LINE	UN	EAF TAG	EAF ENTITY	EAF DEFINITION	EAF COMMENT	UN	SAF TAG	SAF ENTITY	SAF DEFINITION	SAF COMMENT
1	0	Def. 00a.	'*lex* ' (as stem)	for '*log* (as stem) in natural language throughout'.						
2	0	Def. 00b.	'*phon* ' (as stem)	for '*cen* (as stem) in spoken natural language throughout'.	Comment: In accordance with the intention of the preliminary definitions, no terms involving *lex, phon* or *graph* are included in the definitions below. All terms for natural language can be generated by substituting *phon* for *cen* , and *lex* for *log* throughout the definitions. This allows a rather neater presentation of the postulates for extended axiomatic functionalism than was possible for the versions of standard axiomatic functionalism.					
3	0	Def. 00c.	'*graph* ' (as stem)	for '*cen* (as stem) in written natural language throughout'.	Comment: In accordance with the intention of the preliminary definitions, no terms involving *lex* , *phon* or *graph* are included in the definitions below. All terms for natural language can be generated by substituting *phon or graph* for *cen,* and *lex* for *log* throughout the definitions. This allows a rather neater presentation of the postulates for extended axiomatic functionalism than was possible for the versions of standard axiomatic functionalism.					
4	0	Def. 00d.	'Linguistics'	for 'semiotics (Def. F4.5) in natural language'.						
5	0	Def. 00e.	'*ont* ' (as stem)	for '*log* , *cen* , or *del* (as stems) throughout'.	Comment: In principle the preliminary definition of *ont* should allow for the elimination of terms involving *ont* throughout. In practice, a number of terms involving *ont* have been retained; e.g. allont (Def. 26o), onto (Def. 3a1), ontotactics (Def. 3b), etc. A more radical strategy would be to define *log* , *cen* , and *del* as varieties of *ont* here, and to eliminate the use of the terms *log* , *cen* , and *del* in the postulates wherever possible. I have not adopted this strategy, as it would have meant significantly altering the form of the postulates, and rendering them far less easily comparable with versions of the postulates for standard axiomatic functionalism.					
6	A	**Axiom A.**	All features (Def. 1c1) in semiotic sets are functional (Def. 1a) (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 41, Axiom A; Mulder 1989: 436, Axiom A).		Comment: Axiom A states the point of view of the theory, i.e. the functional principle. The definitions under Axiom A give an interpretation to the axiom, and provide a system-ontological (cf. Def. 3a1a) definition of semiotic system (Def. 1c, Def. 5). The reason why the term 'semiotic system' (Def. 1c, Def. 5) is not used in the axiom itself is that otherwise the recognition of functionality for features (Def. 1c1) in sub-systems (cf. Def. 1b) of semiotic systems (Def. 1c, Def. 5) (e.g. cenology (Def. 2b1a), cenotactics (Def. 2b1c), logology (Def. 2a4a), logotactics (Def. 2a4c), etc.) would be precluded (adapted from Mulder 1989: 436).	A	**Axiom A.**	All features in semiotic sets are functional (Mulder 1989: 436).		Axiom A states the point of view of the theory, i.e. 'the functional principle'. [Def. 1a-1c] give an interpretation to the axiom, and provide an ontological definition of 'semiotic system'. The reason why the term 'semiotic system' is not already used in the axiom is that otherwise the recognition of 'functionality' for features in sub-systems of semiotic systems (e.g. 'phonology', 'phonotactics', 'grammar', 'syntax', etc. in a natural language) would be precluded (Mulder 1989: 436).
7	A	Def. 01a.	'Functional'	for 'separately relevant to the purport of the whole to which it is a part' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 41, Def.1a; Mulder 1989: 436, Def. 1a).		A	Def. 01a.	'Functional'	for 'separately relevant to the purport of the whole of which it is a part' (Mulder 1989: 436).	
8	A	Def. 01b.	'System'	for 'self-contained (Def. 1b1) set of features (Def. 1c1) with a common purport' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 41, Def.1b; Mulder 1989: 436, Def. 1b).		A	Def. 01b.	'System'	for 'self-contained set of features with a common purport' (Mulder 1989: 436).	

9	A	Def. 01b1.	'Self-contained'	for 'representing all relative dependencies (cf. Def. 6a, Def. 6b, Def. 11a, Def. 11b, Def. 11c) of its members as members of the set in question'.	Comment: The notions functional (Def. 1a.) and self-contained can be applied to combinations (Def. 6c) (of items) as well as to sets. In the case of combinations (Def. 6c) the term members has to be replaced by constituents (Def. 7f1) (adapted from Mulder and Hervey 1980: 41, Def. 1b1; Mulder 1989: 436, Def. 1b1).	A	Def. 01b1.	'Self-contained'	for 'representing all relative dependencies of its members (or constituents), as members (or constituents) of the set (or combination), in question' (Mulder 1989: 436).	The notions 'functional' and 'self-contained' can, of course, be applied to 'combinations (of items)' as well as to 'sets'. In the case of 'combinations', the term 'members' has to be replaced by 'constituents' (Mulder 1989: 436).
10	A	Def. 01c.	'Semiotic system'	for 'system (Def. 1b) of conventions for communication'.	Comment: Alternative definition to Def. 5 (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 42, Def. 1c; Mulder 1989: 436, Def. 1c).	A	Def. 01c.	'Semiotic system'	for 'system of conventions for communication'. Alternative definition to Def. 5 (Mulder 1989: 436).	
11	A	Def. 01c1.	'Features'	for 'elements, analytical properties of elements, or relations between elements or properties of elements' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 42, Def. 1c1; Mulder 1989: 436, Def. 1c1).		A	Def. 01c1.	'Features'	for 'elements, analytical properties of elements or relations between elements or analytical properties of elements' (Mulder 1989: 436).	
12	A	Def. 01c2.	'Entity'	for 'element or discrete disjunct analytical property of element' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 42, Def. 1c2; Mulder 1989: 436, Def. 1c2).		A	Def. 01c2.	'Entity'	for 'element, or discrete analytical property of element' (Mulder 1989: 436).	
13	A	Def. 01c2a.	'Basic entity' or 'minimum entity'	for 'entity in ontomics (Def. 3a1a1), ontidics (Def. 3a1a2), ontematics (Def. 3a1b), or ontotactics (Def. 3b) which is not further analysable at that level'.	Comment: Basic entity (or minimum entity) means essentially the same thing as ultimate constituent (Def. 7f1b). There is, however, a difference in point of view. Ultimate constituent (Def. 7f1b) implies a decompositional analysis, whereas basic entity implies a compositional analysis. It is theorematic that in ontomics (Def. 3a1a1) and ontidics (Def. 3a1a2), the basic entity is also the unit (Def. 9e). See also: base (Def. 20a).					
14	A	Def. 01c3.	'Semiotic entity'	for 'entity (Def. 1c2) in semiotic system (Def. 1c, Def. 5)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 42, Def. 1c3; Mulder 1989: 437, Def. 1c3).	Comment: In *Foundations of axiomatic linguistics* , Mulder includes a Def. 1d. "'Communication for 'subjective (i.e. involving choice or optionality) conveyance of information'. This rules out 'labels', 'names' or 'designations', not to be confused with 'communicating' these or about these, from being 'communication' in our sense" (Mulder 1989: 437). For reasons why I have excluded this definition from this set of postulates, see Dickins 1998: 418; Note 1).	A	Def. 01c3.	'Semiotic entity'	for 'entity in semiotic system' (Mulder 1989: 437).	Def. 1c1-1c3 provide instructions for the consistent usage of the terms 'feature', 'entity', and 'semiotic entity'. Such terms as 'element', and also 'item' remain undefined, i.e. they are to be regarded as 'primitive terms', to be used in their 'ordinary language' sense (Mulder 1989: 437).
15					Comment: In *Foundations of axiomatic linguistics* , Mulder includes a Def. 1d. "'Communication for 'subjective (i.e. involving choice or optionality) conveyance of information'. This rules out 'labels', 'names' or 'designations', not to be confused with 'communicating' these or about these, from being 'communication' in our sense" (Mulder 1989: 437). For reasons why I have excluded this definition from this set of postulates, see Dickins 1998: 418; Note 1).	A	Def. 01d.	'Communication'	for 'subjective (i.e. involving choice or optionality) conveyance of information' (Mulder 1989: 437).	This rules out 'labels', 'names', or 'designations', not to be confused with 'communicating' these or about these, from being 'communication' in our sense (Mulder 1989: 437).

16	B	**Axiom B.**	Semiotic systems (Def. 1c, Def. 5) contain simple (cf. Def. 4a), and may contain complex (cf. Def. 6c) ordered (cf. Def. 4b2), or complex (cf. Def. 6c) unordered (cf. Def. 4b1) logos (Def. 2a4), cenos (Def. 2b1), and delos (Def. 2c1) (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 42, Axiom B; Mulder 1989: 437, Axiom B).		Comment: Axiom B is the most powerful axiom of the whole theory. It harbours (after being given an interpretation by means of definitions that follow it) the theory of semiotic systems (Def. 1c, Def. 5) (which is one of the sub-theories), as well as almost the whole of the system ontology (Def. 3a1a) of any semiotic system (Def. 1c, Def. 5) (i.e. cenology (Def. 2b1a), logology (Def. 2a4a) and delology (Def. 2c1a)) with the exception of the para-ontotactic (cf. Def. 19f) sub-systems (Def. 1b). The latter are covered by Axioms C and D. The system ontology (Def. 3a1a) is unfolded in Definitions 2-16c, together with the basic methodology for descriptions in logology (Def. 2a4a), cenology (Def. 2b1a), and delology (Def. 2c1a). Definitions 2-2a3b and 2b develop that part of the theory of indices which is relevant to semiotic systems (Def. 1c, Def. 5) (adapted from Mulder 1989: 437-8).	B	**Axiom B.**	Semiotic systems contain simple, and may contain complex ordered, and/or complex unordered signa and figurae (Mulder 1989: 437).		Axiom B is the most powerful axiom of the whole theory. It harbours (after being given an interpretation by means of definitions that follow it) the theory of semiotic systems (which is one of the sub-theories), as well as almost the whole of the systemology of any semiotic system (i.e. for natural languages both phonology and grammar), with the exception of the para-tactic sub-systems. The latter are covered by Axioms C and D. The systemology is unfolded in definitions 2-16c, together with the basic methodology for both plerological (grammatical) and cenological (for spoken language: phonological) descriptions. Definitions 2-2a3b and 2b develop that part of the theory of indices which is relevant to semiotic systems (Mulder 1989: 437).
17	B	Def. 02.	'Index'	for 'class of items with information-value (Def. 2a)' (cf. Mulder 1989: 437, Def. 2).	Comment: Index is here formally defined as a class. The term "index", however, can also be used for an item (i.e. member) of the class making up the index. See Dickins 1998: 418; Note 2; also Def. F4, below.	B	Def. 02.	'Index'	for 'item or class of items with information-value' (Mulder 1989: 437).	
18	B	Def. 02a.	'Information-value'	for 'specific set of potential interpretations' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 42, Def. 2; Mulder 1989: 436, Def. 2a).		B	Def. 02a.	'Information-value'	for 'specific set of potential interpretations' (Mulder 1989: 437).	
19	B	Def. 02a1.	'Signum' (symbolised: S)	for 'sign (Def. 2a2)' or 'symbol (Def. 2a3)'. Alternative definition: 'Semiotic entity (Def. 1c3) which has both morphontic (cf. Def. F3h) and semantic (cf. Def. F4.3) aspects'. Also: 'Entity in signum ontology (Def. F4.4) corresponding to logo (Def. 2a4) in system ontology (Def. 3a1a).	Comment: Alternative definition to Def. 24 (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 42, Def. 2a; Mulder 1989: 437, Def. 2a1).	B	Def. 02a1.	'Signum'	for 'Sign or Symbol'. Alternative definition: 'semiotic entity with both form and information-value' (Mulder 1989: 437).	
20	B	Def. 02a2.	'Sign'	for 'signum (Def. 2a1, Def. 24) the information-value (Def. 2a) of all of whose allosemes (Def. 24c1a) is determined by wholly fixed conventions' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 42, Def. 2a1; Mulder 1989: 437, Def. 2a2).		B	Def. 02a2.	'Sign'	for 'signum with wholly fixed conventional information-value'. Alternative definition: 'index possessing the property of denotation' (Mulder 1989: 437).	
21					Comment: Cf. extended axiomatic functionalism Def. 2c.	B	Def. 02a2a.	'Denotation'	for 'wholly fixed conventional information-value of index in semiotic system' (Mulder 1989: 437).	

22	B	Def. 02a3.	'Symbol'	for 'signum (Def. 2a1, Def. 24) the information-value (Def. 2a) of at least one of whose allosemes (Def. 24c1a) is not determined by wholly fixed conventions, i.e to which a temporary information-value (Def. 2a) can be attached by a definition' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 42, Def. 2a2; Mulder 1989: 437, Def. 2a3).		B	Def. 02a3.	'Symbol'	for 'signum with not wholly fixed conventional information-value, i.e. to which a temporary information-value can be attached by a definition' (Mulder 1989: 437).	
23	B	Def. 02a3a.	'Proper symbol'	for 'symbol (Def. 2a3) with partially fixed conventional information-value (Def. 2a)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 42, Def. 2a2a; Mulder 1989: 436, Def. 2a3a).		B	Def. 02a3a.	'Proper symbol'	for 'symbol with partially fixed conventional information-value' (Mulder 1989: 437).	
24	B	Def. 02a3b.	'Nonce symbol'	for 'symbol (Def. 2a3) with wholly non-fixed conventional information-value (Def. 2a), i.e. with no fixed information-value (Def. 2a) at all' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 42, Def. 2a2b; Mulder 1989: 436, Def. 2a3b).	Comment: Definitions for both proper symbol (Def. 2a3a) and nonce symbol (Def. 2a3b) have been included here. However, it may be that the notion nonce symbol in particular should be excluded from the postulates. As Shimizu and Lamb note, "The subdivision of symbols into proper symbols and nonce symbols ... we both consider problematic" (Shimizu and Lamb 1985: 118; cf. Dickins 1998: 13-16).	B	Def. 02a3b.	'Nonce symbol'	for 'symbol with wholly non-fixed conventional information-value, i.e. with no fixed information-value at all' (Mulder 1989: 437).	
25	B	Def. 02a4.	'Logo'	for 'entity (Def. 1c2) in system ontology (Def. 3a1a) corresponding to a signum (Def. 2a1, Def. 24) in system ontology (Def. F4.4)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 42, Def. 2a3; Mulder 1989: 436, Def. 2a4).		B	Def. 02a4.	'Plerological entity' or 'Grammatical entity'	for 'entity in systemology corresponding to a signum' (Mulder 1989: 438).	
26	B	Def. 02a4a.	'Logology'	for 'system (Def. 1b) of logos (Def. 2a4)'. This may be either a simple (cf. Def. 4a) logology (logomics (Def. 2a4a1) or logidics (Def. 2a4a2)) or a complex (cf. Def. 6c) logology (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 42, Def. 2a3a; Mulder 1989: 438, Def. 2a4c).	Comment: Logology is the level of description in the system ontology (Def. 3a1a) which corresponds to logologics (Def. F1b2a4) (also morphologics (Def. F1b1a3) and semologics (Def. F1b2a3)) in the system ontology (Def. F4.4).					
27	B	Def. 02a4a1.	'Logomics'	for 'simple (cf. Def. 4a) logology (Def. 2a4a) which does not interlock (cf. Def. 3c2a) with a complex (cf. Def. 6c) logology (Def. 2a4a)'.	Comment: It follows that a logology (Def. 2a4a) which has a logomics will have only a logomics; i.e. the logology (Def. 2a4a) will consist entirely of an unordered set of logomes (Def. 8b5) in opposition to one another.					

28	B	Def. 02a4a2.	'Logidics'	for 'simple (cf. Def. 4a) logology (Def. 2a4a) which interlocks (cf. Def. 3c2a) with a complex (cf. Def. 6c) logology (Def. 2a4a), i.e. which interlocks (cf. Def. 3c2a) with a logematics (Def. 2a4b) or with a logidotactics (Def. 2a4c1)'.						
29	B	Def. 02a4b.	'Logematics'	for 'complex (cf. Def. 6c) unordered (cf. Def. 4b1) logology (Def. 2a4a)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 42, Def. 2a3b; Mulder 1989: 438, Def. 2a4a).	Comment: A logematics interlocks (cf. Def. 3c2a) with a logemotactics (Def. 2a4c2).	B	Def. 02a4a.	'Plerematics' or 'morphology'	for 'complex unordered plerological system' (Mulder 1989: 438).	
30	B	Def. 02a4c.	'Logotactics'	for 'complex (cf. Def. 6c) ordered (cf. Def. 4b2) logology (Def. 2a4a)'. Alternative definition: 'logidotactics (Def. 2a4c1) or logemotactics (Def. 2a4c2)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 42, Def. 2a3c; Mulder 1989: 438, Def. 2a4b).	Comment: A logotactics interlocks (cf. Def. 3c2a) with a para-logotactics (Def.19c).		Def. 02a4b.	'Plerotactics' or 'syntax'	for 'complex ordered plerological system' (Mulder 1989: 438).	
31	B	Def. 02a4c1.	'Logidotactics'	for 'logotactics (Def. 2a4c) in a compound (cf. Def. 5a) logology (Def. 2a4a) which does not include a logematics (Def. 2a4b)'.						
32	B	Def. 02a4c2.	'Logemotactics'	for 'logotactics (Def. 2a4c) in a compound (cf. Def. 5a) logology (Def. 2a4a) which includes a logematics (Def. 2a4b)'.						
33	B	Def. 02b.	'Figura'	for semiotic entity (Def. 1c3) which has only a morphontic (cf. Def. F3h) aspect'. Alternative definition: 'Entity in signum ontology (Def. F4.4) corresponding to a ceno (Def. 2b1) in system ontology (Def. 3a1a)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 43, Def. 2b; Mulder 1989: 438, Def. 2b).		B	Def. 02b.	'Figura' for	'semiotic entity which has only form' (Mulder 1989: 438).	
34	B	Def. 02b1.	'Ceno'	for 'entity (Def. 1c2) in system ontology (Def. 3a1a) corresponding to a figura (Def. 2b) in signum ontology (Def. F4.4)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 43, Def. 2b1; Mulder 1989: 438, Def. 2b1).		B	Def. 02b1.	'Cenological entity'	for 'entity in systemology, corresponding to a figura' (Mulder 1989: 438).	

35	B	Def. 02b1a.	'Cenology'	for 'system (Def. 1b) of cenos (Def. 2b1)'. This may be either a simple (cf. Def. 4a) cenology (cenomics (Def. 2b1a1) or cenidics (Def. 2b1a2)) or a complex (cf. Def. 6c) cenology (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 43, Def. 2b1a; Mulder 1989: 438, Def. 2b1c).	Comment: Cenology is the level of description in the system ontology (Def. 3a1a) to which corresponds cenologics (Def. F3g) in the signum ontology (Def. F4.4).	B	Def. 02b1c.	'Cenological system'	for 'system of cenological entities'. Also simply called 'cenology' (Mulder 1989: 438).	
36	B	Def. 02b1a1.	'Cenomics'	for 'simple (cf. Def. 4a) cenology (Def. 2b1a) which does not interlock (cf. Def. 3c2a) with a complex (cf. Def. 6c) cenology (Def. 2b1a)'.	Comment: It follows that a cenology (Def. 2b1a) which has a cenomics will have only a cenomics; i.e. the cenology (Def. 2b1a) will consist entirely of an unordered set of cenomes (Def. 8a5) in opposition to one another.					
37	B	Def. 02b1a2.	'Cenidics'	for 'simple (cf. Def. 4a) cenology (Def. 2b1a) which interlocks (cf. Def. 3c2a) with a complex (cf. Def. 6c) cenology (Def. 2b1a), i.e. which interlocks (cf. Def. 3c2a) with a cenematics (Def. 2b1b) or with a cenidotactics (Def. 2b1c1)'.						
38	B	Def. 02b1b.	'Cenematics'	for 'complex (cf. Def. 6c) unordered (cf. Def. 4b1) cenology (Def. 2b1a)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 43, Def. 2b1b; Mulder 1989: 438, Def. 2b1a).	Comment: A cenematics interlocks (cf. Def. 3c2a) with a cenemotactics (Def. 2b1c2).	B	Def. 02b1a.	'Cenematics'	for 'complex unordered cenological system' (Mulder 1989: 438).	
39	B	Def. 02b1c.	'Cenotactics'	for 'complex (cf. Def. 6c) ordered (cf. Def. 4b2) cenology (Def. 2b1a)'. Alternative definition: 'cenidotactics (Def. 2b1c1) or cenemotactics' (Def. 2b1c2) (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 43, Def. 2b1c; Mulder 1989: 438, Def. 2b1b).	Comment: A cenotactics interlocks (cf. Def. 3c2a) with a para-cenotactics (Def. 18c).	B	Def. 02b1b.	'Cenotactics'	for 'complex ordered cenological system' (Mulder 1989: 438).	
40	B	Def. 02b1c1.	'Cenidotactics'	for 'cenotactics (Def. 2b1c) in a compound (cf. Def. 5a) cenology (Def. 2b1a) which does not include a cenematics (Def. 2b1b)'.						
41	B	Def. 02b1c2.	'Cenemotactics'	for 'cenotactics (Def. 2b1c) in a compound (cf. Def. 5a) cenology (Def. 2b1a) which includes a cenematics (Def. 2b1b)'.						

