

Young Scholars' Developments in Linguistics

Young Scholars' Developments in Linguistics:

Tradition and Change

Edited by

Tatiana V. Dubrovskaya
and Yulia A. Lobina

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing



Young Scholars' Developments in Linguistics: Tradition and Change

Edited by Tatiana V. Dubrovskaya and Yulia A. Lobina

This book first published 2015

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2015 by Tatiana V. Dubrovskaya, Yulia A. Lobina
and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-8265-8

ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-8265-1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Illustrations	vii
List of Tables	viii
Preface	ix
Tatiana Dubrovskaya and Yulia Lobina	

Part I: Linguistic Concepts

Chapter One	2
Panoramic View of the Concept “Function” with a Focus on the Spanish Functional Linguistics Perspective Cristina García González	
Chapter Two	39
Thesaurus Modelling of the Semantic Field for the Term “Coherence” Irina Zhuchkova	

Part II: Language Functioning

Chapter Three	52
The Function of the “Pagka” Discourse Marker Particle in Hanunoo Yrrah Jane S. Epo	
Chapter Four	60
Speech Genres of Negative Evaluation in Russian Culture Tatiana Dubrovskaya	
Chapter Five	83
The Representation of the Opposition between Judicial Power and the People in the Mass Media Discourse of Great Britain and Russia Natalia Dankova	

Chapter Six.....	96
Language Use and Attitudes among Agusan Manobo People in the Philippines	
Rose Marie P. Campos	

Part III: Literature and Translation Studies

Chapter Seven.....	108
The Dynamic of Money and Marriage in Guy de Maupassant's <i>The Necklace</i> and O'Henry's <i>The Gift of the Magi</i>	
Hibah Shabkhez, Azka Mahboob and Ibreez Shabkhez	

Chapter Eight.....	115
A Plethora of Paradoxes in Francis Scott Fitzgerald's Novel <i>The Great Gatsby</i>	
Lyudmila Roptanova and Natalia Zueva	

Chapter Nine.....	123
Exploring Translation Methodologies of Medical Terminology in Fiction	
Roksolana Povoroznyuk	

Part Four: Language Contact and Teaching

Chapter Ten.....	142
Plurilingual Competence and Existential Competence (<i>savoir-être</i>) of the Language Learner: A Successful Marriage?	
Radosław Kucharczyk and Maciej Smuk	

Chapter Eleven.....	151
Borrowed Computer Lexis in the Russian Language: Regular Process and Peripheral Phenomena	
Olga Osetrova and Natalia Krasheninnikova	

Contributors.....	165
-------------------	-----

Index.....	167
------------	-----

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

- Fig. 1-1 The presentation scale
- Fig. 1-2 The quality scale
- Fig. 1-3 The combined scale
- Fig. 1-4 Alarcos' taxonomy of functions
- Fig. 1-5 Articulations' functions by Gutiérrez Ordóñez
- Fig. 2-1 Semantic field of the term "coherence"
- Fig. 6-1 Language use in four major domains
- Fig. 6-2 Importance of the Agusan Manobo language
- Fig. 6-3 Responses towards statements about Agusan Manobo
- Fig. 9-1 Instances of the literal and oblique rendering in the target text
- Fig. 9-2 Distribution of the literal translation techniques in the target text
- Fig. 9-2 Distribution of the literal translation techniques in the target text
- Fig. 9-3 Distribution of the oblique translation techniques in the target text

LIST OF TABLES

- Table 2-1. Results of the componential analysis of the terms “cohesion” and “coherence”
- Table 3-1. *Pagka* Associations
- Table 4-1. Culture-language correlation
- Table 6-1. Summary of answers to Q74
- Table 6-2. Summary of answers to Q73
- Table 9-1. Etymological classification of medical terminology in the target text
- Table 9-2. The ratio of translation techniques used for the rendering of terminological units in the Russian translation of *The Signature of All Things* by E. Gilbert
- Table 10-1. Number of foreign languages learned
- Table 10-2. Links between plurilingual competence and the development of meta-components of the existential competence
- Table 10-3. Impact of plurilingual competence on attitudes and behaviors

PREFACE

This book is a result of the II International Young Scholars Conference entitled “Lexicon, Discourse and Speaker Studies”, which took place in Ulyanovsk, Russia, in April 2014. Contributions to the volume are revised versions of the papers presented on that occasion. The volume has a few very important characteristics which have predetermined its overall conception and philosophy.

Because the conference was organized in Russia, nearly half of the papers included in the volume—5 out of a total 11—are written by Russian authors, and in this respect the volume can be viewed as representing a concise collage of linguistic research in Russia. Due to the lack of English-language publications by Russian scholars, Russian linguistics is sometimes deemed to occupy the periphery of world language studies. The present volume aims to prove otherwise. In no way does the book present an exhaustive and coherent picture of Russian linguistics; however, it does shed light on some major trends of research in the country.

At the same time, we aspire to demonstrate explicitly that Russian linguistics is not developing in isolation. The conference united researchers from a number of countries in different parts of the world, including Poland, Spain, Pakistan, Thailand and Ukraine, and was, no doubt, fruitful and enriching for the participants. Internationalization finds its outlets not only in that young scholars share views with their counterparts around the world, they also build up their research on international traditions and draw inspiration from classics of world linguistics, such as Saussure, Hjelmslev, Sapir, etc., as well as from modern world renowned authors, e.g. Hofstede, Wierzbicka, Yule, etc.

