

Language Works 6(1)

Welcome to this issue of Language Works and a happy summer to all from the editors. While we write this, the sun is out, the European Football Championship is being played, and it is beginning to feel like there may actually be a life after the Corona pandemic.

Even though the last year has been most concerned with social gathering limitations, Zoom education, and a very slow return to normal, and even though it has at times felt like the entire world has been put on pause, we are proud to say that Language Works is still going strong. And here we can present articles from authors who certainly have not been put on pause.

Welcome. And happy reading!

The articles in this issue

In this issue, we can present three articles:

Christophe Zerakitsky Vies explores how the phone [s] is articulated in different phonological domains, i.e. when [s] is positioned initially, medially and finally in the stress group, the prosodic phrase, and/or the utterance, respectively. The phonological position of [s] is correlated with acoustic features like [s]' duration and spectral composition which is seen as a consequence of a more energetic articulation of [s]. Vies finds a correlation between position and articulation, but not the cumulative effect which may have been expected.

Gustav Styrbjørn Johannessen presents a new theory of antonymy, i.e. 'words that mean the opposite of each other'. This theory is based on fundamental, 'natural', conceptual metaphors associated with the human condition, e.g. metaphors like UP/DOWN. Apart from presenting former theories of antonymy and his own theory, Johannessen also proposes methods for empirical testing of the theory as well as discussing weaknesses in the theory.

Sofie Meyer and Anna Olsen present an analysis of the features that constitute the speech act 'threat'. What is required for an utterance to be perceived as a 'well-formed' threat (and for the author to be potentially punished for their utterance)? The analysis draws on a theoretical background in inter alia speech act theory and politeness theory, and to illustrate the model, data from two authentic cases regarding stalking, are analysed. Utterances from the two cases are analysed grammatically and pragmatically to uncover their potential as threats, and especially the distinction between direct and indirect threats (i.e. threats which require background knowledge about the context to be interpreted as threats) is discussed.

Your article in the next issue?

Do you have a good idea or a project that could interest others? As a student, you may have an essay that could be turned into an article. As a teacher, you may have supervised or assessed an essay that you think could become a good article. Or perhaps you have participated in a conference, workshop, seminar, or course that could be the basis for a thematic section/special issue of Language Works?

We are looking for articles of quality, but what you submit does not have to be perfect. We promise that we as editors will help you improve your article if you send it to us. All articles will get a review from an expert with suggestions for changes and improvements. So, it takes work to publish, but this is also a good way of improving your communication competences. We prefer that you write your article in English or Danish/Norwegian/Swedish, but should you wish to write in another language, talk to us about it.

Contact us if you have a draft, or just an idea, for an article. Contact info and information on the contents and format of articles as well as deadlines can be found on this page.