42	B	Def. 02b1d.	'Cenological form' (symbolised: *p*)	for 'notion in signum ontology (Def. F4.4), corresponding to feature (Def. 1c1) potentially belonging to cenology (Def. 2b1a)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 43, Def. 3a4; Mulder 1989: 438, Def. 2b1d). Alternative definition to Def. 23. Formal definition: $p = \{f^{i,\ldots,n}\mathrm{Rd}\}$.		B	Def. 02b1d.	'Cenological form'	for 'notion in Signum-theory, corresponding to feature potentially belonging to cenological system' (Mulder 1989: 438).	
43	B	Def. 02c.	'Denotation'	for 'semiotic entity (Def. 1c3) which has only a semantic (cf. Def. F4.3) aspect'. Alternative definition 'Entity in signum ontology (Def. F4.4) corresponding to delo (Def. 2c1) in system ontology (Def. 3a1a)'.	Comment: Cf. standard axiomatic functionalism Def. 2a2a.					
44	B	Def. 02c1.	'Delo'	for 'entity (Def. 1c2) in system ontology (Def. 3a1a) corresponding to a denotation (Def. 2c) in signum ontology (Def. F4.4)'.						
45	B	Def. 02c1a.	'Delology'	for 'system (Def. 1b) of delos (Def. 2c1)'. This may be either a simple (cf. Def. 4a) delology (delomics (Def. 2c1a1) or delidics (Def. 2c1a2)) or a complex (cf. Def. 6c) delology.	Comment: Delology is the level of description in the system ontology (Def. 3a1a) to which corresponds delologics (Def. F4.2) in the signum ontology (Def. F4.4).					
46	B	Def. 02c1a1.	'Delomics'	for 'simple (cf. Def. 4a) delology (Def. 2c1a) which does not interlock (cf. Def. 3c2a) with a complex (cf. Def. 6c) delology (Def. 2c1a)'.	Comment: It follows that a delology (Def. 2c1a) which has a delomics will have only a delomics; i.e. the delology (Def. 2c1a) will consist entirely of an unordered set of delomes (Def. 8c5) in opposition to one another.					
47	B	Def. 02c1a2.	'Delidics'	for 'simple (cf. Def. 4a) delology (Def. 2c1a) which interlocks (cf. Def. 3c2a) with a complex (cf. Def. 6c) delology (Def. 2c1a), i.e. with a delematics (Def. 2c1b) or with a delidotactics (Def. 2c1c1)'.						
48	B	Def. 02c1b.	'Delematics'	for 'complex (cf. Def. 6c) unordered (cf. Def. 4b1) delology (Def. 2c1a)'.	Comment: A delematics interlocks (cf. Def. 3c2a) with a delemotactics (Def. 2c1c2).					
49	B	Def. 02c1c.	'Delotactics'	for 'complex (cf. Def. 6c) ordered (cf. Def. 4b2) delology (Def. 2c1a)'. Alternative definition: 'delidotactics (Def. 2c1c1) or delemotactics (Def. 2c1c2)'.	Comment: A delotactics interlocks (cf. Def. 3c2a) with a para-delotactics (Def. 18i).					

50	B	Def. 02c1c1.	'Delidotactics'	for 'delotactics (Def. 2c1c) in a compound (cf. Def. 5a) delology (Def. 2c1a) which does not include a delematics (Def. 2c1b)'.						
51	B	Def. 02c1c2.	'Delemotactics'	for 'delotactics (Def. 2c1c) in a compound (cf. Def. 5a) delology (Def. 2c1a) which includes a delematics (Def. 2c1b)'.						
52	B	Def. 02c1d.	'Delological form' (symbolised: *q*)	for 'notion in signum ontology (Def. F4.4), corresponding to feature (Def. 1c1) potentially belonging to delology (Def. 2c1a)'. Formal definition: *q* = {*g i*$^{\cdots n}$Re}. Alternative definition to Def. 23c.	Comment: Def. 3a in Mulder and Hervey (1980: 43) and Mulder (1989: 438), which provides a definition for phonology, and more generally for forms with *phon* , is rendered unnecesary in the extended version by the inclusion of Def. 0b.					
53	B	Def. 03a1.	'Onto'	for 'logo (Def. 2a4), ceno (Def. 2b1), or delo (Def. 2c1)'.						
54	B	Def. 03a1a.	'System ontology'	for 'logology (Def. 2a4a), cenology (Def. 2b1a), and delology (Def. 2c1a)' (cf. Mulder 1989: 438, Def. 2b2).		B	Def. 02b2.	'Systemology' for 'cenological system and plerological (grammatical) system' or for 'the sub-theory dealing with the description of the systemology (in the above sense) of semiotic systems' (the same goes for cenematics, cenotactics, etc., i.e. for the sub-systems of systemology) (Mulder 1989: 438).	for 'cenological system and plerological (grammatical) system' or for 'the sub-theory dealing with the description of the systemology (in the above sense) of semiotic systems' (the same goes for cenematics, cenotactics, etc., i.e. for the sub-systems of systemology). [438]	
55					Comment: Cf. extended axiomatic functionalism, Def. 0b.	B	Def. 03a.	'Phonology, Phonematics, Phonotactics, Phonological entity, Phonological system, Phonological form, etc.'	for 'Cenology, Cenematics, Cenotactics, etc. in natural language' (Mulder 1989: 438).	For other semiotic systems often convenient terms can be coined, e.g. 'graphology', etc., for 'writing-conventions', etc. The terms 'plerological' and 'grammatical' are synonymous, and 'plerematics' and 'plerotactics' are synonymous with 'morphology' and 'grammar' respectively. The terms with 'cene-' and 'ceno-' apply to any semiotic system, the terms with 'phone-' and 'phono-' only to natural (spoken) languages (Mulder 1989: 438).
56	B	Def. 03a1a1.	'Ontomics'	for 'logomics (Def. 2a4a1), cenomics (Def. 2b1a1), or delomics (Def. 2c1a1)'.	Comment: It follows that a system ontology (Def. 3a1a) which has an ontomics will have only an ontomics; i.e. the system ontology (Def. 3a1a) will consist entirely of an unordered set of ontomes (Def. 8d5) in opposition to one another.					
57	B	Def. 03a1a2.	'Ontidics'	for 'logidics (Def. 2a4a2), cenidics (Def. 2b1a2), or delidics (Def. 2c1a2)'.						

58	B	Def. 03a1b.	'Ontematics'	for 'logematics (Def. 2a4b), cenematics (Def. 2b1b), or delematics (Def. 2c1b)'.	Comment: An ontematics interlocks (cf. Def. 3c2a) with an ontemotactics (Def. 3a1c2).					
59	B	Def. 03a1c1.	'Ontidotactics'	for 'logidotactics (Def. 2a4c1), cenidotactics (Def. 2b1c1), or delidotactics (Def. 2c1c1)'.						
60	B	Def. 03a1c2.	'Ontemotactics'	for 'logemotactics (Def. 2a4c2), cenemotactics (Def. 2b1c2) or delemotactics (Def. 2c1c2)'.						
61	B	Def. 03a1d.	'Ontological form'	for 'cenological form (Def. 2b1d, Def. 23), or delological form (Def. 2c1d, Def. 23c)'.						
62	B	Def. 03b.	'Ontotactics' or 'articulation'	for 'logotactics (Def. 2a4c), cenotactics (Def. 2b1c), or delotactics (Def. 2c1c)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 43, Def. 3b; Mulder 1989: 439, Def. 3b).	Comment: An ontotactics interlocks (Def. 3c2a) with a para-ontotactics (Def. 19f).	B	Def. 03b.	'Articulation'	for 'cenotactics or plerotactics' (Mulder 1989: 439).	
63	B	Def. 03c.	'Double articulation (Def. 3b)'	for 'both logotactics (Def. 2a4c) and cenotactics (Def. 2b1c), or both logotactics (Def. 2a4c) and delotactics (Def. 2c1c)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 43, Def. 3c; Mulder 1989: 439, Def. 3c).		B	Def. 03c.	'Double articulation'	for 'cenotactics and plerotactics' (Mulder 1989: 439).	
64	B	Def. 03c1.	'Language'	for 'semiotic system (Def. 1c, Def. 5) with double articulation (Def. 3c) with respect to both morphontics (Def. 3h) and semantics (Def. F4.3)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 43, Def. 3c1; Mulder 1989: 439, Def. 3c1).	Comment: That is to say, a "language" in this technical sense has a cenotactics (Def. 2b1c), a logotactics (Def. 2a4c), and a delotactics (Def. 2c1c).	B	Def. 03c1.	'Language'	for 'semiotic system with double articulation' (Mulder 1989: 439).	

65	B	Def. 03c2.	'Proper language (Def. 3c1)'	for 'semiotic system (Def. 1c, Def. 5) with a cenology (Def. 2b1a) containing both a cenematics (Def. 2b1b) and a cenotactics (Def. 2b1c), a delology (Def. 2c1a) containing both a delematics (Def. 2c1b) and a delotactics (Def. 2c1c), and a logology (Def. 2a4a) containing both a logematics (Def. 2a4b) and a logotactics (Def. 2a4c)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 43, Def. 3c2; Mulder 1989: 439, Def. 3c2).	Comment: All natural languages known to date are proper languages, but not necessarily vice versa. Natural languages, in addition, incorporate para-ontotactics (Def. 19f), but so do some other semiotic systems (Def. 1c, Def. 5) (adapted from Mulder 1989: 439). In *Foundations of axiomatic linguistics* Mulder (1989: 439) implies that all semiotic systems (Def. 1c, Def. 5) by definition have para-tactic levels (cf. para-ontotactics: Def. 19f). This is not the position adopted in earlier versions of the theory (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 43), nor is it the position adopted in the extended version.	B	Def. 03c2.	'Proper language'	for 'semiotic system with a cenology containing both a cenematics and a cenotactics, and a plerology (grammar) containing both a plerematics (morphology) and a plerotactics (syntax)' (Mulder 1989: 439).	All natural languages known to date are proper languages, but not necessarily vice versa. Natural languages, in addition, incorporate para-tactic systems, but so do all other semiotic systems, though for the latter this is often trivial. This is, because the same realizations may correspond to para-cenotactic entities from the one point of view, but to para-plerotactic entities from another. Also, especially in simple systems, tactic realizations may coincide with para-tactic ones, in which 'tactic' and 'para-tactic' are mere different aspects of the same thing. One needs, however, to recognize both aspects, as they account for different realizational features. That is, the tactic notions, e.g. 'ceneme', 'plereme', etc., as models, are not set up in a way which allows them to account for such contrastive (but nevertheless 'functional' from an overall point of view) features as 'pause', 'juncture', etc. In natural language, and many 'language-connected' semiotic systems, however, all this is far from trivial (Mulder 1989: 439).
66	B	Def. 03c2a.	'Interlocking'	for 'in system ontology (Def. 3a1a) the one system (Def. 1b) providing the forms of the realisations (Def. F4.7) of the entities (Def. 1c2) of the other system (Def. 1b), termed transformational interlock', or for 'the one sub-system (Def. 1b providing the basic entities (Def. 1c2a) - i.e. the ultimate constituents (Def. 7f1b) - of the other sub-system (Def. 1b), termed ontological interlock'.	Comment: A cenology (Def. 2b1a) and a logology (Def. 2a4a), also a delology (Def. 2c1a) and a logology (Def. 2a4a), interlock transformationally. A cenology (Def. 2b1a) provides the cenos (Def. 2b1) to which correspond the cenological forms (Def. 2b1d, Def. 23) of the allomorphs (Def. 24b1a) which are the morphontic (cf. Def. F3h) manifestations (Def. 26o) of expressions (Def. 24a), corresponding to logos (Def. 2a4). Similarly a delology (Def. 2c1a) provides the delos (Def. 2c1) to which correspond the delological forms (Def. 2c1d, Def. 23c) of the allosemes (Def. 24c1a) which are the semantic (cf. Def. F4.3) manifestations (Def. 26o) of contents (Def. 24b), corresponding to logos (Def. 2a4). A logidics (Def. 2a4a2) and a logematics (Def. 2a4b), a cenidics (Def. 2b1a2) and cenematics (Def. 2b1b), a delidics (Def. 2c1a2) and a delematics (Def. 2c1b), a logematics (Def. 2a4b) and a logotactics (Def. 2a4c), a cenematics (Def. 2b1b) and a cenotactics (Def. 2b1c), a delematics (Def. 2c1b) and a delotactics (Def. 2c1c), also a logidics (Def. 2a4a2) and a logidotactics (Def. 2a4c1), a cenidics (Def. 2b1a2) and a cenidotactics (Def. 2b1c1), and a delidics (Def. 2c1a2) and a delidotactics (Def. 2c1c1) interlock ontologically. There is also a kind of interlock, similar to ontological interlock, between cenotactics (Def. 2b1c) and para-cenotactics (Def. 18c), logotactics (Def. 2a4c) and para-logotactics (Def. 19c), and delotactics (Def. 2c1c) and para-delotactics (Def. 18i), but this is of a different kind. In these cases the ontotactics (Def. 3b) provide the entities (Def. 1c2) that correspond to the base (Def.	B	Def. 03c2a.	'Interlocking' for 'in systemology the one sub-system providing the forms of the entities of the other sub-system' (a cenological system and plerological system interlock in this way), or for 'the one sub-system providing the basic entities of the other sub-system' (an inventory of simple cenological entities and a cenematics, a cenematics and a cenotactics, as well as an inventory of simple plerological entities and a plerematics, and a plerematics and a plerotactics interlock in this way)	for 'in systemology the one sub-system providing the forms of the entities of the other sub-system' (a cenological system and plerological system interlock in this way), or for 'the one sub-system providing the basic entities of the other sub-system' (an inventory of simple cenological entities and a cenematics, a cenematics and a cenotactics, as well as an inventory of simple plerological entities and a plerematics, and a plerematics and a plerotactics interlock in this way) (Mulder 1989: 439-440).	There is a kind of interlock between 'cenotactics' and 'para-cenotactics', and between 'plerotactics' (syntax) and 'para-plerotactics' (para-syntax, or the sentential level), but this is of a different kind. Cenotactics and plerotactics provide the entities that correspond to elements in the base of para-cenotactic and para-plerotactic entities respectively (Mulder 1989: 439-440).
67	B	Def. 04a.	'Simple system (Def. 1b)'	for 'system (Def. 1b) without combinations (Def. 6c) of entities (Def. 1c2)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 44, Def. 4a; Mulder 1989: 440, Def. 4a).		B	Def. 04a.	'Simple system'	for 'system without combinations of entities' (Mulder 1989: 440).	
68	B	Def. 04b.	'Complex system (Def. 1b)'	for 'system (Def. 1b) with combinations (Def. 6c) of entities (Def. 1c2)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 44, Def. 4b; Mulder 1989: 440, Def.4b).		B	Def. 04b.	'Complex system'	for 'system with combinations of entities' (Mulder 1989: 440).	

69	B	Def. 04b1.	'Unordered system (Def. 1b)'	for 'system (Def. 1b) without ordering relations (Def. 6a) between entities (Def. 1c2)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 44, Def. 4b1; Mulder 1989: 440, Def. 4b1).	Comment: This may be an ontomics (Def. 3a1a1), an ontidics (Def. 3a1a2), or an ontematics (Def. 3a1b).	B	Def. 04b1.	'Unordered system'	for 'complex system without ordering relations between entities' (Mulder 1989: 440).	
70	B	Def. 04b2.	'Ordered system (Def. 1b)'	for 'system (Def. 1b) with ordering relations (Def. 6a) between entities (Def. 1c2)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 44, Def. 4b2; Mulder 1989: 440, Def.4b2).		B	Def. 04b2.	'Ordered system'	for 'complex system with ordering relations between entities' (Mulder 1989: 440).	
71	B	Def. 05.	'Semiotic system'	for 'system (Def. 1b) constituted by the transformational interlock (Def. 3c2a) of one logology (Def. 2a4a) with one cenology (Def. 2b1a) and one delology (Def. 2c1a)'. Alternative definition to Def. 1c (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 44, Def. 5; Mulder 1989: 440, Def. 5).	Comment: "Definitions 3b-5 are specially geared to clarifying the notion proper language. All natural languages are proper languages, but there is at least a theoretical possibility that the reverse does not hold" (Mulder 1989: 440).	B	Def. 05.	'Semiotic system'	for 'communication system with a systemology, i.e. with a cenological system interlocking with a plerological system' (alternative definition to Def. 1c.) (Mulder 1989: 440).	We can, therefore, have semiotic systems where either the cenological system, or the plerological system, or both, are simple, unordered, and/or ordered, which leads to various types. Definitions 3b-5 are specially geared to clarifying the notion 'proper language'. All natural languages are proper languages, but there is at least a theoretical possibility that the reverse does not hold (Mulder 1989: 440).
72	B	Def. 05a.	'Compound semiotic system'	for semiotic system (Def. 1c, Def. 5) that is itself a system (Def. 1b) of ontologically interlocking (Def. 3c2a) systems (Def. 1b)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 83-84).	Comment: Compound semiotic systems (Def. 1c, Def. 5), as defined here, involve interlock (cf. Def. 3c2a) between different levels within the system ontology (Def. 3a1a). Thus a cenology (Def. 2b1a) is compound if there is at least either a cenematics (Def. 2b1b) or a cenidotactics (Def. 2b1c1) interlocking (Def. 3c2a) with the basic inventory of elements (this basic inventory being by definition in this case a cenidics (Def. 2b1a2), and not a cenomics (Def. 2b1a1)).					
73	B	Def. 06a.	'Ordering relations'	for 'asymmetrical (cf. Def. 11a) relations between entities (Def. 1c2) in combinations (constructions) (Def. 6c, Def. 7f)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 44, Def. 6a; Mulder 1989: 440, Def. 6a).		B	Def. 06a.	'Ordering relations'	for 'asymmetrical relations between entities in combinations (constructions)' (Mulder 1989: 440).	
74	B	Def. 06b.	'Relations of simultaneity'	for 'symmetrical (cf. Def. 11b, Def. 11c) relations between entities (Def. 1c2) in combinations (constructions) (Def. 6c, cf. Def. 7f)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 44, Def. 6b; Mulder 1989: 440, Def. 6b).	Comment: "By Axiom A, only functional criteria may be brought to bear in deciding whether a relation is symmetrical or not" (Mulder 1989: 440).	B	Def. 06b.	'Relations of simultaneity'	for 'symmetrical relations between entities in combinations (constructions)' (Mulder 1989: 440).	By Axiom A, only functional criteria may be brought to bear in deciding whether a relation is symmetrical or asymmetrical (Mulder 1989: 440).
75	B	Def. 06c.	'Construction (cf. Def. 7f)' or 'combination' or 'complex'	for 'self-contained (Def. 1b1) complex of entities (Def. 1c2) in cenology (Def. 2b1a), delology (Def. 2c1a) or logology (Def. 2a4a)' (cf. Mulder 1989: 440, Def. 6c).	Comment: The terms imply such notions as: complex ceneme (Def. 8a), cenotagm (Def. 9a), complex para-cenotagm (Def. 18e), complex deleme (Def. 8c), delotagm (Def. 9c), complex para-delotagm (Def. 18k), complex logeme (Def. 8b), logotagm (Def. 9b), complex para-logotagm (Def. 19e), complex sentence (Def. 21) (i.e. consisting of more than one clause (Def. 21a) as its immediate constituents (Def. 7f1a)), and self-contained (Def. 1b1) bundle of immediate constituents (Def. 7f1a) (cf. Mulder 1989: 440-441).	B	Def. 06c.	'Construction' or 'Combination' or 'complex'	for 'self-contained complex of entities in cenological or plerological system' (Mulder 1989: 440).	The terms imply such notions as: 'complex ceneme', 'cenotagm', 'complex para-cenotactic entity', 'complex plereme', 'syntagm', or 'complex sentence' (i.e. consisting of more than one clause as its immediate constituents), and 'self-contained bundle of immediate constituents' (Mulder 1989: 440).

