Paul Tench. V Jornadas Internacionales de Lengua Inglesa, USAL, 2018.

A Life in Phonology

AN INTERVIEW WITH PAUL TENCH

by Marco Luccón*

Nota del Editor: Esta entrevista ha sido realizada con la generosa colaboración de la Prof. Lic. Cinthia P. Smith.

Dr Paul Tench is a retired Senior Lecturer; former Head of the Applied English Language Studies section of the School of English, Communication and Philosophy (1992-1994). Now, the Centre for Language and Communication Research, Cardiff University. He was first appointed to the staff in 1967 in what was then the Department of English, University of Wales Institute of Science and Technology (UWIST), with teaching responsibilities in the theory and practice of language teaching, applied linguistics, phonology and practical phonetics. During the 1970s, he also taught English as a Second Language for University College Cardiff, phonetics and linguistics in the School of Speech Therapy at Llandaff Technical College (now part of the University of South Wales), and phonetics at the Seminar für Sprachmethodik, the German branch of the Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL). In 1979, with a two-year leave of absence, he took up the post of Senior Lecturer in the Department of Modern European Languages at the University of Ilorin, Nigeria, with teaching responsibilities in English speech, applied linguistics, and the University-wide Use of English course delivered to all 1000 first year students. He also helped to design the University's first MA programme in linguistics.

First of all, let me say what an honour it was for me to be invited to give the opening address at Universidad del Salvador's 60th anniversary of the Department of Modern Languages in May 2018. I apologize that I spoke for so long, but you had invited a speaker who gets carried away with his topic! My wife and I appreciated all the courtesies shown to us which made our visit a most memorable one. Thank you so very much.

---

* Profesor Licenciado en Lengua Inglesa por la Universidad del Salvador (USAL). Colaborador Académico de la Escuela de Lenguas Modernas de la USAL. Secretario de Redacción de la Revista IDEAS 2da. Época (USAL). Profesor de fonética y fonología inglesa. Correo electrónico: marco.luccon@usal.edu.ar

What determined your interest in intonation?

Teaching! I had to teach it. I had to teach it at postgraduate level in a course devoted to phonology, to students who were being trained to teach English as a foreign language (or as a second or additional language).

I came into phonetics and phonology more or less by accident! I had taken a postgraduate course in linguistics in Cardiff, Wales, after my BA degree in German, and then went on to the British SIL (Summer Institute of Linguistics) for practical analytical training and then teaching. I wanted to teach grammar, but they were short on phonetics tutors, and so I was assigned to that section. I got a very thorough training in "international" phonetics, which I have never regretted. This gave me confidence when I was appointed in 1967 to teach phonology and practical phonetics as well as language teaching methodology in my department at the University of Wales Institute of Science and Technology (UWIST, one of the predecessors of present-day Cardiff University).

However, as far as intonation was concerned, I was brought up on the traditional British school (Jones, Armstrong & Ward, Gimson, O'Connor & Arnold) with its emphasis on attitudinal meanings. However, that tradition lacked any sense of integration of intonation with either grammar, or indeed with the rest of phonology. In my contacts with the Summer Institute of Linguistics, I became familiar with K.L. Pike's model of intonation, in particular with his classic *Intonation of American English* (1945); he, too, emphasised the attitudinal role of intonation, but at least he did integrate intonation with the broader perspective of a phonological hierarchy as in his huge tome *Language in Relation to a Unified Theory of the Structure of Human Behavior* (Pike, 1967). Both Pike and the British school related intonation to the "grammar" of statements, questions, commands and exclamations, but there was no attempt to integrate intonation as a relevant form of grammar on the scale that Halliday had demonstrated (Halliday, *Intonation and Grammar in British English*, 1967).

When Halliday's *A Course in Spoken English: Intonation* was published in 1970, I was keen to read, study and then teach this new description of intonation. There was an atmosphere of deep interest and commitment to Systemic-Functional Linguistics among my colleagues and this rubbed off on me. What appealed to me was this much broader perspective that Halliday brought to the description of intonation within language as a whole. I sought to reflect that in a modest way in my first major publication, *Pronunciation Skills* (1981).

