

GRADERS IN ACADEMIC SPEECH

JANA SLAVÍČKOVÁ

Czech Language Institute, Prague

Graders (cf. Thompson, I., *Graders in English*, unpublished dissertation) are typical of the emotionally rich conversation. In this study, they are explored in an untypical context: academic speech. It is investigated which grading structures are frequent, which may be idiolectal, which graders as forms in general are frequent and versatile, what are the graded parts of speech, which graders are specific of the scholarly register, whether they upgrade or downgrade, whether they carry emotional meanings. Data is provided by two papers (B. Comrie's on typology and D. Wilson's on relevance).

According to their frequency in two papers, the following graded structures may be considered typical:

VERY + ADJECTIVE

"Very" expresses a high amount of the quality communicated in the adjective, an extreme upgrades even if the grader is relatively non-emotional, as in: *German, for instance, has a rule for forming yes/no questions which is very similar to that of English except that in German you don't need to identify specifically auxiliary verbs.* The tension is strengthened when the upgraded meaning is close to a relevant quality that has not been named explicitly but is implicitly present (i.e. "very similar" – "identical").

Similarly in: *So anti-English is a language which is very similar to English in fact all of its all of vocabulary is exactly the same as English.*

"Very" strengthens validity of a statement (which, in the paper, has a very strong appeal function, is a source of strong tension, is far from neutral, even if not emotional. Which suggests that, in this context, graders carry a personal perspective, which by itself upgrades, as in: *Now, from a formal viewpoint, it's very clear what anti-English is, you can very easily write a rule which....*

Similarly to the preceding, also in the following example "very" upgrades a favourable quality: *Okay the push-down store is a very simple automaton which will take... (even if not literally emotional, favourability stresses the relevance of what is communicated, attracts attention and focuses the information).*

“Very” appears with adverse qualities, and similarly to favourable ones, the resulting meaning is extreme, as in: *In principle, there is no reason why you shouldn't just write it down as a string of figures with no spaces no punctuation or anything. If however you write your numbers down that way it's just gonna very hard to read them.* (Extremes serve argumentation, which is a primary aim in scholarly writing.)

Another example of approaching an extreme: *The kind of explanation that I've given you there that kind of cognitive explanation that I have given is very close to kinds of explanation you find in mainstream generative grammar.*

A reinforced positive argumentation appears in: *Well in the third person it is very useful if the language has gender distinction, it might be narrowed down a little bit...* (pronounced with the stress on grader, which indicates not as much conveying new information as surprisingly reminding what is generally known).

The high amount of a quality is suitable for contrast, as in: *Now English is a very consistent language in terms of being nominative –accusative... and Dyirbal is very consistent in having its major syntactic processes operate on an ergative – absolute basis.*

Another extreme meaning for argumentation: *So in English that's a very strict rule. A surprising contrast appears in: Once again, this distribution, the distribution we actually find makes very good sense if..., or: They do however make very good sense....*

Another extreme (and a negative) quality: *I think it's very hard to answer that question because it's only relatively recently that....*

When used with an evaluating adjective, “very” upgrades evaluation, but also, as in the following, specifies reference: *That's a very again a very standard speech-act account.*

Another example of upgrading the validity of a claim: *That's as clear I mean if one tries gets through Grice's syntax that's a very clear statement, or: In most cases it seems clear that what they encode is concepts, a constituent of a conceptual representation, for example the word “cat” encodes the concept “cat”, the word “chase” encodes the concept “chase”, and so on something which is very easy to understand.*

Another frequently appearing structure, in both papers, is JUST + VERB:

The grader emphasizes an action as against another (it does not intensify the meaning, but its choice), as in: *Now if we were just to look at that particular pair of examples and not consider any of the other sentences of the language there are various ways in which we might describe it.*

In the preceding example, “just” is used to downgrade, and it could be replaced by “only”. In the following, it is synonymous with “simply” and upgrades, cf. *You can't just take your knowledge of the alphabet forwards and immediately say the alphabet backwards.* Whereas in the former “just” focuses, in the latter it sharpens impossibility of a seemingly easy and commonsensical action.