76	B	Def. 07a.	'Paradigmatic'	for 'the oppositional aspect of semiotic entities (Def. 1c2)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 44, Def. 7a; Mulder 1989: 441, Def. 7a).		B	Def. 07a.	'Paradigmatic'	for 'the oppositional aspect of semiotic entities' (Mulder 1989: 441).	
77	B	Def. 07a1.	'Paradigmatic (Def. 7a) relations'	for 'relations of opposition between members of sets' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 44, Def. 7a1; Mulder 1989: 441, Def. 7a1).		B	Def. 07a1.	'Paradigmatic relations'	for 'relations of opposition between members of sets' (Mulder 1989: 441).	
78	B	Def. 07a2.	'Commutation'	for 'alternation (or: choice) between semiotic entities (Def. 1c3) (or 'zero' and semiotic entities (Def. 1c3)) in functional (Def. 1a) opposition as immediate constituents (Def. 7f1a), in a given context' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 44, Def. 7a2; Mulder 1989: 441, Def. 7a2).		B	Def. 07a2.	'Commutation'	for 'alternation (or: choice) between semiotic entities (or 'zero' and semiotic entities) in functional opposition as immediate constituents, in a given context' (Mulder 1989: 441).	
79	B	Def. 07a3.	'Distinctive function' (symbolised: d, for distinctive function in cenology; s, for distinctive function in logology; and e, for distinctive function in delology)	for 'the set of oppositions in which an entity (Def. 1c2) may partake' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 44, Def. 7a3; Mulder 1989: 441, Def. 7a3).	Comment: Distinctive function (d in cenology, s in logology, and e in logology) can be expressed symbolically: "In symbols a~(b∪c∪d), which states the distinctive function of a, in case the set of oppositions a enters into is (a~b, a~c, a~d), and no other. In fact, a~(b∪c∪d) = a~b∪a~c∪a~d" (Mulder 1989: 441).	B	Def. 07a3.	'Distinctive function'	for 'the set of oppositions in which an entity may partake' (Mulder 1989: 441).	In symbols: a ~ (b□c□d), which states the distinctive function of a, in case the set of oppositions a enters is (a ~ b, a ~ c, a ~ d), and no other. In fact, a ~ (b∪c∪d) = a ~ b ∪ a ~ c ∪ a ~ d (Mulder 1989: 441).
80	B	Def. 07a4.	'Neutralization'	for 'suspension of opposition between members of a correlation (Def. 7a4a) in given contexts, and governed by those contexts' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 44, Def. 7a3; Mulder 1989: 441, Def. 7a4).		B	Def. 07a4.	'Neutralization'	for 'suspension of opposition between members of a correlation in given contexts, and governed by those contexts' (Mulder 1989: 441).	
81	B	Def. 07a4a.	'Correlation'	for 'set of ontotactic (Def. 7c) entities (Def. 1c2, Def. 9d1) which have an immediate constituent (Def. 7f1a) in common' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 44, Def. 7a3; Mulder 1989: 441, Def. 7a4a).		B	Def. 07a4a.	'Correlation'	for 'set of tactic entities which have an immediate constituent in common' (Mulder 1989: 441).	

82	B	Def. 07a4b.	'Archionteme'	for 'ontotactic (Def. 7c) entity (Def. 1c2) resulting from neutralization (Def. 7a4)'. Alternative definition: 'Simultaneous (cf. Def. 6b) bundle of ontids (Def. 8d2) in particular contexts, common to two or more ontemes (Def. 8d) in other contexts, i.e. equalling the intersection of those ontemes (Def. 8d)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 44, Def. 7a3; Mulder 1989: 441, Def. 7a4b).	Comment: As is predictable from Def. 0a, Def. 0b, and Def. 0c (preliminary definitions), the term archionteme allows for the generation of the following terms: archilogeme (also, archilmoneme, archimorpheme, in natural language: archilexeme), archiceneme (in spoken natural language: archiphoneme; in written natural language archigrapheme), archideleme. Mulder's definition (Mulder 1989: 441, Def. 7a4b) of archi-features (Def. 1c1) in terms of intersection has been followed in definition 7a4b. here. However, there is reason to believe that a definition of archionteme (etc.) in terms of disjunction might be more globally coherent (cf. Dickins 1998: 427-428; Note 21).	F	Def.7a4b.	'Archiceneme (in natural language: archiphoneme)'	for 'cenotactic entity resulting from neutralization'. Alternative definition: 'Simultaneous bundle of distinctive features in particular contexts, common to two or more cenemes in other contexts, i.e. equalling the intersection of those cenemes'. (Mulder 1989: 441).	
83	B	Def. 07b.	'Syntagmatic'	for 'the ordering (cf. Def. 6a) aspect of semiotic entities (Def. 1c3)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 45, Def. 7b; Mulder 1989: 441, Def. 7b).		B	Def. 07b.	'Syntagmatic'	for 'the ordering aspect of semiotic entities' (Mulder 1989: 441).	
84	B	Def. 07b1.	'Syntagmatic (Def. 7b) relations'	for 'ordering relations (Def. 6a) between semiotic entities (Def. 1c3) in combinations (constructions) (Def. 6c, Def. 7f)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 45, Def. 7b1; Mulder 1989: 441, Def. 7b1).	Comment: "Though the term permutation may seem the syntagmatic equivalent of 'commutation' [Def. 7a2], it is used in a realizational, rather than structural sense, though there may be structural implications. I use it as a primitive term, i.e. I refrain from defining it" (Mulder 1989: 441).	B	Def. 07b1.	'Syntagmatic relations'	for 'ordering relations between semiotic entities in combinations (constructions)' (Mulder 1989: 441).	Though the term 'permutation' may seem the syntagmatic equivalent of 'commutation', it is used in a realizational, rather than structural sense, though there may be structural implications (Mulder 1989: 441).
85	B	Def. 07b2.	'Syntagmatic (Def. 7b) entity (Def. 1c2)'	for 'ontotactic (Def. 7c) entity (Def. 9d1)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 45, Def. 7b2; Mulder 1989: 441, Def. 7b2).	Comment: This implies that it is orderable, and/or has constituents (Def. 7f1) that commute (cf. Def. 7a2) with orderable entities (Def. 1c2), provided it is not intrinsically uncombinable at the level of ontotactics (Def. 3b), (such as 'yes' in English, except in conjunctive constructions (Def. 6c) such as 'yes or no') (adapted from Mulder 1989: 441-442).	B	Def. 07b2.	'Syntagmatic entity'	for 'tactic entity' (Mulder 1989: 441).	This implies that it is orderable, and/or has constituents that commute with orderable entities, provided it is not intrinsically uncombinable at the tactic level (e.g. such as 'yes' in English), except in conjunctive constructions (e.g. 'yes or no'). It will be clear, therefore, that 'distinctive features' and 'monemes' are not syntagmatic entities, but 'phonemes' and 'pleremes', and anything more complex (but below the para-tactic levels), are (Mulder 1989: 441).
86	B	Def. 07c.	'Ontotactic'	for 'logotactic (cf. Def. 2a4c), cenotactic (cf. Def. 2b1c) or delotactic (cf. Def. 2c1c)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 45, Def. 7c; Mulder 1989: 442, Def. 7c).		B	Def. 07c.	'Tactic'	for 'cenotactic' or 'plerotactic (syntactic)' (Mulder 1989: 442).	

87	B	Def. 07c1.	'Ontotactic (Def. 7c) relations'	for 'logotactic relations (Def. 7d1), cenotactic relations (Def. 7e1) or delotactic relations (Def. 7e3)'. Alternative definition: 'constructional relations (Def. 7f) (whether ordering (Def. 6a) or not) between syntagmatic (Def. 7b) entities (Def. 7b2), as immediate constituents (Def. 7f1a) in combinations (constructions) (Def. 6c, cf. Def. 7f)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 45, Def. 7c3; Mulder 1989: 442, Def. 7c2).	Comment: Note that ontotactic (Def. 7c) relations are not necessarily syntagmatic (Def. 7b) relations (Def. 7b1), although syntagmatic (Def. 7b) relations (Def. 7b1) are necessarily ontotactic (Def. 7c) relations. Ontotactic (Def. 7c) relations are relations between syntagmatic (Def. 7b) entities (Def. 7b2) (cf. Mulder 1989: 442, Def. 7c2).	B	Def. 07c2.	'Tactic relations'	for 'cenotactic relations or plerotactic relations'. Alternative definition: 'constructional relations (whether ordering or not) between syntagmatic entities, as immediate constituents in combinations (constructions)' (Mulder 1989: 442).	Note that tactic relations are not necessarily syntagmatic relations, though the reverse holds. 'Tactic relations' are relations between syntagmatic entities (Mulder 1989: 442).
88	B	Def. 07d.	'Logotactic entity (Def. 1c2)'	for 'ontotactic (Def. 7c) entity (Def. 1c2) in logology (Def. 2a4a)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: Def. 7d); Mulder 1989: 442, Def. 7d).		B	Def. 07d.*	'Plerotactic (syntactic) entity'	for 'syntagmatic entity in plerological (grammatical) system' (Mulder 1989: 442).	
89	B	Def. 07d1.	'Logotactic relations'	for 'ontotactic (Def. 7c) relations (Def. 7c1) in logology (Def. 2a4a)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: Def. 7d1); Mulder 1989: 442, Def. 7e).		B	Def. 07e.	'Plerotactic (syntactic) relations'	for 'tactic relations in plerological (grammatical) system' (Mulder 1989: 442).	
90	B	Def. 07e.	'Cenotactic entity (Def. 1c2)'	for 'ontotactic (Def. 7c) entity (Def. 1c2) in cenology (Def. 2b1a)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 45, Def. 7c1); Mulder 1989: 442, Def. 7e1). Alternative definition to Def. 9a2.		B	Def. 07c1.	'Cenotactic entity'	for 'syntagmatic entity in cenological systems' (Mulder 1989: 442).	
91	B	Def. 07e1.	'Cenotactic relations'	for 'ontotactic (Def. 7c) relations (Def. 7c1) in cenology (Def. 2b1a)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 45, Def. 7e); Mulder 1989: 442, Def. 7e1).		B	Def. 07e1.	'Cenotactic relations' for	'tactic relations in cenological system' (Mulder 1989: 442).	
92	B	Def. 07e2.	'Delotactic entity (Def. 1c2)'	for 'ontotactic (Def. 7c) entity (Def. 1c2) in delology (Def. 2c1a)'. Alternative definition to Def. 9c1.						
93	B	Def. 07e3.	'Delotactic relations'	for 'ontotactic (Def. 7c) relations (Def. 7c1) in delology (Def. 2c1a)'.						
94	B	Def. 07f.	'Constructional relations'	for 'relations between immediate constituents (Def. 7f1a)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 45, Def. 7f; Mulder 1989: 442, Def. 7f).	Comment: "Definitions 6a-7f lay the foundations for further terminological developments necessary for an effective description of semiotic systems" (Mulder 1989: 442).	B	Def. 07f.	'Constructional relations'	for 'relations between immediate constituents' (Mulder 1989: 442).	Definitions 6a-7f lay the foundation for further terminological developments necessary for an effective description of semiotic systems (Mulder 1989: 442).

95	B	Def. 07f1.	'Constituents'	for 'entities (Def. 1c2) (of the same kind, i.e. of the same level of abstraction) in self-contained (Def. 1b1) combinations (Def. 6c)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 45, Def. 7f1; Mulder 1989: 442, Def. 7f1).		B	Def. 07f1.	'Constituents'	for 'entities (of the same kind, i.e. of the same level of abstraction) in self-contained combinations' (Mulder 1989: 442).	
96	B	Def. 07f1a.	'Immediate constituents'	for 'constituents (Def. 7f1) that are not constituents (Def. 7f1) of constituents (Def. 7f1) within the combination (Def. 6c) in question' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 45, Def. 7f1a; Mulder 1989: 442, Def. 7f1a).		B	Def. 07f1a.	'Immediate constituents'	for 'constituents that are not constituents of constituents within the combination in question' (Mulder 1989: 442).	
97	B	Def. 07f1b.	'Ultimate constituents'	for 'constituents (Def. 7f1) that are basic (or: minimum) entities (Def. 1c2a) at the level in question' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 45, Def. 7f1b; Mulder 1989: 442, Def. 7f1b).	Comment: It is theorematic that in cenematics (Def. 2b1b), logematics (Def. 2a4b) and delematics (Def. 2c1b), in contradistinction with cenotactics (Def. 2b1c), logotactics (Def. 2a4c) and delotactics (Def. 2c1c), immediate constituents (Def. 7f1a) are always at the same time ultimate constituents (adapted from Mulder 1989: 442-443). See also: basic entity (Def. 1c2a).	B	Def. 07f1b.	'Ultimate constituents'	for 'constituents that are minimum (i.e. simple) entities at the level in question' (Mulder 1989: 442).	Ultimate constituents may be immediate constituents. It is theorematic that in cenematics and pleremat ics (morphology), in contradistinction with cenotactics and plerotactics (syntax), immediate constituents are always at the same time ultimate constituents (Mulder 1989: 442).
98	B	Def. 07g.	'Positions'	for 'divisions within an ontotactic (Def. 7c) construction (Def. 6c), such that in every such division an entity (Def. 1c2), as an immediate constituent Def. 7f1a), can stand and alternate (i.e. commute: cf. Def. 7a2) with other entities (Def. 1c2), or with zero'. Alternative definition: 'divisions within a construction (Def. 6c) corresponding to immediate constituents (Def. 7f1a) as relata of ontotactic (Def. 7c) relations (Def. 7c1)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 46, Def. 7g; Mulder 1989: 443, Def. 7g).		B	Def. 07g.	'Positions' for 'divisions within a tactic construction, such that in every such division an entity, as an immediate constituent of that construction, can stand and alternate, (i.e. commute) with other entities, or with ('. Alternative definition: 'divisions within a construction corresponding to immediate constituents as relata in tactic relations'. [443]	for 'divisions within a tactic construction, such that in every such division an entity, as an immediate constituent of that construction, can stand and alternate, (i.e. commute) with other entities, or with ('. Alternative definition: 'divisions within a construction corresponding to immediate constituents as relata in tactic relations'. [443]	

99	B	Def. 07h.	'Archi-position'	for 'the intersection of two or more positions (Def. 7g)' (cf. Mulder 1989: 443, Def. 7h).	Comment: Mulder argues that in phonotactics (Def. Ob, Def. 2b1c), intersection can only occur between adjacent positions. In lexotactics (Def. 0a, Def. 2a4c) and delotactics (Def. 2c1c), intersection can occur between any two or more peripheral (cf. Def. 13b) positions (Def. 7g) (cf. Mulder 1989: 443). Mulder's approach to the archi-position appears problematic. In order for there to be intersection, the sets involved need to have a member (or members) in common. Different positions considered as sets (of one member each) have no members in common with one another. Therefore, it is not possible for them to intersect. This has led Heselwood (1992: 110) to suggest that neutralization (cf. Def. 7a4) be treated not in terms of intersection, but in terms of disjunction (cf. Dickins 1998: 427-428; Note 21; also comment under Def. 7a4b, relating to the archionteme).	B	Def. 07h.	'Archi-position'	for 'the intersection of two or more positions' (Mulder 1989: 443).	In phonotactics, intersection can only occur between adjacent positions. In syntax, intersection can occur between any two or more peripheral positions, but it can only occur in the case of parallel determination, not in the case of diverse determination (Mulder 1989: 443).
100	B	Def. 08a.	'Ceneme'	for 'self-contained (Def. 1b1) bundle of one or more cenids (distinctive features) (Def. 8a2) as its immediate (Def. 7f1a), and at the same time ultimate (Def. 7f1b), constituents (Def. 7f1)'. Alternative definitions: 'basic (or: minimum) syntagmatic (Def. 7b) entity (Def. 1c2a, Def. 7b2) in cenology (Def. 2b1a)', 'basic (or: minimum) cenotactic (cf. Def. 2b1c) entity (Def. 1c2a, Def. 7e, Def. 9a2)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 46, Def. 8a; Mulder 1989: 443, Def. 8a).		B	Def. 08a.	'Ceneme (in language: phoneme)'	for 'self-contained bundle of one or more distinctive features as its immediate, and at the same time ultimate, constituents'. Alternative definitions: 'Minimum syntagmatic entity in cenological system', 'minimum cenotactic entity' (Mulder 1989: 443).	
101	B	Def. 08a1.	'Cenematic (cf. Def. 2b1b) complex (cf.Def. 6c)'	for 'complex (cf. Def. 6c) ceneme (Def. 8a)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 46, Def. 8a1; Mulder 1989: 443, Def. 8a1).	Comment: A complex (cf. Def. 6c) ceneme (Def. 8a) is a cenematic (cf. Def. 2b1b) complex (Def. 6c), as opposed to a cenotactic (cf. Def. 2b1c) complex (Def. 6c). A complex (cf. Def. 6c) ceno (Def. 2b1) is either cenematically (cf. Def. 2b1b) complex (Def. 6c) or cenotactically (cf. Def. 2b1c) complex (Def. 6c), or para-cenotactically (cf. Def. 18c) complex (Def. 6c) (adapted from Mulder 1989: 443).	B	Def. 08a1.	'Cenematic complex'	for 'complex ceneme' (Mulder 1989: 443).	A complex ceneme is a cenematic complex, as opposed to a cenotactic complex. A complex cenological entity is either cenematically or cenotactically complex. Or it may, of course, be para-cenotactically complex (Mulder 1989: 443).
102	B	Def. 08a2.	'Cenid' or 'distinctive feature'	for 'unit (Def. 9e) in cenidics (Def. 2b1a2)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 46, Def. 8a3; Mulder 1989: 443, Def. 8a2). Alternative definitions: 'Basic (or: minimum) entity (Def. 1c2a) in cenematics (Def. 2b1b)', 'basic (or: minimum) entity (Def. 1c2a) in cenidotactics (Def. 2b1c1)'.	Comment: Since cenidics (Def. 2b1a2) is a simple system (Def. 1b), the cenid (distinctive feature) is not only the unit (Def. 9e) in cenidics (Def. 2b1a2), but is also the basic (or: minimum) entity (Def. 1c2a) in cenidics (Def. 2b1a2). I have avoided using a definition of the cenid along these lines (although it accords with the form of the definitions given by Mulder (Mulder and Hervey 1980: 46, Def. 8a3; Mulder 1989: 443, Def. 8a2), since the presentation of the cenid as the basic (or: minimum) entity (Def. 1c2a) in both cenidics (Def. 2b1a2), cenematics (Def. 2b1b), and cenidotactics (Def. 2b1c1) suggests a greater similarity between these two levels than they in fact possess.	B	Def. 08a2.	'Distinctive feature' for	'minimum cenological entity' (Mulder 1989: 443).	