How much do you owe to Halliday's findings in his works on intonation?

In a phrase: a great deal indeed.

Many would argue that the significance of intonation in grammar was one of the major contributions that Halliday made to linguistic theory in the early days of "scale and category" theory (*Categories of the theory of grammar*, 1961). He identified three overarching "metafunctions" of language: the "ideational" which has the function of indicating what we are talking about; the "interpersonal" tells us about ourselves as speakers and others as listeners; and the "textual" which functions to relate what we say to its context in discourse or the situational reality.

He also contributed what has now become standard practice in intonation theory and analysis with the distinction between *tonality* (the segmentation of spoken discourse into discrete units of intonation), *tonicity* (the location of the most prominent element within each unit) and *tone* (the pitch level and/or movement associated with that prominent element); and although others may use alternative terminology, this basic, regular, threefold distinction was first clearly propounded by Halliday.

Allow me to briefly illustrate these two contributions, and forgive the more academic tone in these next two paragraphs.

Take, for instance, Halliday's introduction to the transitivity system with his example of a commotion in the air up above us (see Halliday *An introduction to Functional Grammar*, 1985, p. 101), and in response to a question such as "What's that?" or "What's going on?" a statement is made in respect to birds flying overhead. Grammar is required to state what is going on:

> (1)   Some birds are flying overhead

We recognise the reference to a process in the selection of a verb (*fly*), the reference to an actor involved in the process in the selection of a nominal group (*some birds*) and the reference to a circumstance in the form of an adjunct of location (*overhead*); thus, we recognise the measure of transitivity (in the ideational metafunction). Furthermore, we recognize the mood in the interpersonal metafunction by the position of the subject before any finite form, and in this case, we recognize a declarative clause for a statement (or response). And in the textual metafunction, we recognize *some birds* as the theme and *are flying overhead* as the rheme. Thus, we recognize the selections in the grammar that English makes available to the user from all the available options.

However, this grammatical selection to make reference to "the commotion in the air up above us" has to be realized in substance, the physical manifestation of language. The options available are either various forms of a visual nature (including writing, of course) or speech. Now just as words require pronunciation, so does grammar. In this particular case, we

are quite likely, in the envisaged situation, to say (1) as a single intonation unit, with a falling tone accompanying -*head*

    (1a)   Some birds are flying over\<u>head</u>

This particular intonation arrangement indicates that the whole clause is to be recognized as a single piece of information, with all its information being regarded as new, or fresh, and, moreover, as a piece of information being complete in itself and presented as a statement. Thus, the grammatical selection of (1) has now been "articulated" in substance as (1a).

Now, back to a more conversational mode. This kind of integration of information with grammar is one of the reasons why I personally prefer Halliday's treatment of intonation to other major treatments. I liked the way that intonation was integrated into the rest of phonology, through the hierarchy of phonemes, syllables, feet (rhythm groups) and then intonation. I could see the sense of the three subsystems of tonality, tonicity and tone; clearly distinct yet interdependent systems. I liked the notion of language as a resource stored in the mind as the potential for creating messages.

However, when teaching from Halliday (1970), I could not help being struck by the different kinds of "meaning" that intonation was said to convey within this "over-broad" all-inclusive notion of grammar. "Statements", it seemed to me, belonged to a quite different kind of meaning from "dependent clause"; both these "meanings" were quite different in kind from notions of "forcefulness" or "reservation"; new and given information was of a different order again; likewise, "unit of information".

So, I set about trying to disentangle all these different kinds of meaning. It seemed to me to me that the primary function of intonation was the speaker's management of the information of their message, how they processed the total message into pieces (or "chunks") of information in terms of their understanding about what their listener knew. This involved tonality, tonicity and tone. Likewise, secondly, there were actual contrasts in meaning between identical wordings that could only be disambiguated through intonation.