Common sense vs actual effect appear in: *In principle there is no reason why you shouldn't just write it down as a string of figures with no spaces no punctuation or anything. If however you write your numbers down that way it's just gonna very hard to read them.*

Upgrading through stressing necessity of an action appears in: *It's hard to see how it could be given any other kind of explanation because from all other viewpoints structure-dependence is if anything more complex than structure independence. It just turns out that humans are constructed in such a way that they find it easier to work with structure-dependence.*

Simplicity of the solution is stressed in: *It makes no difference what the first element is and you just put this after the first element whatever it might be.*

The listener is prepared for a strong meaning by “just”, as in: *That's a fairly standard account of our recent work and I'm just speculating explicitly and saying that....*

“Just” synonymous with “only” rather than “simply” but still focusing, and thus upgrading, appears in *...and what we've got in these cases is really constraints that that non-declarative syntax does not encode 'the speaker is saying that' or 'the speaker is asking that' or 'the speaker is ordering you', there's no concept hidden there it just pushes you in a certain direction.*

Quite frequent (in both papers) is also VERY + ADVERB: similarly to very + adjective, it serves argumentation, as in: *Now from a formal viewpoint it's very clear what anti-English is you can very easily write a rule which..., or ...so that you can get very easily from the French rule to the anti-French rule.*

A high degree stresses the quality, as in: *...they're very specifically linguistic. But if you think if you think of some of the kinds of formal explanations the formal grammarians come up with....*

“Very” upgrading an adverb of frequency gives stress to the whole utterance, as in: *What is interesting, however, is that as you look at the way second-position clitics behave cross-linguistically, very often little bits of structure-dependence start creeping in. Or: It's very often that they violate the topic-comment structure. Or: I guess the inferential phase of comprehension consists of two main subphases: one construction of impl sorry of explicatures very often in constructing an explicature you have to perform inference process and that's....*

“Very” expresses the degree of validity of various parts of information, as in: *And I want to argue though I don't (...) very convincingly I don't know at least three of those four categories are very clearly exemplified....*

Relatively frequent is also the structure EXACTLY + ADJECTIVE, as in “exactly the same”, as in: *The rules are slightly different but in both cases they are structure-dependent. So anti-English is a language which is very similar to English in fact all of its all of vocabulary is exactly the same as English. Or: ...in English for most virtually all syntactic purposes the subject of the intransitive clause behaves exactly the same as the subject or agent of the transitive clause.* (Redundancy in the latter makes comprehension of the two compared notions easier.)

The grader may affect the whole information stretch, as in: *It turns out that Dyirbal has exactly the same constraint.* If the determined noun is not general, as in the previous example, the grader serves an immediate adjoining of further salient information, as in: *What it communicates will have exactly the same explicatures and implicatures as six.*

The identity which “exactly” strengthens is of various kind: not only sameness, but also parallelism, as in: *Exactly parallel treatments are available to the attitudinal adverbs in two.*

Other grading structures are frequent in one paper only and minor in the other, which may indicate personal obsession, rather than any functional pattern. They include INDEED + STATEMENT, as in: *Now why if anti-English is from a formal viewpoint so much simpler than real English rather than anti-English indeed why is it that all human languages are real languages rather than anti-languages? Or: And indeed I would hypothesize that there can be no such language, or, where the “colouring markedness” of a structure competes with “neutral” meaning ‘in fact, in reality’: In fact you can even go a little bit further notice that I did a slight distinction between second and first persons. It’s somewhat easier to force distinct referents for second person pronouns than for first person pronouns. And indeed we find some languages....*

Whenever the meaning of “in fact” is redundant, since understood, the expression takes on the function of a grader, as in: *...in English for most virtually all syntactic purposes the subject of the intransitive clause behaves exactly the same as the subject or agent of the transitive clause. Indeed English grammar traditionally doesn’t make any distinction between what we’ve just called subjects and that’s perfectly valid within English syntax.*

Uneven is also the distribution of RATHER + ADJECTIVE, as in: *One other area in which we can see this, a rather trivial area is if... Similarly in: Of course when you do that that’s that’s the uninteresting sort of case, rather trivial sort of case... The grader prepares listeners for a weak statement (I.T.: has an editorial function). Even if difference is not adverse, “rather” applies here too, as in: Those are there are explanations which are rather different in type... Or in: Okay so I think for these reasons the number of people who have been prepared to entertain explanations of both kinds has been rather small.*

When the statement is prepared by means of a grader, the quality need not be adverse but quite the opposite, as in: *They apply only to items which have rather unique phonological properties.*

Author-dependence seems to be also SIMPLY + VERB, as in: *From a formal viewpoint too what we were interested in was simply providing a formal explicit description of the grammar of languages.* The grader affects a whole verbal clause, and emphasizes its factuality no matter how surprising its simplicity may be. (The grader is not emotional, but evaluative, which, however, is highly marked in scholarly discourse, and may bring similar effects as emotion in casual conversation.)