103	B	Def. 08a3.	'Hypercenid' or 'hyperfeature'	for 'cenid (distinctive feature) (Def. 8a2) in a particular cenematic (cf. Def. 2b1b) context, equivalent to two or more cenids (distinctive features) (Def. 8a2) in at least one other cenematic (cf. Def. 2b1b) context' (cf. Mulder 1989: 443, Def. 8a3).		B	Def. 08a3.	'Hyper-feature'	for 'distinctive feature in a particular phonematic context, equivalent to two or more distinctive features in at least one other phonematic context' (Mulder 1989: 443).	
104	B	Def. 08a4.	'Hyperceneme'	for 'ceneme (Def. 8a) consisting of, or containing, one or more hypercenids (hyper-features) (Def. 8a3)' (cf. Mulder 1989: 443, Def. 8a4).		B	Def. 08a4.	'Hyperphoneme'	for 'phoneme consisting of, or containing, one or more hyper-features' (Mulder 1989: 443).	
105	B	Def. 08a5.	'Cenome'	for 'unit (Def. 9e) in cenomics (Def. 2b1a1)'.	Comment: Since cenomics (Def. 2b1a1) is a simple system (Def. 4a) ontology (Def. 3a1a) the cenome is not only the unit (Def. 9e) in cenomics (Def. 2b1a1), it is also the basic (or: minimum) entity (Def. 1c2a).					
106	B	Def. 08b.	'Logeme'	for 'self-contained (Def. 1b1) (by definition: simultaneous; cf. Def. 6b) bundle of one or more logids (monemes) (Def. 8b2) as its immediate (Def. 7f1a), and at the same time ultimate (Def. 7f1b), constituents (Def. 7f1)'. Alternative definitions: 'basic (or: minimum) syntagmatic (Def. 7b) entity (Def. 1c2a, Def. 7b2) in logology (Def. 2a4a)', 'basic (or: minimum) entity (Def. 1c2a) in logotactics (Def. 2a4c)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 47, Def. 8b; Mulder 1989: 443, Def. 8b).		B	Def. 08b.	'Plereme' for 'self-contained (by definition: simultaneous) bundle of one or more monemes as its immediate, and at the same time ultimate, constituents'. Alternative definitions: 'minimum syntagmatic entity in plerological (grammatical) system', 'minimum plerotactic (syntactic) entity'. [443]	for 'self-contained (by definition: simultaneous) bundle of one or more monemes as its immediate, and at the same time ultimate, constituents'. Alternative definitions: 'minimum syntagmatic entity in plerological (grammatical) system', 'minimum plerotactic (syntactic) entity' (Mulder 1989: 443).	From the point of view of the set of allomorphs, one can distinguish within 'plereme' between 'word' and 'grammateme'. If we set up the set of allomorphs in such a way that all allomorphs are continuous, i.e. uninterrupted in realization, they are properly called 'words', otherwise it is better to refer to them as 'grammatemes'. The distinction has, however, only importance from the point of view of realization. It has no structural importance (Mulder 1989: 443).
107	B	Def. 08b1.	'Logematic (cf. Def. 2a4b) complex (Def. 6c)'	for 'complex (cf. Def. 6c) logeme (Def. 8b)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 47, Def. 8b2; Mulder 1989: 444, Def. 8b1).	Comment: A complex (cf. Def. 6c) logeme (Def. 8b) is a logematic (cf. Def. 2a4b) complex (Def. 6c), as opposed to a logotactic (cf. Def. 2a4c) complex (Def. 6c). A complex (cf. Def. 6c) logo (Def. 2a4) is either logematically (cf. Def. 2a4b) complex (Def. 6c) or logotactically (cf. Def. 2a4c) complex (Def. 6c), or para-logotactically (cf. Def. 19c) complex (Def. 6c), i.e. it consists of more than one clause (Def. 21a) (adapted from Mulder 1989: 444, Def. 8b1).	B	Def. 08b1.	'Plerematic (morphological) complex'	for 'complex plereme' (Mulder 1989: 444).	A complex plereme is a plerematic (morphological) complex as opposed to a plerotactic (syntactic) complex. A complex plerological entity is either plerematically (morphologically) complex or plerotactically (syntactically) complex. Or it may, of course, be complex at the sentential level, i.e. consist of more than one clause (Mulder 1989: 444).

108	B	Def. 08b2.	'Logid' or 'moneme' or 'morpheme'	for 'unit (Def. 9e) in logidics (Def. 2a4a2)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 47, Def. 8b3; Mulder 1989: 444, Def. 8b2). Alternative definition: 'Basic (or: minimum) entity (Def. 1c2a) in logematics (Def. 2a4b)', 'basic (or: minimum) entity (Def. 1c2a) in logidotactics (Def. 2a4c1)'.	Comment: Since logidics (Def. 2a4a2) is a simple system (Def. 1b), the logid (moneme, morpheme) is not only the unit (Def. 9e) in logidics (Def. 2a4a2), but is also the basic (or: minimum) entity (Def. 1c2a) in logidics (Def. 2a4a2). See comment under cenid (Def. 8b2).	B	Def. 08b2.	'Moneme'	for 'minimum plerological (grammatical) entity'. Monemes are the grammatical analogues of 'distinctive features' (Mulder 1989: 444).	
109	B	Def. 08b3.	'Hyperlogid', or 'hyper-moneme', or 'hypermorpheme'	for 'logid (moneme, morpheme) (Def. 8b2) in a particular logematic (cf. Def. 2a4b) context, equivalent to two or more logids (monemes, morphemes) (Def. 8b2) in at least one other logematic (cf. Def. 2a4b) context' .							
110	B	Def. 08b4.	'Hyperlogeme'	for 'logeme (Def. 8b) consisting of, or containing, one or more hyperlogids (hyper-monemes) (Def. 8b3)'.							
111	B	Def. 08b5.	'Logome'	for 'unit (Def. 9e) in logomics (Def. 2a4a1)'.	Comment: Since logomics (Def. 2a4a1) is a simple system (Def. 4a) ontology (Def. 3a1a) the logome is not only the unit (Def. 9e) in logomics (Def. 2a4a1), it is also the basic (or: minimum) entity (Def. 1c2a).					
112	B	Def. 08c.	'Deleme'	for 'self-contained (Def. 1b1) (by definition: simultaneous; cf. Def. 6b) bundle of one or more delids (Def. 8c2) as its immediate (Def. 7f1a), and at the same time ultimate (Def. 7f1b), constituents (Def. 7f1)'. Alternative definitions: 'basic (or: minimum) syntagmatic (Def. 7b) entity (Def. 1c2a, Def. 7b2) in delology (Def. 2c1a)', 'basic (or: minimum) delotactic (cf. Def. 2c1c) entity (Def. 1c2a, Def. 7e, Def. 9c1)'.							
113	B	Def. 08c1.	'Delematic (cf. Def. 2c1b) complex (Def. 6c)'	for 'complex (cf. Def. 6c) deleme (Def. 8c)'.	Comment: A complex (cf. Def. 6c) deleme (Def. 8c) is a delematic (cf. Def. 2c1b) complex (Def. 6c), as opposed to a delotactic (cf. Def. 2c1c) complex (Def. 6c). A complex (cf. Def. 6c) delo (Def. 2c1) is either delematically (cf. Def. 2c1b) complex (Def. 6c) or delotactically (cf. Def. 2c1c) complex (Def. 6c), or para-delotactically (cf. Def. 18i) complex (Def. 6c).					

114	B	Def. 08c2.	'Delid'	for 'unit (Def. 9e) in delidics (Def. 2c1a2)'. Alternative definition:'Basic (or: minimum) entity (Def. 1c2a) in delematics (Def. 2c1b)', 'basic (or: minimum) entity (Def. 1c2a) in delidotactics (Def. 2c1c1)'.	Comment: Since delidics (Def. 2c1a2) is a simple system (Def. 4a), the delid is not only the unit (Def. 9e) in delidics (Def. 2c1a2), but is also the basic (or: minimum) entity (Def. 1c2a) in delidics (Def. 2c1a2). See comment under 'cenid' (Def. 8b2).					
115	B	Def. 08c3.	'Hyperdelid'	for 'delid (Def. 8c2) in a particular delematic (cf. Def. 2c1b) context, equivalent to two or more delids (Def. 8c2) in at least one other delematic (cf. Def. 2c1b) context'.						
116	B	Def. 08c4.	'Hyperdeleme'	for 'deleme (Def. 8c) consisting of, or containing, one or more hyperdelids (Def. 8a3)'.						
117	B	Def. 08c5.	'Delome'	for 'unit (Def. 9e) in delomics (Def. 2c1a1)'.	Comment: Since delomics (Def. 2c1a1) is a simple system (Def. 4a) ontology (Def. 3a1a) the delome is not only the unit (Def. 9e) in delomics (Def. 2c1a1), it is also the basic (or: minimum) entity (Def. 1c2a).					
118	B	Def. 08d.	'Onteme'	for 'ceneme (Def. 8a), logeme (Def. 8b), or deleme (Def. 8c)'.						
119	B	Def. 08d1.	'Ontematic (cf. Def. 3a1b) complex (Def. 6c)'	for 'cenematic (cf. Def. 2b1b) complex (cf. Def. 8a1), logematic (cf. Def. 2a4b) complex (cf. Def. 8b1), or delematic (cf. Def. 2c1b) complex (Def. 8c1)'.						
120	B	Def. 08d2.	'Ontid'	for 'cenid (Def. 8a2), logid (Def. 8b2), or delid (Def. 8c2)'.						
121	B	Def. 08d3.	'Hyperontid'	for 'hypercenid (Def. 8a3), hyperlogid ('hypermoneme', 'hypermorpheme' (Def. 8b3), or hyperdelid (Def. 8c3)'.						
122	B	Def. 08d4.	'Hyperonteme'	for 'hyperceneme (Def. 8a4), hyperlogeme (Def. 8b4), or hyperdeleme (Def. 8c4)'.						
123	B	Def. 08d5.	'Ontome'	for 'unit (Def. 9e) in ontomics(Def. 3a1a1)'.	Comment: Since ontomics (Def. 3a1a1) is a simple system (Def. 4a) ontology (Def. 3a1a1) the ontome is not only the unit (Def. 9e) in ontomics (Def. 3a1a1), it is also the basic (or: minimum) entity (Def. 1c2a).					

124	B	Def. 09a.	'Cenotagm' or 'distributional unit'	for 'self-contained (Def. 1b1) bundle of positions (Def. 7g) in cenotactics (Def. 2b1c)', or for 'instance of a self-contained bundle of positions (Def. 7g) in cenotactics (Def. 2b1c)'. Alternative definition for 'distributional unit' in the former, i.e. abstract, sense: 'minimum type of structure within which the distribution (Def. 9a1) of cenotactic (cf. Def. 2b1c) entities (Def. 7e, Def. 9a2) can be described completely and exhaustively'. Alternative definition for cenotagm, in the second sense, 'unit (Def. 9e) in cenotactics (Def. 2b1c)'. Alternative definition for cenotagm allied to the second sense,	Comment: "That is to say that nothing outside such a structure can determine the distribution [Def. 9a1] of immediate constituent [Def. 7f1a] entities [Def. 1c2] within the structure. It is possible that we may in some cases have to describe further the distribution of types of distributional unit with respect to one another. In fact, I tend to use the term 'distributional unit' in the more abstract sense, and the term 'cenotagm' (phonotagm) for an instance of a distributional unit" (Mulder 1989: 444).	B	Def. 09a.	'Distributional unit' or 'cenotagm (in natural language: phonotagm)' for 'self-contained bundle of positions in cenotactics', or for 'instance of a self-contained bundle of positions in cenotactics'. Alternative definition for 'distributional unit' in the former, i.e. abstract, sense: 'minimum type of structure within which the distribution of cenotactic (natural language: phonotactic) entities can be described completely and	for 'self-contained bundle of positions in cenotactics', or for 'instance of a self-contained bundle of positions in cenotactics'. Alternative definition for 'distributional unit' in the former, i.e. abstract, sense: 'minimum type of structure within which the distribution of cenotactic (natural language: phonotactic) entities can be described completely and exhaustively' (Mulder 1989: 444).	This is to say that nothing outside such a structure can determine the distribution of immediate constituent entities within the structure. It is possible that we may in some cases have to describe further the distribution of types of distributional unit in respect of one another (Mulder 1989: 444).
125	B	Def. 09a0a.	'Cenidotagm'	for 'self-contained (Def. 1b1) bundle of positions (Def. 7g) in cenidotactics (Def. 2b1c1), or for 'instance of self-contained (Def. 1b1) bundle of positions (Def. 7g) in cenidotactics (Def. 2b1c1)'. Alternative definition for cenidotagm, in the second sense, 'unit (Def. 9e) in cenidotactics (Def. 2b1c1)'. Alternative definition allied to second sense, 'base (Def. 20a) in para-cenotactics (Def. 18c) in the case of a compound (cf. Def. 5a) cenology (Def. 2b1a) which does not contain a cenematics (Def. 2b1b) but does contain a para-cenotactics (Def. 18c)'.							

126	B	Def. 09a0b.	'Cenemotagm'	for 'self-contained (Def. 1b1) bundle of positions (Def. 7g) in cenemotactics (Def. 2b1c2)' or for 'instance of self-contained (Def. 1b1) bundle of positions (Def. 7g) in cenemotactics (Def. 2b1c2)'. Alternative definition for cenemotagm, in the second sense, 'unit (Def. 9e) in cenemotactics (Def. 2b1c2)'. Alternative definition allied to second sense, 'base (Def. 20a) in para-cenotactics (Def. 18c) in the case of a compound (cf. Def. 5a) cenology (Def. 2b1a) which contains a cenematics (Def. 2b1b) and a para-cenotactics (Def. 18c)'.						
127	B	Def. 09a0c.	'Cenotheme'	for 'in cenotactics (Def. 2b1c) self-contained (Def. 1b1) (by definition: simultaneous; cf. Def. 6b) bundle of two or more cenos (Def. 2b1) as its immediate constituents (Def. 7f1a)'.						
128	B	Def. 09a1.	'Distribution'	for 'the set of occurrences of an entity (Def. 1c2) in constructional relations (Def. 7f) with other entities (Def. 1c2) as immediate constituents (Def. 7f1a) in the same construction (Def. 6c)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 47, Def. 9a1; Mulder 1989: 444, Def. 9a1).		B	Def. 09a1.	'Distribution'	for 'the set of occurrences of an entity in constructional relations with other entities as immediate constituents in the same construction' (Mulder 1989: 444).	
129	B	Def. 09a2.	'Cenotactic (cf. Def. 2b1c) entity (Def. 1c2)'	for 'ceneme (Def. 8a) or cenotagm (Def. 9a)' (cf. Mulder 1989: 445, Def. 9b1). Alternative definition to Def. 7e.						

130	B	Def. 09b.	'Logotagm'	for 'self-contained (Def. 1b1) bundle of positions (Def. 7g) in logotactics (Def. 2a4c)', or for 'instance of a self-contained bundle of positions (Def. 7g) in logotactics (Def. 2a4c). Alternative definition for 'logotagm' in the first sense 'underlying structure (Def. 14c) of a self-contained (Def. 1b1) bundle of logotactic entities (Def. 7d, Def. 9b1)'. Alternative definitions for logotagm in the second sense 'self-contained (Def. 1b1) bundle of logotactic entities (Def. 7d, Def. 9b1), as immediate constituents (Def. 7f1a)', or 'logotactic complex (Def. 6c)'. Alternative definition for logotagm, in the second sense, 'unit (Def. 9e) in		B	Def. 09b.	'Syntagm (plerotagm)' for 'self-contained bundle of positions in plerological (grammatical) system' or for 'instance of a self-contained bundle of positions in plerological (grammatical) system'. Alternative definition for 'syntagm' in the first sense: 'underlying structure of a self-contained bundle of plerotactic (syntactic) entities', and in the second sense: 'self-contained bundle of plerotactic (syntactic)	for 'self-contained bundle of positions in plerological (grammatical) system' or for 'instance of a self-contained bundle of positions in plerological (grammatical) system'. Alternative definition for 'syntagm' in the first sense: 'underlying structure of a self-contained bundle of plerotactic (syntactic) entities', and in the second sense: 'self-contained bundle of plerotactic (syntactic) entities, as immediate constituents', or 'plerotactic complex'. [444-5]	
131	B	Def. 09b0a.	'Logidotagm'	for 'self-contained (Def. 1b1) bundle of positions (Def. 7g) in logidotactics (Def. 2a4c1)', or for 'instance of self-contained (Def. 1b1) bundle of positions (Def. 7g) in logidotactics (Def. 2a4c1)'. Alternative definition for logidotagm, in the second sense, 'unit (Def. 9e) in logidotactics (Def. 2a4c1)'. Alternative definition allied to second sense, 'base (Def. 20a) in para-logotactics (Def. 19c) in the case of a compound (cf. Def. 5a) logology (Def. 2a4a) which does not contain a logematics (Def. 2a4c2) but does contain a para-logotactics (Def. 19c)'.							

132	B	Def. 09b0b.	'Logemotagm'	for 'self-contained (Def. 1b1) bundle of positions (Def. 7g) in logemotactics (Def. 2a4c2)', or for 'instance of self-contained (Def. 1b1) bundle of positions (Def. 7g) in logemotactics (Def. 2a4c2)'. Alternative definition for logemotagm, in the second sense, 'unit (Def. 9e) in logemotactics (Def. 2a4c2)'. Alternative definition allied to second sense, 'base (Def. 20a) in para-logotactics (Def. 19c) in the case of a compound (cf. Def. 5a) logology (Def. 2a4a) which contains a logematics (Def. 2a4b) and a para-logotactics (Def. 19c)'.						
133	B	Def. 09b0c.	'Logotheme'	for 'in logotactics (Def. 2a4c) self-contained (Def. 01b1) (by definition: simultaneous; cf. Def. 6b) bundle of two or more logos (Def. 2a4) as its immediate constituents (Def. 7f1a)'.						
134	B	Def. 09b1.	'Logotactic (cf. Def. 2a4c) entity (Def. 1c2)'	for 'logeme (Def. 8b), or logotagm (Def. 9b)' (cf. Mulder 1989: 445, Def. 9b1). Alternative definition to Def. 7d.		B	Def. 09b1.	'Syntactic (plerotactic) entities'	for 'pleremes or syntagms' (Mulder 1989: 445).	
135	B	Def. 09c.	'Delotagm'	for 'self-contained (Def. 1b1) bundle of positions (Def. 7g) in delotactics (Def. 2c1c)', or for 'instance of a self-contained bundle of positions (Def. 7g) in delotactics (Def. 2c1c)'. Alternative definition for delotagm, in the second sense, 'unit (Def. 9e) in delotactics (Def. 2c1c)'. Alternative definition allied to second sense, 'base (Def. 20a) in para-delotactics (Def. 18i)'.						

136	B	Def. 09c0a.	'Delidotagm'	for 'self-contained (Def. 1b1) bundle of positions (Def. 7g) in delidotactics (Def. 2c1c1)', or for 'instance of self-contained (Def. 1b1) bundle of positions (Def. 7g) in delidotactics (Def. 2c1c1)'. Alternative definition for delidotagm, in second sense, 'unit (Def. 9e) in delidotactics (Def. 2c1c1)'. Alternative definition allied to second sense, 'base (Def. 20a) in para-delotactics (Def. 18i) in the case of a compound (cf. Def. 5a) delology (Def. 2c1a) which does not contain a delematics (Def. 2c1b) but does contain a para-delotactics (Def. 18i)'.						
137	B	Def. 09c0b.	'Delemotagm'	for 'self-contained (Def. 1b1) bundle of positions (Def. 7g) in delematics (Def. 2c1b)', or for 'instance of self-contained (Def. 1b1) bundle of positions (Def. 7g) in delemotactics (Def. 2c1c2)'. Alternative definition for delemotagm, in second sense, 'unit (Def. 9e) in delemotactics (Def. 2c1c2)'. Alternative definition allied to second sense, 'base (Def. 20a) in para-delotactics (Def. 18i) in the case of a compound (cf. Def. 5a) delology (Def. 2c1a) which contains a delematics (Def. 2c1b) and a para-delotactics (Def. 18i)'.						
138	B	Def. 09c0c.	'Delotheme'	for 'in delotactics (Def. 2c1c) self-contained (Def. 1b1) (by definition: simultaneous; cf. Def. 6b) bundle of two or more delos (Def. 2c1) as its immediate constituents (Def. 7f1a)'.						
139	B	Def. 09c1.	'Delotactic (cf. Def. 2c1c) entity (Def. 1c2)'	for 'deleme (Def. 8c) or delotagm (Def. 9c)'. Alternative definition to Def. 7e2.						