Thirdly, the so-called "grammar" of statements, etc. was not just about syntax; but as communicative functions, statements could be expressed in any number of forms of syntax. However, the over-riding consideration was the intonation of knowing something, or not knowing and having to ask someone who did. So, I developed the notions of "speaker dominance" ("I know and tell you") and "speaker deference" ("I don't know and ask you"), together with their required intonation patterns. This applied not only to the giving of information, but also to the vast array of communicative functions that we use language for getting people to do things, and even in relating

socially with one another – greetings, congratulations, sympathy, etc. I learned from Dell Hymes about communicative competence, and also from Leech & Svartvik's *A Communicative Grammar of English* (1975), and applied all this to intonation.

Fourthly, I couldn't forget that intonation has indeed an attitudinal function, which had been foremost in intonation studies up to that time. Fifthly and sixthly, what Halliday had not explored but Pike had and then David Brazil did, there are larger structures of language above sentences where intonation has distinct roles. Just as in written discourse, messages in spoken discourse rely on a larger unit of "chunking", on what I called "phonological paragraphs", and finally, different kinds of discourse have their own distinct intonational sound –what I called their "prosodic composition"– so that we can quickly discern what kind of discourse we are hearing.

This categorization of the functions was my contribution to SFL intonation studies in my 1990 publication *The Roles of Intonation in English Discourse*, which was turned into a more textbook-like format in 1996, *The Intonation Systems of English.* There I included the notion of "information status" to distinguish between major, minor, incomplete, implied and highlighted information.

Analysis of actual spontaneous spoken text is crucial to developing a theory and a description of intonation. That led me to note two relatively recent intonation innovations in standard forms of spoken English: the mid-level tone with a low level pretonic for routine listing information and the raised high rise for the clever strategy of stating something new and at the same time checking the listener's understanding of it. These innovations were included in my more recent textbook *Transcribing the Sound of English* (2011). That textbook was the direct result of my teaching in Cardiff and the presentations I had made in various conferences.

I did find Halliday's use of numbers to refer to the set of intonation options a bit irksome, because I kept forgetting what they stood for. I felt that iconic symbols were much easier to interpret and remember. I think many people would agree with me. There were a few other minor niggles, but they are so minor as not to affect my overall sense of indebtedness to Halliday's fresh creative thinking about intonation.

Finally, I suddenly realized that the different categories of meanings that I have just outlined exploit different elements of the total intonation system. My classification of intonational meanings in the semantic system networks in English discourse had this other interesting feature, which I thought was

worth drawing attention to: each network is associated with a particular subsystem, or subsystems, of the total intonational system for the language:

1, 2   the organization of information and the disambiguation of syntactic "minimal pairs" involves **tonality**, **tonicity** and **tone** (status of information)
3   the communication of speech acts involves **tone** (dominance/ deference)
4   the expression of attitude involves **secondary tone** (variations)
5   discourse organization involves **paratones** (phonological paragraphing)
6   the identification of genres involves **prosodic composition** (including intonation)

That was an incredibly satisfying discovery.

In 1979, you took a leave of absence to take up a Senior Lecturer post in the Department of Modern European Languages at the University of Ilorin, Nigeria. What led to that decision and how would you define the experience?

I had been teaching in the Department of English in UWIST for more than ten years when we embarked on a Masters course in Education (MEd) with University College Cardiff (another predecessor of the present Cardiff University). We were recruiting people from all over the world, and I felt that I needed experience of English language teaching beyond Europe. An MEd student from Nigeria encouraged me to apply for teaching posts in their new universities; also we had friends from the church we belonged to who had been involved in linguistics work in Nigeria. So I applied and got a Senior Lecturer position in Ilorin. We went as a family with three young children.

It was a very valuable experience: another country, a different culture and a very different climate. My teaching went pretty well in the first year of my two-year contract, but the second year was a much greater challenge, with the loss of experienced staff and a financial crisis that left us without replacements. I was suddenly responsible for the delivery of a compulsory *Use of English* course for a thousand students. With the goodwill of the remaining staff we did it. We even managed that year to design their first MA course in applied linguistics.