Finally, most of the authors are young scholars, who are making their first steps and attempting to discover new horizons in a vast field of language and literary studies. The prominent Russian scholar and the founder of the Russian conversational studies, Olga Sirotinina, claims in her latest book:

“The language system never exists in anybody’s mind—whether a common speaker’s or a highly qualified linguist’s—in its full complexity and inconsistency because of its chaotic formation and incessant continuous changes, as well as its vastness (...) That is why more and more new studies of different language subsystems appear, which encompass specific details of particular areas and distinct ‘painful areas’ of the system, discovering their appearances in usage, establishing unknown facts, etc. (...). And there is no end to comprehending all the complexities of the Russian language system and likewise the systems of other languages” (Sirotnina 2013, 6-7) (Translated from Russian into English by the editors).

Being aware of the enormity of the task set before them, the young scholars endeavour to grasp language regularities and offer explanations for various linguistic phenomena, thus, introducing changes while relying on the solid traditions of previous achievements.

“Tradition and change” has been made a leitmotif for the present volume. The young researchers, natural advocates of change, delve into language processes, their causes, mechanisms and interrelations with social changes. However, as is made manifest in many papers, any change is based on tradition and does not exist without tradition, whether we speak of traditions in terminology, approach, data or method. The book contains four sections, each of which embraces one specific sphere of language studies.

In Part I García focuses on the key linguistic term “function” as it evolves in different linguistic schools of thought throughout the 20th century. She emphasizes divergences in the usage of the term, as well as indicating evolution of the concept in works of particular scholars. The other contributor to this part, **Zhuchkova**, is keen on bringing about consensus among members of the international linguistic community as to how the notion of “coherence” should be understood. In her paper, she aims at uniting all the meanings of the key notion as well as related terms into a single semantic field using the technique of thesaurus Modelling.

Part II “Language functioning: discourse studies and pragmatics” features four papers. It starts with a paper by **Epo**, who explores the discourse marker particle in traditional folktales in the Philippines. The Russian language in its interrelation with Russian culture becomes the object of scrutiny in a paper by **Dubrovskaya**. The author identifies traditional characteristics and values of the Russian culture and seeks to illustrate how these values influence people’s communication patterns in

situations of conflict irrespective of the discourse type. The summary of ethnographic studies is followed by a genre analysis, which embraces the analysis of compositional patterns and specific linguistics tools as well as the consideration of some pragmatic factors. **Dankova** also concentrates on national specifics of language functioning but draws upon media discourse, which immediately reflects social changes. The author unveils discursive representations of the relationship between people and judicial power in the Russian and British print media and aspires to demonstrate their potential influence on public perception of judicial power in two societies. The final contribution is a paper by **Campos**, who uses a traditional sociolinguistic methodology, including orally-administered questionnaires, informal interviews and participant observation, to examine the language use and attitudes to languages of the Agusan Manobo people in the Philippines. She reveals that the majority of her respondents have positive attitudes towards their native language, though it remains a traditional and dominant means of communication only in the domain of the home.

Part III concentrates on literary discourse. The first two papers analyse traditional cultural values, such as money and marriage, as well as mechanisms of their representation in literature. **Shabkhez, Mahboob** and **Shabkhez** reveal similarities and differences in treating these subjects in French and American short stories as well as indicating how characters are represented through their attitude to the issues. **Roptanova** and **Zueva** concentrate on one particular stylistic device—paradox—and argue that it is this technique that has always drawn the readers' attention to Fitzgerald's new interpretation of the American Dream. Traditional values embodied in literature tend to transform when they are presented to a foreign reader through the lens of the translator. Strategic choices made by translators may be influenced by social changes in their countries, the genre of the book or the nature of the item rendered. **Povoroznyuk** turns her attention to medical terminology, which forms an important layer of lexicon in a specific type of text—the hybrid fictional text. The author performs a comparative analysis of the original and translated versions of the same text and claims that sense-for-sense translation techniques are more appropriate in rendering a hybrid fictional text.

The area of language contact and teaching has gained attention in **Part IV**, which is comprised of three papers. In this part, the authors shed light on changes that relate to the field. **Kucharczyk** and **Smuk** address the issue of plurilingual competence, which is nowadays achieved by an increasing number of people. The researchers explore how the identity of a

foreign language learner develops and argue that language learning might change some elements of the person's existential competence such as personality traits and ensuing behaviour, attitudes, values and beliefs, and cognitive styles. The authors go on to show that this relationship is strengthened with the learner's growing number of foreign languages.

The issue of language contacts, and transformations caused by them, becomes the object of enquiry in the paper by **Osetrova** and **Krasheninnikova**. They investigate the role of borrowed English computer lexis in activating peripheral processes in the Russian language. They contend that adapting borrowed computer lexis of English origin to the Russian language is connected to such peripheral phenomena as spelling and morphological varieties, fluctuations in morphological gender, parallel borrowing and repeated borrowing, and that these phenomena seem to be active enough to affect the core of the language system.