140	B	Def. 09d.	'Ontotagm'	for 'cenotagm (Def. 9a), logotagm (Def. 9b), or delotagm (Def. 9c)'.						
141	B	Def. 09d0a.	'Ontidotagm'	for 'cenidotagm (Def. 9a0a), logidotagm (Def. 9b0a), or delidotagm (Def. 9c0a)'.						
142	B	Def. 09d0b.	'Ontemotagm'	for 'cenemotagm (Def. 9a0b), logemotagm (Def. 9b0b), or delemotagm (Def. 9c0b)'.						
143	B	Def. 09d0c.	'Ontotheme'	for 'cenotheme (Def. 9a0c), logotheme (Def. 9b0c), or delotheme (Def. 9c0c).	Comment: cf. Dickins 1998: 138-150.					
144	B	Def. 09d1.	'Ontotactic (Def. 7c) entities (Def. 1c2)'	for 'cenotactic entities (Def. 7e, Def. 9a2), logotactic entities (Def. 7d1, Def. 9b1), or delotactic entities (Def. 7e2, Def. 9c1)' or for 'ontemes (Def. 8d) or ontotagms (Def. 9d)'.						
145	B	Def. 09e.	'Unit'	for 'onto (Def. 3a1) in a particular non-compound (cf. Def. 5a) semiotic system (Def. 1c, Def. 5) which constitutes a self-contained (Def. 1b1) set or combination (Def. 6c) in that semiotic system (Def. 1c, Def. 5)'.						
146	B	Def. 10.	'Syntagmeme'	for 'paradigmeme (Def. 10a) in a particular position (Def. 7g) and in its capacity of standing in that position (Def. 7g)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 48, Def. 10; Mulder 1989: 445, Def. 10).		B	Def. 10.	'Syntagmeme'	for 'paradigmeme in a particular position, and in its capacity of standing in that particular position' (Mulder 1989: 445).	
147	B	Def. 10a.	'Paradigmeme'	for 'member of a self-contained (Def. 1b1) set of entities (Def. 1c2) in functional (Def. 1a) opposition in a given context'. Alternative definition: 'member of a paradigm (Def. 10b)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 48, Def. 10a; Mulder 1989: 445, Def. 10a).		B	Def. 10a.	'Paradigmeme'	for 'member of a self-contained set of entities in functional opposition in a given context'. Alternatively: 'member of a paradigm' (Mulder 1989: 445).	
148	B	Def. 10b.	'Paradigm'	for 'set of entities (Def. 1c2) in functional (Def. 1a) opposition in a given context' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 46, Def. 7g1); Mulder 1989: 445, Def. 10b).	Comment: Definitions 7-10b refer to general notions in the description of semiotic systems (Def. 1c, Def. 5). Definitions 8a-8a4, 9a-9a0b, and 9b2 are specifically relevant to cenology (Def. 2b1a). Definitions 8b-8b4 and 9b-9b1 are specifically relevant to logology (Def. 2a4a). Definitions 8c-8c4 and 9c-9c1 are specifically relevant to delology (Def. 2c1a). Definitions 8d-8d4 and 9d-9e are general statements.	B	Def. 10b.	'Paradigm'	for 'set of entities in functional opposition in a given context' (Mulder 1989: 445).	Definitions 7f-10b refer to general notions in the description of semiotic systems though definitions 8a, 8a1, 8a2, and 9e are more relevant to cenology (in natural language: phonology), whereas definitions 8b-8b2 are more relevant to plerology (grammar) (Mulder 1989: 445).

149	B	Def. 11a.	'Relation of sub-ordination (or: determination)'	for 'direct ontotactic (Def. 7c) asymmetrical (cf. Def. 6a) relation (Def. 15) of functional (Def. 1a) dependency' (cf. Def. 1b1, Def. 6a, Def. 11b, Def. 11c). Alternative definition: 'direct ontotactic (Def. 7c) relation (Def. 15) of unilateral functional (Def. 1a) dependency (cf. Def. 1b1, Def. 6a, Def. 11b, Def. 11c)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 48, Def. 11a); Mulder 1989: 445, Def. 11a).	Comment: The converse of sub-ordination is super-ordination (or: government). If *a* and *b* are in direct ontotactic (Def. 7c) relation (Def. 15), and *a* is for its function dependent on *b*, but not vice versa (in symbols *a*→*b*), a is said to be sub-ordinate to *b*, and *b* super-ordinate to *a*. Furthermore, *a* is said to be standing in peripheral (cf. Def. 13b) and *b* in nuclear (cf. Def. 13a) position (Def. 7g) in the construction (Def. 6c) in question. Super-ordination (or: government) and the notions nuclear (cf. Def. 13a) and peripheral (cf. Def. 13b) are hereby defined as well (adapted from Mulder 1989: 445).	B	Def. 11a.	'Relation of sub-ordination (or: determination)'	for 'direct tactic asymmetrical relation of functional dependency'. Alternative definition: 'direct tactic relation of unilateral functional dependency'. (Mulder 1989: 445).	Its converse is super-ordination (or: government). If a and b are in direct tactic relation, and a is for its tactic function dependent on b, but not vice versa (in symbols: a → b), a is said to be subordinate to b, and b super-ordinate to a. Furthermore, a is said to be standing in peripheral, and b in nuclear position in the construction in question. 'Super-ordination (or: government)' and the notions 'nuclear' and 'peripheral' are hereby defined as well (Mulder 1989: 445).
150	B	Def. 11b.	'Relation of coordination'	for 'direct ontotactic (Def. 7c) (by implication: symmetrical (cf. Def. 6a, Def. 11c) relation (Def. 15) of mutual functional (Def. 1a) independency (cf. Def. 1b1, Def. 6a, Def. 11a, Def. 11c)'. Alternative definition: 'direct ontotactic (Def. 7c) relation (Def.15) of bilateral functional (Def. 1a) independency (cf. Def. 1b1, Def. 6a, Def. 11a, Def. 11c)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 48, Def. 11b); Mulder 1989: 445, Def. 11b).	Comment: If *a* and *b* are in direct ontotactic (Def. 7c) relation (Def. 15), and *a* is for its ontotactic (Def. 7c) function independent of *b*, and vice versa, *a* and *b* are said to be coordinated (in symbols: *a*←/→*b*) (adapted from Mulder 1989: 445-446).	B	Def. 11b.	'Relation of coordination'	for 'direct tactic (by implication: symmetrical, and therefore simultaneous) relation of mutual functional independency' (Mulder 1989: 445). Alternative definition: 'direct tactic relation of bilateral functional independency' (Mulder 1989: 446).	If a and b are in direct tactic relation, and a is for its tactic function independent of b, and vice versa, a and b are said to be coordinated (in symbols: a←/→b) (Mulder 1989: 446).
151	B	Def. 11c.	'Relation of interordination'	for 'direct ontotactic (Def. 7c) (by implication: symmetrical (cf. Def. 6a, Def. 11b) relation (Def. 15) of mutual functional (Def. 1a) dependency (cf. Def. 1b1, Def. 6a, Def. 11a, Def. 11b)'. Alternative definition: 'direct ontotactic (Def. 7c) relation (Def. 15) of bilateral functional (Def. 1a) dependency (cf. Def. 1b1, Def. 6a, Def. 11a, Def. 11b)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 49, Def. 11c); Mulder 1989: 446, Def. 11c).	Comment: If *a* and *b* are in direct ontotactic (Def. 7c) relation (Def. 15), and *a* is for its ontotactic (Def. 7c) function dependent on *b*, as well as vice versa, *a* and *b* are said to be inter-ordinated (in symbols: *a*↔*b*) (adapted from Mulder 1989: 446).	B	Def. 11c.	'Relation of interordination'	for 'direct tactic (by implication: symmetrical, i.e. simultaneous) relation of mutual functional dependency'. Alternative definition: 'direct tactic relation of bilateral functional dependency' (Mulder 1989: 446).	If a and b are in direct tactic relation, and a is for its tactic function dependent on b, as well as vice versa, a and b are said to be inter-ordinated (in symbols: 'a↔b)'. Note that Defs. 11b and 11c, unlike 11a, refer to non-syntagmatic relations between syntagmatic entities (Mulder 1989: 446).

152	B	Def. 12a.	'Relation of unilateral occurrence dependency'	for 'relation such that one of two entities (Def. 1c2) in direct relation (Def. 15) which are immediate constituents (Def. 7f1a) in a construction (Def. 6c) can occur in the construction (Def. 6c) in question, whilst the other is zero' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 49, Def. 12b); Mulder 1989: 446, Def. 12a).	Comment: "In symbols [*a*]*b* or *a* [*b*], the square brackets indicating the occurrence-dependent entity [Def. 1c2], i.e. in the above case it requires the other item, or an item in the same position [Def. 7g], for its occurrence, but not vice versa. The dependent item is called an 'expansion' [Def. 13c]" (Mulder 1989: 446).	B	Def. 12a.	'Relation of unilateral occurrence dependency'	for 'relation such that one of two entities in direct relation which are immediate constituents in a construction, can occur in the construction in question, whilst the other is zero' (Mulder 1989: 446).	In symbols: [a]b or a[b], the square brackets indicating the occurrence dependent entity, i.e. in the above case it requires the other item, or an item in the same position, for its occurrence, but not vice versa. The dependent item is called an 'expansion' (Mulder 1989: 446).
153	B	Def. 12b.	'Bilateral occurrence independency'	for 'relation such that either of two entities (Def. 1c2) in direct relation (Def. 15) which are immediate constituents (Def. 7f1a) in a construction (Def. 6c) can occur in the construction (Def. 6c) while the other is zero' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 50, Def. 12c); Mulder 1989: 446, Def. 12b).	Comment: "In symbols [*a*][*b*]. Both items are 'expansions' [Def. 13c] in respect of one another" (Mulder 1989: 446).	B	Def. 12b.	'Bilateral occurrence independency'	for 'relation such that either of two entities in direct relation which are immediate constituents in a construction can occur in the construction in question, whilst the other is zero' (Mulder 1989: 446).	In symbols [a] [b]. Both items are 'expansions' in respect of one another (Mulder 1989: 446).
154	B	Def. 12c.	'Bilateral occurrence interdependency'	for 'relation such that neither of two entities (Def. 1c2) in direct relation (Def. 15) which are immediate constituents (Def. 7f1a) in a construction (Def. 6c) can occur in the construction (Def. 6c) in question, whilst the other is zero' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 49, Def. 12a); Mulder 1989: 446, Def. 12c).	Comment: "In symbols *ab* . Neither of the items are 'expansions' [Def. 13c] in respect of one another" (Mulder 1989: 446).	B	Def. 12c.	'Bilateral occurrence interdependency'	for 'relation such that neither of two entities in direct relation which are immediate constituents in a construction can occur in the construction in question, whilst the other is (' (Mulder 1989: 446).	In symbols ab. Neither of the items are 'expansions' in respect of one another (Mulder 1989: 446).
155	B	Def. 13a.	'Nucleus' or 'governing entity (Def. 1c2)'	for 'in a relation of sub-ordination (Def. 11a) the identity element for the ontotactic (Def. 7c) functions of the elements' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 50, Def. 13a); Mulder 1989: 446, Def. 13a).	Comment: In symbols: *b* →*a* , [*b*]→*a* , *a* ←*b* , or *a* ←[*b*], in which *a* is the nucleus. That is, the ontotactic (Def. 7c) relations (Def. 7c1) of the other immediate constituents (Def. 7f1a) depend for their ontotactic (Def. 7c) function on their relation with the nucleus (adapted from Mulder 1989: 446).	B	Def. 13a.	'Nucleus' or 'governing entity'	for 'in a relation of sub-ordination, the identity element for the tactic functions of the other elements' (Mulder 1989: 446).	In symbols: *b* → *a* , [*b*]→*a* , *a* ←*b* , or *a* ←[*b*], in which *a* is the nucleus. That is, the tactic relations of the other immediate constituents depend for their tactic function on their relation with the nucleus.
156	B	Def. 13b.	'Peripheral entity (Def. 1c2)' or 'governed entity (Def. 1c2)' or 'determinant entity (Def. 1c2)'	for 'in a relation of sub-ordination (Def. 11a), a non-nuclear (cf. Def. 13a) immediate constituent (Def. 7f1a)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 50, Def. 13b); Mulder 1989: 447, Def. 13b).	Comment: In symbols: *b* in the representations for Def. 11a, and Def. 13a (adapted from Mulder 1989: 447).	B	Def. 13b.	'Peripheral entity' or 'governed entity' or 'determinant entity'	for 'in a relation of sub-ordination, a non-nuclear immediate constituent' (Mulder 1989: 447).	In symbols: b, in the above representations. See Def. 11a and 13a (Mulder 1989: 447).

157	B	Def. 13c.	'Expansion'	for 'immediate constituent (Def. 7f1a) that commutes (cf. Def. 7a2) with zero' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 50, Def. 13c); Mulder 1989: 447, Def. 13c).	Comment: In symbols *a* →[*b*], i.e. sub-ordination (cf. Def. 11a, Def. 13a), in which *a* is an expansion; also [*a*]←/→[*b*], i.e. coordination (cf. Def. 11b), in which both *a* and *b* are expansions. The term 'expansion' is always used with reference to another entity (Def. 1c2) with which the other entity (Def. 1c2) is in direct ontotactic (Def. 7c) relation (Def. 15). Complex (cf. Def. 6c) expansions may contain entities (Def. 1c2) that are themselves not expansions, e.g. [[*a*]→*b*]→*c* , or even [*a* →*b*]→*c* (adapted from Mulder 1989: 447). In both the earlier version of the postulates (Mulder and Hervey 1980: 50-51) and the revised version (Mulder 1989: 447-448) a distinction is made between diverse determination (Def. 14a; cf. also Def. 11a) and parallel determination (Def. 14b; cf. also Def. 11a). It seems that this distinction cannot be coherently applied (cf. Heselwood 1995; also Dickins 1998: 138-150). It is therefore excluded from these postulates for extended axiomatic functionalism along with the corresponding definition numbers.	B	Def. 13c.	'Expansion'	for 'immediate constituent that commutes with (' (Mulder 1989: 447).	In symbols [a] → b, in which a is an expansion; also [a]←/→[b], i.e. coordination, in which both a and b are expansions. The term 'expansion' is always used with reference to another entity with which the other entity is in direct tactic relation. Complex expansions may contain entities that are themselves not expansions, e.g. [[a]→b]→c, or even [a→b]→c (Mulder 1989: 447).
158					Comment: In both the earlier version of the postulates (Mulder and Hervey 1980: 50-51) and the revised version (Mulder 1989: 447-448) a distinction is made between diverse determination (Def. 14a; cf. also Def. 11a) and parallel determination (Def. 14b; cf. also Def. 11a). It seems that this distinction cannot be coherently applied (cf. Heselwood 1995; also Dickins 1998: 138-150). It is therefore excluded from these postulates for extended axiomatic functionalism along with the corresponding definition numbers.	B	Def. 14a.	'Diverse determination' or 'disjunctive determination'	for 'self-contained complex of tactic relations, such that two or more peripheral immediate constituents are subordinated to a nucleus, but demonstrably in different ways' (Mulder 1989: 447).	I.e. *a* R_x*c* and *b* R_y*c* , where *a* and *b* are peripheral, *c* is nuclear, and R_x and R_y represent different tactic relations. [...] A both sufficient and necessary condition is that at least two of the peripheral entities in question belong to the same distribution-class. Because in cenotactics all relations must involve time and space (on which all our sensory perceptions depend, and without which there could not be 'form' at all) in a functional capacity, in cenotactics there is in the above case diverse determination by logical necessity. There are other logical reasons, but this is for the present purpose sufficient (Mulder 1989: 447).
159					Comment: In both the earlier version of the postulates (Mulder and Hervey 1980: 50-51) and the revised version (Mulder 1989: 447-448) a distinction is made between diverse determination (Def. 14a; cf. also Def. 11a) and parallel determination (Def. 14b; cf. also Def. 11a). It seems that this distinction cannot be coherently applied (cf. Heselwood 1995; also Dickins 1998: 138-150). It is therefore excluded from these postulates for extended axiomatic functionalism along with the corresponding definition numbers.	B	Def. 14b.	'Parallel determination' or 'disjunctive determination'	for 'self-contained complex of tactic relations, such that no two immediate constituents can be demonstrated to determine the nucleus in different ways' (Mulder 1989: 447-8).	This implies that one has to assume parallel determination until this is refuted by the successful application of Def. 14a. [...] Both sufficient and necessary condition: All peripheral entities, or their commutants, belong to different distribution classes (Mulder 1989: 447-8).
160	B	Def. 14c.	'Underlying structure'	for 'abstract representation of an ontotactic (Def. 7c) complex (Def. 6c) in terms of positions (Def. 7g), with or without indication of occurrence dependency (cf. Def. 12a, Def. 12b, Def. 12c)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 51, Def. 14c); Mulder 1989: 448, Def. 14c).		B	Def. 14c.	'Underlying syntactic structure'	for 'abstract representation of a syntactic complex in terms of positions, with or without indication of occurrence dependency' (Mulder 1989: 448).	
161	B	Def. 15.	'Direct relation'	for 'relation between constituents (Def. 7f1) (not necessarily immediate constituents (Def. 7f1a)) that is not a relation via other constituents (Def. 7f1)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 51, Def. 15); Mulder 1989: 448, Def. 15).		B	Def. 15.	'Direct relation'	for 'relation between constituents (not necessarily immediate constituents) that is not a relation via other constituents' (Mulder 1989: 448).	

162	B	Def. 16a.	'Conflation'	for 'a single realisation (Def. F4.7) corresponding to more than one constituent (Def. 7f1) (not immediate constituents (Def. 7f1a)) having a similar ontotactic (Def. 7c) function, in a construction (Def. 6c)' (cf. Mulder 1989: 448, Def. 16a).	Comment: "Example: 'John likes but I hate him', where 'hate' functions in two different but equivalent positions [Def. 7g]. Representation: 'John likes |him| but I hate him'. ... The unshaded box around 'him' indicates that there is conflation at that point" (Mulder 1989: 448). As Mulder also notes (1989: 448), in the earlier version of the postulates, conflation was termed ellipsis (Mulder and Hervey 1980: 57, Def. 21). I suspect that the attempt to treat ellipsis, of any type, as a structural matter may be ill-conceived (cf. Dickins 1998: 343-348).	B	Def. 16a.	'Conflation'	for 'a single realization corresponding to more than one constituent (not immediate constituents) having a similar tactic function, in a construction' (Mulder 1989: 448).	Example: 'John likes but I hate him', where 'him' functions in two different, but equivalent, positions. […] In the older (1980) version of the postulates, this was called 'ellipsis' (Mulder 1989: 448).
163	B	Def. 16b.	'Functional (Def. 1a) amalgamation'	for 'one single entity (Def. 1c2) having different ontotactic (Def. 7c) functions (and therefore corresponding to more than one constituent (Def. 7f1)) on different level of the analysis' (cf. Mulder 1989: 448, Def. 16b).	Comment: "In phonology [Def. 0b, Def. 2b1a] an example is a single phoneme [Def. 8a] standing in a 'final' position [Def. 7g] in one phonotagm [Def. 9a], but in an initial position [Def. 7g] in another phonotagm [Def. 9a]" (Mulder 1989: 448).	B	Def. 16b.	'Functional amalgamation'	for 'one single entity having different tactic functions (and therefore corresponding to more than one constituent) on different levels of the analysis' (Mulder 1989: 448).	In phonology an example is a single phoneme standing in a 'final' position in one phonotagm, but at the same time in an 'initial' position in another (adjacent) phonotagm. In syntax an example is: 'the man who bought that' (Mulder 1989: 448).
164	B	Def. 16c.	'Antecedence' or 'post-cedence'	for 'a case in which an ontotagm (Def. 9d) from the structural (but not the realisational (cf. Def. F4.7)) point of view is only partly well-formed, but the "missing" entity (Def. 1c2) is represented elsewhere' (cf. Mulder 1989: 448, Def. 16c).	Comment: Mulder (1989: 449) provides further discussion of the notions of antecedence and postcedence. It seems possible, that as with ellipsis, these notions will not be required in the extended version. Definitions 11a to 16c in the standard version further develop the whole of syntax (plerotactics). The relevant notions are presented and the methodology is developed in some detail (cf. Mulder 1989: 449). As has been noted, the applicability of some of these notions to the extended version may be doubted. It also remains to be seen whether the notions presented in these definitions are equally applicable to logotactics (Def. 2a4c) and to delotactics (Def. 2c1c).	B	Def. 16c	'Antecedence' or 'post-cedence'	for 'a case in which a syntagm from the structural (but not from the realizational) point of view is only partly well-formed, but the 'missing' entity is represented elsewhere' (Mulder 1989: 449).	E.g. 'the book he give me' [...]. The 'antecedent' entity is here 'the book'. The empty box indicates that the construction is a semi-x (where x stands for the type of construction in question, in this case an 'indirect transitive predicative based syntagm'). Note that the non-well-formedness is merely a matter of structural analysis, not of actual deficiency. There may be cases in which the antecedent is merely 'implied'. Definitions 11a to 16c further develop the whole of syntax. All the relevant notions are presented, and the methodology is developed in fairly great detail (Mulder 1989: 449).
165	C	**Axiom C.**	Ontos (Def. Def. 03a1) may have para-ontotactic features (Def. 17), i.e. cenos (Def. 2b1) may have para-cenotactic features (Def. 18), delos (Def. 2c1) may have para-delotactic features (Def. 18f), and logos (Def. 2a4) may have para-logotactic features (Def. 19) (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 52, Axiom C; Mulder 1989: 449, Axiom C).		Comment: Axiom C and related definitions deal with the para-ontotactics (Def. 19f), i.e. principally with para-cenotactic features (Def. 18), para-logotactic features (Def. 19) and para-delotactic features (Def. 18f). To para-cenotactic features (Def. 18) in natural language (i.e. para-phonotactics features) belong features (Def. 1c1) such as tone (cf. Def. 18b), and accent and juncture. To para-logotactic features (Def. 19) in natural language (i.e. para-lexotactic features) belong features (Def. 1c1) such as intonation (cf. Def. 19a) (adapted from Mulder 1989: 452).	C	**Axiom C.**	Cenological entities may have para-cenotactic features and plerological entities may have para-syntactic features (Mulder 1989: 449).		Axiom C and related definitions deal with the para-cenotactic (in natural language: para-phonotactic) features and with the para-plerotactic (para-syntactic) features. To the former belong, in natural languages, such features as 'tone' (in so-called tone-languages), which is a distinctive para-phonotactic feature, and accent and juncture, which are contrastive para-phonotactic features. Para-plerotactic features, such as intonation in natural languages, are sentential features, i.e. they pertain to sentences and clauses (which are the sole two types of sentential entity), albeit that not all sentential features are para-plerotactic features (Mulder 1989: 452).