Good friends, both Nigerian and other expatriates, helped us through all the changes, the illnesses and accidents. We travelled as much as we could, visiting the far North, both west and east. One highlight was to persuade a fisherman to take me out onto Lake Chad. I think the two years there developed me both professionally and as a person. My wife thinks I still

drive too much like a Nigerian! I was also glad that our children gained an insight into how people in other parts of the world live, a very valuable addition to their education. And we appreciate what we have at home, including the constant supply of water, electricity and groceries.

I'm glad we went.

A recent new dimension in your research is the application of phonology to the creation of new orthographies for unwritten languages in Africa. What conclusions have you reached in this field?

When I reached 60 years of age, I wondered whether I should stay in academia. Circumstances and a generous head of department persuaded me to do so, so that I could to some extent combine my university teaching with fieldwork on helping people to create spelling systems for as their yet unwritten languages. The Seed Company, associated with the Summer Institute of Linguistics, ran workshops in various parts of the world training people for Bible translation and opened up a new project in Nigeria in 2004. My contribution was at the initial workshop of a whole series, at which a spelling system was devised for each of the languages represented. Colleagues at Cardiff claimed that it would be impossible to analyse the phonology of a language and produce a writing system in the three weeks allotted to each workshop. But that is precisely what we achieved!

A bit of psycholinguistics and cognitive linguistics helped me in this (see, for instance, Aitchison's *Words in the Mind*, 1987, 1994, 2003). The whole of a person's ability in a language is in their mind, including the phonology and phonetic realizations. The speakers of an unwritten language have all that in their minds. In Nigeria and Zambia where we worked, we had the advantage of being able to work through English with people who were bi- and multi-lingual in English, their unwritten vernacular and a trade language like Hausa and Lozi.

I thoroughly enjoyed this work. It was a very practical application of phonology and phonetics; I enjoyed working with Africans who were keen to see results; and I think I enjoyed most of all the sheer delight they displayed when they saw the spelling system of their language emerge for the first time. The outcome of this work had enormous social impact, leading not only to translation of parts of the Bible, but also to dictionaries, education materials, linguistics articles and new literary talent. It raised the profile of the language in the eyes of the people and gave them pride in their own distinctive identity.

I wrote up my efforts in the first language I worked on, which was published by the *Journal of the International Phonetic Association* in 2007. That language was called Tera, and I have since worked with Ngizim, Glavda,

Ichen (Etkywen, in Taraba State) and Boi (TiYaa, in Bauchi State). In Zambia, it was the Shanjo people that I helped, in Western Province.

What kind of involvement have you retained at Cardiff University since your retirement?

I was appointed as Honorary Research Associate on my retirement in 2007. Since then, I have used this connection to author my 2011 book which Cambridge University Press had commissioned from me and numerous articles for publication in journals. I oversaw the final research studies of two PhD candidates.

I feel now that my academic contributions are coming to an end. There were four main strands to my academic career: phonetics and phonology; pronunciation teaching; intonation research; and the creation of new orthographies for unwritten languages. I have more or less concluded most of these now, with the exception of writing a book on word phonology from a Systemic-Functional Linguistics perspective. That is my main project at the moment; it was commissioned by colleagues at Cardiff University.

How important is it for you to teach pronunciation in ESL courses?

I can answer this one quickly. Yes, it *is* important. *Very* important.

We had a very relevant experience of this recently when my wife and I flew from Trelew to Buenos Aires. An air steward addressed the passengers in Spanish with the usual announcements, and then another addressed us in English, but we could hardly understand a word she said! We knew it was supposed to be English because we had understood "Ladies and gentlemen" at the beginning, but, honestly, I don't think we could make out a single word she said after that! She obviously knew what she wanted to say, and no doubt her grammar, vocabulary and discourse were impeccable, but without intelligible pronunciation, the announcements became complete *non*-announcements! It was astonishingly incomprehensible!