In: *So I’m simply tonight going to motivate those distinctions,* “simply” also introduces an idea which is basic, relevant, and formulated plainly, and upgrades the formulation.

“Simply” may upgrade by stressing the logical character of a solution (thus self-evaluating), as in: *By contrast the implicatures of an utterance are simply all those propositions which are communicated but not explicitly... or Even in that back-*

ground it’s clear that Mary’s utterance in one a is simply a more explicit version of six.

“Simply” may indicate a straightforward solution, as in: *Truth conditions according to Grice would be determined simply by fourteen a and fourteen b.*

Belonging to a speaker’s idiolect seems to be EXTREMELY + ADJECTIVE, as in: *So the distinction between ‘He hid himself’ and ‘he hid him’ is extremely useful. Or: By contrast, in the other grammatical persons, in the first and second person, it is extremely rare indeed, only under almost pathological conditions, that you get the possibility of a shift in referent. It is extremely rare that the referent in a single person’s utterance it’s extremely rare that the referent of a second or first person pronoun to shift..., or: Certainly you’ll have to be able to identify the beginning of the sentence... So the notion the structure-dependence if you like the structure-dependence hypothesis would require... that every aspect of the rule be structure-dependent. Any departure from that is extremely rare cross-linguistically, most syntactic rules in most languages are very strictly structure-dependent.*

ACTUALLY + VERB also appears to be idiolectal, as in: *Now as Kaplan points out those two propositions differ in their truth conditions. There’s actually no difference in which way you analyse the pronoun “I”. An intonation-independent grader appears in: There’s one that I have doubts about it’s actually the category of conceptual implicature. Similarly in: And so I worked my paper up basically based that... My argument essentially is a non-declarative syntax being non-conceptual but procedural? Is that the way to avoid performative hypothesis. When I actually went back and looked at Steve Levinson’s book which summarizes as I would call all the arguments against performative analysis basically very fewer work against the higher-level explicature I’ve found... In the last two examples, when the grader just emphasizes the verbal phrase and appears with a certain author, it is probable that this is a gambit.*

Concerning the occurrence of graders as forms in general, regardless of what they (up)grade, the following ones are most frequent:

- (1) VERY, appearing with adjectives, adverbs, comparatives, participles, and quantifiers (29 occurrences in the sample),
- (2) JUST, appearing with verbs, adjectives, nouns, clauses, and prepositions (16).

Also relatively frequent are:

EXACTLY, followed by adjectives, verbs, and clauses (7),

MUCH, followed by comparatives and clauses (5),

RATHER, followed by adjectives and adverbs (8),

SIMPLY, followed by verbs and nouns (7),

MOST, followed by adjectives and adverbs (6),

REALLY, followed by quantifiers, verbs, nouns, adjectives, participles and adverbs (8).

VERY + PARTICIPLE appears when the participle works as a syntactic adjective, as in: *So there are some exceptions to structure-dependence but they are very restricted.*

VERY + QUANTIFIER appears in: *Okay first of all there is very much work in progress.*

JUST + ADJECTIVE appears in: *So if you take something as unstructured string and then try to perform some operation it's just something which human beings unlike many automata many computers human beings are just very bad at that.* Just + adjective appear in a negative context, with the adverse meaning, as also in: *It's not at all clear what it would mean on a procedural account by saying that there was an ambiguity. What sort of ambiguity would it be? It's just just not obvious what you do if you try to deal with ambiguity on procedural terms.* "Just" emphasizes necessity.

