"*Know Your Coffee!*" The Cultural Semantics of a Lexico-Syntactic Molecule of English

Gian Marco Farese[1]

[1] Department of Languages, Literatures, Cultures and Mediations, University of Milan, Sesto San Giovanni, Milan, Italy

Correspondence: Gian Marco Farese, Department of Languages, Literatures, Cultures and Mediations, University of Milan, 1 Piazza Indro Montanelli, 20099 Sesto San Giovanni, Milan, Italy. E-mail: gianmarco.farese@unimi.it

Abstract

This paper presents a cultural semantic analysis of the English syntactic construction '*know your* + noun' made combining the analytical principles and methods of ethnosyntax (Wierzbicka, 1988, 2003, 2006a) with those of corpus-based discourse analysis (Baker, 2006; Partington et al., 2004). Three main points are made in the paper: (i) '*know your* n.' constitutes an indissoluble lexico-syntactic molecule of English expressing its own specific meaning; (ii) this construction is both genre-specific and subject to intralinguistic variation; (iii) this construction is quintessentially Anglo, because it reflects Anglo cultural assumptions about personal autonomy informing certain speech practices in English discourse (Goddard & Wierzbicka, 2004; Wierzbicka, 2006b) and defies easy translation in other languages. The analysis is based on the findings of a corpus search in GLOWBE across varieties of English complemented by additional data from the web. The results provide a clear picture of the meaning of '*know your* n.' and of where it situates within the broad range of *know*-constructions. Ultimately, the paper emphasises the contribution that corpus-based, empirical discourse analysis can make to the semantics and ethnography of syntax as well as to the study of the interface between syntax, semantics and culture.

Keywords: compositionality, corpus-based syntactic analysis, cultural semantics, ethnosyntax, know, world Englishes

1. Introduction

Over the last four decades, the study of the interface between syntax and semantics has become increasingly widespread in linguistics research (Wierzbicka, 1985, 1988; Bouchard, 1995; Chierchia, 1999; Chierchia & McConnell-Ginet, 2000; Van Valin, 2005; Hackl, 2013; Fleischhauer, Latrouite, & Osswald, 2016). Instead of examining syntactic constructions from a purely formal point of view, linguists have focused their attention on the meanings of syntax. They have examined the relation between certain (morpho)syntactic forms and the expression of specific meanings, the extent to which the overall meaning of a syntactic construction corresponds to the sum of the individual meanings of its lexical constituents (a principle known as 'compositionality'; Levin & Pinker, 1992) and have identified distinctions in meaning and pragmatic function between different syntactic constructions. As pointed out by Wierzbicka (1988, p. 3), "every grammatical construction encodes a certain meaning, which can be revealed and rigorously stated, so that the meanings of different constructions can be compared in a precise and illuminating fashion, both within one language and across language boundaries".

However, a semantic analysis of a syntactic construction is not valid for its own sake only. It can open the doors to other areas of linguistic inquiry that are perhaps less evident and apparently unrelated to meaning. One component of the meaning of a syntactic construction that is not always immediately visible at prima facie investigation is the cultural one. Just like the lexicon, syntactic constructions, too, encompass culture-specific norms, values and assumptions in their meanings. By analysing the meaning of a syntactic construction, it is possible to identify the set of culture-specific values and assumptions that encourage the expression of that meaning in discourse, particularly in the performance of certain speech practices that are culturally salient in a particular language. Notable examples of the connection between semantics, syntax, speech practices and culture include the English *to-* passive construction of reporting verbs (e.g., *Mary is believed to be dishonest*) and its relation to Anglo epistemic caution and precision (Wierzbicka, 1988, 2003, 2006a), the use of whimperatives

like *could you* and *would you* in the formulation of requests in English and their relation to Anglo personal autonomy (Wierzbicka, 2006b), the Japanese epistemic markers *kana*, *darou(ka)* and *(n)janai ka* (roughly, 'I wonder', 'maybe') and their relation to Japanese indecisiveness in discourse (Asano-Cavanagh, 2016), and the Italian absolute superlative of adjectives (e.g., *bellissimo*, roughly 'very beautiful') and nouns (e.g., *offertissima*, roughly, 'very special/big discount') and its relation to the culturally salient practices of exaggeration and unrestrained expression of feelings in Italian (Farese, 2019, 2020).

I am persuaded that one construction that lends itself well to a multilevel analysis that combines semantics, syntax, discourse and ethnography of speaking is the English '*know your* + noun' used in phrases of the kind *know your rights/limits/coffee/customers/market* etc. Despite being used consistently in English discourse and being widely attested in English language corpora, this construction has never been recognised as a separate valency option of the verb *know* in English grammars (Aarts, 2011; Quirk et al., 1985; Huddleston & Pullam, 2002), nor has it ever been investigated from the semantic point of view in previous studies of *know* (next section). Presumably, this gap in the research is due to the assumption that '*know your* n.' is both syntactically and semantically as basic and simple as '*know something*' or '*know someone/a place*'. This is possibly the reason why the contexts of use of '*know your* n.' have not yet been examined in detail, and neither have they been clearly distinguished from those of other *know*-constructions. Without an accurate discourse analysis, it is impossible to pinpoint the meaning of '*know your* n.' and verify whether or not contexts of use of this syntactic construction are similar to those of other *know*-constructions. In light of this gap, there is room for four empirical questions which this paper seeks to answer satisfactorily: (i) what is the meaning of '*know your* n.' and is it compositional? (ii) is '*know your* n.' in any way different semantically from almost identical constructions formed with different verbs? (e.g., '*make/create your* n.'); (iii) are there any peculiarities or distinctive features of the use of '*know your* n.' in English discourse? (iv) are there any Anglo cultural values and assumptions embedded in the meaning of such a small construction?

In addition to elucidating the meaning of '*know your* n.' and trying to answer these research questions, the present analysis has four other objectives. First, to encourage a semantic approach to the analysis of syntax that is broad in perspective and scope, and embraces pragmatics and culture, too. Second, to question the suitability and appropriateness for linguistic description of certain traditional grammatical labels like "imperative", "exhortative" and "possessive", which would be almost automatically applied to the lexical constituents forming the construction under analysis. As I shall discuss, in the case of the constituents of '*know your* n.' these labels are semantically unclear and inaccurate. Third, to demonstrate the suitability of a specific methodology, corpus-based discourse analysis, for semantic and cultural analyses of syntax. Forth, to demonstrate that '*know your* n.' is quintessentially Anglo, in the sense that its meaning is inextricably linked to the Anglo cultural value of personal autonomy influencing the performance of certain speech practices in English discourse, particularly the formulation of requests, suggestions and advice (Goddard & Wierzbicka, 2004; Wierzbicka, 2006b).

