient syllable at pre-tonic. Take, for example, a stepping protonic (see 1.3.2): the salient syllables step down at relatively regular pitch intervals -

\[ \text{etc.} \]

A tonic syllable at the end of this pretonic sequence would take a lower pitch level than would be expected of another pretonic salient syllable

\[ \text{pretonic} \quad \text{tonic syllable} \]

7.1.3. Rise-fall

The rise-fall tone in Welsh is, as the name suggests, a combination of two other tones in that it is bi-directional: it is a fall preceded by a rise. Its phonetic expence can be seen to vary according to the character of the tonic syllable and posttonic.

(a) Tonic syllable only - no posttonic: the rise-fall will take place entirely on the tonic syllable e.g.

\[ // \text{can} // \text{(song)} \]
(b) If the tonic vowel is long and followed by a posttonic, then the tonic syllable may carry the rising component of the tone only, or part of the fall also e.g.

\[
// \text{can oedd e} // \quad (A \text{ song it was})
\]

or

\[
\]

(c) If the tonic vowel is short and followed by a non-salient posttonic syllable (or syllables) within the tonic foot, the rising component of the rise-fall tone will be realized by the pitch difference between the tonic syllable and immediately following posttonic syllable. The falling component will be realized according to the composition of the posttonic. If the posttonic consists of one syllable, the fall will take place on this syllable:

\[
// \text{cynta (first)} //
\]

If the posttonic consists of more than one syllable, the fall may be "spread" along those syllables or may be realized only by the pitch differences between them (though the final syllable in the posttonic will normally have a slight downward pitch movement in any case):

\[
// \text{bynta dauth y twpsyn} // \quad (the \text{ idiot came first})
\]

or

\[
\]
or a combination of these. 3

3 An interesting case arose in the data in connection with the rise-fall, where the tonic syllable could genuinely be called a silent stress, working in much the same way as the well attested /k)kju/ for "thankyou" in English (Jones (1932) p.227). The following constructed example shows the point more clearly: if in answer to the question:

//.. chi'n / dod i'r / gen / 'fory //
you (asp) come to the game tomorrow
Are you coming to the game tomorrow?

the speaker replies apologetically:

// ćcen ı / dod ond ... //
would like I come but
I'd like to come but ...

the listener perceives this as a rise-fall (plus rise) which is the choice of tone associated with the meaning to be conveyed (apologetic and qualificatory), although what he actually hears in a physical sense is a fall (plus rise), which would entail a different shade of meaning. (Obviously I am not suggesting that every native speaker has an inbuilt analytical knowledge of his intonation system. We are basically speaking in terms of competence). He physically hears a fall because the tonic word "licen" (I would like) is contracted to "ćcen", so that the first syllable consists of only the voiceless velar plosive /k/, which does not carry a pitch. Without a salient syllable preceding "ćcen", then, a rise-fall would not be possible. Therefore through comprehension of the speaker's intention not only do we make a decision on the tone which is involved and thereby accept the presence of a syllable preceding "ćcen" which the theory requires to be salient (the tonic syllable is by definition a salient syllable), we also make a judgement about the relative pitch of that syllable, placing it on a level below the beginning of the fall on "ćcen".
7.1.4. Level

The level tone has no pitch movement as such. It maintains a level pitch from the tonic syllable to the end of the tone-group.

7.2. Phonology and function of tone

At a primary level of delicacy, the system of tone in the dialect of Welsh described here consists of two terms:

Tone 1 - fall
Tone 2 - rise

It is crucial to bear in mind at this stage that the above statement is made with consideration for the purposes of this thesis vis-à-vis to explore the system of tone from the point of view of its exponence of discourse functions. Alternative approaches might produce an alternative number of terms and/or an alternative classification. Compare for instance Halliday (1967), whose primary degree of delicacy for the English tone system includes five terms, where tone 3 (low rise) is distinguished phonologically - though not always phonetically - from tone 2 (high rise). Similarly with tone 4 (fall-rise), broken tone 2 (fall-rise) and compound tone 13 (fall plus rise). The rationale is concisely provided by El-Henoufy: "... the phonological analysis itself is oriented towards grammar as well as towards phonetics. That is, the criteria taken into account in assigning a particular pitch movement to a particular tone are not just phonetic - the function of the pitch movement in the particular (grammatically defined) environment is also taken into account. Thus, it is possible for two utterances to have phonetically indistinguishable pitch movements and yet be
assigned to different tones; or, conversely, to have different pitch movements assigned to the same tone (at least at the primary degree of delicacy) — this being done in order to show functional similarities." (El-Menoufy (1969) p. 334). The number and classification of the terms in the phonological system of tone are therefore seen to depend on the point of view from which the analysis is taken, there being therefore no independently existing phonological system of tone. It is quite possible that were this thesis to follow the type of approach set out by Halliday and followed by El-Menoufy, the terms within the tone system would be presented differently. If this turned out to be the case, it would be interesting to see at a much later stage if and how the two or more systems could be "compromised" to account for more than one approach (e.g. tonal exponence of grammatical contrasts, tonal exponence of discourse functions), or indeed if the approaches could be compromised as well.

The intention of this thesis is to single out one tone for examination in relation to the discourse function it is seen to expound. We will first need to go to a further level of delicacy in order to reach what will be known as "marked tone 1". This tone was chosen for discussion on the basis of its functional similarity to certain types of marked focus (see part II) and its interaction with them.

Inevitably such an approach will result in the neglect of other areas of tone and the discourse functions they expound. The initial dichotomy of the terms in the system is made on an over-general principle of "final" and "non-final". This notion will have to be
examined and improved a good deal before it can be accepted as a fundamental theoretical tenet. I would suggest, however, that a more satisfactory terminology could be borrowed from the field of musical theory, so that instead of "final" and "non-final" which do not seem to me to capture the relationship between sequences of tones very well, we could adopt the terms "resolving" and "non-resolving" respectively.

In music, a chord may be "resolved" by a following chord, or it may be left "unresolved". For instance, if playing in the key of C, we had the following sequence of chords in a phrase:

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
C & G & C & G & F & C \\
\end{array}
\]

the final C chord (the "tonic" in musical terms) resolves the preceding G chord (the "dominant"), and gives a sense of completion to the phrase as a whole - it could be the end of a song, as it were. If, on the other hand, the above phrase were repeated without the final C chord - i.e. if it ended on the third C chord - then that final C chord would be left unresolved. The phrase would need either another (resolving) chord, or a following phrase, in order to avoid leaving the listener with a sense of its being incomplete.

It would be unwise to attempt to draw too many parallels in this respect between tone and music, but there is enough (striking) similarity in the above feature to warrant our adapting the above musical notion for the purpose of displaying a discoursal function of tone, such that tone 1 would generally be assigned a resolving function and tone 2 a non-resolving function. The question of what, in phonological terms, tone 1 resolves, and what this unit
would correspond to in the discourse, will be left open as far as this thesis goes. The topic is one which crops up in most intonation studies, it being generally agreed that there is a need to set up a unit of higher rank than the tone-group. Fox (1973) postulates a "paratone-group" on the basis of tone-sequences in English, this unit having the structure

\[(\text{minor})_n \quad \text{major} \quad (\text{minor})_n\]
i.e. an obligatory "major" tone-group optionally preceded and/or followed by any number of minor tone-groups.

Brazil (1975) on the other hand argues for the establishment of such a unit on the basis of key sequence. This unit, which he leaves nameless and whose theoretical implications he does not pursue in that particular paper, would have the structure:

\[(\text{Hi}gh \text{ key}_{1...n}) \quad \text{Mid key} \quad (\text{Lo}w \text{ key}_{1...n})\]

The implications of Brazil's suggestions will be taken up and discussed in Part IV of this work. Both these approaches are estimated as valuable contributions to the discussion of a higher ranking phonological unit. It is indeed possible that a combination of both approaches may be more valuable still: for instance, whether a particular tone is seen in terms of its pitch-range (high - low), slope (steep-gradual) and direction (rising-falling) as having the function "resolving" or "non-resolving" may best be considered against the background of the key within which the tone-group is set.

These suggestions will not be followed up in this thesis. Indeed, the terms "resolving" and "non-resolving" must be seen as extremely general functional categories, and not as part of a statement to the

---

Strictly speaking, if we stuck to the musical parallel, tone I would resolve another tone, as a chord resolves another chord. Here, though, we are thinking more in terms of the "complete" musical phrase rather than a single chord within a phrase - in other words, a phonological unit above the tone-group, and a discoursal unit above the IU.
effect that each instance of a rising tone will invariably be non-final in the utterance (or, more importantly, in the concomitant unit which would be established as a corollary to the theory), or that a falling tone will always occur final. Such a claim would constitute a gross oversimplification of the facts. For instance, a rising (generally non-resolving) tone could follow a falling (generally resolving) tone and give the impression of finality. Conversely, a falling tone may sometimes not give the impression of finality i.e. it may at certain points not fulfil a resolving function. It is suggested that there are many variables involved with the resolving functions in discourse which cannot be accounted for simply within the tonal system. It is not, for example, merely a case of whether a falling tone reaches low level of the speaker's tessitura or stops at a level which is non-low. In many cases a fall to non-low can quite easily fulfil a resolving function. Much of this would depend for one thing on the choice of key. A particular tone, described phonetically, could have a resolving function when co-occurring with a particular key selection, but may lose that function with an alternative key selection. Further, these variables cannot all be accounted for under the general heading of intonation. The listener may well be depending upon cues of a different order, the most obvious of which would be:


2. Tempo: e.g. the speaker speeds up at the end of a tone-group, continuing at speed into the following tone-group. This device is characteristically used when the speaker realizes that other cues (like syntax and intonation for instance) will lead the hearer to
believe that that particular (higher ranking) unit is being resolved; the hearer may take this as an opportunity to assume the role of speaker; the speaker, however, does not want to relinquish his role and therefore speeds up tempo. A consequence of this device is of course the absence of a pause-marker (see 1.1) which would normally be expected.

3. Accompanying non-verbal paralinguistic features: continuance of certain kinesic features such as a particular facial set, a gesture (such as point etc.), can frequently serve to signal that the speaker has not finished what he wants to say. Eye-contact and body movement seem to be especially important in this respect. Kendon (1967) reports that the ends of utterances where there is an exchange of the role of speaker are frequently indicated by a sustained gaze combined with a characteristic head position. Where these features did not occur, response was less immediate, which indicated that kinesic accompaniment of this nature was an important factor in the smooth flow of conversational interaction. During hesitation, when the speaker had not finished, the tendency was on his part to avoid eye-contact, which Kendon suggested functioned as an inhibitory signal to the listener. In a later paper, Kendon (1970) suggests that what he calls "movement co-ordination" between speaker and hearer means that the listener is in some way able to anticipate what the speaker is going to say (see also Weisser 1967), which tends to support an analysis-by-synthesis theory of speech perception. This in turn allows for flexibility in the size of the speech unit that is processed. The listener can synthesize expected units of speech in terms of syllables,
phrases, or larger semantic (discourse) units. Kendon seems therefore to be approaching via kinesic avenues the type of unit we discussed above in phonological terms.

It would seem, then, that a number of time-consuming experiments are needed in order to clarify this particular discourse function of tone. The interest of this thesis lies in an alternative function, more in line with that which was proposed in Part II for certain types of information focus and its exponent tonicity.