Now, I'm not saying that pronunciation is *all*-important or even more important than the other elements of language. I have always maintained that intelligibility depends upon a good standard of grammar, vocabulary, discourse and pronunciation. They are all equally important, even though there is a huge amount of grammar to master, an enormous load of vocabulary to become familiar with, and a wide range of discourse considerations to take into account. Learners, however, dare not neglect competence in pronunciation.

And pronunciation is not just a matter of consonants and vowels in words, but word stress, rhythm and intonation. Learners need to be able recognize short forms and unstressed forms even if they don't master them

themselves; in other words, learners need to be acquainted with the speech habits of others, including native speakers, to be able to understand the subtleties often expressed in speech.

Is there any subject or topic that you would have liked to deal with but is still pending?

As I have already indicated, I feel that my academic career is drawing to a close, now that I am in my late 70s. The only thing that is pending is the completion of my study of word phonology in a SFL perspective, and I look forward to completing that.

I wish I had had more time and energy for other projects. I had developed a mechanism for determining phonological interlanguage: *Methodology in Phonological Interlanguage*, 1996; *Phonological Universals and the Pronunciation of English*, 1998; *An Applied Interlanguage Experiment into Phonological Misperceptions of Adult Learners*, 2001; *Non-native speakers' misperceptions of English vowels and consonants: evidence from Korean adults in UK*, 2003; *Towards a Description of Tamil English Standard Pronunciation*, 2009. I gathered data for an analysis on Malagasy learners of English, which was influenced by an additional language, French; I wanted to investigate phonological interlanguage in a trilingual situation. I helped one PhD candidate do something similar for Rwandan learners of English, where French was again involved, as well as the local language, Kinyarwanda.

Secondly, I wanted to explore the sound-to-spelling mechanism in the minds of native speakers of English, rather like the way I had done with speakers of unwritten languages. A couple of postgraduate students and I had gathered data from a large number of young adults. A preliminary report appeared in 2008, *Spelling in the Mind: phonemic-graphemic correspondence hypotheses*. I would like to have completed a more definitive study of that.

Thirdly, I was interested in a particular cultural phenomenon of phonology: how British people currently interpret sounds as either more feminine or more masculine. Another postgraduate student and I amassed data on the perception of invented names in modern electronic games as either male or female. I would like to have completed that study also.

Fourthly, one of my PhD candidates acquired extremely valuable data on English teachers' perceptions on the role and value of pronunciation in a Greek context. I hope that she might be able to publish some of those findings. It would be a great contribution to the emerging interest in "teacher cognition" in language teaching.

Fifthly, I would like to have published my adaptation of a book on practical phonetics for Nigerian students; but there was probably not a huge market for it!

Finally, I would have liked to have revised my 1996 book, *The Intonation Systems of English*, but the publisher forestalled me by re-publishing the original version. However, I realize that I have not yet fully comprehended one feature of intonation, which came to light in one of the discussions at Universidad del Salvador. It concerns what some have called "event sentences", such as:

> Marco on his mobile phone: "Cinthia, are you alright? I heard a
> loud crash. What happened?"

> Cinthia on her mobile phone: |\Yes| the \ceiling collapsed|

In many cases of event sentences involving a verb in final position, the verb does not take the tonic even though it is the final lexical item. If the verb is semantically "weak" as in *the postman called*, you could argue that *called* is what a postman does routinely and so is treated as "given information". But ceilings don't routinely collapse! You could then, on the other hand, argue that since Cinthia is at the scene and surveys the debris on the floor, that *collapsed* is "given information" in her situation. But so is the gaping hole above her. So, why focus on the ceiling, when *collapsed* is also as semantically "rich" as *ceiling*? That's the puzzle. In event sentences with a final verb like these with an initial subject noun, it seems that we perceive that noun as the primary focus in the situation, i.e. "What has happened to x?" But I'm not sure that's the whole explanation.

Oh, and one more potential interest: the training of air stewardesses on *Aerolíneas Argentinas* to articulate their announcements with intelligible pronunciation!

From your personal perspective, in which direction will the field of phonetics and phonology evolve in the future?

I really can't tell. With any new approach to the study of language, it will always be necessary to include the dimension of phonology.