JUST + NOUN: in the negative, "just" is synonymous with "only", as in: *Example I've given you of structure-dependence is one which seems to characterize human cognition in general and not just ways in which human beings deal with language.* "Just", arguing for a solution, helps the argumentation (makes it more persuasive by non-informational elements), as in: *Why is it so hard for non-native speakers of German to grasp the meanings of the particles "Ja" and "Doch". Anyone who worked on the thing knows, you know. It's terrible! Ehm. But procedural account is just answer to this question.*

JUST + CLAUSE: with a relative clause, "just" increases contrastive focusing, as in: *So if you take something as unstructured string and then try to perform some operation it's just something which human beings unlike many automata, many computers, human beings are just very bad at that.* "Just" related to the whole noun phrase appears in: *On the explication analysis what's constructed is a conceptual representation containing the concept "seriously" in both cases and it's perfectly easy to see how that ambiguity was out it's just the regular conceptual ambiguity.*

JUST + PREPOSITION appears in: *Dyirbal just like English allows omission of the addressee pronoun.*

Concerning the still frequent (and typical) uses, EXACTLY also appears with VERBS, as in: *So what exactly is procedural meaning... (where it borders on the non-grading, i.e. adverbial use) and clauses, as in: In fact, in the mathematics of automata theory one of the simplest kind of automata is a pushdown store which does exactly what I did just there.*

MUCH + COMPARATIVE brings a lexical, rather than contextual, intensification: *Now why if anti-English is from a formal viewpoint so much simpler than real English why is it that real English why is it that English is real English rather than anti-English.* Or: *If we say something like 'The man dropped the melon and burst' even now it's much more likely that the melon would burst if dropped, the only interpretation that the English syntax allows is that the man burst.* Or: *Typically, words are on the borderline between grammatical and phonological units. They usually correlate much more clearly with phonology though...* Grading may also affect the lesser degree of a quality, as in: *It is much less likely that a transitive direct object or patient will have control over an action.*

RATHER + ADVERB appears in: *On the one hand there are explanations which relate rather directly to the formal properties of language.* The grader emphasizes without any attempt to mask an adverse meaning.

SIMPLY + NOUN may strengthen the emphasis in a relative clause, as in: *And that's simply a respect in which languages differ.* "Simply" emphasizes the infinitival structure as well, as in: *It seems that the development away from the second person clitics is the easier one given one have said given materials that I've exaggerated the easier one to explain because that's simply the inquisition of structure-dependence to get rid of structure-independence rule.*

MOST + ADJECTIVE appears in: *Mow let's go on to ask where is that function most necessary most useful I don't want to say it's necessary Old English doesn't have it it's obviously not necessary but where is it most useful where is it least useful,* or in: *However, I would be most reluctant to analyse "hah" as encoding concept 'X doesn't mean that' and that just doesn't seem plausible.* A neutral expression of a higher amount of a quality.

MOST + ADVERB, as in: *In a sense we end up with a hierarchy third as I've written here first person at the top where you're most likely to have reflexives.*

REALLY + VERB is on the borderline between a grader and an adverb, the intonation being decisive, as in: *There are possibly some other explanations, though, there're other explanations that have been suggested but they don't really work as well.* Verb is stressed, as also in: *If you ask a speech-act theorist whether he thinks that illocutionary force indicators are procedural or perceptual, you won't get an answer... and I think that's a mistake but but one really needs to make precise which of those two types of meaning are being proposed.* Or: *So my conclusion about these things is that the concept 'discourse' or 'pragmatic connectives' is not a unitary phenomenon and it is really gonna have to be treated on a case by case basis.*

REALLY + QUANTIFIER, as in: *On the other hand there are other universals which make really no sense in formal terms.*

REALLY + ADVERB in *...it's a word-order rule so it looks like it's a syntactic rule. If you say it's not a if you say it's absolutely not a syntactic rule then you're really in danger of becoming circular.*

REALLY + ADJECTIVE in: *One question I like to come back to later if I have time is whether it's really true that all non-truth-conditional meanings contribute to high-level implicature.*

REALLY + NOUN: *...and what we've got in these cases is really constraints that that non-declarative syntax does not encode 'the speaker is saying that' or 'the speaker is asking that' or 'the speaker is ordering you' there's no concept hidden there it just pushes you in a certain direction.*

According to the number of functional contexts, "really" is the most versatile grader – it appears in 6 contexts, "just" and "very" both in 5. Three contexts appear with "exactly", "relatively", and "quite".