Our tone system consists at the primary degree of delicacy, based on phonetic criteria and general discourse function, of two terms: tone 1 (fall) and tone 2 (rise). Further degrees of delicacy would have to take into account features of direction (the rise-fall and level tones have not yet been included), pitch-range, width, and possibly other linguistic features such as co-occurring syntactic or discourse categories. Since we are here interested in the exponence and discourse function of one type of tone only, an extensive analysis of tonal distinctions and degrees of delicacy will not be necessary. As far as direction goes, we place the rise fall into the primary category of tone 1, and the level tone into tone 2. The latter decision is based on the characteristically non-resolving function expounded by the level tone, for in phonetic terms it no more resembles a rise than it does a fall. 5

---

5 Although the same may be said of the rise-fall in that it constitutes a combination of both pitch directions, most intonation studies agree that a bidirectional tone basically follows the characteristics of its final direction (see, for example, Crystal (1969)). Thus in English the fall rise is normally included with the falling-type tones.
the level tone in the data co-occurred to a large extent with reported speech markers e.g.

(1) // .. a oedd yn / fam // elistedd / lawr / fam'na //
and (aux) my mother sit down there
and my mother was sitting down there

.. yn / cwrlo ei / gwalt // r'wel // .. a mae'n
(asp) curl her hair you see and (aux) my curling her hair, you see; and my

/ dad yn / *dwaed // navr'te // beth am/boliu
father (asp) say now then what about
father says: "Now then, what about

/ "John / Pullin" meddai fa // .. a mae'n / fam
John Pullin says he and (aux) my mother
John Pullin?" he says. And my mother

yn / *dwaed // .. ydy / e'n / pertbyn i
(asp) say (aux) he(asp) belong to
says: "Is he related to

/ "Albert / Pullin" //
Albert Pullin
Albert Pullin?"

*= level tone.

That is all that need be said about tone 2 for the purposes of this thesis. Our interest for the remainder of this section lies
with tone 1 or at least certain varieties of it which we shall call for convenience the marked forms. Instances of unmarked tone 1 are taken here to be where the onset of a simple falling tone is either at or below the pitch level of the last syllable of the pretonic of that tone-group (symbol = 1). The marked form is therefore defined in terms of two remaining broad categories of phonetic exponence:

(a) where the onset of a simple falling tone is at a pitch level above that of the final syllable in the pretonic (but see below) (symbol +1)

(b) where the pitch direction is a rise fall (symbol +1).

This can be diagrammatically represented as follows:

```
  Tone 1
   /   \
  /     \
/       \
unmarked       marked
          /   \          /   \-+1 e.g.
         /     \         /     \-e.g.
     l e.g.          l+ e.g.
```

The following discussion centres around the discoursal functions displayed by marked tone 1.

7.2.1. It was suggested in Part II that the discoursal function displayed by certain types of marked non-lexical focus was to imply the existence in the discourse of another element, that other element being specified as derivable by contrast with the focal item e.g.

(2) A: // byddwch / mwy na/turiol //
    be      more natural
    Be more natural.
B: // .. fi / yn na/turiol //
I (asp) natural
I am natural.

A: // nage na/turiol // . . dim / 'na fel chi'n (neg) natural not that like you (asp)
Not natural. That's not how you

/ siarad a / fi coch //
speak with me look
speak to me, look.

In (2), we have two contrastive presuppositions:

(a) The focal pronominal in A's reply implies a contrast between
"the way B is speaking at that point in the discourse and the
way B normally speaks to A".

(b) The focal aspect marker in B's reply involves a polarity con-
trast, as is characteristic of focal aspect markers. A's
first statement ("be more natural") implies that B is not acting
naturally. B's assertion that he is (being) natural is in
contrast with this.

(4) // .. wyt ti'n / priodi / cyn / cwpla //
(aux) you(asp)marry before finish
Are you getting married before finishing?

The focal preposition "cyn" (before) belongs to the semantically
categorized subset of "time" propositions, and involves a contrast
among members of this set i.e. "Are you getting married before, as
opposed to after/when etc. you finish?"
In examples like (2) and (4), the discoursal presupposition characterized by the implication of contrast was taken to be the responsibility of the marked focus. In other words, the contrastive presupposition was seen to hold irrespective of the tone which had its point of origin at the tonic syllable. It was not unusual, however, to find in the data a variety of marked tone 1 co-occurring with this type of focus. In these cases, the tone was seen in the role of "supporting" the contrast - the contrast would have been present whether the tone was marked tone 1 or not. Instances of marked tone 1 become interesting, however, when they do not co-occur with foci which themselves involve contrastive presuppositions, and this will be discussed shortly. The discourse function we suggest is displayed by marked tone 1, then, is similar to that suggested for various kinds of marked non-lexical focus viz. it generally involves a contrastive presupposition. It can display this function in three ways, depending on the focus:

1. Supportingly.
2. Discriminatingly.
3. Independently.

1. The first of these has already been discussed at various points in Part II: when marked tone 1 co-occurs with a marked non-lexical focus which involves a contrastive presupposition, the former plays a supportive role to the latter, since the contrast would have been operative even in the absence of the former.

6 It is not claimed that it always does so, nor that that is its only function.
2. Marked tone 1 can discriminate between marked and unmarked focus when tonicity does not. In this sense it does more than merely support the contrast because without the use of marked tone 1 it would not be clear whether the contrast was operative or not. Nevertheless it is focus which bears the responsibility for the contrast once it has been delimited by marked tone 1. For instance, we saw in Part II that demonstrative determiners, on the whole involving a contrastive presupposition, lacked this general characteristic in certain contexts e.g. unmarked focus is phonologically expounded by marked tonicity, the tonic syllable being (part of) the demonstrative determiner, when the latter qualifies certain "time" nouns like "blwyddyn" (year), "wythnos" (week), "mis" (month), "haf" (summer), "gaeaf" (winter) e.g.

(5) // dorra' i / ddim yn / galon // .. os / na
will break I not my heart if (neg)
I won't break my heart, if I don't

gaf i / "job" haf / hyn //
will get I job summer this
get a job this summer.

Although tonicity is marked in (5) (second tone-group), focus may be marked or unmarked, depending on what is included in the focal information constituent. The focal information constituent would be syntactically realized by "haf hyn" if focus were unmarked, and by "hyn" alone if it were marked (see 5.2.2). Tonicity in these cases does not discriminate between marked and unmarked focus. Tone, however, does. Use of marked tone 1 in the second tone-group in (5)
would signal marked focus, the focal information constituent being syntactically realized by the demonstrative determiner alone, and another element is implied which is derivable by contrast with it: "I won't break my heart if I don't get a job this summer, but I shall be very upset if I don't get one next summer." Unmarked tone 1 on the other hand would signal that focus is unmarked (which is how (5) appeared in the data, incidentally). The focal information constituent would be realized by "haf hyn", the appropriate English gloss in this case being "I shan't break my heart if I don't get a job this summer."

We get a similar thing happening with certain focal possessives. We saw in 5.2.2.b) that the focus in

\[(6) \quad /\ldots \text{yn} / \text{gi} / \text{i wnaeth e} /\]

my dog me did it

It was my dog that did it/That dog of mine did it.

in answer to something like

\[(7) \quad /\text{pwy} / \text{wnaeth e} /\]

who did it

Who did it?

is potentially marked or unmarked, though tonicity would be marked in either case. That is to say, the focal information constituent may be realized by the possessive alone (marked focus - contrastive presupposition), or by the head noun plus the possessive (unmarked focus - no presupposition). Again it is tone (and not tonicity) which can discriminate between marked and unmarked focus. Use of marked tone 1 in (6) would render the gloss: "It was my dog, and not yours/his etc., that did it."
This discriminating function of marked tone 1 can be tabulated as follows:

1. Focus in a particular instance may be marked or unmarked (as in (5) and (6)).

2. The phonological exponent of the system of information focus - tonicity - does not discriminate between marked and unmarked focus in such cases.

3. The discriminating function can be carried out by tone selection.

4. Use of marked tone 1 signals that focus is marked.

5. Once focus is signalled as marked, it entails a contrastive presupposition. This is essentially the responsibility of marked focus.

6. Marked tone 1 then plays a supporting role to the contrast which marked focus entails.

7. The discriminating use of marked tone 1 therefore includes the supporting function.

3. The independently contrastive function of marked tone 1 means just that: the choice of tone has a contrastive function in the discourse independent of the focus, which means in effect that focus in such cases does not involve a contrastive presupposition. This differs from the previous two contrastive functions in that the tone here does not merely support a contrast already operative, nor does it discriminate in cases where there is a potential contrast - here the contrast is the direct responsibility of marked tone 1. It is possible to subdivide this category into two sets on the basis of the syntactic status of the item which realizes the focal information
constituent, although basically the same mechanism is apparent in both cases.

(a) Non-lexical item realizing the focal information constituent:

It was noted in 5.2.2.v) that demonstrative pronouns realizing the focal information constituent when in final position in the IU did not entail a contrastive presupposition. In example (105) of Part II, we saw a focal demonstrative pronominal operating in what was ostensibly the same IU but in two different situations. It suits our purpose here to repeat this example below:

(7)(a) I go into an art gallery with my father, and immediately upon entering our eyes fall on the first painting exhibited. My father turns to me and says:

// .. wel / both wyt ti'n / meddw am / hwma //

Well what (aux) you(asp) think of that?

After examining this particular painting and this one only we turn round and walk out of the gallery, never to enter it again.

(b) We have seen the majority of the paintings in the art gallery, and have had some heated discussions over our respective evaluations of the various paintings concerning which we have been far from agreement. Neither understands the other's point of view. My father comes across a particular painting which he esteems very highly and which he feels even his stupid son likes as well. He turns to me and says:

//
Now, in situation (a), focus was unmarked. There was no discoursal presupposition over and above the referential function characteristic of all pronominals. Situation (b), however, leads us to expect contrastive implications viz. "that one as opposed to all the others you've been silly about". It was suggested in Part II that a difference in tone selection would be in evidence between the two utterances. We may now be more specific and suggest the likelihood of marked tone 1 in (b). The function of marked tone 1 here is to place the focal demonstrative in a contrastive relationship with another demonstrative (e.g. "that one as opposed to those") or, which basically amounts to the same thing, a pronoun referent (the other paintings). The contrast would not be operative without the use of marked tone 1. Marked tone 1 here then expounds the discoursal function, independently of focus, of signalling the existence of another element in the discourse, that element being derivable by contrast with the focal element.

(b) Lexical item realizing the focal information constituent.

In 5.3.4, it was suggested that contrastive presupposition was not a function of lexical focus, whether marked or unmarked. Possible exceptions were discussed, like "egocentric" verbs ("galw" (call), "dweud" (say) etc.), and proper nouns (3.3.3), but on the whole it

---

7 Independently of focus, because focus in these cases is not responsible for the contrast. It is not completely independent, of course, because the focal element is involved in the contrast.

8 Or some part of the IU which includes the focal item; see below.
was considered undesirable to associate contrast as used in this thesis with lexical focus. Non-final lexical focus was taken to entail a presupposition (in the majority of cases, but see 5.3.2), namely, that any lexical items in the IU following the one which realized the focal information constituent were specified as given information, derivable in some way from the discourse (see 5.3). When the final lexical item in the IU realized the focal information constituent, focus was said to be unmarked (but see again 5.3.2), and there was no discoursal presupposition.

