cases having the stress of the genitive form) the resultant Slovenian paradigm copies the stress of the nominative form (pásuljižek = pásuljajižek). This is surprising in the face of the fact that Slovenian does have mobile paradigms (žakômov = žakômov “marriage”) and that there are many cognates which would lead us to predict the final stress in the resultant Slovene (e.g. Serbo-Croatian đelinižek = đelinižek, Slovene đelinižek = đelinižek). Lexical Conservatism constrains the hypothesis space here and predicts the correct result.

Next we analyze three cases where in spite of LC a pair of allomorphs is borrowed, in order to show that LC nevertheless constrains important ways. First, we analyze Italian verbs borrowed into Maltese (Hoberman & Aronoff 2003), where e.g. suggerire “sugger-liscra a ‘to suggest’ is mapped onto a paradigm in which both suggerier and suggerierxxx are exponents of the stem. As we will show, this mapping is actually preferred by LC as it prevents adding a new allomorph with stress on the stem suggerier/suggerier.

Next we turn to the Dutch alternation between long and short vowels in open/closed syllable contexts, which affects a closed class of native nouns and has surprisingly been extended to certain Latinate items e.g. /moli/ ~ /moli/ “mole(s)”, but not all e.g. /xram/ ~ /xraman/ “gram(s)”. LC correctly predicts that allomorphy in singular-plural pairs depends on licensing by related words, e.g. /molariteit/ “molarity”.

A third case of borrowed alternation comes from Serbo-Croatian, where some Spanish nouns in –os have plural allomorphs in –os e.g. flamingo ~ flamingos: i. Vowel-final singular allomorphs would cause ineffability with native plural morphology and hence adding plural allomorphs is the least costly solution.

As a result of the three analyses, a loanword integration model emerges in which the inherent entanglement of phonology, morphology and lexicon in borrowing is taken seriously and formalised.
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Modal verbs of necessity across languages and disciplines.

Sinkuniene, Jolanta and Van Olmen, Daniel
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Recent years have witnessed an upsurge of interest in various aspects of academic discourse especially from cross-linguistic and cross-disciplinary perspectives (Fløttum, Dahl & Kinn 2006, Hyland & Bondi 2006, Fløttum 2008, Suomela-Salini & Dervín 2009, among others). Current research addresses ways and means scientific authors of different cultural background construe stance while “language variation across disciplines is now one of the more fruitful lines of research” (Hyland 2011: 178). While a variety of lexico-grammatical means used by scientific authors to construct stance are extensively investigated in academic discourse, little research is done on the distribution and usage patterns of necessity modal verbs across languages and disciplines.

In this paper we attempt to contribute to the growing cross-linguistic and cross-disciplinary research on academic discourse as well as to address the issue of epistemic modality and evidentiality from a cross-linguistic perspective. We conduct a contrastive study of the modal verbs of necessity in the CorAlIt (corpus of academic texts in Lithuanian, see Usoniene et al. 2011), a comparable corpus of English (based on Davies 2008) and a comparable corpus of Dutch (our own compilation). The markers under investigation are must, moeten and tûreti ‘have to’. The study employs contrastive corpus based methodology as well as qualitative and quantitative analysis.

In the first part, we compare the frequency and the usage patterns of these verbs to check whether there is any disciplinary and language specific variation in their usage. We also concentrate on the issue of writer-reader interaction and analyze if the modal verbs under investigation are more typical in their root meaning and therefore enable the author to construct a dialogically constructive (White 2003) position, or whether they are more frequently used as epistemic and/or evidential markers and open up a dialogically expansive (White 2003) position of the author. In the second part, we focus on what one could call the non-root meanings of these modal verbs, i.e. on their epistemic and/or evidential uses. Academic discourse provides the perfect empirical basis to weigh in on the debate about “evaluative” must versus “purely evidential” moeten (see De Haan 2001 but compare Cornillie 2009) and on the epistemic and/or evidential status of tûreti ‘to have’ (see Holvoet 2009). The paper describes and explains the ways in
which Lithuanian, English and Dutch are alike and/or differ in general and, more specifically, in academic texts – bearing in mind linguistic and stylistic dissimilarities between the languages.
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**Racism under the radar: representations of Roma in the Czech press.**
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This paper derives from an interdisciplinary study of representation of the Roma minority in Czech press reporting. This study is especially timely, as there has been an upsurge in ethnic tension in recent months, particularly in the north of the Czech Republic, and the issue has been at the forefront of domestic news stories. The legislative norms that underlie civil society in modern democracies such as EU states mitigate against the deployment of media language that is obviously discriminatory or racist; however, studies in the UK and elsewhere (e.g. van Dijk, 2000; Teo, 2000; Gabriellatos and Baker, 2008) have shown that media often bypass these norms, paying lip service to cultural tolerance while using “under-the-radar” linguistic codes that undermine it.

The paper presents a critical analysis of rhetorical representations in news reports, highlighting devices in mainstream media language that substitute defamatory hate speech with seemingly more neutral linguistic forms. Specifically, I explore the framing devices used by Czech journalists that obfuscate meanings which are otherwise potentially unethical and/or exclusionary, thereby circumventing accusations of intolerance.

Particular attention is paid to the role of dysphemism. Dysphemism denotes derogatory and usually proscribed naming strategies, but, the paper argues, encompasses common “acceptable” (i.e. legally or ethically permissible) stereotypes, and might also extend beyond pure lexis to other framing devices such as exclusionary pronoun use, or stylistic phenomena such as negative conceptual metaphors. The depth of embedment renders hate speech less conspicuous in news editorial and narrative styles. Furthermore, language can function simultaneously as euphemism and dysphemism, and can facilitate the encoding of hate speech.

Using the combined tools of critical discourse analysis (CDA) and corpus linguistics (using the media language section of the Czech National Corpus as well as a DfR corpus) and drawing on the combined CDA/corpus methodology proposed by Gabriellatos and Baker (2008), a profile of journalistic style with respect to current representations of minorities in the Czech Republic is beginning to emerge. As this study develops over time, the growing amount of data will reveal clearer patterns of discursive change in a society whose domestic media are still relatively under-monitored in the non-Czech speaking world.