The materials and methods of the present study are introduced in Section 3. This is preceded by a brief overview of what is already known about the English verb *know* in Section 2. A discourse analysis of '*know your* n.' is presented in Section 4. This is followed by a syntactic and semantic analysis in Section 5. The paper concludes with a summary of the results of the analysis and with a discussion of the contribution that corpus-based, empirical discourse analysis can make to the semantics and ethnography of syntax as well as to the study of the interface between syntax, semantics and culture.

2. What We Know About *Know*

The English verb *know* and its equivalents in other languages have attracted the attention of various scholars over the years, including cognitivists (Shetreet et al., 2019), epistemologists (Stich, Mizumoto, & McCready, 2018; Mizumoto, Ganeri, & Goddard, 2020) and obviously linguists (Goddard, 2002, 2015; Capone, 2011; Wierzbicka, 2018; Farese, 2018; Abenina-Adar, 2019). In this paper, I do not intend to discuss the epistemological question of 'propositional knowledge attribution', i.e., whether one can legitimately claim that *Mary knows that Rome is the capital of Italy* by attributing such knowledge to Mary. The focus here is strictly semantic and syntactic.

In the Natural Semantic Metalanguage framework (Wierzbicka, 1996; Goddard & Wierzbicka, 2014; Goddard, 2018), *know* is listed among the sixty-five semantic primes. It is believed that this word lexicalises a semantically basic, indefinable and widely cross-translatable concept, the claim being that not only is it impossible to reduce *know* to a simpler concept, but also to provide a non-circular definition of its meaning (e.g., 'to know is to have knowledge of something'). *Know* also appears in studies where the interface between semantics and pragmatics has been investigated (most notably, Dudley, Rowe, Hacquard, & Lidz, 2017). In

particular, it is typically labelled as a 'factive' verb and as a presupposition trigger. The 'factivity' of *know* is based on two presuppositions: (i) the content of the complement of *know* is always true; (ii) the complement of *know* represents common knowledge or knowledge that is potentially accessible to many. The position taken in this paper is that in order to pinpoint the meaning of a word clearly and precisely, it is necessary to examine the different linguistic environments in which it can appear. In the case of *know*, it is necessary to analyse its meaning in the different syntactic constructions in which it is used in English discourse. Only in this way is it possible to analyse '*know your* n.' vis-à-vis other *know*-constructions and identify possible semantic distinctions.

The recognised constructions and valency options of the English verb *know* include the following. Each of these is associated with a distinct meaning:

- *I (don't) know (it)* – dialogical uses of *know*

- *know that* – knowledge fully or partially expressed in words, knowledge attribution

- *know something (about something)* – knowledge not expressed in words

- *know someone/a place* – experiential knowing, non-verbalizable knowledge

- *know + wh-word* (*where/when/why*) – knowledge that could be expressed in words

- *know if/whether* – yes/no questions, choices between alternatives

- *know how* – ability deriving from knowing (*I know how$_1$ to do it*); ability to report facts (*I know how$_2$ it happened*)

- *wanting to know* – asking questions, requests for information

Of these, the dialogical uses *I (don't) know (it)* and the construction indicating 'knowledge not expressed in words' (*someone knows something about something*) have been identified as the simplest and semantically basic. All other constructions are believed to be semantically more complex and explicable via these two (Wierzbicka, 2018). At this point, one could legitimately ask why '*know your* n.' is not on the list. One possible reason could be, as previously mentioned, the assumption that this construction is an application or extension of '*know something*' or '*know someone*'. If this assumption is taken into account, the question of differentiating '*know your* n.' from other *know*-constructions does not even arise. A second plausible reason could be the lower level of cross-translatability of '*know your* n.' compared to all other *know*-constructions. There is no equivalent construction in Italian, for example. Despite being identical in both use and meaning to the English *know*, the Italian verb *sapere* is not used in the same construction in Italian. The other Italian *know*-verb *conoscere*, used to express experiential knowledge like '*know someone/a place*', could be used to translate the English '*know your* n.' in certain cases only. For example, *conosci i tuoi diritti* ('know your rights') or *conosci i tuoi limiti* ('know your limits') would be fine, but **conosci il tuo caffè* ('your coffee') or *conosci il tuo CV* ('your CV') sound definitely unidiomatic in Italian.

As I see it, rather than why, a more valuable question for argumentative purposes is whether or not there should be a place for '*know your* n.' in the above list of *know*-constructions. To exclude it from the list would be tantamount to claiming that, for example, *know your rights* is not different semantically from *you (don't) know it* or *you know John*. On the contrary, to include it would imply that a separate meaning is ascribed to *know your rights*. The latter position is taken here; the present analysis is aimed precisely at demonstrating that '*know your* n.' expresses a specific meaning which is neatly distinct from the meanings of all other *know*-constructions. As the paper will show, the distinctiveness of the meaning of this construction is directly proportional to its high level of specificity in discourse, which is why it is necessary to start from the analysis of the contexts of use of this construction. Any preconception about the meaning of '*know your* n.' based on what is already known about other *know*-constructions would inevitably conflict with evidence from language use. For this reason, it is preferable to abandon any preconception and take an inductive approach, starting from the linguistic data and then formulating plausible hypotheses about the semantics of '*know your* n.' based on its use in discourse.

3. Methodology and Data

The present analysis is based on the empirical findings of a corpus search across varieties of English in GLOWBE (the corpus of Global Web-Based English) (Note 1). This corpus contains about 1.9 billion words of web texts collected from twenty different Anglophone countries. The data include both written and transcribed spoken texts divided in two separate genres (general and blog). The choice to use a corpus to examine the semantics of a syntactic construction was deliberate. A corpus-based discourse analysis permits the identification of semantically relevant elements, including negative material (impossible or ungrammatical collocations indicating a semantic clash) and a clear and precise delimitation of the range of possible collocates that can fit

into a construction on the basis of semantic compatibility. At the same time, the selection of a corpus with linguistic data from many different varieties of the same language like GLOWBE permits the identification of other significant features of a construction that are not specifically syntactic or semantic, but related to discourse and culture. These include any observable differences in use across countries, cultures and varieties as well as any demonstrable genre-specificity. The corpus search gave a total result of 18.303 instances, with peaks of about three-thousand and five-hundred in American and British English, followed by an average of one thousand instances in Canadian, Irish and Australian English, and about five-hundred instances in New Zealand, Singapore, Nigerian and Philippines English:

HELP	ⓘ ★	WORDS	ALL	US	CA	GB	IE	AU	NZ	IN	LK	PK	BD	SG	MY	PH	HK	ZA	NG	GH	KE	TZ	JM
1	ⓘ ★	KNOW YOUR	18303	3679	1424	3585	1006	1607	799	1001	283	365	337	457	436	524	339	477	564	317	404	332	367

0.923 seconds

Figure 1. Total results of the corpus search in GLOWBE

The selection of the countries and varieties for the cross-cultural comparison was based on two criteria: (i) a common sufficient number of instances to be compared (at least four-hundred and fifty); (ii) physical and cultural distance. It was hypothesized that the sharpest and most interesting cultural differences in collocations would emerge from countries which, despite sharing the same language, are physically and culturally distant from one another. This hypothesis was confirmed by the body of collected data. For each variety, the first four-hundred and fifty occurrences were examined, firstly to see which nouns collocate consistently and more frequently across varieties and secondly, to see which nouns are more frequent in or unique to certain varieties. The nouns were divided into separate conceptual categories. The higher frequency of particular conceptual categories in specific varieties would indicate a higher degree of cultural salience for these categories in certain countries, and therefore would reveal intracultural variation.

Compared to the entire body of data available in the corpus, the total number of results of the search is rather insignificant. This element alone indicates that '*know your* n.' is infrequent and highly context-specific in English discourse (more in Section 4). In addition to that, the specificity of this syntactic construction is also reflected in the restricted range of nouns that can collocate with *your*. Fifteen examples in extended context were selected from the body of collected data to make a discourse analysis. Five other examples are presented in Appendix A. In this way, it was possible to examine the surrounding context of '*know your* n.' precisely and explain the suitability of its meaning for specific text types in English.

The selected group of fifteen was complemented by additional data from the web, specifically two online articles and one e-mail representing the American and the Australian varieties. In the end, the combination between the analytical principles and methods of corpus-based discourse analysis (Baker, 2006; Partington et al., 2004) and those of ethnosyntax and cultural semantics (Wierzbicka, 1988, 2003, 2006a) has provided a comprehensive picture of '*know your* n.', elucidating its meaning and clarifying its context of use, its communicative function in discourse and its cultural underpinnings.

4. Corpus Findings and Discourse Analysis

The most significant discursive feature emerging from the corpus data is the genre-specificity of '*know your* n.' deriving primarily from the fact that this construction is not attested in English spoken discourse. This suggests that its meaning is felt to be suitable for written discourse only. Furthermore, the collected examples indicate that, in English discourse, this construction is used exclusively in informative texts, typically magazines, guidebooks, online articles, e-mails, noticeboards and signs. The author's main communicative purpose in these texts is to inform the reader about possible opportunities, outcomes, solutions and situations of which the recipient might be unaware or might not have contemplated, to explain certain differences to the reader or to offer advice, suggestions and guidelines to the reader about their actions, choices and personal relationships. The author of the text does this by setting examples and ad hoc cases, so that the reader can know what they can do, how to do certain things well or better, and what is preferable or advisable not to do.

The texts in which '*know your* n.' appears are not simply informative; they are also persuasive. The author emphasises the importance for the reader of knowing certain things or people not simply for the sake of wisdom or better knowledge, but for the reader's own sake. The author succeeds in being convincing by highlighting the advantages and benefits that the reader would obtain from knowing. In particular, there is a strong emphasis on the conceptual relation between knowing and doing (a know-how approach). The assumption is that the knowledge to be acquired will improve the reader's actions considerably in different ways ('if I can know well, I

can do well'); for example, the reader will know how to work better, how to make better choices and better performances, how to build better relationships, how to develop an advanced and more in-depth self-consciousness and how to avoid making mistakes. Examples (1) to (10) from GLOWBE, representing different varieties of English, illustrate the contexts of use of '*know your* n.':

(1) Please be proactive with your health and know your HIV status today (GLOWBE, Nigeria, general).

(2) Know your tween! As a youngster approaches their teen years, you will undoubtedly see a considerable modification in their habits as well as perspective (GLOWBE, South Africa, blog).

(3) Don't find a nice location and then try to figure out how to make it look good on camera. Know your camera, know your gear, know your limitations, think up a scene that would look good with those resources and then try to find locations, people, costumes and so forth that match (GLOWBE, New Zealand, general).

(4) Know your customers. Yes, the start-up of a new business is a hectic time. But the fact that your business is small scaled has its advantages (GLOWBE, Kenya, general).

(5) In a relationship, the first person you must take care of is you. Know your boundaries so that you can recognize when someone crosses them and let him know when something is not acceptable to you (GLOWBE, Australia, general).

(6) Know your audience. The content you create, who will it be aimed at? This piece fits perfectly within the Daily Mail's own brand and objectives (GLOWBE, Great Britain, general).

(7) In this instance, Nestle knew that Greenpeace would continue to attack and probe and poke, and still, nothing was done by Nestle to prepare for the group's unavoidable attack on its Social Media properties. This kind of thing is nothing new. Someone at Nestle fell asleep at the wheel. Tip: Know your enemies. Anticipate their tactics. Be ready (GLOWBE, Unites States, blog).

(8) Know your rights. Employers have to follow proper procedures—if not, you can sue for unfair dismissal and could be awarded up to 90 days' pay in compensation (GLOWBE, Great Britain, general).

(9) Know your market. Particularly when writing textbooks, it's important to know "who the competitors are, and how you would best them," says Karen Hopkin, a freelance science writer who has been working for 12 years with Bruce Alberts, Martin Raff, and other biology big wigs on the widely used graduate textbook Molecular Biology of the Cell and its undergraduate version, Essential Cell Biology. This might include adding interactive features, such as quizzes at the end of each chapter, notes Hopkin, a regular contributor to The Scientist. "Is that your life passion? No, but if it's useful for the users of the book, then you give it to them, and that makes your book more marketable." (GLOWBE, US, general).

(10) Know your own limits. If you are tired or unable to ride relatively comfortably on the front, go to the back. Over extending yourself can lead to being dropped and the group having to wait and look after you (GLOWBE, Ireland, general).

The rhetorical metadiscourse typical of persuasive texts—from stance and engagement tools to emotional language (Hyland, 2005, 2018)—recurs consistently in the collected examples, which abound with enhancing and emotional adjectives like *huge*, *crucial*, *important*, *best*, *new*, *better*, *productive*, *beneficial*, *irritating*, nouns like *tips*, *solutions*, *skills*, *experience*, and verbs like *help*, *tailor*, *gain*, *optimize*, *boost*, *enrich* (indicated in italics in examples 11 to 15). These serve to highlight the different ways in which the knowledge to be acquired can be beneficial to the reader.