This position now needs to be modified slightly. The modification will, however, be made in the light of the present discussion on tone, specifically marked tone 1, and the basic statement reiterated above regarding lexical focus will hold. In other words, although we now wish to speak of contrast in the context of lexical focus, it is nevertheless maintained that the contrast is not the responsibility of the focus. If a lexical focus per se were attributed the potential of being contrastive, it would have to be marked, by virtue of its entailing a presupposition in the discourse, and such a characteristic could not be restricted to non-final lexical focus which is marked anyway, for non-final lexical focus is marked by virtue of its position in the IU and not by virtue of its inherent status as a lexical item. If, then, we were to accept the possibility of lexical focus entailing a contrastive presupposition, we would have to admit final lexical focus into that category, thus forfeiting the generalization we could otherwise make as regards unmarked lexical focus. A final lexical focus in such a situation could therefore be marked or
unmarked, and we would be faced with the enormous problem of specifying the conditions under which it appears as one or the other.

We avoid this undesirable state of affairs by maintaining our original position that:

(a) Final lexical focus, with certain exceptions the conditions governing which are specifiable, involves no discoursal presupposition and is therefore unmarked.

(b) Non-final lexical focus is marked by virtue of its position in the IU, the presupposition involved merely being the signalling of subsequent lexical items in the IU as given information.

Focus per se, when the focal information constituent is realized by a lexical item, does not appertain to relations of contrast within the discourse. Yet a focal lexical item can appear in contrast to another element in the discourse, and in many cases can be signalled as doing so. One way of realizing this signalling device is by use of marked tone 1. It may also, as was mentioned in 5.3.4, be signalled in other ways, e.g. by certain syntactic devices, such as "heblaw" (not to mention), "hyd yn oed" (even), comparatives etc. Our interest here, however, lies in the function of marked tone 1 in this respect.9

---

9 It is important to note at this point that marked tone 1 can signal a contrast. Use of the modal indicates that the signalling of contrast is not the exclusive function of marked tone 1, and that marked tone 1 will not necessarily signal a contrast in all instances of its occurrence. The tendency to overdo things, to try and manipulate reluctant and unconvincing examples to fit a theory already established or taking shape, in situations like this seems to me exemplified in one of Sharpe's (1953) examples of the fall-rise in English (which is taken to have a similar function to marked tone 1 in Welsh - see below 7.2.2), where vocative "Sir!""might be said to have a flavour of 'It's you, not someone else, that I'm calling.'" (p.37-8).
If we examine the following examples, we see how marked tone 1 signals a contrast in the discourse. Marked tone 1 has its point of origin at the tonic syllable which is doubly underlined. The particular exponent of marked tone 1 will be shown by the numerical symbol at the beginning of the tone-group: 1+ symbolizes a simple fall whose pitch onset is at a level above that of the final syllable of the pretonic; +1 symbolizes a rise-fall.

(8) // .. mae / dau / wanol / "system" o "into/nation" reit//

is two different system of intonation right

The two languages have different intonation systems -

.. gyda'r / dau / iaith // 1+ .. fel mae / dau //"system

with the two languages like is two system

right? - like they have two different

o / eiriau 'da nhw //

of words with them

word systems.

"geiriau" (words - mutated) is in contrast here with "intonation" (intonation). This contrast, nothing to do with focus which is unmarked, is signalled by marked tone 1 having its point of origin at the tonic syllable "ei".

(9) A: // trueni am / Nixon / cofia //

pity for Nixon remember

Pity for Nixon, mind.

B: // +1 trueni am e //

pity for him

Pity for him?
Use of marked tone 1 by B, who is very surprised at A's sentiment, signals something like: "Pity? Anything but pity." "Pity" is placed in a contrast with a number of other sentiments which B feels would be more appropriate.

(10) // .. yn / "seventy / two" // .. allai / "Wallace" //

in seventy two could Wallace

In seventy two, Wallace could

.. fod / wedi / mynd a'r / "votes" // +1
(aux) (asp) go with the votes

have taken the votes

.. oedd yn / mynd i / "Nixon" // .. chi'n
(aux)(asp) go to Nixon you(asp)

that were going to Nixon, you

/ desall // +1 .. a byddai'r / llall wedi mynd
understand and (aux) the other(asp) go
understand; and the other would have got

/ "through" / wedyn // +1 .. ond gas / "Wallace" ei
through then but got Wallace his

through. But Wallace got

/ saethu // .. yn "convenient" / iawn // +1 .. a

shoot (asp) convenient very and

shot - very conveniently. And

/ hefyd oen nhw'n / weddl // +1 .. byddai
also (aux)they(asp) think (aux)
also they thought there would be
something in the tapes about Kennedy

ciel ci / saethu //

going shot.

We shall take the five instances of marked tone 1 separately and in the order they appear in the text.

(a) "'Nixon'" = Here we have Nixon in simple opposition to Wallace in relation to the way in which votes were expected to go.

(b) "'through'" = "the other would have got through as opposed to failing as he probably would have done if Wallace hadn't split the vote."

(c) "saethu" (shoot) = "Wallace got shot instead of splitting the vote."

(d) "'hefyd'" (too) = focus is contrastive here - tone plays a supporting role.

(e) "'Kennedy'" = additional contrast: "Kennedy, as well as Wallace, getting shot."

(11) A: // acha / dwywaith // 1+ wnaeth e / "Bob / Hope" //

with twice did he Bob Hope

It was during two weeks that he did Bob Hope -

un / wythnos // .. a / wedyn 'ny'r / ail

one week and after that the second one week, and then the second
The first use of marked tone I here ("Hope") puts Bob Hope in contrast with Richard Nixon. The second is more interesting ("tymor") in that speaker B completes the utterance begun by speaker A who cannot remember the appropriate word. B not only supplies the word she believes A was searching for, she also uses the tone she believes A would have used viz. marked tone 1, and thereby puts the focal item "tymor" (season) into a contrastive relationship with an earlier part of the text: "dwywaith" (twice, meaning 'two weeks').

(12) / .. oedd e yn yr / undeb yn / Bethel / Tumble / new // was he in the union in Bethel Tumble now

He was in the union in Bethel Tumble now,

+/1 .. a'i / whear e // +1 .. oedd ei / whear e and his sister him was his sister him

and his sister - his sister was

'tan // 1+ ed // there too
"chwar" (sister - mutated) is in additional contrast both times with the subject (her brother) in the first tone-group. Marked tone 1 with "ed" is merely supportive, focus being marked.

(13) A: // nage / sevin //
    (neg) sevin
    not sevin.

B: // +1 is / sevin oedd e //
    yes sevin was it

Yes, it was a sevin.

A: // nage / ddim //
    no not
    No it wasn't.

C: // na // +1 siarad amboitu / sevin oedd e //
    no talk about sevin (aux) he
    No. It was talking about sevin he was.

The first use of marked tone 1 ("is") involves a polarity contrast - "You say it wasn't but it was." The second instance ("siarad" - (speak)) refers back to the type of contrast we noted was common with focal "egocentrism" verbs (see 5.3.1) e.g.

// "Jumbo" oen nhw'n / galw fe //
    Jumbo (aux) they(asp) call him

Jumbo they called him.

implies "but his name was ...." Similarly in (13), the contrast implied by marked tone 1 on "siarad" is "He was talking about sevin, but he didn't actually bring any."
(14) // .. aethon ni / lawr y / Bont // wythnos / hyn //
   went we down the Bont this week
   We went down the Bont this week,
   .. pan oedd / "license" / ni am y / Gwili //
   when was license us for the Gwili
   when our license was for the Gwili
   .. a'r / Marlais // .. a / fomydd / bach / fel'na
   and the Marlais and rivers small like that
   and the Marlais and small rivers like that,
   / ch'wel // +l nad yw e / am y / Llwchwr / ch'wel//
   you see (neg) is it for the Loughor you see
   you see. It isn't for the Loughor, you see.

"Llwchwr" (Loughor), a river, is in contrast with other smaller
rivers, like the Gwili and the Marlais.

(15) A: // .. ydy hi'n / bwrw / maes //
   (aux) it(asp) rain out
   Is it raining out?
   B: // arlluys hi // +l .. mae hi 'di / "stop"-c //
   pour it (aux) it (asp) stop
   Pouring, It's stopped.

Straightforward opposition here between "pouring" and the rain having
stopped.

(16) A: // .. chi 'di cael / tywydd / de // .. chwarae / teg //
   you(asp) get weather good play fair
   You've had good weather, fair play.
This is an interesting use of marked tone 1, for there is no implication of contrast here. Rather, the tone fulfils an *emphatic* function, reiterating more forcefully the information supplied by the preceding speaker. In this role, marked tone 1 retains its similarity with marked non-lexical focus in terms of exponence of discourse functions, as we saw in the discussion of focal verbal auxiliaries and aspect markers, for instance (5.2.4.b).

We will now look at a short extract from the data analysed which is amply furnished with usage of marked tone 1. Letters to the left of the text line will refer to the examples of marked tone occurring in linear order on that line. Some of the examples may not be quite so straightforward in terms of the contrasts they imply as were those discussed in (8) - (15). It is hoped, however, that they can be handled within this general theory.

(17) A: // ble 'ych / chi'n gweld // .. te/ladu / lliw //
Where(aux) you(asp) see television colour

Where do you see colour television?

(a) B: // +1 welais / i ddim o fe // +1 clywed nhw'n / dweud yn
saw I not of it hear them(asp) say in
I didn't see it. I heard them saying

(b) Llan/dovery / hedd i wnes / i // .. allen i wend //
Llandovery today did I could I see
in Llandovery today. I could see
+1 .. te/ledu / lliw
television colour
colour television

(c)  
'tua / hefyd //
here too
here too.

A: // ble //
where
Where?

(d)  
B: // 1+ .. fi 'di bod / lan 'da / "Mrs. / Job" // +1
I (asp) be up with Mrs. Job
I've been up with Mrs. Job.

(e)  
gwelais i'r / briodas ar te/ledu / lliw //
saw I the wedding on television colour
I saw the wedding on colour television.

A: // pwy / briodas //
who wedding
which wedding?

(f)  
B: // 1+ briodas / "Princess / Anne" // .. y
wedding Princess Anne the
Princess Anne's wedding.

/ dywysoges / Anne //
Princess Anne
Princess Anne.
(g) A: // "auntie" / Hannah // +1 cwilydd arno chi //
    Auntie Hannah, shame on you.

Auntie Hannah, Shame on you.

cerdded / lan / man'na i weld / hwun //
walk up there to see that

Walking up there to see that.

(h)(i) B: // do // +1 a // gerddwn i / 'to // +1 hefyd //
yes and would walk I again too

Yes. And I'd walk again too.

nawr'te //
now then

Now then!

(i) C: // .. cymerodd / Gwyneth // +1 .."day / off" //
took Gwyneth day off

Gwyneth took a day off.

faint oedd / mewn //
how many were in

How many were in?

(k) +1 .. oedd / again 'da hi yn / eistedd yn y /"room"//
    were twenty with her(asp) sit in the room

She had twenty sitting in the room.

(l) D: // +1 .. oedd / pobun / yna mwn/hau e // +1 .. y
    (aux) everyone (asp) enjoy it the

Everyone was enjoying it - the
me Nywed yu
women (asp)

women

(m)  un/wedig //
special
especially.