Over a hundred years ago, in his *Course in General Linguistics* F. de Saussure made the following argument regarding the field of linguistics:

“(...) there is no other field in which so many absurd notions, prejudices, mirages, and fictions have sprung up. From the psychological viewpoint these errors are of interest, but the task of the linguist is, above all else, to condemn them and to dispel them as best he can” (Saussure 1959, 7).

We hope that this book will not add to the list of linguistic absurdities but, instead, contribute to the comprehension of some language phenomena in terms of tradition and change.

Tatiana Dubrovskaya
Yulia Lobina

References

1. De Saussure, F. 1959. *Course in General Linguistics*. New York: Philosophical Library.
2. Sirotinina, O.B. 2013. *Russkij jazyk: sistema, uzus i sozdavaemyje imi riski*. Saratov: Saratovskij gosudarstvennyj universitet.

PART I:
LINGUISTIC CONCEPTS

CHAPTER ONE

PANORAMIC VIEW OF THE CONCEPT “FUNCTION” WITH A FOCUS ON THE SPANISH FUNCTIONAL LINGUISTICS PERSPECTIVE

CRISTINA GARCÍA GONZÁLEZ

1. Introduction

The notion of function has been key throughout the history of linguistic science. This concept has been used widely not only in the science of language itself, but also in disciplines such as sociology, psychology, communication theory, mathematics and philosophy. Focusing on the field of linguistics, it is not difficult to see that function is a polysemous term and that there has always been a considerable degree of confusion associated with it. Indeed, it was in this sense that Martinet, already by the mid-20th century, argued that:

“Contemporary linguists often use the word function, but they do not agree as to the value that has to be attached to it and they do not always take the trouble to specify what it is that they understand for this purpose” (Martinet 1955, 39).

Later, Gregory would note that “the use of the word function in linguistics has been, and is, diverse” (Gregory 1987, 94).

In this contribution, we will analyse the concept of function throughout the 20th- and 21st- century linguistic tradition, especially in functional linguistics, and particularly in Spanish functional linguistics. What follows is divided into four parts:

- a) The prefunctional view of the term;
- b) The different meanings of function in a selection of functional branches of linguistics;

- c) A more detailed analysis of the diverse ways in which this notion has been understood in Spanish functional linguistics;
- d) Finally, some conclusions will be offered.

The prior literature on the concept of function in linguistics is extremely heterogeneous. Most works are framed within an author’s specific view of the concept, and indeed, it is very rare to find studies that aim to analyse the concept in a broad and inclusive way. In fact, those few works in which such an attempt is made tend to be small sections within larger-scale works (Daneš 1987, 4-7; Eguren 1988-1989, 69-74; Gregory 1987, 94-97; Gutiérrez Ordóñez 1994a, 697; Halliday 1974, 43-50; Halliday 1976, 30; Hymes 1984, 54-59; Lyons 1981, 224-225; Nuyts 1992, 26-32, 62-64; Rojo 1983, 53-56; Sornicola 1993, 158-161, 167-170; etc). There are several references which take a wider approach, and these have served as a point of departure for our contribution (Tabouret-Keller, 2007-2008; Muñoz Núñez, 2001; Martín Arista, 2001; Sornicola, 2011 or Martinet, 1969).

Taking the above into account, then, it was necessary both to provide an analysis of the notion of function and also to offer a new perspective on it. The latter will be based on the widest possible perspective, beginning with the very origins of linguistic science, and be followed by looking at a selection of branches of functional linguistics (especially the Spanish branch).

1.1 Methodology

As a first step, we identified those non-functional linguistic approaches that we considered influential in terms of their treatment of this notion, trying to determine exactly what they understood by function. Secondly, and after having also identified a selection of functional branches of linguistics, we tried to determine exactly what function meant for these. Lastly, we focused on the Spanish branch.

Amongst the greatest difficulties with the current study was in distinguishing when the term function was used in a metalinguistic way and when it was simply used by an author as a common and non-technical word. The latter, clearly, was of no interest in this contribution. Another difficulty was the fact that whereas some linguists explain what function meant for them in a precise manner, most did not. Thus, where the term was not explicitly defined, it was necessary to read their texts and discern the meaning as it was used by these specific authors. Furthermore, it

should be noted that for some linguists this concept is key in their theoretical formulations whereas for others, even though they consider themselves to be functionalists, the notion of function is not in fact of central importance. In such cases, it was especially difficult to find any concrete description of what the concept meant for them, usually because they assumed it was clear and they did not have to explain it.

Finally, it should be stressed that the current study is based on the function concept. That means that, wherever possible, all kinds of compound terms in which function serves as a *surname* (i.e. pragmatic function, phonetic function, etc.) have been ignored, in that our interest is in the strict meaning of function and its particular ramifications.

2. The prefunctional view of the term function

In this section, we will consider the ways in which different linguists have used the concept of function. Although these conceptions are not functionalist in a strict sense, they represent an important step towards the development of this area. In particular, we will consider four conceptions: the ones of Saussure; the Prague Linguistic Circle; Hjelmslev; and the Distributionalism.

2.1 Ferdinand de Saussure

In terms of scientific linguistics, the term function was first used by Saussure. His *Course in General Linguistics* mentions the concept several times, and, in a sense, it can also be said that he established the enduring tradition of using this term in a polysemous way.