In addition, these texts present two other recurring characteristics. First, the invitation to know is complemented by an explanation of the reason why this is important or beneficial to the reader. Second, the author of the text strategically mentions the experience of others, past experiences or cases, the prototypical way of operating in a particular sector, or even shared knowledge, values, beliefs and assumptions, and possible future outcomes so that the reader knows what others do or what to expect and will not make mistakes. The sequence of rhetorical moves performed by the author is not fixed, but flexible. The '*know your* n.' move might precede or follow other moves depending on how the author constructs the message:

(11) Know your beans. Most Melbourne beans come from high-quality Arabica or high-yielding Robusta. Most Australians have milk coffee, so they *need* a stronger Robusta bean for flavour and the fresher the coffee, the better the taste and aroma (GLOWBE, Australia, general).

(12) Know Your Deadlines. Shipping is a *huge* part of commerce these days, as more and more consumers are willing—and happy—to use tools like smartphones, tablets, and laptops to do their shopping on the Internet from the *comfort* of your own home. Hopefully your business is *optimized* to meet this relatively new

demand, and if it is you want to make sure you know what your shipping deadlines are so that you can get people the things they need as soon as possible (GLOWBE, Great Britain, general).

(13) Know Your Audience. No matter if you're a personal or business blogger, it's *important* to know who your readers are. By recognizing who they are it can *help* you write *better* content and also spur ideas for *new* content from their feedback, comments, and input. Know Your Keywords. If you don't want to go for full-on SEO, do this one thing: know the keywords that relate to your post. You can *easily* look up keywords on Google or other search sites and incorporate them into your headline, leading copy or tags. It's the *minimum* you can do to *help* naturally *boost* people finding your blog (GLOWBE, Canada, general).

(14) In this article we'll take a look at seven *keys* or *tips* that will hopefully help to make your own efforts with side projects more *beneficial*. 1. Know Your Purpose. There are any number of different reasons why you could start a side project. Maybe you are just looking for a project that will *allow you* to do the things you *enjoy*, but with *more creative freedom* than your full-time work. Or it could be that you want to learn some *new* skill and you're using the side project to *gain experience*. For many designers the motivation is at least partially motivated by the opportunity for income. You could be looking for a little extra money on top of your full-time income, or it could be that you're a freelancer and you're trying to make *more productive* use of your time between client projects. It's *important* to know your purpose and your motivation because it *should* dictate how you go about managing the side project (GLOWBE, Singapore, general).

(15) Know Your CV. You *should* know your CV inside out and back-to-front before meeting with a company. You want to prove to the interviewer that you have the *skills* and *experience* required to carry out the role to a *high* standard. Being ready and able to answer questions on work you've done and projects you've carried out will give the interviewer a *better* idea of what you can bring to the company but, will also show that you are *confident* and take *pride* in your work (GLOWBE, Ireland, general).

Such a diverse set of complementary information provided by the author of the text makes '*know your* n.' compatible with different verb tenses: the present tense is used to refer to shared knowledge and beliefs, to mention the general state of things and to provide explanations; the past tense is used to mention previous cases and experiences; lexical tools expressing the future time are used to describe possible outcomes. The presence of *if*-clauses, too, is observable in the examples; these, however, are never used to describe a possible negative outcome that might occur if the reader does not follow the author's recommendation (something like 'if you don't know this, something bad will happen to you'; more in Section 5). There is also a constant presence of action verbs in the examples (*anticipate*, *be proactive/ready*, *try*, *create*, *give*, *go*) and of verbs of cognition (especially *think*), but no near-synonyms of *know* are attested (e.g., *remember*, *learn*, *study*). The use of modals and semi-modals like *should* and *need* emphasize the importance of knowing and the advice/recommendation-giving purpose of the author. Noticeably, the emphasis in the examples is consistently on the second person singular, never on the first person; *you* and *your* are the undisputed protagonists of these texts (*you want to know*, *you should know*, *you give it to them*, *you want to prove*; more in Section 5).

The examples illustrate that the nominal constituent in this construction can vary; however, not any noun can fit into it. Syntactic combinability is determined by semantic compatibility; in this case, semantically compatible nouns must indicate something related to the reader's personal sphere which can be good for this person to know. It is this factor that restricts the range of possible collocates of *your* in this construction. Collocations of nouns that are not in line with this semantic factor were not attested in GLOWBE (e.g., **know your books/shoes/clothes/school bag/house/credit card*). Table 1 presents a list of the most frequent nominal collocates attested across varieties of English in GLOWBE; the list is based on a descending scale of frequency and on a division into separate conceptual categories:

Table 1. The most frequent nouns in '*know your* n.' across varieties of English in GLOWBE, divided in conceptual categories.

1 (30%)	economy and finance	e.g., *customers, market, audience, stakeholders*
2 (25%)	affiliated people	e.g., *audience, followers, readers, enemies, friends, tween, children*
3 (20%)	legal issues	e.g., *rights*
4 (15%)	personality and behaviour/mindfulness	e.g., *limits, weaknesses, strengths, boundaries, LGBTQ + flag*
5 (4%)	personal health	e.g., *HIV status, fertile times, cycle*
6 (3%)	life environment	e.g., *neighbourhood, city, nation, country*
7 (2%)	personal tastes and preferences	e.g., *beans, coffee, meme*
8 (1%)	possessions	e.g., *camera, (new) iPad, surfboard, mobile*

The conceptual categories with the highest frequencies in use are also the culturally salient ones, those to which the greatest importance for an individual's personal life is attached in different Anglophone countries. Noticeably, 'possessions' represent the least frequent conceptual category, a point to which I shall return in the next Section. The search across varieties of English in GLOWBE has confirmed the central role of culture in both syntax and speech practices. The corpus data indicate that there is considerable variation in the type of nouns that can fit into '*know your* n.' in different varieties. More specifically, certain nouns enjoy a higher degree of frequency and thus of cultural salience in specific varieties in comparison with others. For example, in British and American English, nouns belonging to the conceptual categories of 'economy and finance' and 'affiliated people' occur much more frequently than those belonging to the category of 'personal tastes'. In Australian English, nouns belonging to the conceptual categories of 'personality' and 'possessions' occur much more frequently than in any other variety; the same applies to nouns belonging to the category of 'personal health' in Irish English. Moreover, certain collocations recur only in specific varieties, most notably *HIV status* in Nigerian English and *CV* in Irish English. Once again, the higher frequency or uniqueness of certain conceptual categories or nouns in specific varieties reflects a higher degree of salience in the public opinion and debate of specific countries. The main intracultural differences are summarized in Table 2, which includes both "inner circle" and "outer circle" countries (Kachru, 1985).