RELATIVELY occurs with quantifiers, as in *...in relatively few cases do we have independent confirmation of the cognitive structure,* or adjective, as in: *And if you read it in Old English you'll get 'thou', 'thou hiddest thee', 'I hid me', 'he hid Adam hid him' and so on. So you get a clear illustration of all three grammatical persons in one relatively short part of a text.* Or adverb, as in: *I think it's very hard to answer that question because it's only relatively recently that...*

QUITE occurs with quantifiers, as in: *One such example which has been discussed quite a lot in the literature*, with adjectives, as in: *...and you can ask me about them in question time I'll talk about them I'll be quite happy to talk a little bit about them*, and you're quite right, and adverbs, as in: *...in that early work it was stated quite explicitly*, and *But the question is Do all of the words encode concepts is all of word meaning to be analysed in perceptual terms. Now the answer even if we restrict ourselves to the most straightforward cases of truth-conditional meanings so formal semantics semanticists seems to be quite clearly no.*

Concerning the upgraded parts of speech, adjective is clearly on the lead (75 occurrences), followed by verb (29) and adverb (20), minor are prepositions.

Some of the graders are typical of casual conversation as well: "nearly", "slightly", "somewhat", "so", "a little bit", "too", "(not) at all", "least", "almost", "well", "perfectly", "fairly", "virtually", "real", "absolutely", "easily", "highly", "one hundred per cent", "terribly". Other graders are not described for non-restricted distribution, but are, for various reasons, recorded in scholarly register. They include: "even", "crucially", "generally", "always", "(no) whatsoever", "at least", "horribly", "of course", "obviously", "(not) in any case", "apparently", "purely", "certainly", "directly", "essentially", "so called", "basically".

Graders that appear additionally (a) need not be proper graders, but the borderline cases, are (b) formal variants of the expressions included, (c) 100% graders with a limited distribution.

EVEN appears with an ADJECTIVE, as in: *...or you have to identify words which are presumably in some sense morphological units you can argue even phonological units certainly not syntactic units*, or: *so there was a sort of strong, descriptive and even anti-explanatory bias*, with a QUANTIFIER, as in: *However, it turns out that in many languages perhaps even most languages of the world languages are not purely nominative-accusative or purely ergative-absolutive*, or a VERB PHRASE, as in: *In fact, you can even go a little bit further notice that I did a slight distinction between second and first persons.*

Some of the uses are on the borderline (a), grading in the second example is lexico-syntactic, "even" makes the meaning of the structure more explicit (does not, however, on its own grade it). When a part of another grader, it may take over its grading force, as in the fourth example. In other cases it expresses an extreme alternative, not in extent, measure, or amount, but with regard to other factors (the first example); in the third example, grading is suggested by the quantifier "most" (which lexically expresses either amount or measure), and some grading force can be transferred from there.

"Even" is not a lexical grader but may derive its grading force from the context, either from a grading syntactic structure (thus approaches referring graders), co-occurring graders, or the lexical context.

CRUCIALLY, as in: *But this requires crucially that you identify pieces of syntactic structure*. Synonyms can be found among graders: "so much", "particularly", "absolutely", "pretty well", "enormously", which allows to classify "crucially" as a grader. Its grading function is weakened by an adverbial position (after the verb).

On the other hand, "crucially" (similarly to "basically" or "essentially") is typical of scholarly discourse, aiming at the essence of phenomena; (a) + (c).

GENERALLY, as in: *It seems to be generally true if humans are going to manipulate unstructured objects then in order to manipulate them...* Semantically, it is only loosely related to graders expressing high degree – not a large amount of a quality is concerned but large scope of its validity; (a) + (c).

ALWAYS, as in: *The telephone numbers as they are written down for humans are always divided into groups of figures although those groups of figures have no significance no necessary significance whatsoever*. Regularity is interesting from a theoretical point of view: regularity of an action intensifies this action in academic register. "Always" is not a proper grader, but an intensifying adverb, its grading interpretation is undermined by intonational prominence; (a) + (c).

(NO) WHATSOEVER, as in above and also: *So that there is no evidence whatsoever to say that "Hah" ever encodes a concept*, is a formal variant of "(not) at all"; (b).

AT LEAST, appearing with ADJECTIVES, as in: *Okay while you hear one of the aims of one of at least short-term aims of generative grammar is...*, and with NUMERALS, as in: *And I want to argue, though I don't (...) very convincingly I don't know at least three of those four categories are very clearly exemplified*. Not a proper grader, not typical exclusively of academic writing, related to graders in that it anticipates and stresses the quality that follows, this quality is not extreme, as with editorial graders, but rather reasonably realistic; (a).