With increasing electronic sophistication, we will no doubt learn even more about the subtleties of articulation, audition and perception of the whole range of sounds from the smallest item to the rhythm and intonation of whole discourses.

From a language teaching point of view, there is, I suppose, a danger of there being so much research forthcoming, that teachers are simply not able

to keep up with it, or if they are able, of being overwhelmed with it all; and that, from their perspective, the research will be too esoteric.

I would like to see the reinstatement of the value of contrastive analysis, because it yields valuable information for the linguist and the teacher. I'm not thinking of its so-called predictive power, because I know that language contrasts are not the only component of the learner's task in acquiring intelligible pronunciation; but CA provides much relevant information. It might eventually be possible even to contrast an individual's own mother tongue accent with the relevant accent of the new language.

But I will finish with a challenge, especially to those who patiently listened to my long discourse on intonation at Universidad del Salvador, with its constant references to Megan Markle about to marry Prince Harry. So instead of

Meghan Markle is marrying Prince Harry on \Saturday|

try *Harry and Megan are expecting their first baby in spring*!

1. |Meghan Markle is marrying Prince Harry on \Saturday|

    One piece of information, all of which is new, in one complete clause, and pronounced as a statement in one single unit of intonation (tonality), with tonic on final lexical item (tonicity), carrying a falling tone.

2. |Meghan Markle is marrying Prince \Harry |on \Saturday|

    Two pieces of information, as two units of intonation with tonics and tones in each unit

3. |Meghan \Markle |is marrying Prince Harry on \Saturday|

    Two pieces of information

4. |Meghan \Markle |is marrying Prince \Harry |on \Saturday|

    Three pieces of information.

5. |Meghan Markle is marrying Prince \Harry on Saturday|

    One piece of information, but with focus on a non-final lexical item

6. |Meghan Markle is \marrying Prince Harry on Saturday|

    One piece of information, but with focus on a non-final lexical item

7. |Meghan \Markle is marrying Prince Harry on Saturday|

    One piece of information, but with focus on a non-final lexical item

8. |\Meghan Markle is marrying Prince Harry on Saturday|

    One piece of information, but with focus on a non-final lexical item

9. |Meghan Markle \is marrying Prince Harry on Saturday|

   One piece of information, but with focus on a non-lexical item

10. |Meghan Markle is marrying \Prince Harry on Saturday|

   One piece of information, but with focus on a non-final lexical item

11. |Meghan Markle is \marrying Prince Harry |on \Saturday|

   Two pieces of information, but with focus on a non-final lexical item in the first unit, etc.

12. |Meghan Markle is marrying Prince Harry on /Saturday|…

   One piece of incomplete information

13. |Meghan Markle is marrying Prince /Harry on Saturday|…

   One piece of incomplete information but with focus on a non-final lexical item, etc.

14. |Meghan Markle is marrying Prince /Harry |on \Saturday|

   Two pieces of information; the first incomplete, the second major

15. |Meghan Markle is marrying Prince \Harry |on /Saturday|

   Two pieces of information; the first is major, the second minor

16. |Meghan Markle is marrying Prince Harry on \/Saturday|

   One piece of information, but with the implication of another, unspoken, piece of information

17. |Meghan Markle is marrying Prince \/Harry on Saturday|

   One piece of information, but with the implication of another unspoken piece focussed on a non-lexical item, etc.

18. |Meghan \/Markle |is marrying Prince Harry on \Saturday|

   Two pieces of information, with the theme/subject highlighted

19. |On \/Saturday| Meghan Markle is marrying Prince \Harry|

   Marked theme

The total tone system to signal status of information is as follows:

fall	\\ major information		this is my first visit to Buenos \Aires	
(final) rise	/ minor information		this is my first visit to Latin \America | this /century	
(non-final) rise	/ incomplete information		this is my first visit to Buenos /Aires	…
(final) fall-rise	\/ implication		this is my first visit to Buenos \/Aires	
(non-final) fall-rise	\/		my \/first visit	…

highlighting of theme	

20. |Is Meghan Markle marrying Prince Harry on /<u>Sat</u>urday |

One piece of information, all of which is new, in one complete clause, and pronounced as a question in one single unit of intonation (tonality), with tonic on final lexical item (tonicity), carrying a rising tone.