166	C	Def. 17.	'Para-ontotactic features'	for 'para-cenotactic (cf. Def. 18c) features (Def. 18), para-logotactic (cf. Def. 19c) features (Def. 19), or para-delotactic (cf. Def. 18i) features (Def. 18f)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 52, Def. 16; Mulder 1989: 449, Def. 17). Alternative definition: 'features (Def. 1c1) in para-ontotactics (Def. 19f)'.	Comment: cf. Mulder (1989: 450-451) for an extended discussion of corresponding notions in standard axiomatic functionalism.	C	Def. 17.	'Para-tactic features'	for 'para-cenotactic or para-syntactic features' (Mulder 1989: 449).	In natural language these are usually, but (from a functional point of view) inappropriately, lumped together under the term 'prosody'. This is because their phonetic substance is usually 'pitch' or 'stress', or a mixture of the two. But also 'pause' or 'juncture' plays a role in this respect. Another type of para-tactic feature, frequently encountered in natural language, is difference in sequential order, i.e. permutation of the tactic entities involved. E.g. 'can he do it' versus 'he can do it'. This should not be confused with realizational permutation as a means of expressing syntactic relations, e.g. 'John hit Mary' versus 'Mary hit John'. The latter have to do with the actual syntactic construction, and are therefore not para-tactic. The term para-tactic implies that the features involved are not inherent in the form of the tactic constituents and their arrangement, i.e. that they are not merely realizational on the tactic level. E.g. there is nothing in the phonemic constituence of the form of the word 'blackbird', nor in the fact that there are two phonotagms that can account for the fact that it represents a unit on a higher than tactic level with an accent (in neutral realization) on the first syllable, and nor is the fact that an entity represents, say, a clause, inherent in the conglomeration (which is not even 'constituency') of tactic
167	C	Def. 18.	'Para-cenotactic features'	for 'features (Def. 1c1) corresponding to cenological form (Def. 2b1d, Def. 23), accompanying, but not determining the identity of cenotactic entities (Def. 7e, Def. 9a2)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 53, Def. 17; Mulder 1989: 451, Def. 18).	Comment: A cenotactic entity (Def. 7e, Def. 9a2) in combination (Def. 6c) with para-cenotactic features assumes an identity of its own at the level of para-cenotactics (Def. 18c) (adapted from Mulder 1989: 451).	C	Def. 18.	'Para-cenotactic features'	for 'features corresponding to cenological form, accompanying, but not determining the identity of cenotactic entities' (Mulder 1989: 451).	Of course, a cenotactic entity in combination with such features assumes an identity of its own on the para-cenotactic level. In cases where this is trivial, they are only different entities from different points of view, just as, for instance, a plereme is a maximum entity from the morphological, but a minimum entity from the syntactic point of view.
168	C	Def. 18a.	'Contrastive para-cenotactic features'	for 'para-cenotactic features (Def. 18) with the function of groupment over and above cenotactic (cf. Def. 2b1c) groupment' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 53, Def. 17a; Mulder 1989: 451, Def. 18a).	Comment: One should not be misled by the terminology into thinking that contrastive para-ontotactic features (Def. 17) are not functional (Def. 1a). They are, as so many other things, e.g. logotactic relations (Def. 7d1), distinctive (cf. Def. 7a3) in a systemic (cf. Def. 1b), not in a directly oppositional sense (adapted from Mulder 1989: 451).	C	Def. 18a.	'Contrastive para-cenotactic features'	for 'para-cenotactic features with the function of groupment over and above cenotactic groupment' (Mulder 1989: 451).	
169	C	Def. 18b.	'Distinctive (cf. Def. 7a3) para-cenotactic features'	for 'para-cenotactic features (Def. 18) that are in a relation of direct opposition with one or more other para--cenotactic features (Def. 18), or with zero' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 53, Def. 17b; Mulder 1989: 451, Def. 18b). Alternative definition: 'features (Def. 1c1) in para-cenotactics (Def. 18c)'.	Comment: "A typical example is distinctive 'tone', as, for instance, in Chinese. Trivially, unless there is no one-one correspondence (in which case it would not be trivial), also the phonological [cf. Def. 0b] forms [Def. 2b1d, Def. 23] of distinctive intonations are distinctive para-cenotactic (para-phonotactic) features" (Mulder 1989: 451).	C	Def. 18b.*	'Distinctive para-cenotactic features'	for 'para-cenotactic features that are in a relation of direct opposition with one or more other para-cenotactic features, or with zero' (Mulder 1989: 451).	A typical example is distinctive 'tone', as, for instance, in Chinese. Trivially, unless there is no one-one correspondence (in which case it would not be trivial), also the phonological forms of distinctive intonations are distinctive para-cenotactic (para-phonotactic) features, whilst the intonations themselves are para-syntactic features. One should not be misled by the terminology in thinking that 'contrastive para-tactic' features are not functional. They are, as so many other things, e.g. syntactic relations, distinctive in a systemic, not in a directly oppositional, sense. 'Distinctive para-tactic features' are, however, distinctive in the latter sense.
170	C	Def. 18c.	'Para-cenotactics'	for 'system (Def. 1b) of para-cenotactic entities (Def. 18d)'.						

171	C	Def. 18d.	'Para-cenotactic entity'	for 'ceno (Def. 2b1) over and above the level of cenotactics (Def. 2b1c)'. Alternative definition, 'entity in para-cenotactics (Def. 18c).						
172	C	Def. 18e.	'Para-cenotagm'	for 'unit (Def. 9e) in para-cenotactics (Def. 18c)'.						
173	C	Def. 18f.	'Para-delotactic features'	for 'features (Def. 1c1) corresponding to delological form (Def. 2c1d, Def. 23c), accompanying, but not determining the identity of delotactic entities (Def. 7e2, Def. 9c1)'. Alternative definition: 'Features (Def. 1c1) in para-delotactics (Def. 18i)'.						
174	C	Def. 18g.	'Contrastive para-delotactic features'	for 'para-delotactic features (Def. 18f) with the function of groupment over and above delotactic (cf. Def. 2c1c) groupment'.						
175	C	Def. 18h.	'Distinctive (cf. Def. 7a3) para-delotactic features'	for 'para-delotactic features (Def. 18f) that are in a relation of direct opposition with one or more other para-delotactic features (Def. 18f), or with zero'.						
176	C	Def. 18i.	'Para-delotactics'	for 'system (Def. 1b) of para-delotactic entities (Def. 18j)'.						
177	C	Def. 18j.	'Para-delotactic entity'	for 'delo (Def. 2c1) over and above the level of delotactics (Def. 2c1c)'. Alternative definition: 'entity in a para-delotactics (Def. 18i)'.						
178	C	Def. 18k.	'Para-delotagm'	for 'unit (Def. 9e) in para-delotactics (Def. 18i)'.						
179	C	Def. 19.	'Para-logotactic features'	for 'features (Def. 1c1) accompanying, but not determining the identity of, logotactic entities (Def. 7d, Def. 9b1) or conglomerations of logotactic entities (Def. 7d, Def. 9b1; cf. Def. 21, Def. 21a)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 54, Def. 18; Mulder 1989: 451, Def. 19).	Comment: Para-logotactic entities (Def. 1c2) or conglomerations of para-logotactic entities (Def. 1c2) in combination (Def. 6c) with para-logotactic features assume an identity of their own on the sentential level, i.e. they become sentential entities (Def. 21b), that is sentences (Def. 21) or clauses (Def. 21a) (adapted from Mulder 1989: 451).	C	Def. 19.	'Para-syntactic features' or 'para-plerotactic features'	for 'features accompanying, but not determining the identity of, syntactic entities or conglomerations of syntactic entities' (Mulder 1989: 451).	Syntactic entities or conglomerations of syntactic entities in combination with para-syntactic features assume an identity of their own on the sentential level, i.e. they become sentential entities (i.e. 'sentences' or 'clauses', see below, Def. 21, 21a) (Mulder 1989: 451).

180	C	Def. 19a.	'Contrastive para-logotactic (cf. Def. 19c) features (Def. 19)'	for 'features (Def. 1c1) with the function of groupment over and above logotactic (cf. Def. 2a4c) groupment' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 54, Def. 18a; Mulder 1989: 451, Def. 19a).	Comment: "In language the suspensive, i.e. 'comma' or 'semi-colon' intonation type belong to this, but also the 'distinctive' types such as 'finality' ('full-stop type'), 'finality with emphasis' ('exclamation-type'), and 'question', though having a directly distinctive function [Def. 7a3], correspond, from another point of view, to contrastive features [Def. 1c1], as they too provide groupment" (Mulder 1989: 452).	C	Def. 19a.	'Contrastive para-syntactic features'	for 'features with the function of groupment over and above syntactic groupment' (Mulder 1989: 451-2).	In language the suspensive, i.e. 'comma' or 'semi-colon' intonation type belong to this, but also the 'distinctive types such as 'finality' ('full stop type'), 'finality with emphasis' ('exclamation-type'), and 'question', though having a directly distinctive function, correspond, from another point of view, to contrastive features, as they too provide groupment (Mulder 1989: 451-2).
181	C	Def. 19b.	'Distinctive (cf. Def. 7a3) para-logotactic (cf. Def. 19c) features (Def. 19)'	for 'para-logotactic (cf. Def. 19c) features (Def. 19) that are in a direct relation of opposition with other para-logotactic features (Def. 19) or with zero' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 54, Def. 18b; Mulder 1989: 452, Def. 19b).		C	Def. 19b.	'Distinctive para-syntactic features'	for 'para-syntactic features that are in a direct relation of opposition with other para-syntactic features or with (' (Mulder 1989: 452).	It is possible that the 'finality' (full stop type) could be regarded as Ø, but there seems little profit in doing this (Mulder 1989: 452).
182	C	Def. 19c.	'Para-logotactics'	for 'system (Def. 1b) of para-logotactic entities (Def. 19d)'.							
183	C	Def. 19d.	'Para-logotactic entity (Def. 1c2)'	for 'logo (Def. 2a4) over and above the level of logotactics (Def. 2a4c)'. Alternative definition, 'entity in para-logotactics (Def. 19c)'.		C	Def. 20.	'Para-tactic entities' for 'tactic entities or conglomerations of tactic entities, together with accompanying para-tactic features, such that the whole assumes an identity on a level different from the tactic level'. Alternative definition: 'entity constituted by a base and para-tactic features'. [452]	for 'tactic entities or conglomerations of tactic entities, together with accompanying para-tactic features, such that the whole assumes an identity on a level different from the tactic level'. Alternative definition: 'entity constituted by a base and para-tactic features'. [452]	
184	C	Def. 19e.	'Para-logotagm'	for 'unit (Def. 9e) in para-logotactics (Def. 19c)'.							
185	C	Def. 19f.	'Para-ontotactics'	for 'para-logotactics (Def. 19c), para-cenotactics (Def. 18c), or para-delotactics (Def. 18i)'.							

186	C	Def. 20.	'Para-ontotagm'	for 'unit (Def. 9e) in para-ontotactics (Def. 19f)'. Alternative definition: 'ontotactic (Def. 7c) entities (Def. 1c2) or conglomeration of ontotactic (Def. 7c) entities (Def. 1c2), together with accompanying para-ontotactic features (Def. 17), such that the whole assumes an identity on a level different from the ontotactic (Def. 7c) level (i.e. the level of ontotactics (Def. 3b))' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 55, Def. 19; Mulder 1989: 452, Def. 20).						
187	C	Def. 20a.	'Base'	for 'in a para-ontotagm (Def. 20.), the total complex (Def. 6c) of those features (Def. 1c1) that correspond (on the level of para-ontotactics: Def. 19f) to the ontotactic (Def. 7c) entities (Def. 1c2)' (cf. Mulder – Hervey 1980: 56, Def. 20b; Mulder 1989: 452, Def. 20a).	Comment: See also "basic entity" (Def. 1c2a).	C	Def. 20a.	'Base'	for 'in a para-tactic entity, the total complex of those features that correspond (on another level) to tactic entities' (Mulder 1989: 452).	
188	C	Def. 20b.	'Complex (cf. Def. 6c) para-ontotagm (Def. 20)'	for 'self-contained (Def. 1b1) entity (Def. 1c2) constituted by two or more para-ontotagms (Def. 20), together with further accompanying para-ontotactic features (Def. 17)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 56, Def. 19a; Mulder 1989: 452, Def. 20b).		C	Def. 20b.	'Complex para-tactic entity'	for 'self-contained entity constituted by two or more para-tactic entities, together with further accompanying para-tactic features' (Mulder 1989: 452).	

189	D	**Axiom D.**	All semiotic systems (Def. 1c, Def. 5) contain sentences (Def. 21) (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 56, Axiom D; Mulder 1989: 453, Axiom D).		Comment: Axioms B, C and D together cover the whole of the cenology (Def. 2b1a), logology (Def. 2a4a) and delology (Def. 2c1a), i.e. the system ontology (Def. 3a1a) (cf. Mulder 1989: 452-453). In Mulder's revised version of the postulates Axiom D reads, "All semiotic systems contain sentences, constituted by a base and para-syntactic features" (Mulder 1989: 453). This contrasts with Axiom D in the earlier version of the postulates, which reads, "All semiotic systems contain sentences" (Mulder and Hervey 1980: 56). I can see no need in specifying that all semiotic systems [Def. 1c, Def. 5] must have para-syntactic features [= para-logotactic features (Def. 19)], since in many cases these will merely be "zero" features (Def. 1c1). It seems more sensible to adopt the position indicated in the older version of the postulates that not all semiotic systems (Def. 1c, Def. 5) need have para-ontotactics (Def. 19f). Axiom D sets the sentential level (as one aspect of the para-logotactics: Def. 19c) apart from the rest of the logology (Def. 2a4a), especially the logotactics (Def. 2a4c). This separation is one of the more conspicuous features of axiomatic functionalism, and is designed to resolve some aspects of the dilemma of well-formedness vs. non-well-formedness (cf. Mulder 1989: 454). In the following Definitions, I do not consider descriptive issues in para-delotactics (Def. 18i) paralleling those relating to sentence (Def. 21) and clause (Def. 21a). I have left these to be worked through in later and more developed versions of the postulates for extended axiomatic	D	**Axiom D.**	All semiotic systems contain sentences, constituted by a base and para-syntactic features (Mulder 1989: 453).		Axioms B, C, and D together cover the whole of cenology (in natural language: phonology) and plerology (grammar), i.e. the whole of the systemology (see Chapters V and VI). One has to be careful to distinguish from the para-tactic (i.e. para-cenotactic and para-plerotactic) features such realizational features as I have called 'connotative stress', which is physically similar to realizations of 'accent', and 'connotative modulation', which is similar to realizations of 'intonation'. These affect 'connotation', not 'denotation', and could perhaps profitably be dealt with under the heading of 'pragmatics'. Without extending the theory by adding one or more axioms, together with definitions, this is outside our scope. It is doubtful whether the theory itself could be so extended without coming into conflict with the functional principle and its interpretations, but it would be worthwhile investigating this. For the time being, however, if we wish to indulge in matters of 'pragmatics' we should use or set up for it a separate and independent theory. Because of physical similarities and physical simultaneity, even between the actual para-tactic features themselves, it is for this area of research clearer than ever that one cannot base one's description on matters of realization (the inductive approach). One might as well measure the weight or the commercial value of a load of books, and,
190	D	Def. 21.	'Sentence'	for 'logo (Def. 2a4) (by definition corresponding to a signum (Def. 2a1, Def. 24)) with such features (Def. 1c1) that it cannot be a feature (Def. 1c1) (constituent (Def. 7f1) or other feature (Def. 1c1)) of another logo (Def. 2a4)'. Alternative definition: 'signum (Def. 2a1, Def. 24) such that it is a self-contained (Def. 1b1) vehicle for conveying messages' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 56, Def. 20; Mulder 1989: 453, Def. 21).		D	Def. 21.	'Sentence' for 'plerological entity (by definition corresponding to a signum) with such features that it cannot be a feature (constituent, or other feature) of another plerological entity'. Alternative definition: 'signum such that is a self-contained vehicle for conveying messages'. [453]	for 'plerological entity (by definition corresponding to a signum) with such features that it cannot be a feature (constituent, or other feature) of another plerological entity'. Alternative definition: 'signum such that is a self-contained vehicle for conveying messages'. [453]	
191	D	Def. 21a	'Clause'	for 'immediate constituent (Def. 7f1a) (perhaps the only one) of a sentence (Def. 21)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 56, Def. 20a; Mulder 1989: 453, Def. 21a).	Comment: A clause is therefore, by implication, also a para-logotactic entity (Def. 19d), and as all para-logotactic entities (Def. 19d) are sentential entities (Def. 21b), though not vice versa, a clause is a sentential entity (Def. 21b) (adapted from Mulder 1989: 453-454).	D	Def. 21a.	'Clause'	for 'immediate constituent (perhaps the only one) of a sentence' (Mulder 1989: 453).	A clause is therefore, by implication, also a para-syntactic entity, and as all para-syntactic entities are sentential entities, though not vice versa, a clause is a sentential entity (Mulder 1989: 453).
192	D	Def. 21b.	'Sentential features (Def. 1c1) or entities (Def. 1c2)'	for 'such features (Def. 1c1) or entities (Def. 1c2) as determine particular signa (Def. 2a1, Def. 24) to be sentences (Def. 21)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 56, Def. 20c; Mulder 1989: 454, Def. 21b).	Comment: These are not necessarily para-logotactic features (Def. 19), though the latter are necessarily sentential features (adapted from Mulder 1989: 454).	D	Def. 21b.	'Sentential features or entities'	for 'such features or entities as determine particular signa to be sentential entities' (Mulder 1989: 454).	These are not necessarily para-syntactic features, though the latter are necessarily sentential features (Mulder 1989: 454).