Table 2. Intracultural variation of '*know your* n.' in GLOWBE

Great Britain	Customers (6), rights (4), limits (3), interest rates, market, audience, business plan, industry, target client, assets, enemy, allies, competitors
United States	rights (10), limits/boundaries (4), enemy (4), audience (4), policy's deductable, fear, risks
Australia	strengths and weaknesses (4), rights (4), limits (3), sexual rights (2), tape recorder, surfboards, stuff, keywords, mood, feelings, family history
Ireland	limits (7), rights (7), CV (3), craft (2), lung function, cycle, medical history
Nigeria	HIV status (6), needs, values, professional skills, customer (5), limits (2)
Singapore	purpose (4), audience (5), industry, limitations (4), options (4), market (3)

Note. The numbers in brackets indicate the number of single instances.

Although this nominal variation does not affect the global meaning of '*know your* n.', it reflects a substantial degree of intracultural variation that needs to be considered in order to obtain a comprehensive picture of this syntactic construction. Examples (16) to (18), taken from different online sources, are consistent with the corpus data with respect to both discursive characteristics and genre-specificity. Example (16) is an-email circulated among numerous recipients, whereas (17) and (18) are two online articles:

(16) From: xxx, NTEU

Sent: Saturday, February 5, 2022 6:18:04 AM

Omicron: know your rights and how to return safely to work

Omicron continues to pose health and safety *risks* to workers across the country. NTEU has attended an emergency meeting of Australian union leaders to discuss the *best* way forward to *protect* workers. xxx (NTEU National Assistant Secretary) will share the outcomes of that meeting with you and also outline NTEU's position on how employers can *ensure the health and safety* of university workers is the *fundamental* driver of decision-making by our universities. xxx (NTEU Director, Campaigns and Organising) will also explain NTEU's plans for organising to secure *adequate protections* for all staff and students.

(17) Lost luggage? Know your rights

When luggage disappears, passengers are often pulled into a baffling world of forms, phone lines with pre-recorded messages and endless waits. But you have more *rights* than you might realise when your bags disappear and there are long-term *solutions* to this *irritating* aspect of air travel. [...] You have *rights* when a bag goes missing, which is something few passengers seem to understand. (http://www.straitstimes.com/lifestyle/travel/lost-luggage-know-your-rights, last accessed March 2022)

(18) Know your nation—Capturing and curating history for social good.

We all agree that the older generations are a *fundamentally important* part of our community. But if we take the time to really get to know them, both our and their lives will be *enriched*. We bring stories to the community; through *facilitated* conversations and storytelling, we *create intimate settings—safe* spaces—for people to share their *stories* and *experiences deeply* and *naturally*. We use parts of the stories we capture to *promote* and

celebrate the history of people in the community. We hope to *inspire* interaction across generations and *preserve* cultural heritage for the future. You will obtain a copy of the full audio and a professional photograph, taken during the session, for you and your family to *treasure*. We provide a copy of all audio we capture to the State Library of WA to ensure that we *preserve* local heritage. We build workshops and programmes that provide tools to capture personal stories, and *acknowledge and celebrate their value*. (http://www.knowyournation.com.au/, last accessed March 2022)

The consistency of the observable discursive features of '*know your* n.' across a variety of examples generates a systematic pattern of use that enables the analyst to put forward plausible hypotheses about its meaning. These are presented in the next section.

Figure 2. A '*know your coffee*' sign on sale on Amazon.com

5. Syntactic and Semantic Analysis

There is a neat discrepancy between the syntactic simplicity of '*know your* n.', made up of only three lexical constituents, and its meaning, which is demonstrably complex and loaded with hidden cultural content. As with '*know something*' and '*know someone/a place*', its closest formal and syntactic equivalents, in '*know your* n.' the verb *know* functions as predicate and is followed by a noun phrase functioning as direct object and obligatory complement of the verb. The noun phrase is made up of two words, a "possessive" and a noun. The formal and syntactic resemblance between '*know your* n.' and '*know something*' (or '*know someone/a place*') is deceiving. While the latter is flexible in that various types of nouns can occupy the D.O. position, '*know your* n.' is relatively fixed and crystalised. As the examples illustrate, only the noun in the NP can vary (in the sense that different nouns, singular or plural, can occupy that position), whereas *know* and *your*, as well as the implicit subject *you*, remain unvaried.

The formal resemblance between these constructions may induce one to think that they are identical in meaning, too. In fact, however, this is not the case. The meaning of '*know your* n.' includes different and additional semantic components which are not part of the meanings of any other *know*-construction. Firstly, it reflects the fact that the form of the verb *know* is fixed and inseparably linked to the here-and-now of the exchange. '*Know your* n.' is inherently and distinctively interactional, in the sense that, unlike other *know*-, it is used exclusively in I~you interactions. It is part of a speech act in which the person who says *know* (the speaker) does not correspond to the subject of knowing (the hearer). Crucially, the speech act component ('I say to you now: …') is not part of the invariant meaning of '*know something*' or '*know someone/a place*'. Secondly, the meaning of '*know your* n'. includes the semantic contribution of *your* and thirdly, it reflects the semantics of the compatible nominal collocates. To have a clear picture of the global semantics of '*know your* n.', it will be helpful to proceed in order and examine the meanings of each lexical constituent one by one. In this way, it will be possible to clarify their semantic contribution and the question of the compositionality of this construction.

One way of examining the meaning of the verb *know* is to make a typical formal and functional analysis. Grammatically, the verb *know* in '*know your* n.' would be classified as an "imperative" or an "exhortative" form. However, neither "imperative" nor "exhortative" capture the meaning and function of *know* as used in this construction clearly and precisely. In this case, the speaker does not issue an overt directive or command to the interlocutor ('I want you to know this'). If it were a bare "imperative" like *open the door!*, '*know your* n.' would admit the use of negation (when a speaker tells the hearer not to do something) or the addition of other semantic arguments specifying when or how the interlocutor should know. However, neither option is acceptable (**know not your rights!*; **know well/exactly/now/immediately your rights!*).