21. |Is Meghan Markle marrying Prince /<u>Harry</u> on Saturday |

Question with a focus on a non-final lexical item, etc.

22. |/<u>Is</u> Meghan Markle marrying Prince Harry on Saturday |

Question casting doubt on the whole information

23. |Is Meghan Markle marrying Prince Harry on \/<u>Sat</u>urday |

Question with a specific focus

24. Meghan Markle is marrying Prince Harry on \<u>Sat</u>urday | /<u>is</u>n't she

Tag, expressing uncertainty

25. Meghan Markle is marrying Prince Harry on \<u>Sat</u>urday | \<u>is</u>n't she

Tag, expressing certainty

26. Meghan Markle is marrying Prince Harry on \<u>Sat</u>urday | /<u>is</u> she

Tag, acknowledging new information

27. |Who is marrying Prince \<u>Harry</u> |

Wh-questions show that most of the information is known

28. |/<u>Who</u> is marrying Prince Harry |

Wh-question expressing uncertainty

29. |When is Meghan Markle marrying Prince \<u>Harry</u> |

30. |/<u>When</u> is Meghan Markle marrying Prince Harry |

The tone system for communicative functions is as follows:

fall	\	statements, *wh*-questions
rise	/	*yes/no* questions
fall-rise	\/	questions with specific focus

This applies to all communicative functions:

fall	\	speaker dominance to express knowing something, authority, their own feelings

rise	/	speaker deference to other person's knowledge, authority and feelings
fall-rise	\/	speaker deference with specific focus

31. |Isn't it \<u>won</u>derful|that Meghan Markle is marrying Prince \<u>Harry</u>|

Interrogative as exclamation

32. |Do you know what's happening on \<u>Saturday</u>|

Interrogative as statement ("I'm going to tell you …")

33. (|Is Meghan Markle marrying Prince Harry on /<u>Saturday</u>|. |/<u>Pardon</u>|)
|Is Meghan Markle marrying Prince Harry on \ <u>Sat</u>urday|

Interrogative as statement ("What I said was …")

A few other examples:

|You should visit Pata\<u>gonia</u>| Advice (speaker's authority)
|You could visit Pata/<u>gonia</u>| Suggestion (listener's decision)
|Safe /<u>journey</u>| Good wish (listener's feelings)
|Good \<u>morn</u>ing| Greeting (plain, formal)
|Good /<u>morn</u>ing| Greetings (friendly)