(n)  Eh // o // +1 .. oedd e'n // neis //
oh was it(asp) nice

Oh, it was nice.

(a) // +1 welsis / i ddin o fe //
(b) // +1 clywed nhw'n / dweud ym Llan/dovery / heddiw wnes / i //

These particular examples have already been dealt with from a focal point of view in 6.1.2. (minor non-lexical focus). The minor focal pronominal involves a contrastive presupposition which includes the focal information constituent in the contrastive base. The use of marked tone 1 supports the combinatorial implications of major and minor focus together. There is a reciprocal relationship of contrast between the two IUs (a) and (b). (a) implies cataphorically derivable information (by contrast) from (b) (i.e. "not see" vs. "hear"; "I" vs. "people in Llandovery").

We have an interesting cluster of features operating together here. If we assume that the focal information constituent in (a) is realized by the auxiliary features (see 5.2.4.a) - which is perfectly plausible, the verb "gweld" (see) having already been mentioned by the previous speaker - we have initially a polarity contrast ("By your
question: 'Where do you see a colour T.V.?', you seem to assume that I saw that programme. Your assumption is wrong: I did not see it').

We also have a minor focal pronounal which signals a contrast with another part of the discourse (see above); and on top this marked tone 1 functions in a supporting role. Similar mechanics (apart from the polarity contrast) operate in (b), though here the information is anaphorically derivable by contrast.

(c) \[+1 / tedu \arn / hefyd \]
"hefyd" (too), which has been described as an explicit marker of additional contrast (5.2.2.1) and elsewhere, has its contrastive implications here supported by marked tone 1.

(d) \[+1 / di bod / lan / Mrs. / Job\]
Focus here is unmarked. The contrast signalled independently by marked tone 1 may not seem to be strictly like the ones we have been dealing with hitherto. That is to say, whereas a contrastive focus implies the existence of another element in the discourse derivable by contrast with the focal item, the implied contrast element does not seem to be in clear evidence from a cursory examination of (d) above.

It is obviously not, for instance, "I've been up to Mrs. Job as opposed to someone else." There is, however, still a contrast signalled by use of marked tone 1, keeping within the earlier definition of contrast within the discourse (5.2.1). I would suggest that it is as follows: "Your question, or rather questions, lead me to believe that you think I have no access to a colour television. I now assert, by calling upon the possession of a colour T.V. by my friend Mrs. Job as evidence, that your assumption is wrong." The
contrast is between what B takes to be A's belief, and her statement of evidence in opposition to that belief.

(e) // +1 gwalais i'r / briodas ar teledu / lliv //

The focal presupposition involved in (e) is the specification of "teledu lliv" as given information. Use of marked tone 1 signals a contrast in operation over and above the presupposition involved by the marked lexical focus. This contrast is similar in terms of its implications for the discourse to that discussed in (d). In fact one could say that the two contrasts support each other. "You may believe that I do not see a colour T.V., but the truth is that I saw the wedding on colour T.V." Effectively then the contrast is between seeing the wedding on colour T.V. and seeing nothing on colour T.V.

(f) // 1+ priodas / "Princess / Anne" //

Focus is unmarked. The contrast signalled by tone 1+ is one which is in common use and which could be glossed by the rhetorical question "Who do you think?" It is significant that in the following IU (see text extract (17)) where the information is more or less repeated, albeit with a Welsh translation of the English "princess", marked tone 1 is replaced by neutral tone 1. The contrast has been established. The speaker sees no need to emphasize it.

(g) // +1 cwilydd arno chi //

Focus is unmarked, and though tone +1 is used, it is difficult to see whether any contrast is involved. A possibility would run as follows: B is quite proud of seeing the royal wedding on colour T.V. Anti-royalist A, on the other hand, has feelings about the matter which are in direct opposition to those of B, so pride vs. shame. One must,
however, always guard against the danger of overdoing things, in order to fit all one's examples into the theory one has set up.

It is quite possible that tone +1 fulfills a different function in (g) - e.g. attitude exponence in conjunction with other features - and I would not wish to press for the validity of the above contrast.

(h)(i) // 1+ a / gerddwm i / to // +1 hebys //

Focus is marked in (h) and (i). In (h) the focal information constituent is realized by a co-ordinating conjunction. The contrast suggested to be involved by this type of focus was between the relation expounded by the conjunction and the lack of such a relation (5.2.5). The relation expounded by "a" (and) is additional: tone 1+ supports this contrast. It could be glossed: "so don't think I wouldn't." The contrast in (i) is straightforwardly additional, tone +1 again appearing in support.

An interesting point deriving from the above examples is the identification of marked tone 1 (1+ in (h)). Where marked tone 1 is expounded phonetically by a rise-fall (+1), the problem does not arise, but where it is expounded by a simple fall, our present definition cannot cope with tone-groups which have no pretonic, against which to gauge the pitch onset of the fall, as is the case in (h). We may either restrict the occurrence of tone 1+ to tone-groups which have pretonics, or we expand our definition. The former option has a restrictive effect on our theory which is undesirable - it is suggested the presence or absence of a pretonic makes no essential difference to the potential function of tone 1+ - so we opt to expand our definition. For tone-groups which have no
protonics then, a fall is considered to be an exponent of marked tone 1 if:

(i) the tone-group is in a higher key\(^{10}\) than that of the preceding tone-groups.

(ii) the tone-group is in a high key.\(^{10}\)

\(^{10}\) Key is the subject of Part IV of this work. Key refers to the "pitch-setting" of a tone-group, normally characterized by the pitch onset of the first salient syllable of the tone-group (in (i) and (ii) above, the tonic syllable). The pitch range is arbitrarily split into three keys: high, mid and low, each of which occupies approximately a third of the speaker's tessitura.

(ii) takes care of discourse- or utterance-initial tone-groups, and tone-groups following other high key tone-groups where (i) cannot apply. (i) on the other hand takes care of certain mid-key tone-groups which in the context following low key tone-groups can have a contrastive function. ((h) is covered by both (i) and (ii)).

Focus is unmarked. The contrast signalled by tone 1+ is relatively straightforward: "You may think Auntie Hannah was stupid in walking to Mrs. Job's to see the wedding on T.V., but Gwyneth went as far as to take the day off work to see it." i.e. "walking up to Mrs. Job's" vs. "taking the day off work."

Focus is marked but the presupposition involved is only the specification of what follows it in the IU as given. Tone +1 however signals a contrast as well. The contrast suggested is similar to that
suggested for certain instances of focal pronouns in 5.2.2.a) (see (36) in that section for example), viz. between what is actually the case and what is expected. The speaker of (k) takes the view that his audience will not expect the announcement that there were as many as twenty people in his wife's living-room watching T.V. This assumption is based on shared knowledge of the size of the living-room, as well as, presumably, the irregularity of entertaining such a large number of people at the same time when the entertainment amounts to watching T.V. The contrast is therefore between "twenty" as opposed to what one would normally expect.

(1) // +1 .. oedd / nôbun yn mwyn’/nau e //

Focus is marked, the presupposition being characteristic of that involved by a focal indefinite: here, between "everybody" and "not everybody" or "nobody". Tone +1 supports this contrast. The information (including the contrast) is probably for the benefit of A, who fails to believe that anyone could really enjoy such a spectacle.

(m) // +1 .. y mewn ywod yn en/wedig //

There does not seem to be any implication of contrast here. Rather the tonal function seems to be of an emphatic or "highlighting" nature, which is consonant with the semantics of the phrase "yn enwedig" (especially).

(n) // +1 .. oedd e'n / nois //

Focus is unmarked. Tone +1 however can be seen as fulfilling either or both of two functions:
(i) Emphasis. A reiteration (reformulation) of D's preceding favourable evaluation of the wedding spectacle.

(ii) Contrast: between B's assessment of the wedding as being "nice", and A's earlier denigration of it.

The more interesting examples in the above extract, (as well as (8) - (15)) concern the use of marked tone 1 to signal a contrast independently of the focal implications as opposed to merely supporting them. This is generally the case when the focal information constituent is realized by a lexical item, for lexical items form an open set, thus making it difficult to specify an area within which the contrast can operate. One must take into account, however, that lexical contrast, where it occurs, is discourse dependent, so that when marked tone 1 signals a contrast which involves lexical focus, it also signals the fact that, for the participants, at this particular point in the discourse there are two or more items operating in a uniquely structured closed set determined by that particular part of the discourse, which outside the discourse would merely be terms in a vast open set. In other words, the discourse arranges at any given time according to the subject matter a number of items which for the interactants move towards the formation of a closed system and are thus in potential contrast to each other. Obviously one would expect these items in the majority of cases to be semantically related in some way: thus in (17)(a) we have "gwald" (see) vs. "clywed" (hear); in (8), we have "geiriau" (words) vs. "'intonation'" etc.

7.2.2. A brief note on the Fall Rise tone

The falling-rising tone did occur in the data, albeit rarely. It is not included in the Welsh tonal system outlined above on the grounds
that it is here considered a borrowing from English.

This raises the interesting question of the relationship between English and Welsh. In straight diachronic terms of course the answer is relatively straightforward viz. distant cousins descended from the sister languages of Germanic and Celtic. In sociolinguistic terms, however, the situation is far from simple. Since before the tenth century, the two languages have lived side by side in a small country with English gradually gaining the upper hand, until just about everyone in Wales who speaks Welsh (20.8% of the population according to the 1971 census) also speaks English (according to the same census, only 1.3% are monoglot Welsh).

It is a sad but inescapable fact that the main language of Wales is now English. The overpowering constant influence of English in Wales accompanied by the inevitable decline in terms of Welsh literacy must have a very real effect on the actual Welsh language as it is now spoken. This is seen, possibly most obviously, in the very high number of English borrowings in spoken Welsh, but we may also presume that the influence of English has been felt at other levels of the Welsh language, and intonation is an obvious candidate. It is beyond the scope of this thesis to trace the development of Welsh intonation since before the tenth century, or to trace the influence of English on the Welsh system, but the number of similarities between the two systems serve to support the idea of English influence, and one interesting example in particular in contemporary Welsh concerns the fall-rise tone.
Thomas (1967) does not include the fall-rise in her description of Welsh intonation. It is not included here either as a term in the Welsh tone system, but this is not to say that it did not occur in the data. The argument for its exclusion is based mainly on its paucity of occurrence, but in the rare cases where it did occur, it fulfilled similar discoursal functions to the way it is used in English, and it is suggested that the fall-rise in English fulfils a similar function to that attributed above to marked tone 1 in Welsh (see 7.2.1) e.g.

(10) A: // ydych chi 'di / cael peth wrth / Lance a / Fona//
(aux) you (asp) get thing by Lance and Mona

Have you had some from Lance and Mona,

wadyn 'ny // ... oen nhw'n mynd / addo / cael
after that (aux) they(asp) go promise get

afterwards? They were going ... promising to get

peth i chi // sevin //
thing to you sevin

some for you. Sewin.

B: // .. nage / sevin gawson / *ni //
(neg) sevin got we

It wasn't a sevin that we got.

(* = fall rise).