Not only is the lexical and semantic expansion of '*know your* n.' blocked by the genre-specificity and by the range of semantically compatible nouns, but also by specific norms of English cultural pragmatics related to the quintessentially Anglo cultural value of personal autonomy or freedom from imposition (Goddard & Wierzbicka, 2004; Wierzbicka, 2006b), whereby speakers are strongly discouraged from telling someone what to do, including what to know:

> [in Anglo countries, many people think like this:]
>
> when someone is doing something
>
> it is good if this someone can think about it like this:
>
> "I am doing this because I want to do it, not because someone else wants me to do it"
>
> [in Anglo countries, many people think like this:]
>
> when I want someone to do something
>
> I can't say something like this to this someone:
>
> "I want you to do it, you have to do it because of this"
>
> [in Anglo countries, many people think like this:]
>
> no-one can say to someone about something:
>
> "you have to think like this about it because I want you to think like this about it"
>
> no-one can say to someone about something:
>
> "you can't think like this about it because I don't want you to think like this about it"
>
> when I want other people to know how I think about something
>
> it is good if I say something like this:
>
> "I think about it like this, I know that other people can think not like this"

(adapted from Wierzbicka, 2006, p. 36)

These cultural assumptions have implications for discourse; when formulating requests, speakers of English avoid using "bare imperatives" and issuing overt directives. On the contrary, they make sure that they sound unimposing when formulating suggestions and giving advice, and that the interlocutor can decide what to do freely and autonomously. An utterance like '*know your rights*' is perfectly in line with this cultural assumption, because it is an unimposing invitation to know something. The speaker says something that will make the hearer think—freely and autonomously—'I want to know this, not because someone else wants me to know it'. The relevance of Anglo personal autonomy is also reflected in the fact that in the examples other types of recommendation made by the author are expressed exclusively in second person (e.g., in (15), '*you want to prove*', not '*I want you to prove*'). For the same reason, the label "exhortative" is inaccurate. "Exhorting" someone to do something involves a considerable emotional commitment on the part of the speaker. However, '*know your* n.' is incompatible with any sort of emotional pressure from the speaker on the hearer (**urgently/absolutely know your limits!*; **know your audience very much!*; **I beg/beseech you, know your rights!*). It is no coincidence that other *know*-constructions do not admit the same form (**know that!; *know if/whether!; *know Jim/Liz!*). Prior to being syntactic or semantic, the reason for this inadmissibility is cultural. The acceptability of *know* in this particular form can be explained hypothesizing that, in this specific context, *know* is used to convey the message 'it is good for you if you know this'.

The distinctive advice-giving function of '*know your* n.' is based on two levels of presupposition. First, the speaker presupposes that the hearer does not already know these things. This could be seen as a potential face-threatening act from the point of view of linguistic impoliteness. Second, it is assumed that it can be good for the reader to know these things. It is this presupposition that distinguishes the meaning of '*know your* n.'

from those of almost identical constructions formed with different verbs, for example '*make/choose your (own)* n.' (e.g., *make your own pizza*). Differently from the former, in the latter there is no presupposition that the hearer cannot know or does not know how to make their own stuff, and no assumption that the hearer can or will benefit from making or choosing their own stuff.

The unimposing tone of '*know your* n.', and hence its acceptability in English discourse, also derive from the semantic contribution of *your*. This lexical constituent, too, is fixed in the construction (**know his/their rights*) because the focus is invariably on the interlocutor. Although grammatically *your* would be classified as a "possessive adjective", this is another inaccurate descriptive label in this case. The semantically compatible nouns collocating with *your* in the phrase do not indicate the hearer's possessions and properties, except in a very small number of cases, as Table 1 illustrates. This suggests that, in this construction, *your* expresses a different meaning from the idea 'this is yours', even when it is reinforced by *own* (which could point in this direction). The semantic contribution of *your* consists in the idea that it can be good if the hearer thinks 'this is something about me, I want to know this well' and 'it will be good for me if I know this'. The speaker assumes that if the hearer can think like this, they will be more willing to know more about the things or people in question. At the same time, *your* anticipates the advantages and benefits that the hearer would obtain from knowing; for example, the interlocutor would benefit from knowing well the difference between different blends of coffee so that they can choose *their own* one, that which they like the most, without making mistakes. Likewise, someone who is invited to know their market, customers or audience would benefit from knowing how to relate well to them as well as what their expectations and preferences are to avoid cases of miscommunication and misunderstanding.

The avoidance of mistakes, however, is not part of the expressed meaning. The examples do not suggest that the meaning of '*know your* n.' also includes the idea 'it will be bad for you if you don't know this'. In no case do the speakers in the collected examples emphasise the possible negative consequences that might derive from a lack of knowledge. The emphasis is strictly on the positive aspects, and understandably so. A component 'it will be bad for you if you don't know this' cannot be posited for the meaning of '*know your* n.', because it would sound terribly imposing and pressing to an Anglo hearer and would conflict with the previously mentioned cultural value of personal autonomy or freedom from imposition. By not expressing this meaning in discourse, the speaker gives the hearer freedom of choice and avoids putting emotional pressure on them. It is the hearer who will eventually decide—freely and autonomously—whether or not and what to know.

The meaning expressed by *your* is strategically effective for the speaker's communicative purpose. By specifying that this is something about the hearer, the speaker will sound more convincing and will secure both attentiveness and emotional involvement from the interlocutor. The semantic relevance of *your* can be appreciated if one compares the '*know your* n.' construction with its near-equivalent '*know the* n.', e.g., *ABC news: know the stories* (Note 2). Although the form and function of the verb *know* are identical in these two constructions, the emphasis on the interlocutor's personal sphere is absent in the latter. In the case of '*know the* n.', the hearer is simply invited to know something, not something about themselves.

Considering that any alteration of the sequence of the lexical constituents, any replacement of these, and any lexical expansion would sensibly alter the expressed meaning to the extent of making the construction unusable in discourse, it seems reasonable to conclude that '*know your* n.' constitutes a single and inseparable semantic block expressing a single, composite meaning. Its meaning is non-compositional, because it is impossible to break it down into separate semantic units. In this case, each lexical constituent makes sense only in combination with the others. Just as the verb *know* expresses a different meaning when followed by the NP '*your* n.', the "possessive" *your* expresses a different meaning when preceded by *know* and when followed by certain nouns indicating something about the hearer's life and relationships. Moreover, the individual forms and meanings of the lexical constituents of '*know your* n.' are different from other forms and meanings of these words in different syntactic constructions. In many different contexts, *your* does express the meaning 'this is yours'.

In sum, the meaning in question is not lexical, but syntactic or, more precisely, molecular. It is the meaning of a lexico-syntactic molecule made up of different atoms of meaning which, only in combination, express the meaning pinpointed here. Molecular meanings highlight the discrepancy between syntax and semantics; as the case of '*know your* n.' shows, the level of semantic complexity can be inversely proportional to that of syntactic complexity. Only an in-depth semantic analysis can shed light on invisible components of meaning which a purely formal, syntactic analysis may not reveal at first glance. At the same time, a semantic analysis can highlight other levels of specificity in addition to contextual and genre-specificity discussed in the previous section.