193	D	Def. 21c.	'Sentential markers'	for 'occurrence dependent (cf. Def. 12a) sentential features or entities (Def. 21b) that are not para-logotactic features (Def. 19) or entities (Def. 19d), but correspond to logotactic (cf. Def. 2a4c) features (Def. 1c1) or entities (Def. 7d, Def. 9b1)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 56, Def. 20c1; Mulder 1989: 454, Def. 21c).	Comment: cf. the long discussion of sentential markers in Mulder (1989: 454).	D	Def. 21c.	'Sentential markers'	for 'occurrence dependent sentential features or entities that are not para-syntactic features or entities, but correspond to syntactic features or entities' (Mulder 1989: 454).	That is, such features or entities determine, just as para-syntactic features do, particular entities to be sentential entities. But there is no sentential entity without para-syntactic features. It is therefore the latter, rather than sentential markers, which are not compulsory, that are the actual features that make something to be sentential. I refrain from formally defining other types of sentential entity, as more research has to be done, and the adequacy of the ideas I have at present has to be tested over a wide range of languages. Note that neither the notions 'sentential feature' and 'para-syntactic feature', nor the notions 'sentential entity' and 'para-syntactic entity' are equivalent, but the notions 'sentential level' and 'para-syntactic level' are equivalent by mutual implication. This concludes the systemology. It sets the sentential level apart from the rest of grammar, especially syntax. This separation is one of the more conspicuous features of axiomatic functionalism. It effectively removes the dilemma of well-formedness versus non-well-formedness in syntax and many another dilemma which tends to plague linguists of other persuasions (Mulder 1989: 454).
194	E	**Axiom E.**	There may be a many-to-one relation between cenetic form (Def. 22a) and figura (Def. 2b) (alloceny (Def. 23a)), and between cenological form (Def. 2b1d, Def. 23) and expression (Def. 24a) (allomorphy (Def. 24b1)), and vice versa: homoceny (Def. 25a) and homomorphy (Def. 26a) respectively. There may also be a many-to-one relationship between semantic form (Def. 23b1) and denotation (Def. 2c) (allodely (Def. 23c1)), and between delological form		Comment: Axiom E and the ensuing Definitions deal with aspects of the signum ontology (Def. F4.4), principally at the allontic (cf. Def. 26o) level (i.e. the allontics; cf. Dickins 1998: 137; also Mulder 1989: 457). They also deal with the protocolising levels of general cenetics (Def. 22d) and general semantics (Def. 23b4) allied to the signum ontology (Def. F4.4).	E	**Axiom E.**	There may be a many-to-one relation between cenetic form and figura (allophony), and between cenological form and signum (allomorphy), and vice versa (homophony and homomorphy respectively) (Mulder 1989: 454).		

195	E	Def. 22.	'Cenetic image' (symbolised: *i*)	for 'model for the unique form of a singular realisation (Def. F4.7), i.e. an instantiation (Def. F4.6), in morphontics (Def. F3h)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 59, Def. 22; Mulder 1989: 454, Def. 22), or for 'model for the unique form of a single entity (Def. 1c2) which is capable of being the instantiation (Def. F4.6) of a figura (Def. 2b)'.		E	Def. 22.	'Image'	for 'model for the unique form of a singular realization of a cenetic feature' (in natural language: speech-sound) (Mulder 1989: 454-5]. Symbolized: i.	
196	E	Def. 22a.	'Cenetic form' (symbolised: *f*)	for 'class of impressionistically similar cenetic images (Def. 22)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 56, Def. 22a; Mulder 1989: 453, Def. 22a). Formal definition *f* ={*i* }, the braces indicating that it is a self-contained (Def. 1b1) class of *i* . (cf. Mulder 1989: 445).						
197	E	Def. 22b.	'Image cenetics'	for 'the sub-theory dealing with the description of cenetic images (Def. 22)'.						
198	E	Def. 22c.	'Form cenetics'	for 'the sub-theory dealing with the description of cenetic forms (Def. 22a)'.						
199	E	Def. 22d.	'General cenetics'	for 'image cenetics (Def. 22b) and form cenetics (Def. 22c)'.						
200	E	Def. 23.	'Cenological form (symbolised: *p*)'	for 'a particular self-contained (Def. 1b1) class of one or more particular cenetic forms (Def. 22a) (i.e. {*f*}), each member *f* in its capacity of having a particular distinctive function (Def. 7a3) d in cenology (Def. 2b1a)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 60, Def. 23; Mulder 1989: 455, Def. 23). Formal definition: p = {$f^{i...n}$Rd}, where $^{i...n}$ indicates 'each one of a particular class' (cf. Mulder 1989: 455). Alternative definition to Def. 2b1d.		E	Def. 23.	'Cenological (phonological) form' (symbolized: p)	for 'a particular self-contained class of one or more particular cenetic (phonetic) forms (i.e. {f}), each member f in its capacity of having a particular distinctive function d' (Mulder 1989: 455). Formal definition: pi = {$f^{i...n}$Rdi}, where the superscripts ^{i} stands for any integer, and can be read as 'a particular' or 'a specific', and $^{i...n}$ indicates 'each one of a particular class'.	As much of the following is in the first place relevant to natural language, I shall use further the appropriate terminology. It will be easy enough to translate this into more general semiotic terminology, or to coin new terms as required (Mulder 1989: 455).

201	E	Def. 23a.	'Alloceny'	for 'one cenological form (Def. 2b1d, Def. 23), the manifestations (Def. 26o) of which corresponding to two or more cenetic forms (Def. 22a)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 60, Def. 23a; Mulder 1989: 455, Def. 23a). Formal definition: '$f^i Rd^i \sim f^j Rd^{i'}$', where also ^{j} stands for an integer, signifying 'a particular' but $^{i \neq j}$, and ~ can be read as 'compared with'. (cf. Mulder 1989: 455).		E	Def. 23a.	'Allophony'	for 'one phonological form, the realization of which corresponding to two or more phonetic forms' (Mulder 1989: 455). Formal definition: '$f^i Rd^i \sim f^j Rd^{i'}$', where also ^{j} stands for an integer, signifying 'a particular', but $^{i \neq j}$, and ~ can be read as 'compared with'.	
202	E	Def. 23a1.	'Allocene'	either for 'one of the terms of 'alloceny' (Def. 23a) as a comparison', or for 'an allocenic entity (Def. 1c2) where there is no comparison with another allocenic entity (Def. 1c2), i.e. {i}Rd *or* f^iRd' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 60, Def. 23a; Mulder 1989: 455, Def. 23a1).		E	Def. 23a1.	'Allophone'	for 'one of the terms of 'allophony' as a comparison' (Mulder 1989: 455).	If there is no allophony a term of that kind is properly called a 'phone', i.e. '$f^i Rd^{i'}$ is a 'phone', but often for this also the term 'allophone' is used (Mulder 1989: 455).
203	E	Def. 23a2.	'Allocenics'	for 'the sub-theory within the signum ontology (Def. F4.4) dealing with the description of allocenes (second sense) (Def. 23a1) and related notions'.						
204	E	Def. 23a3.	'Monoceny'	for 'state of affairs in which a figura (Def. 2b) has only one allocene (second sense) (Def. 23a1)'.						
205	E	Def. 23a4.	'Polyceny'	for 'state of affairs in which a figura (Def. 2b) has more than one allocene (second sense) (Def. 23a1)'.						
206	E	Def. 23b.	'Semantic image' (symbolised: *j*)	for 'model for the unique form of a singular realisation (Def. F4.7), i.e. an instantiation (Def. F4.6), in semantics (Def. F4.3)', or for 'model for the unique form of a single entity (Def. 1c2) which is capable of being the instantiation (Def. F4.6) of a denotation (Def. 2c)'. Alternative definition to Def. F4b.						

207	E	Def. 23b1.	'Semantic form' (symbolised: *g*)	for 'class of impressionistically similar semantic images (Def. 23b, Def. F4b)'. Formal definition: $g = \{j\}$, the braces indicating that it is a self-contained (Def. 1b1) class of *j* (cf. Mulder 1989: 445).						
208	E	Def. 23b2.	'Image semantics'	for 'the sub-theory dealing with the description of semantic images (Def. 23b, Def. F4b)'.						
209	E	Def. 23b3.	'Form semantics'	for 'the sub-theory dealing with the description of semantic forms (Def. 23b1)'.						
210	E	Def. 23b4.	'General semantics'	for 'image cenetics (Def. 23b2) and form semantics (Def. 23b3)'.						
211	E	Def. 23c.	'Delological form (symbolised: *q*)'	for 'a particular self-contained (Def. 1b1) class of one or particular semantic forms (Def. 23b1) (i.e. $\{q\}$), each member *q* in its capacity of having a particular distinctive function (Def. 7a3) e in delology (Def. 2c1a)'. Formal definition: $q = \{g^{i...n}\mathrm{Re}\}$, where $^{i...n}$ indicates 'each one of a particular class'. Alternative definition to Def. 2c1d.						
212	E	Def. 23c1.	'Allodely'	for 'one denotation (Def. 2c), the manifestations (Def. 26o) of which corresponding to two or more semantic forms (Def. 23b1)'. Formal definition: $g^{i}\mathrm{Re}^{i} \sim g^{j}\mathrm{Re}^{i}$, where also ^{j} stands for an integer, signifying 'a particular' but $^{i \neq j}$ and ~ can be read as 'compared with'.						
213	E	Def. 23c2.	'Allodele' or 'denotatum-type'	either for 'one of the terms of 'allodely' (Def. 23c1) as a comparison', or for 'an allodelic entity (Def. 1c2) where there is no comparison with another allodelic entity (Def. 1c2), i.e. $g\,\mathrm{Re}$ or $\{j\}\mathrm{Re}$'.						

214	E	Def. 23c3.	'Allodelics'	for 'the sub-theory within the signum ontology (Def. F4.4) dealing with the description of allodeles (second sense) (Def. 23c2) and related notions'.						
215	E	Def. 23c4.	'Monodely'	for 'state of affairs in which a denotation (Def. 2c) has only one allodele (second sense) (Def. 23c2)'.						
216	E	Def. 23c5.	'Polydely'	for 'state of affairs in which a denotation (Def. 2c) has more than one allodele (second sense) (Def. 23c2)'.						
217	E	Def. 24.	'Signum' (symbolised: S)	for 'the conjunction of a particular expression (Def. 24a) and a particular content (Def. 24b), which mutually imply one another'. Formal definition: S= E&C, or S={$p^{i...n}$Rs}&{$q^{i...n}$Rs} .	Comment: Alternative definition to Def. 2a1 (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 60, Def. 24; Mulder 1989:455, Def. 24).	E	Def. 24.	'Signum (symbolized S)'	for 'the conjunction of a particular expression and a particular content which mutually imply one another' (Mulder 1989: 455). Formal definitions: 'E & C' or {$p^{i...n}$Rd^{i}} & {d^{i}$p^{i...n}$} (Mulder 1989: 455).	As E implies C and vice versa, and either implies S and vice versa, any two of those are equivalent by mutual implication. It is therefore, in practice, admissible to use the formula for 'expression', i.e. {$p^{i...n}$Rd^{i}}, instead of the more lengthy formula, for 'signum' itself. The same holds for when we are dealing with the notions 'allomorph', etc (Mulder 1989: 455).
218	E	Def. 24a.	'Expression' (symbolised: E)'	for 'a particular self-contained (Def. 1b1) class of one or more particular cenological forms (Def. 2b1d, Def. 23) (i.e. {*p* }) each member in its capacity of having a particular distinctive function (cf. Def. 7a3) s'. Formal definition: E = {$p^{i...n}$Rs} (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 60, Def. 24a; Mulder 1989: 455, Def. 24a).	Comment: Mulder defines expression formally as: E^{i} = {$f^{i...n}$Rd^{i}}, commenting, "As *p* has already distinctive function incorporated, i.e. p^{i} = {$f^{i...n}$Rd^{i}}, the distinctive function d in 'Expression' (or in 'Content', or in 'Signum') is by implication distinctive function at a further level, i.e. on the signum-level" (Mulder 1989: 456). This elegant proposal seems to be ruled out in the extended version (and arguably also in the standard version) by virtue of the need to incorporate on a coherent basis a definition for both cenete (Def. F3d), i.e. *i*Rd, and morphete (or form in Hervey's sense) (Def. F1b1a0), i.e. *i* Rs (cf. Dickins 1998: 422-423; Note 9).	E	Def. 24a.	'Expression (symbolized E)'	for 'a particular self-contained class of one or more particular phonological forms (i.e. {p}) each member in its capacity of having a particular distinctive function d' (Mulder 1989: 455-6). Formal definition Ei = {$p^{i...n}$Rd^{i}}.	As p has already distinctive function incorporated, i.e. pi = {$f^{i...n}$Rd^{i}} , the distinctive function d in 'Expression' (or in 'Content', or in 'Signum') is by implication distinctive function at a further level, i.e. on the signum-level (Mulder 1989: 455-6).
219	E	Def. 24b.	'Content' (symbolised: C)'	for 'a particular self-contained (Def. 1b1) class of one or more particular delological forms (Def. 2c1d, Def. 23c) (i.e. {*q* }) each member in its capacity of having a particular distinctive function (Def. 7a3) s'. Formal definition: C = {$q^{i...n}$Rs} (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 61, Def. 24b; Mulder 1989: 456, Def. 24b).		E	Def. 24b.	'Content (symbolized C)' for 'a class of one particular distinctive function d being and in its capacity of being the particular distinctive function of each member of a particular self-contained class of phonological forms'. Alternative definition: 'the converse of expression'. [456]. Formal definition: '{d^{i}R$p^{i...n}$}'.	for 'a class of one particular distinctive function d being and in its capacity of being the particular distinctive function of each member of a particular self-contained class of phonological forms'. Alternative definition: 'the converse of expression'. [456]. Formal definition: '{d^{i}Rp$^{i...n}$}'.	

220	E	Def. 24b1.	'Allomorphy'	for 'one signum (Def. 2a1, Def. 24), the allomorphic (cf. Def. 24b1b) manifestations (Def. 26o) of which corresponding to two or more cenological forms (Def. 2b1d, Def. 23)'. Formal definition: $p^{i}Rs^{i} \sim p^{j}Rs^{i}$ (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 61, Def. 24a1; Mulder 1989: 456, Def. 24b1).		E	Def. 24b1.	'Allomorphy'	for 'one signum, the realization of which corresponding to two or more phonological forms' (Mulder 1989: 456). Formal definition: $'p^{i}Rd^{i} \sim p^{j}Rd^{i}, {}^{i}{\neq}j'$.	
221	E	Def. 24b1a.	'Allomorph'	either for 'one of the terms of 'allomorphy' (Def. 24b1) as a comparison', or for 'an allomorphic entity (Def. 1c2) where there is no comparison with another allomorphic entity (Def. 1c2), i.e. $p^{i}Rs^{i}$'' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 61, Def. 24a1; Mulder 1989: 456, Def. 24b1a).		E	Def. 24b1a.	'Allomorph'	for 'one of the terms of 'Allomorphy' as a comparison' (Mulder 1989: 456).	If there is no allomorphy, a term of that kind is properly called a morph, i.e. $'p^{i}Rd^{i}'$ is a 'morph', but often for this also the term 'allomorph' is used instead (Mulder 1989: 456).
222	E	Def. 24b1b.	'Allomorphics'	for 'the sub-theory within the signum ontology (Def. F4.4) dealing with the description of allomorphs (second sense) (Def. 24b1a) and related notions'.						
223	E	Def. 24b1c.	'Monomorphy'	for 'state of affairs in which a signum (Def. 2a1, Def. 24) has only one allomorph (second sense) (Def. 24b1a)'.						
224	E	Def. 24b1d.	'Polymorphy'	for 'state of affairs in which a signum (Def. 2a1, Def. 24) has more than one allomorph (second sense) (Def. 24b1a)'.						
225	E	Def. 24b1e.	'Allomorphon'	for 'a particular cenetic form (Def. 22a) in its capacity of standing in relation to a particular distinctive function (Def. 7a3) in cenology (Def. 2b1a) in its capacity of standing in relation to a particular distinctive function (Def. 7a3) in logology (Def. 2a4a)'. Formal definition: $(f\mathrm{Rd})\mathrm{Rs}$ or $\{(i\mathrm{Rd})\mathrm{Rs}\}$.						

226	E	Def. 24b1f.	'Allomorphony'	for 'one signum (Def. 2a1, Def. 24) the allomorphonic (cf. Def. 24b1h) manifestations (Def. 26o) of which corresponding to one cenological form (Def. 2b1d, Def. 23), but to more than one cenetic form (Def. 22a)'.						
227	E	Def. 24b1g.	'Polymorphony'	for 'state of affairs in which a signum (Def. 2a1, Def. 24) has more than one allomorphon (Def. 24b1e)'.						
228	E	Def. 24b1h.	'Allomorphonics'	for 'the sub-theory within the signum ontology (Def. F4.4) dealing with the description of allomorphons (Def. 24b1e)'.						
229	E	Def. 24c1.	'Allosemy'	for 'one signum (Def. 2a1, Def. 24), the allosemic (cf. Def. 24c1b) manifestations (Def. 26p) of which corresponding to two or more delological forms (Def. 2c1d, Def. 23c)'. Formal definition: $q^{i}Rs^{i} \sim q^{j}Rs^{i}$.						
230	E	Def. 24c1a.	'Alloseme'	either for 'one of the terms of 'allosemy' (Def. 24c1) as a comparison', or for 'an allosemic entity (Def. 1c2) where there is no comparison with another allosemic entity (Def. 1c2), i.e. $q^{i}Rs^{i'}$.						
231	E	Def. 24c1b.	'Allosemics'	for 'the sub-theory within the signum ontology (Def. F4.4) dealing with the description of allosemes (second sense) (Def. 24c1a) and related notions'.						
232	E	Def. 24c1c.	'Monosemy'	for 'state of affairs in which a signum (Def. 2a1, Def. 24) has only one alloseme (second sense) (Def. 24c1a)'.						
233	E	Def. 24c1d.	'Polysemy'	for 'state of affairs in which a signum (Def. 2a1, Def. 24) has more than one alloseme (second sense) (Def. 24c1a)'.						

234	E	Def. 24c1e.	'Allosemon' or 'reference-type'	for 'a particular semantic form (Def. 23b1) in its capacity of standing in relation to a particular distinctive function (Def. 7a3) in delology (Def. 2c1a) in its capacity of standing in relation to a particular distinctive function (Def. 7a3) in logology (Def. 2a4a)'. Formal definition: (*g* Re)Rs *or* {(*j* Re)Rs}.						
235	E	Def. 24c1f.	'Allosemony'	for 'one signum (Def. 2a1, Def. 24) the allosemonic (cf. Def. 24c1h) manifestation (Def. 26o) of which corresponding to one delological form (Def. 2c1d, Def. 23c), but to more than one semantic form (Def. 23b1)'.						
236	E	Def. 24c1g.	'Polysemony'	for 'state of affairs in which one signum (Def. 2a1, Def. 24) has more than one allosemon (Def. 24c1e)'.						
237	E	Def. 24c1h.	'Allosemonics'	for 'the sub-theory within the signum ontology (Def. F4.4) dealing with the description of allosemons (Def. 24c1e)'.						
238	E	Def. 25.	'Homocene'	for 'allocene (second sense) (Def. 23a1) of one figura (Def. 2b) in comparison with and having the same cenetic form (Def. 22a) as allocene (second sense) (Def. 23a1) of another figura (Def. 2b)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 61, Def. 25; Mulder 1989: 456, Def. 25).		E	Def. 25.	'Homophone'	for 'allophone of one figura, the realization of which corresponding to that of an allophone of another figura' (Mulder 1989: 456). Formal definition of 'homophony': 'fiRdi ~ fiRdj, i (j.	
239	E	Def. 25a.	'Homoceny'	for 'relationship obtaining between homocenes (Def. 25). Formal definition of homoceny: $f^{i}\mathrm{Rd}^{i} \sim f^{j}\mathrm{Rd}^{j},\ ^{i \neq j}$.						
240	E	Def. 25b.	'Heterocene'	for 'allocene (second sense) (Def. 23a1) of one figura (Def. 2b) in comparison with and having a different cenetic form (Def. 22a) from allocene (second sense) (Def. 23a1) of another figura (Def. 2b)'.						