The fall-rise here takes a supportive role, the focal pronominal itself involving a contrastive presupposition: "You might have had sevin; we certainly didn't."
This aspect of the fall-rise in English is touched upon but unfortunately not developed by El-Halim (1969), and is dealt with in Sharpe (1958): "Falling-rising intonation patterns have very generally been credited ... with being, so to speak, the contrastive intonation par excellence." (p.137). The dangerous consequence of such a blanket statement is of overdoing things, as was noted in footnote 9. One observation made by Sharpe in this paper was that "the contrast ... need not be felt to apply only to the word containing the focal syllable. Thus 'I've peeled the potatoes' may as often suggest 'but I've not made the bed' as 'but I've not peeled the apples.' (p.137). Compare this to (17)(b) where the contrast is not between "heddiw" (today) and some other time, but between "clyved nhw'n dweud y Llandovery heddiw" (heard them saying in Llandovery today) and actually 'seeing it'.

8.0. The notion of "key" goes back to Henry Sweet: "Besides the separate inflections of which it is made up, each sentence, or sentence-group, has a general pitch or key of its own" (Sweet (1906: p.70). Sweet's assessment of the functions of key is very generalised:

"For ordinary purposes it is enough to distinguish three keys:

- high \( \uparrow \)
- middle \( \uparrow \downarrow \)
- low \( \downarrow \)

The high key is the natural expression of energetic and joyful emotions, the low of sadness and solemnity.

Change of key has also a purely logical significance. Thus questions are naturally uttered in a higher key than answers, and parenthetic clauses in a lower key than those which state the main facts. In all natural speech there is an incessant change of key." (p.70-1).

The function of key for Sweet then was a matter of attitude or "logic". One would not wish to deny the validity of Sweet's observations, but one could certainly attempt to expand them.

Whilst key, like tone, may well have functional implications for attitudinal and grammatical exponence\(^1\), our interest in this thesis

---

\(^1\) The use of key here differs from Halliday's use of the term (1975): "The 'key' is expressed by the choice of tone, the system of pitch contours that is carried by the tone-group" (p.19). Halliday's key is therefore nothing to do with the pitch setting of the tone-group, rather with what we have been calling 'tone'.
lies in the significance of key as a feature of discourse function exponence.

Sweat defined key as the "general pitch" of a "sentence or sentence-group". Taking the tone-group as the phonological unit in which the system of key operates, we may slightly redefine Sweet's conception of key as the pitch setting of a tone-group as indicated by the first salient syllable of that tone-group. The first syllable of the pretonic of a tone-group will set the key for that tone-group. In the absence of a pretonic, the key will be defined in terms of the pitch onset of the tonic syllable.

For present purposes, as well as for practical reasons, we follow Sweet in recognizing three terms in the system of key: High, Mid, and Low.

8.1. Brazil (1975), without discussing the implications of his suggestion, posits a phonological unit of higher rank than the tone-group based on key sequence. This unit has the structure:

\[(\text{High}_1 \ldots n) \text{ Mid } (\text{Low}_1 \ldots n)\]

Without committing itself either way as to the acceptance of this proposition for a phonological unit of higher rank than the tone-group, this thesis recognizes the value of such a suggestion on the basis of the implications it has for the discourse functions expounded by key. As Brazil puts it: "Any occurrence of a high-key tone-group can

\[\text{But see the suggestions in 7.2.2, regarding the possibility of taking account of both key and tone in the consideration of a unit of higher rank than the tone-group.}\]
be thought of as being phonetically bound to a succeeding tone-group; any low key tone-group as bound to the preceding one. The former carries the implication: 'There is more to follow'; the latter: 'This is said in a situation created by something that went before'. In discourse, we can say that one sets up expectations, the other has prerequisites" (p.10).

Adopting this statement of Brazil's as a basis for our study, we attribute to high key the following fundamental discourse function: high key signals the beginning of a new unit in the discourse - a departure from what has gone before in semantico-pragmatic terms (see Rees and Urquhart (1976)). Low key signals the continuation of such a unit. Use of low key becomes interesting when it appears in utterance initial position, for there it signals a continuance of the unit begun (or continued from someone else's initiation) by the preceding speaker. It implies: "What I am saying now is a continuation of the last utterance. I feel there is more to say about the subject, and am carrying on from where you left off in an attempt to complete it."

8.1.1. The respective discourse function expounded by key can be demonstrated in cases of co-occurrence with what Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) have called "frames", which function to indicate boundaries in the discourse. Many frames which are used in English - Sinclair and Coulthard list examples like "right", "well", "good", "O.K.", "now", etc. - also occur in the dialect of Welsh described here. For instance, we have direct translational equivalents

---

3 I am not at all sure what he means by "phonetically" here. "Phonologically" or "structurally" would have seemed a better choice.
the first four in Sinclair and Coulthard's list above along with "navr' (now), "navr'te" (now then) etc. Two basic kinds of frames are suggested here:

(a) \textbf{initiating}: "What I am about to say constitutes a departure in semantico-pragmatic terms from what has immediately preceded", (or in the case of discourse - initial frames: "I am about to open a topic of discussion").

(b) \textbf{terminating}: "I have come to the end of that particular semantico-pragmatic unit, which I now consider to be complete".

Certain semantic restrictions may apply to the frames with regard to which particular function they fulfil. Some frames are likely to fulfil one particular function more than another, whilst some frames tend not to fulfil one particular function at all. For instance, "navr'te" (now then), "navr" (now), and "wel" (well) are unlikely to fulfil a terminating function. It has been a noticeable feature of my own experience of highly structured discourses like school or university teaching situations that the most regularly used frames are those which fulfil with equal case both the functions mentioned above, in Welsh and in English, e.g. "right", "O.K.", "good".

Now, it is suggested that a primary feature in the signalling of the particular function a given frame fulfils at any point in the discourse, apart from the semantic restrictions just mentioned, is key selection. \footnote{\textit{The reader may wish to reflect upon the choice of key he would use for the frame at the beginning of this last sentence ("now") if he were reading it aloud.}} High key signals that a frame has an initiating function; low key that it has a terminating function:
We have already nominated mid key as a neutral term in that it sets up no expectations and need have no prerequisites. When a frame is spoken with mid key, then, it is not specifically initiating nor terminating. One could in fact attribute it an ambivalent status in that it may fulfil both functions simultaneously i.e. "not only have I completed what I have to say about that particular (part of the) topic, but I am now also going to begin a fresh (part of the) topic."

We will now take a constructed example which could conceivably form part of a history lesson or lecture in Welsh. We will follow it with a frame in order to see the implications for the discourse which depend on what key is used:

(1) // .. a / wedi'r /cwbl // bai y / Sæson oedd e //

and after the lot blame the English was it

And after all, it was the fault of the English.

reit //

right

Right.

Low key with the frame here would mean: "That's all I'm going to say about that. Either the lesson/lecture is at an end, or I'm going to
start a new topic." High key would signal the fact that the teacher is about to begin a new subject. This view is supported by the anomalous effect on the audience if a high key frame was followed by silence. They would be left "up in the air", as it were, waiting for the speaker to go on to his new topic.5

8.1.2. Structural and Strategic Uses of High and Low Key

What has been said about the discourse functions expounded by key in the above discussion of frames can be seen to be generally applicable to the rest of the discourse. That is to say, a high key tone-group generally signals a structural change in the discourse in terms of a new conceptual paragraph. A low key tone-group generally signals the continuation of a conceptual paragraph. If we accept these as the basic functions of high and low key, with mid key assuming a neutral status, we can then go on to examine instances which appear to be deviant in some way: for instance, the use of high key where it is obvious there is no structural change to a new conceptual paragraph. It is suggested that one way of dealing with apparently deviant cases of this nature is to view them as strategic devices by the speaker within the general framework of discourse function expounded by key as described above.

If the structural use of high key signals the beginning of a conceptual paragraph, it carries with it the advice to the listener to pay attention in view of the fact that a new unit is beginning: "Don't miss this because it's the introduction of a new topic, and

5 It would, of course, be possible to bring the lesson/lecture to a close if we followed the high key frame with something like "We'll leave it there for today", or "We'll carry on from there next time." We would view such markers of finality as fresh semantico-pragmatic units.
therefore important that you should grasp it." Strategic use of high key where there is no structural change in evidence then merely signals the fact that the speaker considers what he is communicating to be important for the hearer. As far as the structure of the discourse goes, strategic use of high key expounds no function; it carries only the residual implications of high key when the structural function has been extracted, as it were. So that instead of "Don't miss this because it's the beginning of a new topic and therefore important that you should grasp it", strategic use of high key implies "Don't miss this because I, as the speaker, consider what I am saying now to be important for you." Strategic use of high key can therefore be seen as designed to create in the listener a similar awareness/anticipation/attention as does its structural use but without the latter's implications for the structure of the discourse.

One interesting use in the data of strategic high key was to smooth over or avoid an argument. The argument was between two of the four females in the company over the name of a fish which had been presented to one of them some time previously by a mutual friend:

(2) A: // ydych chi 'di / cael path wrth / "Lance" a / Fona //
(aux) you (asp) get thing from Lance and Mona
Have you had any from Lance and Mona after?

... oen nhw'n / addo / cael path i chi //
(aux)they.(asp) promise get thing to you
They were promising to get some for you.
A sewin.

B: // nage / sewin gawson / ni //
not sewin got we
It wasn't a sewin that we got.

A: // ie "Auntie" / Hannah //
yes auntie Hannah
Yes, Auntie Hannah.

B: // nage // ddim // siwr // .. dim / sewin oedd e o /gubl//
no (neg) sure not sewin was it of all
No, it certainly was not. It wasn't a sewin at all.

A: // ie / sewin oedd e //
yes sewin was it
It was a sewin.

B: // nage / ddim // ---
no not
It wasn't.

C: // bath oedd / hwnna y / nosvaith / 'my // ife //
what was that the evening that is it
What was that that evening, is it?

The elder lady, who had received (and eaten) the fish, was rather
hotly (note the tonality in B's second utterance) disputing her
neice's insistent claim that the fish was a sewin. One of the males
in the company (C in the example) then enters the conversation with a
question about the fish spoken in a high key, in an attempt to stop
the ladies arguing and to provide a rational solution. The high
key here hardly signals a structural change as the topic is still
about the identity of the mysterious fish. The question is not
really "necessary" as an information seeker since it is clear to the
whole company which fish is being discussed. Rather it is strategic
use of high key, drawing attention to the question in an attempt to
steer the same subject matter in a new, more sensible direction which
would avoid female disputes. (He in fact succeeds).

Low key can be handled in a similar way. If structural use of
low key signals a continuance of the current conceptual paragraph,
strategic use of low key, where it is evident that what is being
said would be more suited to a different conceptual paragraph from
that which immediately preceded it, amounts almost to a deception by
the speaker. It may be used for a number of reasons:

1. Bringing the topic back to something that had been left not long
ago. The length of time lapsed is important here - or rather how
much has been said during the time lapsed. A preface of the sort
"going back to what you were saying about ..." is not unusual in
cases like this. There is one instance in the text where a speaker
gives a fresh direction to the discourse (though within a very
general topic i.e. fish, fishing), yet instead of using high key, as
one would expect, uses strategic low key. The point here is that he
had begun the same story (in fact said exactly the same thing
(// aethon ni / lawr y / Bont // (We went down the Bont)) but had been
interrupted some 28 separate utterances previously.
2. Introducing a new topic which is in some way connected to what preceded but not sufficiently so to be part of the same conceptual paragraph. The speaker may wish to get it in without showing he is in effect changing the topic, possibly to suit his story.