HORRIBLY, as in: *The only point this is it's horribly important point that only point on which the kind of explanation I've just given you differs...* A synonym of "terribly", thus (b) (but with the meaning of an "unpleasant experience", and surprising to be heard from a native speaker).

OF COURSE, as in: *And this, of course, gives us minimal contrasts like John hid himself, the same person involved, versus John hid him, two different people involved*. Logical solution is a kind of upgrading in argumentation, yet not lexical, or syntactic, but topical/informational, and related to graders; (a) + (c).

OBVIOUSLY, as in: *Now let's go on to ask where is that function most necessary most useful I don't want to say it's necessary Old English doesn't have it it's obviously not necessary but where is it most useful where is it least useful*. Some property is easy to see, to be supported by empirical evidence, as with "apparently", which is relevant in argumentation; (c). In this register, it also upgrades the following expression; (a). Unlike the mainstream graders, however, it is not the amount of quality which is stressed but its validity.

(NOT) IN ANY CASE, as in: *It's not clear to me in any case if you can do that with first person's pronouns since I presume even schizophrenics can't do it because one personality is not aware of the existence of the other personality*. A lexical synonym of "(not) at all"; (b).

APPARENTLY, as in: *Then we wonder why the person is saying this apparently absurd thing*; (a) + (c).

PURELY, as in: *However, it turns out that in many languages perhaps even most languages of the world languages are not purely nominative –accusative or purely ergative – absolutive.* By its lexical meaning “purely” expresses the amount of quality indicated in the following adjective, even if it also excludes other qualities, nuances or their mixtures. Thus (a), possibly synonymous with “absolutely”, “completely”, “totally”; (b).

CERTAINLY, as in: *Certainly, you’ll have to be able to identify the beginning of the sentence....* Related to graders via upgrading the validity of a whole statement; (a) + (c).

DIRECTLY, as in: *But there’s another more important question that I want to raise I’ve already mentioned it in passing, but actually Diane Blackwall’s analysis of “so”, “after all”, “therefore”, and “soon” directly conflicts with Grice.* The grader interpretation is supported by its position before verb. The verb is upgraded not via a high amount of the quality concerned, but via the way an action is accomplished, which may be due to the lexical meaning of the verb “to conflict”; (a).

ESSENTIALLY, as in: *There is another alternative analysis, however... ‘I’ may be treated as not encoding the concept – the speaker – but a procedure for identifying the referent of the pronoun essentially a procedure that said ‘identify the speaker put his name in the proposition’.* The meaning of “essence” is an upgrader in scholarly register, yet in this example it explains the previous thought, which blunts its upgrading force; (c) + (a).

BASICALLY, with a VERB, as in: *And so I worked my paper up basically based on that My argument essentially is a non-declarative syntax being non-conceptual but procedural?,* and a COMPARATIVE, as in (ctnd): *Which summarizes as I would call all the arguments against performative analysis basically very fewer work against the higher-level explicature I’ve found.* The first occurrence is a time-killer, the other grader is typical of scholarly register; (a) + (c).

Some of the “untypical” graders are lexical variants of the graders covered: “purely”, “(not) in any case”, “horribly”, “(no) whatsoever”. Other graders are the borderline cases, deriving their grading potential from the context, either syntactic (“even”) or lexical (“directly conflicts”), intonational (“always”), or topical (“of course”). They may upgrade not the quantity but validity, which is typical of scholarly register, as with “crucially”, “generally”, “essentially”, “basically”, “obviously”, or “apparently”.

The relationship to mainstream graders may be close or loose to various extent; looser but still included are disjuncts like “certainly”. The grading function may be weakened by neutral adverbial interpretation, as with “purely”. Some of the expressions approach graders in their editorial function (“at least”).

Relevance in an academic context, however, allows for the interpretation of a grading force even with the preceding expressions. Strongly upgrading in the scholarly register are the meanings relevant for argumentation: validity, regularity, logicity of the solution, essentiality, generality, empirical evidence.

The factual grading function is decisive as against the form: the same form may and may not be considered a grader, but a time-killer, thematic mover/specifier, as with “essentially” or “basically”.

Nearly all of the uses are upgrading. They upgrade both along the scale and in extremes (cf. peak, pole, and scale graders, I.T.), as in: *He then hears a slightly more complex statement in English,* and: *So anti-English is a language which is very similar to English in fact all of its vocabulary all of vocabulary is exactly the same as English.* The same holds for the validity-claiming graders, as in: *Certainly, you’ll have to be able to identify the beginning of the sentence,* and: *There are possibly some other explanations, though, there’re other explanations that have been suggested but they don’t really work as well.*

Downgrading appears in special circumstances, and is always accompanied by upgrading.