Saussure referred to this concept within the different linguistic fields addressed in his *Course*. Nevertheless, he did not provide any concrete description of what the concept meant for him. In *Phonemes in the Spoken Chain* section, he equates function with the idea of effect:

“But one who asks why a sound should have a dual function – or a dual acoustical effect, for ‘function’ means just that – is given this reply: the function of a given sound depends on whether the sound receives the ‘syllabic accent’ ” (Saussure 1959, 58);

But the term is also used as a synonym for role:

“It is scarcely necessary to go back to Indo-European sonants and to ask, for example, why Old High German *hagl* changed to *hagal* while *balg* remained intact. In the case the *l*, the second element of an implosive link (ba>l>g>), functioned as a consonant and had no reason to change its function” (Saussure 1959, 63).

In the general section of *Synchronic linguistics* he used the term “signifying function”:

“It is precisely because the terms a and b as such are radically incapable of reaching the level of consciousness – one is always conscious of only the a/b difference – that each term is free to change according to laws that are unrelated to its signifying function” (Saussure 1959, 118).

Saussure argues that the important aspect of linguistic signs lies not in the signs themselves, but the “differences that make it possible to distinguish this word from all others, for differences carry signification” (Saussure 1959, 118). In this sense, the signifying function refers to such differences. Later, in discussing *Grammar and its Subdivisions*, Saussure alludes to the traditional (and ideal) division:

“To separate this study from syntax, it is alleged that syntax has as its object the functions attached to linguistic units while morphology considers only their form” (Saussure 1959, 135).

Yet, he subsequently denies this, arguing that the distinction is illusory: “forms and functions are interdependent and it is difficult, if not impossible, to separate them” (Saussure 1959, 135). Taking the section as a whole, we can deduce that he is in this case referring to syntactic functions. However, the nomenclature of *syntactic function* is only used when talking about old declensions, where the interrelationship between form and function is more evident; he does not mention it to describe prepositional languages, such as French.

In the section *Diachronic Linguistics*, Saussure uses the term function three times. In two of these, we can infer from the context that he is referring to syntactic functions because, in the first of these instances about German, he discusses declensions and cases:

“Ordinarily, then, alternation is distributed regularly among several terms and coincides with an important opposition of function, class, or determination” (Saussure 1959, 159)

In the second, about old Greek, he refers to three possible interpretations, saying:

“In all three instances, there was then a new distribution of units. The old substance was given new functions. The important thing is that no phonetic change intervened to bring about any of the shifts” (Saussure 1959, 180).

Nevertheless, in the same section a new possibility as to what function might have meant for Saussure arises, and it is a sort of semantic role. He equates the concepts of function and meaning, operating in the same direction:

“Under the same conditions the prefix in-, still very much alive although of learned origin, has two distinct forms: ē- (in *inconnu*, *indigne*, *invertébré*, etc.) and in- (in *anavouable*, *inutile*, *inesthétique*, etc.). In no way does this difference break unity of conception, for meaning and function are apprehended as identical, and language has determined where it will use one form to the other” (Saussure 1959, 160-161).

Summing up, function refers to several things for Saussure. When talking about phonetics, it can be a synonym of effect and role; it can also refer to syntactic function, but only in declension-languages; it is in addition used as a sort of semantic role. Furthermore, Saussure is aware of the signifying function of linguistic signs.

2.2 The Prague Linguistic Circle

The Prague Linguistic Circle constitutes the next milestone in linguistics. Indeed, it is the most important prefunctional School:

“Modern functionalist approaches to syntax were pioneered in the 1920s by the scholars associated with the Linguistic Circle of Prague and Prague-based functionalism is a dynamic force today” (Newmeyer 2001, 101).

Moreover, the main ideas of the Prague Linguistic Circle, which served to influence functional linguistics (especially the European branch), are as follows (Cabré and Lorente 2005, 443):

- a) The phonological, grammatical and semantic structures of the language are determined by the functions they achieve in the communities where they are used;
- b) Clauses have to be analysed taking a functional perspective of their use;

- c) A clear distinction has to be established between clause structure and the statement of communicative function;
- d) Clauses are informatively structured according to notions of theme and rheme.

The terminology used within the Prague Linguistic Circle (and its interpretation) is very diverse (Lyons 1981, 26). The function concept well reflects this. Chiss and Puech claim that the diversity of disciplines touched on by the Prague Linguistic Circle scholars force them to find basic units “but for the Prague scholar the notion of function is the place of a complex polysemy” (Chiss, Puech 2001, 797). As Achard-Bayle states:

“The concept of function in language is the key concept in the PLC’s work. It is, in the great diversity of this work, the only common point conferring on the Circle identity and cohesion”.