3. Shy personality. If high key brings attention, he sticks to low.

4. The speaker starts off with something that seems to be a break but wishes to assure his audience that he is keeping within the general topic.

5. Taking over the speaker role as unobtrusively as possible (connected to 3).

   The strategic function of low key is therefore close to its structural function, the difference being that whereas the latter genuinely signals a continuation of the conceptual paragraph, the former fabricates the issue in order to present the appearance of continuation.

   This approach is consonant with general views of high key6 functioning to highlight a particular part of an utterance, with low key having the inversely corresponding damping function. To summon the listener's attention, whether by structural or strategic use of high key, is after all to highlight that particular stretch of speech. What Sweet called "the natural expression of energetic and joyful

---

6 Or "high pitch", in studies where the term "key" is not used. Cf. for instance Chafe (1974) where a highly pitched pretonic is regarded as signalling new information, with low pitch signalling given information.
emotions" can also be explained in this way, though it is not the purpose of this thesis to do so. Sweet also pointed to the "purely logical significance" of key selection, whereby "questions are naturally uttered in a higher key than answers, and parenthetic clauses in a lower key than those which state the main facts" (p.71). The claim for questions being "naturally uttered in a higher key than answers" is, I think, grossly oversimplified. If "naturally" here means "usually" - and it is difficult to see what else it can mean - then the statement does not help us as far as the function of high key is concerned. If we accept the frequency of co-occurrence between questions and high key as a valid and significant statistical fact, and this does seem to be the case from the data studied - then it falls to us to explain why this should be so. This we can do within the framework of the approach adopted here. A question most frequently fulfils the role of what Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) call an "elicitation", which is often an initiatory move in a conceptual paragraph, and therefore it takes high key. This need not always be the case, however, and if a speaker sees the question as being closely bound to what has gone previously, or alternatively wishes to present it so for certain tactical reasons, he has the option of using low key in its structural or strategic role. A worthwhile answer is of course bound to the question which elicited it, and consequently choice of low key would not be surprising. On the other hand, the speaker may consider his answer to be a very significant contribution to the discourse, and as such worthy of drawing the listener's attention to it by using strategic high key.
8.1.3. Requests for Confirmation

Continuing within the broad area of "question and answer", choice of key plays a significant role in exhibiting the degree of confidence in the expectancy of "confirmation". This may best be introduced by questioning a statement of El-Menoufy's (1969) that English tone 1 (fall) when co-occurring with a declarative was always a statement: "Unmarked tone for independent affirmatives without tags is tone 1. In other words, this tone with affirmative structures and in all its varieties, signals simply the contextual category statement" (p.379). Take the following example:

(3) A: How long did it take you to get to Lancaster?
B: Three hours.
A2: You went by car.

A2 is a declarative, and if spoken with tone 1 could only be, according to El-Menoufy, a statement. This thesis, however, sees it in the light of a request from A to B of confirmation, and such an interpretation is supported by the work of Labov (1972): "We find many cases where speakers will not let the conversation continue unless a yes or no answer is given to ... statements. The rule which operates here is one of the simplest invariant rules of discourse. Given two parties in conversation, A and B, we can distinguish as 'A-events' the things that A knows about but B does not; as 'B-events' the things which B knows about but A does not; and as 'AB-events' knowledge which is shared equally by A and B.

The rule then states:

If A makes a statement about a B-event, it is heard as a request for confirmation .... This rule contains the social construct of
"shared knowledge" which is not normally part of a linguistic rule." (p.254).

In (3), $A_2$ is seen as a statement about $a^B$-event (that $B$ went by car to Lancaster) and therefore $A$'s request to $B$ for confirmation. Choice of key would show how confident $A$ is about receiving confirmation from $B$. The following suggestion is put forward here: the higher the key, the less confident the speaker is of gaining confirmation. A request for confirmation in low key therefore shows the speaker is almost totally confident of the correctness of his assumption. Frequently in such cases no verbal confirmation is given by the interactant, and this lack of communication is itself taken as an assent, as it were; for instance, where $A$'s (low key) assumption about the $B$-event is considered so obvious by $B$ that it does not require any verbal confirmation. (Sometimes a nod of the head suffices; sometimes not even that is necessary.) $A$, who also probably realizes this, takes $B$'s lack of response as confirmation of his assumption.

The higher the key $A$ uses for his request, the more pressure is put on $B$ to either confirm or contradict. If $B$ remains uncommunicative after a mid or high key request, $A$ may well continue with a prod of the type "wel oedd e" (well was it?) etc.

Before selecting some examples from the text, it is worth noting that the key used for actual confirmation is also interesting when viewed in relation to the key the request was made in. Confirmation, when given, will normally be low key.\(^7\) When confirmation is refused,\(^7\) a high key request frequently signals what could impressionistically be called "surprise". This is of course quite consonant with our own "lack of confidence" parameter. A high key "surprised" request from $B$, where $B$ may be surprised, or even indignant, at $A$'s surprise.
however - that is, when confirmation turns to contradiction - then a low key request will frequently get a higher key response: a kind of reprimand for showing confidence in a wrong assumption, as it were.

The realtionships between keys of requests for confirmation and confirmations or contradictions, can be tabulated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Confirmation</th>
<th>Contradiction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>L or Ø</td>
<td>H/M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>L or H</td>
<td>H/H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These now follow some examples from the data which demonstrate what has been discussed above:

(4) A₁: // ges i / bump fach // --
    got I five small
    I got five.

B: // .. ym / mle // wedyn 'ny //
    in where after that
    Where, then?

A₁: // ian y / Gvili //
    up the Gvili
    Up the Gvili.

C₁: // H .. dod / ian i'r / Hendy //
    come up to the Hendy
    Coming up to Hendy?
A2: // L na // L na //
no no
No. No.

C2: // ym // mle //
in where
Where?

A3: // pass-o'r // Fforest // ar yr // heol i Caer // syrddin //
pass the Fforest on the road to Carmarthen
Past the Fforest, on the Carmarthen road.

C3: // lawr i // heol y // felin 'te //
down to road the mill then
Down the Mill road then?

A4: // pont // Abraham //
bridge Abraham
Abraham's Bridge.

C4: // o // L pont // Abraham //
oh bridge Abraham
Oh. Abraham's Bridge.

D: // savin sy // fan'na dife //
sewin are there is it
It's sewin that are there, isn't it?

A5: // L na // L "trout" sy // mna // mwa //
no trout are there most
No. It's trout that are there, mostly.
The first request for confirmation in this extract occurs in $C_1$, where $C$ makes a statement about an A-event. His request is high key: there are a number of non-linguistic reasons why he is not sure of his ground e.g. $C$ is not a fisherman, whereas $A$ is; $C$ knows there are a number of stretches of the Gwili which are fishable, though the one he names is the one he knows best etc. etc. $A$'s contradiction is low key.

$C$'s second request for confirmation ($C_3$) is on the same A-event, but the field has been narrowed down (the fishing area in question is along the Carmarthen road). This time he chooses mid key - he is less unsure than before, but still lacks confidence for much the same reasons as last time (the Carmarthen road is a long one).

Note that $A$'s reply ($A_4$) does not take the form of a simple contradiction i.e. 'no'. Had this been the case he would probably have used low key. Instead he supplies the information which $C$ has been guessing at, and chooses mid key.

Although a question rather than a request for confirmation in the way in which we have been using the terms here, it is interesting to see that the key relationship between $D$ and $A_5$ follows that set out in the table on p.371.

(5) A: // .. oedd / Loyd / Harris // Sir / Benfro //

(aux) Lloyd Harris county Pembroke

Lloyd Harris from Pembrokeshire

.. yn pre/gethu // .. yn Bulch y / Rhyw dydd Sul /dwatha'//----

(asp) preach in pass the hill Sunday last

was preaching in Bulch-y-Rhiw last Sunday.
B: // .. oedd e'n / dda / hefyd //
   was he(asp) good too

He was good, too.

C: // L buoch chi / lan "auntie / Katy" //
   were you up auntie Katie

You went up, Auntie Katie.

B: // .. oedd / llond y / capel // llond y / capel //
   was full the chapel full the chapel

There was a chapel-full; a chapel-full.

C's statement in (5) about a B-event is made in low key and has unmarked tone 1: C has surmised from B's comment about the quality of the preacher that B was present, and is confident that her assumption is correct. B gives no verbal confirmation to this low key request, but goes on with a description of the chapel. This is therefore an example of lack of (verbal) confirmation being taken anyway as confirmation.  

8.1.4. Another of Sweet's claims, that "parenthetic clauses" take "a lower key than those which state the main facts", can also be handled within the present approach. If we take "the main facts" as those which are not parenthetic or "incidental", then the "parenthetic clause" can be set against its surrounds by means of a different choice of key selection. Choice of high key would be taken as inappropriate, because the last thing that parenthetic information is likely to constitute is a structural change in the discourse. Rather it is closely connected - in a semantico-pragmatic, and not a syntactic, sense - to what surrounds it. 

---

8 It is always possible of course that B may have shown assent by nodding her head. Unfortunately that type of data cannot be recorded on tape.
It was a three way election, you see,

"Auntie" / Hannah // .. yn / "seventy / two" //
Auntie Hannah in seventy two

"Wallace" // .. fod / wedi / mynd a'r
Wallace could have taken the

/votes" // .. oedd yn / mynd i / "Nixon" //
votes (aux) (asp) go to Nixon
votes that were going to Nixon,

/ "through" / wedyn // .. ond gas / "Wallace" ei / saethu //
through after but got Wallace his shoot
through, then. But Wallace got shot-

/ meddwl // .. byddai / rhywbeth yn y / "tapes"
think would be something in the tapes
thought there would be something in the tapes
The parenthetic information in (6) - contained in the phrase "yn 'convenient' iawn" (very conveniently) - is spoken in a low key, surrounded on both sides by mid key. It is "incidental" to the main body of information, conveying the speaker's own comment on the incident related.

Again one must guard against one's approach prohibiting an alternative. It is not an error, after all - not even an anomaly - to have parenthetic information uttered in high key. Such cases would normally be covered by strategic use of high key.
1. **Pwy yw hon sy'v da ti yn Llundain?**

Who is this (aux) with you in London?

Who's this one you've got in London?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pwy</th>
<th>yw</th>
<th>hon</th>
<th>sy'v</th>
<th>da</th>
<th>ti</th>
<th>yn</th>
<th>Llundain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Nawr (beth yw) IM beth yw enw hi.**

now what is what is name her

now? What's...what's her name?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nawr</th>
<th>beth yw</th>
<th>IM beth yw</th>
<th>enw hi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Beth yw enw hi.**

what is name her

What's her name?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beth yw</th>
<th>enw hi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **"Chris"**

Chris

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;Chris&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **Ie IM .. Chris beth 1+M .. Christine**

yes Chris what Christine

Yes? Chris what? Christine?
6. IM

\[ \text{Ie} \]

\[ \text{Yes} \]

Yes.

7. I; 1L

\[ \text{beth} \]

\[ \text{what} \]

What?

8. P; 1+L

"Heathrington"

Heathrington

9. I; 1+H

"Heathlington"

Heathlington

10. P; 1L

\[ \text{mm} \]

\[ \text{mm} \]

\[ \text{mm} \]
11. M: 1L de | 2L enw | Saesneg | 1+M ie | (exl) name English yes

Well, there's an English name, aye!