The available diachronic linguistic evidence suggests that the meaning of '*know your* n.' is chronologically

specific, too, in that it was not expressed in the past. '*Know your* n.' seems to be a relatively recent development of English syntax and discourse. The OED does mention the construction '*to know one's –*' and provides several examples of it (the oldest dating back to 1559). However, this dictionary ascribes the meanings 'to have learnt something necessary about something' or 'to be well informed about something' to this construction, not 'to learn something about oneself':

1559 J. Aylmer *Harborowe* sig. H They must know their quarter strookes, and the waye how to defende their head.

1749 H. Fielding *Tom Jones* II. ix. iii. 302 These [Heroes] are said to know their Man, and Jones, I believe, knew his Woman.

1776 C. Dibdin *Seraglio* i. ii. 9 Gun. Why I thought to myself; thinks I, the young Youth does not know his Soundings. Reef. Know his Soundings! Why he'll run bump a-shore for want of a Pilot.

1863 C. Kingsley *Water-babies* iii. 123 If they want to describe a finished young gentleman in France, I hear, they say of him, 'Il sait son Rabelais.' But if I want to describe one in England, I say, 'He knows his Bewick.'

1871 'L. Carroll' *Through Looking-glass* ix. 192 Of course you know your ABC.

1891 C. MacEwen *Three Women in Boat* 72 Surprise-turns and crooked bends make you, if you know your river, as crafty as any old fox.

1931 B. Marshall *Father Malachy's Miracle* iv. 73 I know my theology too well to be guilty of any leanings toward modernism.

1952 J. Lait & L. Mortimer *U.S.A. Confidential* ii. xvi. 181 Quigg comes from a '17th St. family' which, if you know your Denver, is a breath above even the city's mile-high rarefied atmosphere.

1991 *Premiere* Aug. 30/2 He knows his cinema grammar—why he's put something in a two-shot or why he didn't want a close-up.

Furthermore, the OED does not make any distinction – and rightly so – between '*know your* n.' and '*know my* n.', '*know his* n.' or '*know their* n.' because, in this case, there is no plausible semantic reason for hypothesising that the meaning of this syntactic construction would vary depending on the "possessive". Not only does the "possessive" *one's* as used in these OED examples not indicate anything personal about the hearer, but it also does not express the idea 'it is good for you if you know this'. The form of the verb *know*, too, in these examples is different from contemporary uses of this construction in that it does not express an invitation to know (except for *know his surroundings!*) and is more typically embedded in subordinate clauses (e.g., *if*-clauses, *to*-passive clauses) or in reported speech and knowledge attribution constructions. Establishing with a certain degree of confidence when '*know your* n.' started being used in its contemporary meaning would require an accurate and systematic analysis across historical corpora of English which is beyond the scope of the present study. Moreover, to the best of my knowledge, historical corpora of English do not provide information about different varieties of English, and therefore would give only a partial picture of its historical evolution. A diachronic semantic and discourse analysis would be extremely valuable for ethnographic investigation, because it would indicate possible changes in cultural values and assumptions influencing English discourse. If it were established conclusively that '*know your* n.' is a recent development of English discourse, one would have to put forward hypotheses about why the expression of this meaning has become salient in current English discourse in comparison with the past. One possible reason could be that this meaning is the result of an increased sociocultural emphasis on knowing one's self better and, in particular, on the fact that nowadays, in order to live well, it is good to know certain key things. To carry out such a work of ethnography of speaking and identify the cultural elements that have become crucial for an individual's well-being in Anglo countries, one could start from the conceptual categories that are more frequent in Table 1.

6. Conclusions

Being based primarily on the findings of the search in one corpus, the cultural semantic analysis of '*know your* n.' presented in this paper is certainly limited. However, it is a good starting point to verify whether or not a search in different corpora can yield consistent results which would reinforce the hypotheses put forward here. A search in historical corpora would be particularly valuable for ethnographic purposes, an aspect that could be barely touched on here for reasons of space. Even though only a very small number of complementary non-corpus examples has been considered here, their consistency with the corpus data is encouraging.

The corpus data have made a significant contribution to the semantic analysis of this syntactic construction in three main ways. First, they were essential to restrict the range of possible nominal collocates of *your* and to

establish the criteria of semantic compatibility. Second, the corpus data in extended context contributed to the identification of the specific textual genre and context in which 'know your n.' is used in English discourse. This was helpful to explain the suitability of the meaning expressed by this syntactic construction for specific text types. Third, the corpus data highlighted the connection between the syntax and semantics of 'know your n.' and the Anglo cultural value of personal autonomy. Without the corpus, it would have been impossible to pinpoint these fundamental elements. Therefore, the application of corpus-based discourse analysis to other types of semantic studies, including other semantic analyses of syntax, is desirable because it can lead to the discovery of significant features that may not emerge from other types of analysis. Most of all, a large corpus like GLOWBE provides considerable amounts of data that enable the analyst to identify systematic patterns and make plausible generalisations.

Ultimately, the present study has emphasised the importance of taking a semantic approach to syntactic analysis. By examining the semantics of 'know your n.', it was possible to identify a case of molecular meaning and also to discuss the question of syntactic and semantic compositionality. The semantic approach, in turn, lead to an ethnographic analysis of this syntactic construction. A syntactic construction does not just represent a grammatical basis for language learning and discourse production. It can also represent the expression of a specific meaning related to a distinctive way of thinking of a community of people and of a culture. If one digs underneath the surface of the syntactic tree, one can identify its roots and make sense of its existence.

References

Aarts, B. (2011). *Oxford modern English grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Abenina-Adar, M. (2019). Know whether and ever free relative clauses. *Semantics and Pragmatics*, *12*, 1−46. https://doi.org/10.3765/sp.12.19

Asano-Cavanagh, Y. (2016). Being 'indecisive' in Japanese: Analysis of kana, darou ka and (n) janai ka. *Studies in Language*, *40*(1), 63−92. https://doi.org/10.1075/sl.40.1.03asa

Baker, P. (2006). *Using corpora in discourse analysis*. London: Continuum. https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350933996

Bouchard, D. (1995). *The semantics of syntax*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Capone, A. (2011). Knowing how and pragmatic intrusion. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, *8*(4), 543−570. https://doi.org/10.1515/iprg.2011.025

Chierchia, G. (1999). Syntax-semantics interface. In R. A. Wilson & F. C. Keil (Eds.), *The MIT Encyclopedia of the Cognitive Sciences* (pp. 824−826). Cambridge (MA). MIT Press.