In the Prague Thesis, we find exclusively the purpose-based view of the concept of function. Signed by Jakobson, Mathesius, Mukarovsky, Bogatyrev, Trnka, Troubetzkoy and Hauranek, it is affirmed that language is a system of purposeful means of expression (Prague Linguistic Circle 1983, 77) and this concept of function as purpose is conditional on all perspectives, including diachronic:

“The conception of language as a functional system must also be observed in the study of their past stages, whether for the purpose of their reconstruction or for the ascertainment of their evolution. (...) If in synchronistic linguistics the elements of the language system are to be evaluated from the viewpoint of their functions, it is just as unfeasible to appreciate also the changes in language without any regard to the system subjected to these changes. (...) Thus, diachronic research not only does not exclude the concepts of system and function, but on the contrary it is incomplete if these concepts are disregarded” (Prague Linguistic Circle 1983, 78).

morphologic:

“The tendencies forming the morphological system manifest two kinds of coherence: on the one hand, keeping in a formal system a number of forms of different functions in which, however, appears the bearer of the same meaning, and on the other hand, keeping in it the forms of the bearers of different meanings, the form being determined by the same function. It is necessary to establish for every language the force of the two tendencies as well as their extent and the organization of the systems dominated by them” (Prague Linguistic Circle 1983, 87).

and syntactic:

“A combination of words, unless it is a fixed one, results from the syntagmatic activity (which, of course, may sometimes be manifested also by one simple word form). The basic syntagmatic act, at the same time the intrinsic sentence-forming act, is the predication. For this reason, functional syntax examines, in the first place, the types of predication, observing at the same time the forms and functions of the grammatical subject” (Prague Linguistic Circle 1983, 86).

Nevertheless, it is in the third epigraph of the Theses (*Problems of research into languages of different functions, especially Slavic*) where the definition of this term is provided. Indeed, it is affirmed that:

“The examination of language requires painstaking attention to the variety of linguistic functions and to the ways in which they are realized in the given way” (Prague Linguistic Circle 1983, 88).

Having distinguished between *internal* and *manifested speech*, it is argued that the latter has an *overwhelmingly social destination* in which it has to be differentiated if the language has a:

- a) Communicative function: the language is directed towards the content of the message, focusing on the meaning. Two *gravitational directions* must be distinguished: whether the speech is situational (relies on its complementation by extralinguistic elements [practical speech]) or if the speech is as compact as possible, striving to be complete and precise (Prague Linguistic Circle 1983, 89);
- b) Poetic function: the language is solely directed towards its form, focusing on the sign itself. This concept would later be greatly developed by Mukařovský (Mukařovský 1976).

Furthermore, they add that:

“It is desirable to examine forms of speech in which one function prevails as well as those in which more functions interpenetrate; in such research the basic question is the different hierarchy of functions in each given case” (Prague Linguistic Circle 1983, 89).

However, the Theses did not contain or reflect the view of all members of the Circle:

“Comparing the formulations of the finalist principle in *Thèses* from 1929 with the formulation of Mathesius in his article on functional linguistics from the same year, a striking difference immediately becomes evident. It is well-known that the corresponding formulation in ‘Theses’ originates from Jakobson” (Danes 1987, 4-5).

In their individual works and contributions, Prague Linguists conceded other meanings. For Bühler, for instance, even though he attributes the purpose meaning for the function concept, in his *Theory of language* he sets out a completely new theory of the functions of the language. It collects a number of ideas which were current in the intellectual atmosphere at the beginning of the 20th century and amalgamates psychological conceptions, primitive semasiology and communication theory. He develops four axioms, with axiom A being the organon model language: “the organon model displays the full multiplicity of fundamental relations, a multiplicity can only be exhibited in the concrete speech” (Bühler 1990, 27-28). In this sense, language is an organon, an instrument to communicate something from one to another, whereas the language functions are seen as semantic functions of the complex linguistic sign (Eguren 1988-1989, 69).

The semantic functions are presented in the following terms: “*expression (Ausdruck), appeal (Appell) and representation*” (Bühler 1990, 35):

- a) The representational function: refers to objects in the real world;
- b) The expressive function: refers to the writer of the text;
- c) The appellative function: refers to the reader of the text.

This model was quite important for the future development of the Prague Linguistic Circle. Galan notes that Bühler’s functional triad had a salutary effect on the Prague School in providing them with a more viable function typology than the one presented in the *Theses* in 1929 (Galan 1988, 105). One of the immediate beneficiaries of Bühler’s theory is Jakobson, who presents an expanded model inspired by the former’s communication theory (Eguren 1988-1989, 70). Under the premise that “language must be investigated in all the variety of its functions” (Jakobson 1987, 66), each of the six factors determines a different function of the language: *expressive* (speaker), *conative* (listener), *referential* (context), *phatic* (contact between the speaker and the listener), *metalinguistic* (code) and *poetic* (message). In fact, the implicit motivation in this schema is Jakobson’s interest in including the poetic function so he

could reconcile literature and linguistic studies. The originality of this proposal lies in the existence of three new functions characterised from linguistics to poetics. Furthermore, metalinguistic functions have a mathematical antecedent, the phatic function recalls the anthropological studies of Malinowski (Malinowski 1923) and the poetic functions were already present in previous Prague texts. It is, indeed, these singularities on which critics have focused: the non-linguistic origins of the theory of communication; the diversity of the sources consulted which implied the cause of their heterogeneity; and the eagerness to consider the poetic function as a linguistic function (Eguren 1988-1989, 70).