34. |Meghan Markle is marrying Prince Harry on \<u>Saturday</u>|

High fall: strong feeling

35. |Meghan Markle is marrying Prince Harry on /\<u>Sat</u>urday|

Rise-fall: intense feeling

36. |Meghan Markle is marrying Prince /\<u>Harry</u> on Saturday|

Low rise-fall: very intense feeling

37. |Meghan Markle is marrying Prince Harry on \<u>Saturday</u>|

Low fall: mildness

38. |Meghan Markle is marrying Prince Harry on /<u>Saturday</u>|

Rise high: strong feeling/challenge

39. |Meghan Markle is marrying Prince Harry on /<u>Saturday</u>|

Rise low: little feeling/grumble

40. |Meghan Markle is marrying Prince Harry on –<u>Saturday</u>|

Mid-level: routine listing

41. |¯Meghan Markle is marrying Prince Harry on \ <u>Sat</u>urday|

High head + fall: insistent

42. |¯Meghan Markle is marrying Prince Harry on \Sat̲urday|

High head + low fall: important

43. |¯Meghan Markle is –marrying Prince _Harry on \ Sat̲urday|

Stepping head: emphatic

44. |\Meghan \Markle is \marrying Prince \Harry on \ Sat̲urday|

Glissando head: forceful

45. |_Meghan Markle is marrying Prince Harry on \Sat̲urday|

Narrow focus on final lexical item

46. |¯ Is Meghan Markle marrying Prince Harry on /Sat̲urday|

Narrow focus on final lexical item

47. |She le̲ft him| to write out the invi̲tations|

Two clauses: main + purpose

48. |She left him to write out the invi̲tations|

One clause with complex verb phrase

49. |She to̲ld him| to hurry things alo̲ng|

Two clauses: main + purpose

50. |She told him to hurry things alo̲ng|

Report clause

51. |You /kno̲w| she did an internship in Buenos A̲ires|

Comment + main clause

52. |You know she did an internship in Buenos A̲ires|

Report clause

53. |She's not marrying him because he is a \/pri̲nce|

Negative domain: reason clause

54. |She's not ma̲rrying him| because he is a \pri̲nce|

Negative domain: main clause

55. |Our da̲ughter| who is ma̲rried| lives in Bri̲stol|

Non-defining relative clause ("adding clause")

56. |Our son who is ma̲rried| lives in Abery̲stwyth|

Defining relative clause

57. |He <u>asked</u> himself| if she would <u>marry</u> him|

ask=transitive; *himself*=reflexive pronoun

58. |He asked him<u>self</u>| if she would <u>mar</u>ry him|

ask=intransitive; *himself*=emphatic pronoun

59. |He <u>washed</u>| and combed his <u>hair</u>|

washed=intransitive

60. |He washed and combed his <u>hair</u>|

washed=transitive

61. |He doesn't <u>comb</u> his hair| /<u>norm</u>ally|

normally=comment adverb

62. |He doesn't comb his hair <u>norm</u>ally|

normally= adverb

63. ¹||˥ So they'll be getting married on \<u>Sat</u>urday|˧ at Windsor \<u>Cas</u>tle|˩ in St George's \<u>Chap</u>el ²||˥ It's going to be quite a \<u>day</u>|˧ with \<u>mill</u>ions|˩ watching on their T\<u>V</u>s ³||˥ but it's also \<u>Cup</u> Final day|˧which is a big \<u>fix</u>ture|˧ in the sporting \<u>cal</u>endar|˩ each \<u>year</u> ⁴||˥ \<u>now</u>|˧ how is Harry's brother \<u>Will</u> going to manage|˧ since he is the groom's /<u>broth</u>er|˩ and the president of the \<u>Foot</u>ball Association ⁵|| ˩ /<u>well</u>|˧ the wedding is at twelve /<u>noon</u>|˧ and the football at quarter past \<u>five</u>| ˩ giving time for Will to get to \<u>both</u> ⁶||˩ what people will \<u>do</u>|˩ for \<u>foot</u>ball| ˥even the royal \<u>fam</u>ily ||

In discourse organization,

> || = boundaries of phonological paragraphs (or paratones)
> ˥ = high baseline
> ˩ = low baseline, with ˥, ˦, ˧ indicating intermediate level baselines

   Typically, paragraphs begin with a high baseline with a high onset, with progressive declination of baselines, and end with a final low baseline and a low tone. Intervening ˥ usually marks unexpected information; repetition of baselines marks information of equal importance; intervening low baseline marks expected information or asides.

64. | Harry's \<u>fath</u>er| \<u>Charles</u>||˥ is the Prince of /<u>Wales</u>

Statement + checking understanding.

Prosodic composition of genres, e.g. news reading, storytelling, poetry recitals, conversation, prayer, sports commentaries, etc.

65. ¹||˥ This is how the story be\gins ²||˩ _On a dark dark /hill| _there was a dark dark \town| _in the dark dark /town| _there was a dark dark \street| _in the dark dark /street| _there was a dark dark \house| _in the dark dark /house| _there was a dark dark \staircase| _down the dark dark /staircase| _there was a dark dark \cellar| _and in the dark dark /cellar|˥ some \skeletons lived

66. *Meghan*:|⁻Har–ry| your ⁻dinner's –ready| *Harry*: |OKa⁻–ay|

With every good wish.

Paul Tench

Cardiff, 2018