Chierchia, G., & McConnell-Ginet, S. (2000). *Meaning and grammar: An introduction to semantics*. Cambridge (MA): MIT Press.

Corpus of Web-Based Global English (GLOWBE). (2022). Retrieved March, 2022, from https://www.english-corpora.org/glowbe/

Dudley, R., Rowe, M., Hacquard, V., & Lidz, J. (2017). Discovering the factivity of know. *Semantics and Linguistic Theory*, *27*, 600−619. https://doi.org/10.3765/salt.v27i0.4185

Farese, G. M. (2018). Is KNOW a semantic universal? Shiru, wakaru and Japanese ethno-epistemology. *Language Sciences*, *66*, 135−150. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2017.09.001

Farese, G. M. (2019). *Italian discourse. A cultural semantic analysis*. Lanham, MD: Lexington.

Farese, G. M. (2020). The ethnopragmatics of English understatement and Italian exaggeration: Clashing cultural scripts for the expression of personal opinions. In K. Mullan, B. Peeters & L. Sadow (Eds.), *Studies in ethnopragmatics, cultural semantics, and intercultural communication* (pp. 59−73). Singapore: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-32-9983-2_4

Fleischhauer, J., Latrouite, A., & Osswald, R. (Eds.). (2016). *Exploring the Syntax-Semantics-Pragmatics Interface*. Dusseldorf: Dusseldorf University Press.

Goddard, C. (2002). *Yes or no? The complex semantics of a simple question*. Paper presented at the 2002 Australian Linguistics Society Conference.

Goddard, C. (2015). *Lexicosyntactic molecules with KNOW and MINE*. Paper presented at the NSM Workshop, Australian National University, July 4 2015.

Goddard, C. (2018). *Ten lectures on Natural Semantic Metalanguage*. Leiden: Brill.

https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004357723

Goddard, C., & Wierzbicka A. (2004). Cultural scripts: What are they and what are they good for? *Intercultural Pragmatics*, *1*(2), 156−166. https://doi.org/10.1515/iprg.2004.1.2.153

Goddard, C., & Wierzbicka, A. (2014). *Words & Meanings. Lexical semantics across domains, languages, and cultures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199668434.001.0001

Hackl, M. (2013). The syntax-semantics interface. *Lingua*, *130*, 66−87. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2013.01.010

Huddleston, R., & Pullum, G. K. (2002). *The Cambridge grammar of the English language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316423530

Hyland, K. (2005). Stance and engagement: A model of interaction in academic discourse. *Discourse Studies*, *7*(2), 173−192. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445605050365

Hyland, K. (2018). *Metadiscourse*. Exploring Interaction in Writing. London: Bloomsbury.

Kachru, B. (1985). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: English language in the outer circle. In R. Quirk & H. Widdowson (Eds.), *English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and literatures* (pp. 11−36). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Levin, B., & Pinker, S. (Eds.) (1992). *Lexical & conceptual semantics*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Mizumoto, M., Ganeri, J., & Goddard, C. (Eds.). (2020). *Ethno-Epistemology. New Directions for Global Epistemology*. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003037774

Oxford English Dictionary. (2022). *Know, v*. Retrieved March, 2022, from http://www.oed.com

Partington, A., Morley, J., & Haarman L. (Eds.). (2004). *Corpora and discourse*. Bern: Peter Lang.

Quirk, R. et al. (1985). *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.

Shetreet, E., Alexander, E. J., Romoli, J., Chierchia, G., & Kupernberg, G. (2019). What we know about knowing: Presuppositions generated by factive verbs influence downstream neural processing. *Cognition*, *184*, 96−106. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2018.11.012

Stich, S., Mizumoto, M., & McCready, E. (Eds.). (2018). *Epistemology for the Rest of the World*. New York: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190865085.001.0001

Van Valin, R. (2005). *Exploring the Syntax-Semantics Interface*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511610578

Wierzbicka, A. (1987). *English speech act verbs. A semantic dictionary*. Sydney: Academic Press.

Wierzbicka, A. (1988). *The semantics of grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/slcs.18

Wierzbicka, A. (1996). *Semantics: Primes and universals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wierzbicka, A. (2003). Cross-cultural pragmatics. In *The semantics of human interaction* (2nd ed.). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110220964

Wierzbicka, A. (2006a). *English: Meaning and culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wierzbicka, A. (2006b). Anglo scripts against "putting pressure" on other people and their linguistic manifestations. In C. Goddard (Ed.), *Ethnopragmatics. Understanding discourse in cultural context* (pp. 31−63). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110911114.31

Wierzbicka, A. (2018). I KNOW: A human universal. In S. Stich, M. Mizumoto & E. McCready (Eds.), *Epistemology for the rest of the world* (pp. 215−250). New York: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190865085.003.0010

Notes

Note 1. Retrieved March, 2022, from https://www.english-corpora.org/glowbe/

Note 2. Retrieved March, 2022, from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SZo3HkUQBg0

Appendix A

Know your surfboards. Learn to pick boards that suit conditions. Progressing has a lot to do with having fun. It's

silly to ride a high-performance shortboard when it's two-foot and weak, when you could be on a fish and getting all sorts of speed to do airs. You can't force a situation. There's a board for every condition. There's so many options with shapes, rockers, fins, fin systems. It's endless. If you're bored with something, try something different. Know your mood. Your surf can be dictated by your mood. If you're super amped-up on coffee and wanna go out and do a million of the sickest turns or biggest airs, you're gonna go and try it (GLOWBE, Australia, general).

Know your capabilities—especially with power tools: Match the size and type of your job to the appropriate tools, and if you don't own the appropriate tools, hire them or a professional to do the job for you. Don't use any tool to do a job it's not designed for—it may end up cutting you instead. Many jobs, such as welding, call for specialized skills so don't give it a crack if you don't have the know-how (GLOWBE, New Zealand, general).

Know your sexual rights. How often do guys say "You would if you loved me…?" Sex shouldn't be the only way you can show somebody you love them. And sex is not meant to be one-sided—it should be something you both want (GLOWBE, Australia, general).

Know your industry. Corporate blogging is all about providing insight. Attending conferences, keynote speeches, exhibitions… anywhere that is likely to give you knowledge should be high on your to-do list. And when you're not attending events, you should be reading other blogs and industry publications so that you know what the key industry trends are (GLOWBE, Great Britain, general).

Know your policy's hurricane deductible. A standard homeowners policy includes a deductible, meaning the homeowner must pay for a portion of the damages before insurance covers the rest. Typically, that's either $500 or $1,000. However, out-of-pocket expenses for hurricane damages can be much higher (GLOWBE, USA, general).

Copyrights