Mathesius' approach to linguistics is particularly important in that he saw himself as both a functionalist:

“Afterwards, Mathesius' model served as the basis for the research of Franticek Danes, Ian Firbas and M. A. K. Halliday, leading them towards a syntax conception that consists of describing each sentence at different levels” (Da Costa, 2010: 443)

and a structuralist, and he gave his approach the name “functional structuralism” (Mathesius 1975, 12). For him, “language phenomena should not be unduly separated from the activity of speaking” (Daneš 1994, 119). This fact is extremely important in his characterisation of the concept of function, always in the frame of the *functional sentence perspective*:

“He distinguished between the abstract system of grammatical elements and the communicative functions to which the elements of that system were applied. Many of his uses of the term ‘function’, in fact, refer to functioning internal to the system. That is, he considered a ‘functional’ distinction to exist between any two grammatical elements that contrast paradigmatically” (Newmeyer 2001, 103).

Troubetzkoy, another well-known scholar of the Prague Linguistic Circle, uses the term function with the sense of purpose, following Bühler, and talks about representational, appellative and expressive functions (Troubetzkoy 1969, 12-20). Nevertheless, he goes one step further and, as Jiménez Ruiz notes, tries to implement Bühler's proposal in the framework of phonology (Jiménez Ruiz 2001, 115):

“Thus, it is possible to observe and consider sound impressions on the plane of representation quite independently of the plane of expression and the plane of appeal” (Troubetzkoy 1969, 27).

So it can be said that Troubetzkoy reserves the term for phonological analysis, talking about a culminative function, a delimitative function and a distinctive function, all of these within the framework of phonology:

“Some phonic properties have a culminative function, that is, they indicate how many ‘units’ (words, combinations of words) are contained in a particular sentence (...). Other sound properties fulfil a delimitative function. They signal the boundary between two units (compounded words, words, morphemes. ...) Finally, still other sound properties have a meaning-differentiating or distinctive function, as they distinguish the individual units of meaning” (Troubetzkoy 1969, 27).

However, Troubetzkoy’s singularity falls within the study of the distinctive function due to its being only one kind of linguistically relevant function, recognised by Troubetzkoy and his followers (Lyons 1981, 224).

2.3 Louis Hjelmslev

Chronologically, the next to use the notion of function was Hjelmslev, providing a wholly new dimension for the concept. For him, descriptions are the only way to attain knowledge and comprehension in a language. And describing the language means explaining the relationships that it has within it. In this sense, he suggests to call functions those relationships or dependences registered by a scientific description: “a dependence that fulfils the conditions for an analysis we shall call a *function*” (Hjelmslev 1969, 33).

In his *Prolegomena*, Hjelmslev devotes one chapter to the concept of function. In it, he argues that there can be functions between a class and its components, or between the components, creating a new concept called a *functive*:

“The terminals of a function we shall call a functive, understanding by *functive* an object that has function to other objects. A functive is said to *contract* its function” (Hjelmslev 1969, 55).

Furthermore, Hjelmslev is entirely aware of the meaning that the concept provides:

“We have adopted the term *function* in a sense that lies midway between the logic-mathematical and the etymological sense (which later has also played a considerable role in science, including linguistic science), in formal respect nearer to the first but not identical with it. It is precisely

such an intermediate combining concept that we need in linguistics. We shall be able to say that an entity within the text (or within the system) has certain functions, and thereby think, first of all with approximation to the logic-mathematical meaning, that the entity has dependences with other entities, such that certain entities premise others - and secondly, with approximation to the etymological meaning that the entity functions in a definite way, fulfils a definite role, assumes a definite 'position' in the chain. In a way, we can see that the etymological meaning of the word *function* is its 'real' definition, which we avoid making explicit and introducing into the definition system, because it is based on more premises than the given formal definition and turns out to be reducible to it" (Hjelmslev 1969, 33-34).

Based on the *constant* and *variable* concepts, Hjelmslev's basic three functions are: *interdependence* (the relation between two constants), *determination* (the relation between a constant and a variable) and *constellation* (between two variables).

2.4 Distributionalism

The function concept also appears in Distributionalism, whose most important figure was Leonard Bloomfield. He was influenced to a great extent by behaviourist psychology, in which it is believed that human behaviour can be wholly predictable and understandable on the basis of situations as they are lived. Hence, studying a language means collecting a set of utterances, as diverse as possible, and afterwards looking for regularities in this corpus. The key notion is the environment, that is, the context (Ducrot and Todorov 1983, 47-48). As a consequence of this, function is defined in the following terms:

"The positions in which a form can appear are its *functions* or, collectively, its *function*. All the forms which can fill a given position thereby constitute a form-class" (Bloomfield 1956, 185).

Although Bloomfield does not make explicit a list of the functions involved, some of those he recognised are modifier (of verbs) (Bloomfield 1956, 194), attribute (Bloomfield 1956, 196, 202), predicate (Bloomfield 1956, 200), determiner (Bloomfield 1956, 204), adjective (Bloomfield 1956, 235), noun (Bloomfield 1956, 236), etc., mixing morphological and syntactic categories.

3. The different meanings of function in the functional branches of linguistics

We have presented the notion of function in a variety of what we have called *prefunctional branches*. However, it is in Functional Linguistics that the concept of function has experienced its greatest development. It is important, nonetheless, to point out that *Functionalism* is a label used to denote many theoretical trends and the definition of function will necessarily be different in each of these.

In order to resolve which functional branches to analyse, the basis for our selection was Butler 2003, although we have completed it based on a modest corpus of works analysing the trend of linguistic functionalism (Cabré and Lorente 2005, Eguren 1988-1989, Maftoon and Shakouri 2012, Santiago Galvis 2011 and Sornicola 1993). With this corpus, we analysed which types of functionalism appeared with greatest frequency, as a means of deciding which ones to include and exclude in the study, and in this way avoid the list of functionalist subtrends being unmanageably large.