12. I: 1L o le mae hi'n | dod nwrte | from where (aux) she (asp) come now then

Where does she come from, now then?

13. M: 1M Ychyfi | (exl)

Ugh!

14. P: 1M FP .. tu faes i | "Watford" outside to Watford

Outside Watford.

15. I: 1M "Hertfordshire" Hertfordshire
16. P: 2M  
now  no

Now, no.

17. I: 1+M  "definitely"  "Watford"  "Hertfordshire"

Definitely. Watford is in Hertfordshire.

18. 1M.  
cymera  di n "geography"  i

take you my geography me

You take my geography....

19. M: 1+2H  "Watford"

Outside Watford.

20. P: 1L  "Watford"

Yes. Outside Watford.
21. M: 12M. tu faes i Watford

outside to Watford

Outside Watford.

22. I: 2M o 2L o 1+M. y "border" 'te

oh oh the border then

Oh? oh? the border, then.

23. P: 1M ie 1+H oedd e' yn "Middlesex" 1M.. ond

yes was it in Middlesex but

Yes. It was in Middlesex but

24. now (aux) (aux) they asp go in

now they've gone into

25. i' r i' r "Greater London Council"

to the to the Greater London Council

the to the Greater London Council.
26. -Ms IH nac oes enwau Cyngraeg am y siroedd

(neg) is names Welsh for the counties
Aren't there any Welsh names for these

27. hyn ' te bois 12L symo I ' n lico ' r

these then boys (neg) I (asp) like the
counties, then, boys? I don't like the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>geiriau</th>
<th>Saesneg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>words</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

English words,

29. I: 1M nawr ' te (un peth ) 1M un peth arall

now then one thong one thing other
Now then one thing... one more thing,

30. nawr te 2M (yd) ydy hi hefyd yn yn yn

now then is she too in in in
now then. Is she, too, at... at... at...
University?

Yes. At the...at University in

Aberystwyth? Oh, that's where you've got

to know her.
36. P: 1+L .. wel ie

   well yes

   Well, yes.

37. I: 1M a beth mae hi ' n cymeryd

   and what (aux) she (asp) take

   And what is she taking?

38. P: FP 1M hanes

   History.

39. I: 1+L "history"

   History.

40. M: 1+2M.. "librarianship" wedais ti ' r glwddgi

   librarianship said you the liar

   You said librarianship, you liar.
41. P: 1M a hanes
and history

And history.

42. I: 2L ydy hi 1M "history" a "librarianship"
is she history and librarianship

Is she? History and librarianship.

43. P: +12M beth yw "librarianship" yng Gymraeg ch wel
what is librarianship in Welsh you see

What's librarianship in Welsh, you see?

44. 1+2M symo i'n gwbo hwnna
(neg) I (asp) know that

I don't know that.

45. I: 1+M llyfrgellyd

librarian

Librarian.
46. M: 1L na 2M llyfrgellydd 1+M .. yw librarian

no librarian is librarian

No. Librarian is librarian.

47. 2M, "librarianship" 1+M llyfrgellyddiaeth

librarianship librarianship

Librarianship, librarianship.

48. "on the ball, boy" on the ball

On the ball, boy, on the ball.

49. P: 1+M. ble ffeindiais ti hwnna 'te

where found you that then

Where did you find that, then?

50. I: 1+L llyfrgellyd

librarian

Librarian.

51. M: 2M llyfrgell 2M llyfrgellydd 2+M llyfrgellyddiaeth

library librarian librarianship

Library, librarian, librarianship.
52. 2M. mae e fel - llen

is it like literature

It's like literature.

53. P: 1M

a hanes

and history

And history.

54. M: 2M llenydd 1+M.. llenyddiaeth 1+M.. haneswr

critic literature historian

Critic, literature, Historian.

55. 2M nagife 2M haneswr

isn't it historian

isn't it? Historian

56. I: (han) - 1L ie 12L.. haneswr bydd e' 2M.. ydy

his.. yes historian will be it (aux)

His.. yes. Historian it'll be. Has

57. hi wedi bod 'na gymaint o amser a ti

she (asp) be there as much of time as you

she been there as much time as you?
58. P: 1M. na 12M. oedd hi cyn fi

| na | 12M. oedd | hi | cyn | fi |

no was she before me

No. She was before me.

59. I: 1M. so bydd hi'n owpla blwyddyn o

| so bydd hi'n | owpla | blwyddyn o |

so (aux) she finish year in

So she'll be finishing a year in

60. flaen ti 2M. wel beth ti mynd i

| flaen ti | 2M. wel | beth ti mynd i |

before you well what you go to

front of you. Well, what are you going to

61. wneud yn y flwyddyn 'na (symo i' n )

| wneud yn y flwyddyn | 'na (symo i' n ) |

do in the year that (neg) I (asp)

do that year, I don't...

62. P: +12H na na 2M. mae hi'n gorffen blwyddyn hyn

| na | na | 2M. mae hi'n gorffen blwyddyn hyn |

no no (aux) she (asp) finish year this

No, no. She's finishing this year.

63. 2M nawr (a wel fi' n gwneud )

| 2M nawr (a wel fi' n gwneud ) |

now and well I (asp) do

now, and... well I'm doing
64. I: +1M  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>blwyddyn</th>
<th>yna</th>
<th>'to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>year</td>
<td>there</td>
<td>again</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

year there again

Another year there.

65. M: +1M.  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mae</th>
<th>e' n gwneud &quot;T.T.&quot;</th>
<th>lan</th>
<th>na</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(aux) he (asp) do T.T. up there.

He's doing T.T. up there,

66. +2M.  
| yn | Aber | ch'wel |

in Aber you see

in Aber, you see.

67. P: +12M.  
| fl 'n gwneud "T.T." | nawr | ch'wel' |

I (asp) do T.T. now you see.

I'm doing T.T. now, you see.

68. +1M.  
| fl 'n gorffen blwyddyn hyn | hefyd |

I (asp) finish year this too

I'm finishing this year, too.

69. M: +12M.  
| mae | e' n gwneud | r'un peth a mae |

(aux) he (asp) do the one thing as (aux)

He's doing the same thing as
71. do it in Aber
    doing it in Aber.

72. I: 1M is 2M. ond beth mae hi'n mynd i wneud

    yes but what (aux) she go to do

    Yes, but what is she going to do

73. pan mae hi'n cwpla 'te +1M. o bydd hi

    when (aux) she (asp) finishes then oh (aux) she
    when she finishes then? Oh, she won't be

74. ddim yn gwneud "T.T." wedyn

    (neg) (asp) do T.T. after
    doing T.T. afterwards.

75. P: +12H na na

    no no
    No, no.
76. I: IM. "so" chi 'n cwpla'r un pryd

so you (asp) finish the one time
So you're finishing the same time.

77. IL

byddwn

(aux)
Yes.

78. IM

de (mae hwn) +IL. mae hwn wedi cael ei

(excl) (aux) this (aux) this (asp) get its
Well, this has been very

79. 

drefnu 'n "great" 'achan

arrange (asp) great boy
well arranged, man.

80. M: IM. mae e 'n glyfar o 1+M. mae e 'n glyfar

is he (asp) clever oh is he (asp) clever
81. 2M. a ti 'n priodi wedyn ni 2M. wyt ti 'n

and you (asp) marry after that (aux) you (asp)
And you're getting married afterwards?

82.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>priodi</th>
<th>cyn</th>
<th>cwpla</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

marry before finish
Are you getting married before you finish?

83. P: 2M

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>beth</th>
<th>2M.</th>
<th>priodi</th>
<th>*Mna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

what marry no
What? Getting married? No!

84. M: 2M.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pam</th>
<th>'my</th>
<th>'chan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

why that boy
Why's that, man?

85. P: 2M

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>nage</th>
<th>Martin Rees</th>
<th>yw 'n</th>
<th>enw</th>
<th>t 'wel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(neg) Martin Rees is my name me you see
My name isn't Martin Rees, you see.
86. M: ti'n wado 'mlaen "good boy" bach

you (asp) knock on good boy little
You're getting on, my boy.

87. I: (Marti) 1+M Martin sy'n gwneud pethau dwl

Marti Martin (aux) (asp) do things daft
It's Martin that does daft things.

88. fel 'na 2M dife

like that is it
like that is it?

89. P: 1M a 1+2H digon o amser 'da f1 i fynd

ah plenty of time with me to go
Ah! I've got plenty of time to go

90. 2M 'to "good boy"

yet good boy
yet, my boy.
91. M: 1L o 1+L. ti 'n credu 'L t' 'n credu "good boy"

Oh you (asp) think you (asp) think good boy
Oh, you think so, you think so, my boy...

92. P: 2L ydw 2L... fi 'n gobeithio 1+M "anyway"

(aux) I (asp) hope anyway
Yes. I hope so anyway.

93. M: 1M.. ti 'n gobeithio 1M nawr 2M 'na welliant

you (asp) hope now that improvement
You hope. Now, that's better.

94. I: 2M.. mæ hi 'n ferch neis 1M ferch neis

is she (asp) girl nice girl nice
She's a nice girl? A nice girl?

95. M: +1L.. ti 'n wado 'mlaen 'achan

you (asp) knock on boy
You're getting on, man.
I (asp) think that anyway
I think so, anyway.

That's not much of a recommendation.

Good. Very good.

The older you get, the fatter you get,
you'll get uglier, if that's possible.
101. I: IM be' sy gyda 'na wneud a fe 1M nola

what (aux) with that do with it fetch

What's that got to do with it? Fetch

102. "towel" i f1 ('dy e ddim gwneud di)

towel to me (aux) it (neg) do -

me a towel. It makes no

103. IM gwneud dim gwaniaeth o gwbl

make no difference of all

makes no difference at all.

104. M: IM cwrs bod e 'n gwneud gwaniaeth

course (aux) it (asp) make difference

Of course it makes a difference.

105. 2M pwy sy mynd i ddigwyl 'no fe

who (aux) go to look on him

Who's going to look at him?
106. Is 1+M. wel 's dim eisimau neb i ddisgwyl 'no fe

well is no need nobody to look on him

Well, there's no need for anyone to look at him.

107. M: 1L beth mae e mynd i wneud 2M jwmpo ar

what (aux) he go to do jump on

What's he going to do? Jump on top

108. ben nhw

head them

of them?

109. I: ("ten-) 1M ten a penny 1M hey 1M ten a penny

Ten a penny, hey, ten a penny,

110. 2M Huw 1M ten a penny"

Huw, ten a penny.
111. P: 1+2M. fli 'n goseithio taw e

I (asp) hope that: it

I hope so.

112. M: 2L. byddid di 'n flin "good boy" 2L byddid

will be you (asp) sorry good boy will be

You'll be sorry, my boy, you'll be

113. di wrth dy hunan 2L. amser byddid di' n

you by your self time will be you (asp)

by yourself by the time that you're

114. deugain oed

forty age

forty years old.

115. I: +1H wel dweud 'tho i nawrte ( be' ble ti

well say to me now then what where you

Well, tell me now then. What, where are you
what you go to grant now
...what are you going to granted now...

what you go to do now (aux) you
What are you going to do now? Are you

(aux) you go to teach or what
Are you going to teach? Or what?

Well, I don't know yet.