“By a narrow margin” graders are ambiguous: it is an extreme quality that has been nearly achieved but, in fact, it has not been achieved, as in: *...when one looks at the way in which it is possible to describe those relations it turns out that in every case or at least nearly every case the most efficient way of describing those relations is in terms of bits of syntactic structure rather than in any other kind rather than in any other terms.* Similarly in: *As I’ve mentioned, Dyirbal is the language which is almost consistently ergative-absolutive.*

Downgrading serves as a syntactic means for contrasting (upgrading) the most salient information, as in: *Now if we were just to look out that particular pair of examples and not consider any of the other sentences of the language there are various ways in which we might describe it – the syntactic and syntagmatic interpretations may differ.* More clearly when it is the grader which is connected with negation: *But it’s something you have to learn. So you can’t just take your knowledge of the alphabet forwards and immediately say the alphabet backwards.* Or: *Example I’ve given you of structure-dependence is one which seems to characterize human cognition in general and not just ways in which human beings deal with language.*

Downgrading meanings appear when a negative or an adverse fact is upgraded: downgrading is not a process but a result, and follows from the lexical semantics of the noun determined, as in: *The second type of language that I’ve mentioned is one which has no distinct reflexive pronouns at all,* or: *I don’t want to say it’s necessary Old English does not have it it’s obviously not necessary.* Or: *It is much less likely that a transitive direct object or patient will have control over an action.* Or: *But basically we exclude these almost pathological instances,* or: *...basically very fewer work against the high-level explicature I’ve found.*

When an adverse meaning is upgraded by expressions of a “small amount”, adversity, in fact, is downgraded by preparing the reader/hearer, even if it is also stressed, as in: *I’m a little bit worrying/worried to say(ing) that at a university so strong in philosophy so I’m not too sure what I’m committing myself to if I talk about the structure of the mind so let me just say if you like in terms of human cognition.* Or: *Okay so I think for these reasons the number of people who have been prepared to entertain explanations of both kinds has been rather small.*

Validity of a statement may be strengthened by downgrading to real estimate, as in: *Okay while you hear one of the aims of one of at least short-term aims of generative grammar is...*, or: *And I want to argue through I don't (...) very convincingly I don't know at least three of those four categories are very clearly exemplified.*

Emotion is present wherever there is a tension. Tension may consist in a close proximity between two points as in: *in every case or at least nearly every case, or a slightly more complex statement.* Tension results from contrasted meanings: *Now if we were just to look at that particular pair of examples and not consider any of the other sentences of the language there are various ways in which we might describe it, or gradation, as in ...or you have to identify words which are presumably in some sense morphological units you can argue even phonological units certainly not syntactic units.*

Emotional is irony, as in *And he is somewhat surprised by the puzzled looks he gets from native speakers of English who are at great difficulty interpreting this sentence.*

The validity-claiming graders (and all those relevant for academic argumentation) make a contrast among described facts, and are also emotional, as in *But this requires crucially that you identify pieces of syntactic structure.* Emotionality may vary depending on intonation, or position: stronger contrast is carried by an antecedent disjunct, as in *Now if anti-English is from a formal viewpoint so much simpler than real English why is it that real English why is it that real English rather than anti-English indeed why is it that all human languages are real languages rather than anti-languages?*

Interpretation of the emotion behind grader does not depend on grader only, but on the whole grading structure, as in "very similar", where the tension is related to a close distance between two points (similarity), and *Now from a formal viewpoint it's very clear what anti-English is, you can very easily write a rule which...*, where "very" intensifies meanings which are relevant in scholarly discourse.

Emotion results from redundancy of information, the more so if connected with formal repetition, as in *In fact, from a formal viewpoint anti-English is much much simpler than real English,* or gathering of graders, as in *By contrast, in the other grammatical persons, in the first and second person it's extremely rare indeed only under almost pathological conditions that you get the possibility of a shift in referents.*

Emotion may be carried by the graded word (the grader prepares the hearer rather than specifies amount or degree), as in *I'm a little bit worried/worrying (to) say(ing) that at a university so strong in philosophy* (the other grader is a compliment to the hearer, another source of emotion) (ctnd) *so I'm not too sure* (euphemism) *what I'm committing myself to if I talk about the structure of the mind.* Similarly, evaluation includes emotion, as in *The other area in which we can see this a rather trivial area is if...*

Emotion is brought by colloquial, everyday common speech graders in academic speech, as "just" (another source of emotion is emphasizing), cf.: *So if you take something as unstructured string and then try to perform some operation it's just some-*

thing which human beings unlike many automata, many computers, human beings are just very bad at that.