Another important question is the characterisation of cognitive linguistics. While the origins of the cognitivism can be found in functional linguistics, we do not include it in our analysis, in that currently it can be said to have become independent from its functional origins. We agree with Da Costa Do Rosario that:

“All linguistic theory is subject to alterations. If this were not so, there would be no reason to conduct theoretical and empirical research, whose results feed back into our scientific positions. Linguistic functionalism is not different” (Da Costa Do Rosario 2010, 444).

He goes on to analyse linguistic functionalism and cognitive studies as two different systems. We also agree with Cabré and Lorente (Cabré, Lorente 2005) in terms of a classification of broad linguistic paradigms, which divides the current field into three: formal, functional and cognitive linguistics. For more on this see González-García and Butler (González-García, Butler 2006) or Tomasello (Tomasello 2008).

Characterising functionalism is a hard task for several reasons. Firstly, the labels assigned to the most representative functionalist studies are usually linked to the name of the scholars who study them, not to the defining characteristics of the theoretical trend itself (Moura Neves 2001, 1). Secondly, and specially, because:

“‘Funcionalism’ is nowadays an overused word in linguistics. It is used to designate so many schools, so many approaches, so many outcomes that one wonders whether it really encompasses a set of positive characteristics, or whether it should not be defined negatively with reference to what it differs from” (Sornicola 1993, 157).

This variety is indeed the main feature for Cabré and Llorente. They argue that the linguistic trend of functionalism is characterised by its diversity of models and proposals, versus the formal Chomskyan paradigm (in fact, this characterisation, based on an opposition to the formal model, is quite common). Furthermore, that all the various parts of the diverse functional whole have in common the necessity of describing language through the study of real language use in concrete communicative situations, because the configuration of language has been developed as a result of different communicative needs (Cabré, Llorente 2005, 10). Defining functionalism by showing a set of positive characteristics has experienced several attempts. For instance, for Da Costa do Rosário (Da Costa do Rosário 2010, 437) there are three: the conception of language as an instrument of communication and social interaction; the establishment of a subject of study based on real use; and the impossible distinction between system and use, in that the latter works as a generator of the former. For Maftoon and Nima Shakouri (Maftoon, Nima Shakouri 2012, 18):

“Functionalist approaches are elucidated first and foremost by the claim that language is seen primarily as a means of human communication in sociocultural and psychological contexts. The linchpin of consensus among functionalists is that the language system is not autonomous from, or self-contained with respect to, external factors”.

Lastly, for Cabré and Lorente, there are six characteristics (Cabré, Lorente 2005, 13): main language function is communication; language is pragmatically motivated - the fact that function conditions the meaning; meaning has an impact on the grammatical configuration of the verbal systems; linguistic universals are related to the language functions; language is a dynamic process; and the external control of the communicative acts explains linguistic variation. Nevertheless, in all the definitions and characterisations there is one such characteristic shared by all of these: the concept of language as a communication tool.

We now present nine proposals from nine functionalist authors or trends, combining where possible chronological and geographical criteria.

Although a diversity of functionalist classifications exists, we have chosen these specific criteria as the most practical for our current purposes.

It must be said, however, that there are other possible classifications. For instance, Bondarko (Bondarko 1991, 9-15) talks about three types of functional grammar: those whose description proceeds from form to meaning (Copenhagen School, The Prague Linguistic Circle, etc.); those whose description proceeds from meaning to form (Badouin de Courtenay or Brutot); and those whose descriptions are made from function to form (Halliday or Givon). Croft (Croft 1995, 491) distinguishes amongst autonomist functionalism, mixed formal/functionalist, typological functionalism and extreme functionalism, depending on whether syntax is considered (or not) to be arbitrary and self-contained. Nichols (Nichols 1984, 102-103) refers to conservative, moderate and extreme types of functionalism, having as his basis the extent to which form is claimed to be motivated by function.

3.1 European functionalisms

3.1.1 František Daneš

In Daneš 1966, the author states as follows:

“It appears that much confusion in the discussions of syntactic problems could be avoided if elements and rules of three different levels were distinguished. The respective levels are:

- (1) Level of the grammatical structure of sentence;
- (2) Level of the semantic structure of sentence;
- (3) Level of the organization of utterance” (Daneš 1966, 225).

Although there is no concrete definition of the concept of function, for Halliday these categories are:

“The manifestation, in the language system, of the functions of language, in the general sense in which the term has been used from the word of Bühler onwards” (Halliday 1974, 47).

In this sense, Daneš is inspired by Bühler’s categories, creating a slightly modified version of them. Daneš’ semantic level corresponds with Bühler’s representational function. However, the level of grammatical structure does not correspond precisely with just one in Bühler’s categorisation, but rather with two. For Halliday, the difference between the expressive and the appellative function can be distinguished from a

psychological point of view, but not linguistically. So, what for Daneš is the grammatical level, for Bühler were these two functions. The level of the organisation of utterance would not have any correspondence in Bühler's system, "since he was not primarily concerned with the nature of the linguistic system" (Bühler 1974, 47). Nevertheless, this is also a functional component, one which we might call a *textual function*, in Halliday's words. This textual function, or level of the organisation of utterance, would be dealt with at length in Daneš 1974.