I'd rather get..... I'd like to get

* See note 3, Part III, p.321.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>121.</th>
<th>&quot;job&quot;</th>
<th>cyn</th>
<th>cyn</th>
<th>dysgu</th>
<th>1+M</th>
<th>&quot;anyway&quot;</th>
<th>2L..</th>
<th>ond</th>
<th>os</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>job</td>
<td>before</td>
<td>before</td>
<td>teach</td>
<td>anyway</td>
<td>but</td>
<td>if</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>122.</th>
<th>deiff</th>
<th>ddim</th>
<th>byd</th>
<th>lan</th>
<th>1M..</th>
<th>bydd</th>
<th>rhaid</th>
<th>fi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>will come nothing</td>
<td>up</td>
<td>will be necessity</td>
<td>me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>123.</th>
<th>2L..</th>
<th>bydd</th>
<th>rhaid</th>
<th>fi</th>
<th>wneud</th>
<th>rhywbeth</th>
<th>so</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>will be necessity</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>something</td>
<td>so</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>124.</th>
<th>I: 2M</th>
<th>both</th>
<th>M. cael</th>
<th>&quot;job&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>what</td>
<td>get</td>
<td>job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>125.</th>
<th>P: 1M</th>
<th>is</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
126. I: 1M  
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

before what
Before what?

127. P: 1M wel 1M. cyn cyn cyn mynd i ditsio 1+M na 'dw i

well before before before go to teach (neg) (aux) I
Well, before, before, before going to teach, I don't want

128.  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>eisiau</th>
<th>titsio</th>
<th>1M well 'da ni gael &quot;job&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

want teach better with me. get job
want to teach. I'd rather get a job.

129. M: 2M. be' sy' n bod ar titsio 'te

what (aux) (asp) be on teach then
What's the matter with teaching, then?

130. I: 1M. ie wow 1M. ie wow nawrte 1M sa munud

yes wow yes wow now wait minute
Yes, wait. Yes, wait now then. Wait a minute.
131. 2M pwy "sort" o waith allet ti gael 'te

who sort of work could you get then

What sort of work could you get, then?

132. (yn yn ) 1M beth wyt ti 'n wneud 1+2M. "zoology" ife

in in what (aux) you (asp) do zoology is it

In..in..What are you doing? Zoology.is it?

133. P: 1M ie 1M ie

yes yes

Yes, yes.

134. I: (wel pwy "sort" o o ) iH. mewn "lab" neu

well who sort of of in lab or

Well, what sort of...of...in a lab or

135. rhywbeth fel 'na

something like that

something like that?
136. P: 1H well | IM rhywbeth | ffordd 'na | ie | IM neu FP
  
  well something way that yes or
  Well, something like that, yes. Or

137. fel | "rep" | i FP | i rhyw | "firm"
  
  like rep to to some firm
as a rep for...for some firm.

138. I: 2M "quite" | 2M.. mae 'n "alright"
  
  "quite" is (asp) alright
Quite. That's alright.

139. M: 1+M. dim | arian yno fe 'achan
  
  no money in it boy
No money in it, boy.

140. P: 1+2L mwy o | arian yn | hwnna na | tîsio
  
  more of money in that than teach
More money in that than...teaching.
141. M: IM.

yn | beth | nawrte

\[ \text{In what now then?} \]

142. P: IM

"rep"

rep

Rep.

143. M: IL

o | 1L faint

\[ \text{Oh? How much?} \]

144. P: 1M

wel | 2L. na 'dw i 'n | gwbo | faint mae nhw 'n

\[ \text{Well, I don't know how much they} \]

145. talu | ond FP

\[ \text{pay, but...} \]
146. I: 1M 1H mae 'r "jobs" 'na i gael 2M oes e

yes are the jobs those to get is it

Yes. Those jobs are to be had, are they?

147. P: +12H oes oes H mae nhw i gael ond FP

is is are they to get but

Yes, yes, they are to be had, but...

148. 1+2M.. wmb beth yw 'r "competition" fel

"I don't know" what is the competition like

I don't know what the competition's like.

149. I: 1M 14M .. ti 'n meddwl gwneud 'na cynta'

oh you (asp) think do that first

Oh. You're thinking of doing that first.

150. ( nawr beth beth mae' r FP) 2-L wedwn ni

now what what (aux) the will say we

Now. What... what's the... -let's say-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>151. 1+M</th>
<th>beth mae 'r</th>
<th>wraig yn mynd i</th>
<th>wneud te</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(aux) the wife</td>
<td>(asp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>go to</td>
<td>do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>then</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What's the wife going to do then?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>152. 1+M</th>
<th>dod 'e'</th>
<th>fela</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Put it like that.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>153. P: 1+2M</th>
<th>na</th>
<th>na 'dw i'n briod</th>
<th>'to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No (neg) am I (asp) married yet

No.. I'm not married yet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>154. I: 1+2M</th>
<th>ie f1 'n gwybo</th>
<th>'na</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yes I (asp) know that

Yes. I know that.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>155. P: 1M</th>
<th>o</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Oh.

Oh.
156. I: "What's she going to do?"

157. H: "I don't know."

158. I: "Librarianship?"

159. P: "Yes."

160. I: "Is it?"
162. F: 2M

I don't know what (aux) she (asp) intend do with it but

There are a couple of good jobs going, man.

164. ZL

as a librarian

165. I: 2M

Yes, but (aux) I (asp) believe be necessity get

Yes, but I thought you had to get...
166.  cael 2L ti 'n gwybod "very good"
get you (asp) know very good

get...you know - very good

167.  qualifications 1+M... cael fod yn "librarian"

qualifications get be (asp) librarian

qualifications to be a librarian.

168. 2L gas Marianne ddim 1+M hyd yn oed FP
got Marianne (neg) even

Marianne didn't even get

169. FP beth ti 'n galw "interview" 2H neu gas

what you (asp) call interview or got

wah't d'you call it - an interview. Or did

170. hi "interview"

she interview
she get an interview?
171. M: 1M coch 2H. beth wnaeth Marianne 2M wnaeth

172.

Marianne 1M gradd yn Saesneg 2M "right"

Marianne degree in English right
did a degree in English, right?

173. I: 2L ie

yes

Yes.

174. M: 1+2M aeth hi i ofyn am "job" -yn 1M "straight off"

wenty she to ask for job straight off

She went to ask for a job, straight off

175. mewn "library" 1M heb ddim "qualifications" o

in library without no qualifications of

in a library, without any qualifications at
176. all
all.

177. I: 2L. oh yes Oh, yes.

178. M: 1M. a "anyway" 12M 'Na pam gas hi ddim o fe

and anyway that why got she (neg) of it
And, anyway, that's why she didn't get it.

179. +12H gas 'hi "interview" 1M "alright" 1M.. ond beth

got she interview alright but what
She got an interview alright, but what

180. mae 'r ferch hyn 2M right +1H mae hi' n gwneud

(aux) the girl this right (aux) she (asp) do
this girl... - right? - she's doing
181. * It mæ i hi'n 1M "qualify-o" am dano fe

(aux) she (asp) qualifying for it

She's qualifying for it.

182. P: 1M ie 2M "qualified librarian" 12M bydd hi

yes qualified librarian will be she

Yes, it's a qualified librarian that she'll

183. wedyn 'ny ch' wel 1+M.. yn "qualified librarian"

after that you see (asp) qualified librarian

be afterwards, you see. A qualified librarian.

184. I: 1M ie 2M.. so bydd hi "more or less" 1+M.. yn

yes so (aux) she more or less (asp)

Yes, so she'll be more or less

185. cerdded mewn i waith

walk in to work

walking into a job.

186. P: 2M.. wel dylai hi

well should she

Well, she should.
187. M: 2L

siwr o
fod

sure of be

Very probably.

188. I: 2M

mae e’ n
"good job"
'achan

is it (asp) good job boy

It’s a good job, man.

189. M: 1M

1+2L
dibynnu fel chi 'n
disgwyl arno fe
"really"

mm depend like you (asp) look on it really

Mm. It depends on how you look at it, really.

190. I: 2M

eh

eh

Eh?

191. M: 1+L

dibynnu fel chi 'n
disgwyl arno fe
1M na 'dw e'

depend like you (asp) look on it (neg) is it

It depends on how you look at it, doesn’t it?

192. 2M

os chi 'n
licio llyfrau
1M "just the job" yw e'

if you (asp) like books just the job is it

If you like books, it’s just the job.
193. iL wel

12M. mae hi

bown o fod

yn

1M. cyn bod

well (aux) she bound of be (asp) before (aux)

Well, she's bound to, before she'd

194. hi 'n
cymeryd
e'

lan 'achan

1M bown o fod

she (asp) take it up boy bound of be

take it up, man. Bound to.

195. Mi 2L

llyfrau

12M pethau
ddio rol

iawn

cofiwc

books things interesting very remember

Books are very interesting things, remember.

196. P: 2L

allid
di

ddarllen

nhw
t ' wel

can you read them you see

You can read them, you see.

197. Mi 2M

welon

ni
gem
dda

heddiw

dad

saw we game good today dad

We saw a good game today, dad.

198. P: 1M

do

yes

Yes!
Well, what a game that was, we thought that it was Welsh secondary schools... after we walked out, before it finished, out in disgust... after we walked out,

...after we walked out,
205. oedd e' oedd e n dweud hi

%sabetto with simultaneous laughter.%

was it (aux) he (asp) say it

He was saying it!

206. P: 1+2M oen oen 1 n dweud hi 2M ac oedd y car

(axu) (aux) I (asp) say it and was the car

Yes, I was saying it. And there was the car.

207. M: 2L oedd y car 1+2M ddim yn gweithio erbyn hyn

(axu) the car (neg) (asp) work by this

The car wasn't working by now.

208. I: 1H y 2M..pwy car

(exl) who car

Eh? What car?

209. P: +1M yng nghar 1

my car me

My car.

210. 2M ond un car +1H sy ddim yn gweithio

but one car (aux) (neg) (asp) work

There's only one car that doesn't work around
211. round man hyn

round place here

here.

212. I: 2H... nac oedd e' 2H nac oedd e'

(neg) was it (neg) was it

Wasn't it? Wasn't it?

213. P: 1L na 1+M beth oedd hi 'n "fire-o" 2M.. ar ddu

no what (aux) it (asp) fire-ing on two

No, what was it firing? It was firing

214. "cylinder" 1+M oedd hi 'n "fire-o"

cylinders (aux) it (asp) fire-ing

on two cylinders.

215. I: +1M nawr 'te pam nawr 'te 2M "plugs" 2M "contact"

now then why now then plugs contacts

Now then, why, now then? Plugs? Contacts?

216. 1M "contact"

contacts

Contacts.
Oh, they were filthy, yes!

Did you pull... where did you find that out then?

Oh, here. When we came back.

Here. It didn't take five minutes to do it.

My suggestion. Thata was my idea.

Wasn't it?
Yes! Well yes! I didn't know.

What was to do you see. I was thinking about taking it down to the garage.

Don't be clever here, now.
He phoned me up this morning, now.

He asked if I was going to see a game in Stradey this afternoon.

I didn't know there was a game on.

He said, "If you're going down,

you can call for me on the way."
Next thing I know, he wanted to do some shopping. He had to fetch a couple

of things before the game.

I'd forgotten the ...er... wicks. I forgot

the wicks this morning, you see, and the pump.
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