Colloquial character of the grader is stressed if the graded word is colloquial as well, as in *In principle there is no reason why you shouldn't just write it down as a string of figures with no spaces no punctuation or anything. If however you write your numbers down that way it's just gonna very hard to read them.* (It is not a single grader as much as its appearance in a pointed context, which adds up to emotional effects.)

The tension may consist in (at least a partial) self-denying/repair, as in *Okay while you hear one of the aims of one of at least short-term aims of generative grammar is...* The tension brings a personal perspective, which, in academic register, is marked, and may be considered a functional equivalent of emotion in casual conversation.

"Rather" also puts determined expressions into a special perspective, as in *Those are there are explanations which are rather different in type, or On the one hand there are explanations which relate rather directly to the formal properties of language.* A special perspective presupposes evaluation (and is a sort of understatement, implicitness, relevant information).

Evaluation may be objective when both measures are outside the producer, as in "relatively": *So you get a clear illustration of all three grammatical persons in one relatively short part of a text.*

The grader may be emotional by itself, as "horribly important" (the more so if misused).

Emotional effects may combine, as a slight distance between two points and a colloquial expression, and the tension may exceed the sentence border, as in: *Well in the third person it is very useful if the language has gender distinction it might be narrowed down a little bit...*

Extremes are the strongest contrasts (if not used as clichés), and highly emotional, as in *So the distinction between 'He hid himself' and 'He hid him' is extremely useful.*

An emotional effect appears if the graded meaning is not primarily gradable, as in *Now English is a very consistent language in terms of being nominative-accusative.*

Academically-relevant meanings may appear in both the grader and the graded word, and increase the final tension, as empiricity and validity, as in *Then we wonder why the person is saying this apparently absurd thing.*

Redundancy and emphasis, contrasts, etc., need not automatically mean emotion. Anything but an economic expression in the academic register, however, is marked, the more so if it is just verbal and not informational, and connected with negation, and has a function similar to emotion in casual conversation: *It is not clear to me in any case if you can do that with first person's pronouns since I presume even schizophrenics can't do it because one personality is not aware of the existence of the other personality.*

The most frequent grading structures include “very+adjective”, “just+verb”, “very+adverb”, “exactly+adjective”. Idiolectal grading structures may be looked for among “indeed+statement”, “rather+adjective”, “simply+verb”, “actually+verb”.

As single forms, the following graders are most frequent: “very”, “just”, “rather”, “really”, “exactly”, “simply”, “most”, “much”. “Really” is the most versatile grader and appears in six functional contexts, “very” and “just” both in five, and “exactly”, “relatively”, and “quite” in three.

Adjective is the most often graded part of speech, somewhat less but still frequent are verbs and adverbs.

Grading effects may be found with expressions that outside academic register are not typical graders. They have meanings relevant for argumentation such as ‘validity’, ‘regularity’, ‘logicity of the solution’, ‘essentiality’, ‘generality’, and ‘empirical evidence’.

Grading does not depend on form as much as contextual factors: next to argumentation-relevant meanings, grading may be reinforced syntactically, lexically, intonationally, and informationally.

Grading generally means upgrading. Downgrading is always accompanied by upgrading; graders may be ambiguous, downgrading serves as a syntactic means for contrasting (upgrading) the salient information, downgrading results from upgrading of either negation or an adverse fact, and validity of a statement may be upgraded by downgrading to real estimate.

In academic speech, graders cause other than informational effects by bringing in tension of various kind (close proximity between two points, contrasts, argumentation-relevant meanings, emphasis, redundancy), personal perspective and evaluation. These effects may be multiplied and considered an equivalent of emotion in conversation.

Graders may cause direct emotional effects, as with irony, intonation, compliments, euphemisms, colloquialisms, or be emotional themselves.

Emotional effects concern not only graders, but also the words graded, and follow from the mood of discourse rather than isolated words.