3.1.2 Jan Firbas

For Firbas, function is a synonym for semantic role (Chamonikolasová 2010, 86), but he operates with a larger unit called *scale*. Firbas thus distinguishes three scales of dynamic semantic roles (functions): the Presentation Scale, the Quality Scale and the Combined Scale (Firbas 1992, 67). The Presentation Scale and the Quality Scale are represented as follows:

Setting (Set)	Presentation of Phenomenon (Pr)	Phenomenon Presented (Ph)
------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------------

Fig. 1-1 The Presentation Scale

Setting (Set)	Bearer of Quality (B)	[Ascription of Quality] ([AofQ])	Quality (Q)	Specification (Sp)	Further Specification (FSp)
------------------	--------------------------	--	----------------	-----------------------	-----------------------------------

Fig. 1-2 The Quality Scale blab la bla

Setting (Set)	Presenta- tion (Pr)	Phenom- enon (Ph)	Bearer of Quality (B)	[Ascription of Quality] ([AofQ])	Quality (Q)	Specifi- cation (Sp)	Further Specification (FSp)
------------------	---------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------------	--	----------------	----------------------------	-----------------------------------

Fig.1-3 The Combined Scale

(The three figures are taken from Chamonikolasová 2010)

"The items of the two sets represent dynamic semantic functions performed by context-independent elements" (Firbas 1992, 67). They are arranged in accordance with a gradual rise in communicative dynamism

and constitute two scales, reflecting the interpretative rather than the lineal arrangement. Furthermore, it is said that, as with the interpretative arrangement, both scales open with a setting, and in the flow of the communication a Ph-element precedes a B-element, the two scales may be combined into what he names as the Combined Scale.

It means that for Firbas the semantic roles of *Setting*, *Presentation of Phenomenon*, *Phenomenon Presented*, *Bearer of Quality*, *Quality*, *Specification* and *Further Specification* are all functions.

3.1.3 André Martinet

Martinet’s conception of function is clear, linking it with purpose meanings and eliminating any kind of Hjelmslev conception:

“Most of the meanings of function are more or less closely linked to the average meaning of ‘role’, ‘useful activity’. We do not find the mathematical sense of the term (functional relation between x and y) applied to language in its totality” (Martinet 1969, 9).

This means that all the different functions noted by Martinet would fall within the role concept. Moreover, Martinet insists on one idea: to remove any linguistically motivated a priori positions in determining linguistic functions, and thus to seek true linguistic function.

In order to determine the different roles that language can develop, he argues for two basic notions: the observation of the language user’s behaviour and the internal use of the language instrument (Martinet 1969, 10). At this point, he accepts the coexistence of different functions, although within a hierarchy, distinguishing between a *function centrale* and several *functions secondaires*. Taking the well-known scheme of communication, he argues that most linguists concur in seeing the central language function in the *communicative function*, as indeed does he:

“This functional method has confirmed the preponderance of the communicative function: only communicative needs allow for both articulations, in synchrony, to account for the fundamental characters of the linguistic units (opposition, discretion, solidarity), of their structure, and in diachronic form, explain the evolution of the systems” (Martinet 1969, 12).

So for Martinet, function refers to the purpose of language. In this sense, function for him is synonymous with *communicative function*, since he considers this to subsume all other senses.

He does recognise other functions of the language and the other purposes they serve (although for Martinet the emphasis is on the communicative exchange). Among these secondary functions we can find *expressive* or *aesthetic* functions, but he also takes into account the function scheme of Jakobson, alluding to *emotive*, *conative*, *poetic*, *referential*, *phatic* and *metalinguistic* functions, in an attempt to distinguish this typology from what he calls sporadic uses of the language (Martinet 1969, 14).

But, in the broad category of secondary functions, we also find the corresponding functions of the articulations concept proposed in 1949. Recognising the linguistic value of Hjelmslev's Glossematics and his isomorphism schema, Martinet notes the existence of another schema in which the linguistic facts are ordered in the frame of successive articulations: a first articulation in minimum units with two sides (*morphemes* for most structuralists and *monemes* for Martinet) and a second in successive minimum units of uniquely distinctive functions, the *phonemes* (Martinet 1957, 108). Hence, he argues for the existence of a distinctive function associated with phonemes (they do not have sense on their own, but they can serve to differentiate semantically opposed units) and of a significative function linked to the monemes due to the fact that they contribute to meaning. (For further information, see Martinet 1976).

Lastly, Martinet talks about function when referring to syntactic functions (in order to see the evolution of this concept, see Rojo 1981). He describes them as language units:

“The relations between the classes that develop different variable functions, that between nouns and the verbs, for example, are the ones that must be examined in syntax. These variable relations are the ones known as grammatical functions” (Martinet 1984, 193).

Feuillard (Feuillard 2001, 31) adds that a syntactic function means a choice between several possible relations, depending on the moneme with which the relation is established. Furthermore, Martinet distinguishes between *obligatoire*, *spécifiques* and *no spécifiques* functions. The only obligatory function is the subject, the rest being classified within the other two categories, depending on the compatibility of the verbs: the specific