241	E	Def. 25c.	'Heteroceny'	for 'relationship between heterocenes (Def. 25b). Formal definition of heteroceny: $f\ ^{i}Rd^{i} \sim f\ ^{j}Rd^{j},\ ^{i\neq j}$.						
242	E	Def. 25d.	'Cene'	for 'allocene (second sense) (Def. 23a1), homocene (Def. 25b), or heterocene (Def. 25c)'.	Comment: Since homocene (Def. 25b) and heterocene (Def. 25c), but not allocene (second sense) (Def. 23a1) imply more than one entity (Def. 1c2), where only a single cene is referred to, this is necessarily an allocene (second sense) (Def. 23a1).					
243	E	Def. 26.	'Homomorph'	for 'allomorph (second sense) (Def. 24b1a) of one signum (Def. 2a1, Def. 24), in comparison with and having the same cenological form (Def. 2b1d, Def. 23) as allomorph (second sense) (Def. 24b1a) of another signum (Def. 2a1, Def. 24)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 61, Def. 26; Mulder 1989: 456, Def. 26).		E	Def. 26.	'Homomorph'	for 'allomorph of one signum, the realization of which corresponding to that of an allomorph of another signum' (Mulder 1989: 456). Formal definition of 'homomorphy': 'piRdi ~ piRdj, i (j'.	
244	E	Def. 26a.	'Homomorphy'	for 'relationship obtaining between homomorphs (Def. 26)'. Formal definition of homomorphy: $p\ ^{i}Rs^{i} \sim p\ ^{i}Rs^{j},\ ^{i\neq j}$.		F	Def. F6a.	'Homomorphy'	for 'the intersecting of a given form class with two or more classes of equivalent utterances (signa)' (Hervey 1980: 207).	In the event of two or more signa having (as classes) members in common with a particular form class, the morphs constituted by the respective intersections of these signa with the given form class are homomorphs with respect to one another (cf. Def. 26) (Hervey 1980: 207).
245	E	Def. 26b.	'Heteromorph' for 'allomorph (second sense) (Def. 24b1a)) of one signum (Def. 2a1, Def. 24), in comparison with and having a different cenological form (Def. 2b1d, Def. 23) from, allomorph (second sense) (Def. 24b1a) of another signum (Def. 2a1, Def. 24)'.							
246	E	Def. 26c.	'Heteromorphy'	for 'relationship obtaining between heteromorphs (Def. 26b). Formal definition of heteromorphy: $p\ ^{i}Rs^{i} \sim p\ ^{j}Rs^{j},\ ^{i\neq j}$.						
247	E	Def. 26d.	'Morph'	for 'allomorph (Def. 24b1a), homomorph (Def. 26), or heteromorph (Def. 26b)'.	Comment: Since homomorph (Def. 26) and heteromorph (Def. 26b), but not allomorph (second sense) (Def. 24b1a) imply more than one entity (Def. 1c2), where only a single morph is referred to, this is necessarily an allomorph (second sense) (Def. 24b1a). Cf. standard axiomatic functionalism, Def. F6.					

248	E	Def. 26e.	'Homoseme'	for 'alloseme (second sense) (Def. 24c1a) of one signum (Def. 2a1, Def. 24), in comparison with and having the same delological form (Def. 2c1d, Def. 23c) as alloseme (second sense) (Def. 24c1a) of another signum (Def. 2a1, Def. 24)'.						
249	E	Def. 26f.	'Homosemy'	for 'relationship obtaining between homosemes (Def. 26e). Formal definition of homosemy: $q^{i}Rs^{i} \sim q^{i}Rs^{j}, {}^{i\neq j}$.						
250	E	Def. 26g.	'Heteroseme'	for 'alloseme (second sense) (Def. 24c1a) of one signum (Def. 2a1, Def. 24), in comparison with and having a different delological form (Def. 2c1d, Def. 23c) from alloseme (second sense) (Def. 24c1a) of another signum (Def. 2a1, Def. 24)'.						
251	E	Def. 26h.	'Heterosemy'	for 'relationship obtaining between heterosemes (Def. 26g)'. Formal definition of heterosemy: $q^{i}Rs^{i} \sim q^{j}Rs^{j}, {}^{i\neq j}$.						
252	E	Def. 26i.	'Seme'	for 'alloseme (Def. 24c1a), homoseme (Def. 26e), or heteroseme (Def. 26g)'.	Comment: Since homoseme (Def. 26e) and heteroseme (Def. 26g), but not alloseme (second sense) (Def. 24c1a) imply more than one entity (Def. 1c2), where only a single seme is referred to, this is necessarily an alloseme (second sense) (Def. 24c1a).					
253	E	Def. 26j.	'Homodele'	for 'allodele (second sense) (Def. 23c2) of one denotation (Def. 2c) in comparison with and having the same semantic form (Def. 23b1) as allodele (second sense) (Def. 23c2) of another denotation (Def. 2c)'.						
254	E	Def. 26k.	'Homodely'	for 'relationship obtaining between homodeles (Def. 26j)'. Formal definition of homodely: $g^{i}Re^{i} \sim g^{i}Re^{j}, {}^{i\neq j}$.						
255	E	Def. 26l.	'Heterodele'	for 'allodele (second sense) (Def. 23c2) of one denotation (Def. 2c) in comparison with and having a different semantic form (Def. 23b1) from allodele (second sense) (Def. 23c2) of another denotation (Def. 2c)'.						

256	E	Def. 26m.	'Heterodely'	for 'relationship obtaining betwen heterodeles (Def. 26m). Formal definition of heterodely: $g^{\ i}\mathrm{Re}^{i} \sim g^{j}\mathrm{Re}^{j},\ i \neq j$.						
257	E	Def. 26n.	'Dele'	for 'allodele (Def. 23c2), homodele (Def. 26j), or heterodele (Def. 26l)'.	Comment: Since homodele (Def. 26j) and heterodele (Def. 26l), but not allodele (second sense) (Def. 23c2) imply more than one entity (Def. 1c2), where only a single dele is referred to, this is necessarily an allodele (second sense) (Def. 23c2).					
258	E	Def. 26o.	'Allont' or 'manifestation'	for 'allomorph (Def. 24b1a), allomorphon (Def. 24b1e), alloseme (Def. 24c1a), allosemon (Def. 24c1e), allocene (Def. 23a1), or allodele (Def. 23c2)'.	Comment: See also: instantiation (Def. F4.6), realisation (Def. F4.7).					
259	E	Def. 27.	'Homonym'	for 'total homonym (Def. 27a) or partial homonym (Def. 27b)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 61, Def. 27; Mulder 1989: 456, Def. 27).		E	Def. 27.	'Homonym'	for 'total class of allomorphs of one signum, in comparison with, and the realizations of its members corresponding to, those of the total class of another signum' (Mulder 1989: 456). Formal definition of homonymy: $\{p^{i\cdots n}\mathrm{Rd}^{i}\} \sim \{p^{i\cdots n}\mathrm{Rd}^{j}\}\ , i \neq j$'.	
260	E	Def. 27a.	'Total homonym'	for 'total class of allomorphs (second sense) (Def. 24b1a) of one signum (Def. 2a1, Def. 24) in comparison with, and the cenological forms (Def. 2b1d, Def. 23) of its members being the same as, those of the total class of allomorphs (second sense) (Def. 24b1a) of another signum (Def. 2a1, Def. 24)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 61, Def. 27; Mulder 1989: 456, Def. 27).						
261	E	Def. 27b.	'Partial homonym'	for 'at least one member of class of allomorphs (second sense) (Def. 24b1a) of one signum (Def. 2a1, Def. 24), in comparison with and having the same cenological form (Def. 2b1d, Def. 23) as at least one member of class of allomorphs (second sense) (Def. 24b1a) as another signum (Def. 2a1, Def. 24), but the two signa (Def. 2a1, Def. 24) not being totally homonymous (Def. 27a)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 61, Def. 27; Mulder 1989: 456, Def. 27).						

262	E	Def. 27c.	'Homonymy'	for 'total homonymy (Def. 27d) or partial homonymy (Def. 27e)'.		F	Def. F6b.	'Homonymy'	for 'the intersecting of two or more distinct classes of equivalent utterances (signa) with one and the same set of form classes' (Hervey 1980: 207).	This means that every (allo)morph (possibly only one) of a given signum has, by requirement, a homomorph among the (allo)morphs (possibly only one) of any homonym of that signum, and vice versa (Hervey 1980: 207).
263	E	Def. 27d.	'Total homonymy'	for 'state of affairs in which total class of allomorphs (second sense) (Def. 24b1a) of one signum (Def. 2a1, Def. 24) is compared with, and has the same cenological forms (Def. 2b1d, Def. 23) as, those of the total class of allomorphs (second sense) (Def. 24b1a) of another signum (Def. 2a1, Def. 24)'.							
264	E	Def. 27e.	'Partial homonymy'	for 'state of affairs in which at least one member of class of allomorphs (second sense) (Def. 24b1a) of one signum (Def. 2a1, Def. 24), is compared with and has the same cenological form (Def. 2b1d, Def. 23) as at least one member of class of allomorphs (second sense) (Def. 24b1a) of another signum (Def. 2a1, Def. 24), but the two signa (Def. 2a1, Def. 24) are not totally homonymous (cf. Def. 27a)'.							
265	E	Def. 28.	'Synonym'	for 'total synonym (Def. 28a) or partial synonym (Def. 28b)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 61, Def. 28; Mulder 1989: 456, Def. 28).		E	Def. 28.	'Synonym'	for 'signum, in comparison with and having the same intrinsic information-value (denotation) as another signum' (Mulder 1989: 456).Formal definition of synonymy: $\{p(^{i...n})^{i}Rd^{i}\}RD^{i} \sim \{p(^{i...n})^{j}Rd^{j}\}RD^{i}$, $^{i}\neq j$, and where D stands for 'denotation'.	
266	E	Def. 28a.	'Total synonym'	for 'total class of allosemes (second sense) (Def. 24c1a) of one signum (Def. 2a1, Def. 24) in comparison with, and the delological forms (Def. 2c1d, Def. 23c) of its members being the same as, those of the total class of allosemes (second sense) (Def. 24c1a) of another signum (Def. 2a1, Def. 24)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 61, Def. 28; Mulder 1989: 456, Def. 28).							

267	E	Def. 28b.	'Partial synonym'	for 'at least one member of class of allosemes (second sense) (Def. 24c1a) of one signum (Def. 2a1, Def. 24), in comparison with and having the same delological form (Def. 2c1d, Def. 23c) as at least one member of class of allosemes (second sense) (Def. 24c1a) of another signum (Def. 2a1, Def. 24), but the two signa (Def. 2a1, Def. 24) not being totally synonymous (Def. 28a)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 61, Def. 28; Mulder 1989: 456, Def. 28).						
268	E	Def. 28c.	'Synonymy'	for 'total synonymy (Def. 28d) or partial synonymy (Def. 28e)'.						
269	E	Def. 28d.	'Total synonymy'	for 'state of affairs in which total class of allosemes (second sense) (Def. 24c1a) of one signum (Def. 2a1, Def. 24) is compared with, and has the same delological forms (Def. 2c1d, Def. 23c) as, those of the total class of allosemes (second sense) (Def. 24c1a) of another signum (Def. 2a1, Def. 24)'.						
270	E	Def. 28e.	'Partial synonymy'	for 'state of affairs in which at least one member of class of allosemes (second sense) (Def. 24c1a) of one signum (Def. 2a1, Def. 24), is compared with and has the same delological form (Def. 2c1d, Def. 23c) as at least one member of class of allosemes (second sense) (Def. 24c1a) of another signum (Def. 2a1, Def. 24), but the two signa (Def. 2a1, Def. 24) are not totally synonymous (cf. Def. 28a)'.						
271					Comment: In extended axiomatic functionalism a distinction is made between two senses of 'utterance': 'logete' (Def. F1b0a), and 'logonete' (Def. F1b0b).	E	Def. 29.	'Utterance'	for 'model for the unique form of a singular realization of a signum' (Mulder 1989: 456-7). Formal definition: '(iRd^{l})Rd'.	

272	F	**Axiom F.**	Signa (Def. 2a1, Def. 24) may be instantiated (cf. Def. F4.6) an unlimited number of times each resulting utterance (Def. F1a, Def. F1b0a, Def. F1bab) being a member of a potentially infinite class of utterances (Def. F1a, Def. F1b0a, Def. F1bab).		Comment: Axiom F in the standard version deals with the semantics (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 203-211; Mulder 1989: 457). In the extended version, some of what is covered by standard axiomatic-functionalist semantics is subsumed under the system ontology (Def. 3a1a), and as such is dealt with by Axioms B, C and D and ensuing Definitions. Other aspects of what is covered by the standard axiomatic-functionalist semantics are subsumed under the extended axiomatic-functionalist signum ontology (Def. F4.4), and as such are dealt with partially by Axiom E and ensuing Definitions. In the extended version, Axiom F - though closely related in form to Axiom F in the standard version - deals not with semantics (cf. Def. F4.3 for a definition of semantics under the extended version), but with aspects of the signum ontology (Def. F4.4) not dealt with by Axiom E. In the following Definitions I have attempted as far as possible to retain the numbers used by Hervey in his postulates for axiomatic-functionalist semantics (Mulder and Hervey 1980: 203-211). Hervey's Definitions are numbered from 1a. As noted in the Introduction to these Postulates, I have prefixed "F" to each of the corresponding Definition numbers in this version of the postulates in order to specify that the following Definitions relate to Axiom F, and to differentiate them from what would sometimes otherwise be identically labelled Definitions under Axioms A and B.	F	**Axiom F.**	Signa may be realized an unlimited number of times (in actual communication) each resulting utterance denoting a denotatum which may belong to potentially infinite denotation class (Hervey 1980: 203).		
273	F	Def. F1a.	'Utterance (both senses: see Def. F1b0a, Def. F1b0b below)'	for 'member of a signum (Def. 2a1, Def. 24) (as a class) such that it is a model for a single realisation (Def. F4.7), i.e. an instantiation (Def. F4.6), of that signum (Def. 2a1, Def. 24)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 203, Def. 1a).	Comment: "This means that "utterance" is to be understood, not in the sense of single communication-act as such, but as a construct or model accounting for and applying to a single communication-act. Furthermore, it is to be noted that this model applies only to communication-acts that are realisations of signa, i.e. realisations that convey information as determined by the conventions governing the appropriate signa. In actual fact only sentences are realised in communications, but since sentences may contain several signa, we may also say that each of these signa is, itself 'separately' realised (within the sentence). Consequently, every signum, whether it is a sentence, or can correspond to, or be part of, a sentence-base (Mulder's Def. 20b), can be said to be realised in actual communication. This gives us the right to account or individual realisations of any signum by setting up a unique model, i.e. "utterance", for each of these realisations. In this way we are entitled to regard every signum as a class of "utterances", each member of which class is a model for a single realisation of the appropriate signum" (Hervey 1980: 203).	F	Def. F1a.	'Utterance'	for 'member of a signum (as a class) such that it is a model for a single realisation (in actual communication) of that signum' (Hervey 1980: 203).	This means that 'utterance' is to be understood, not in the sense of a single communication-act as such, but as a construct or model accounting for and applying to a single communication-act. Furthermore, it is to be noted that this model applies only to communication-acts that are realisations of signa, i.e. realisations that convey information as determined by the conventions governing the appropriate signa. In actual fact only sentences are realised in communication, but since sentences may contain several signa, we may also say that each of these signa is, itself, 'separately' realised (within the sentence). Consequently, every signum, whether it is a sentence, or can correspond to, or be part of, a sentence-base (Def. 20a), can be said to be realised in actual communication. This gives us the right to account for individual realisations of any signum by setting up a unique model, i.e. 'utterance', for each of these realisations. In this way we are entitled to regard every signum as a class of 'utterances', each member of which class is a model for a single realisation of the appropriate signum. The advantages of this view will become apparent when the link is made, via the notion 'utterance', to the individual denotata referred to by utterances (Hervey 1980: 203).

274					Comment: In extended axiomatic functionalism a distinction is made between two senses of 'utterance': 'logete' (Def. F1b0a.), and 'logonete' (Def. Def. F1b0b.)	F	Def. F1b.	'Utterance'	for 'conjunction of a unique form (see below Def. F1b1a) and a unique reference (see below Def. F1b2a)' (Hervey 1980: 203) (Alternative definition to Def. F1a.)	Informally, we may say that the form of an utterance accounts for the necessary aspect of 'substance' without which a signum cannot be realised in actual communication. At the same time the form of an utterance is a 'token' of the expression (see Def. 24a) of the signum whose realisation the given utterance is a model for. That is to say, a form is an intrinsic aspect of an utterance, in the same way that an expression is an intrinsic aspect of a. signum. A reference accounts for the necessary information-bearing aspect without which no act could be construed as a communication act, let alone the realisation of a signum. Form and reference are merely two equally relevant and equally important ways of looking at the same thing (i.e. utterance). Form and reference, as 'tokens' of expression and content respectively, may be conceived of as the converse of one another. This is analogous with the way expression and content, themselves, are each other's converse (see Def. 24). In intuitive terms this view of form and reference can be explained by pointing out that form accounts for the fact that an utterance is not mere substance, but substance necessarily linked with information-content, whereas reference accounts for the fact that an utterance is not just an information-content, but an information-content necessarily linked to a
275	F	Def. F1b0a.	'Logete' or 'Utterance (1st sense; Def. F1a)'	for 'a conjunction of a morphete (Def. F1b1a0) and a semete (Def. F1b2a0)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 203, Def. 1b). Formal definition: *i*Rs & *j*Rs.	Comment: Cf. standard axiomatic functionalism Def. F1b.					
276	F	Def. F1b0b.	'Logonete' or 'Utterance (2nd sense: Def. F1a)' (symbolised: U)	for 'a conjunction of a morphonete (Def. F1b1a4) and a semonete (Def. F1b2a5)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 203, Def. 1b). Formal definition: U = (*i*Rd)Rs & (*j*Re)Rs *or* U= F&R.	Comment: Cf. standard axiomatic functionalism Def. F1b					
277	F	Def. F1b0c.	'Logetics'	for 'the sub-theory within the signum ontology (Def. F4.4) dealing with logetes (Def. F1b0a) or logonetes (F1b0b)'.						
278		Def. F1b0d.	'Logotics'	for 'morphotics' (Def. F1b1a2) and 'semotics' (Def. F1b2a2)						
279	F	Def. F1b0e.	'Logonetics'	for 'the sub-theory within the signum ontology (Def. F4.4) dealing with logonetes (F1b0b)'.						

280	F	Def. F1b1 a0.	'Morphete' or 'form (1st sense: cf. Def. F1b1b)'	for 'cenetic image (Def. 22) in its capacity of having the particular distinctive function (cf. Def. 7a3) appropriate to a particular signum (Def. 2a1, Def. 24)'. Formal definition: *i*Rs (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 204, Def. 11b1a).		F	Def. F1b1a.	'Form'	for 'image (see Def. 22) in its capacity of having the particular distinctive function appropriate to a particular signum' (Hervey 1980: 204).	In formulaic terms $i^{x}Rs^{x}$. Thus the form of an utterance accounts for the spatio-temporally unique nature of the realisation for which the given utterance is a model, at the same time as incalculating the fact of that unique realisation being the realisation of a signum with a particular grammatically distinctive function (Hervey 1980: 204).
281	F	Def. F1b1 a1.	'Morphetics'	for 'the sub-theory within the signum ontology (Def. F4.4) dealing with morphetes (Def. F1b1a0)'.						
282	F	Def. F1b1 a2.	'Morphotics'	for 'morphologics (Def. F1b1a3), allomorphics (Def. 24b1b), morphonetics (Def. F1b1a5), and morphetics (Def. F1b1a1)'.						
283	F	Def. F1b1 a3.	'Morphologics'	for 'the sub-theory within the signum ontology (Def. F4.4) corresponding to logology (Def. 2a4a) in the system ontology (Def. 3a1a) and dealing with expressions (Def. 24a)'.						
284	F	Def. F1b1 a4.	'Morphonete' or 'form (2nd sense: cf. Def. F1b1b)' (symbolised: F)	for 'cenetic image (Def. 22) in its capacity of having the particular distinctive function (cf. Def. 7a3) appropriate to a particular figura (Def. 2b), in its capacity of having the distinctive function (cf. Def. 7a3) appropriate to a particular signum (Def. 2a1, Def. 24)'. Symbolised: F. Formal definition: F = (*i* Rd)Rs (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 204, Def. 1b1a).						
285	F	Def. F1b1 a5.	'Morphonetics'	for 'the sub-theory within the signum ontology (Def. F4.4) dealing with morphonetes (Def. F1b1a4)'.						

286	F	Def. F1b1 b.	'Form (both senses)'	for 'member of an expression (Def. 24a) as a class, such that it is a model for a single realisation (Def. F4.7), i.e. an instantiation (Def. F4.6), of that expression (Def. 24a)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 204, Def. 1b1b).	Comment: "Informally, we may say that the form of an utterance accounts for the necessary aspect of 'substance' without which a signum cannot be realised in actual communication. At the same time the form of an utterance is a 'token' of the expression (see Mulder's Def. 24a) of the signum whose realisation the given utterance is a model for. That is to say, a form is an intrinsic aspect of an utterance, in the same way that an expression is an intrinsic aspect of a signum" (Hervey 1980: 203-204). "Thus the form of an utterance accounts for the spatio-temporally unique nature of the realisation for which the given utterance is a model, at the same time as incalculating the fact of that unique realisation being the realisation of a signum with a particular grammatically [cf. logologically (Def. 2a4a)] distinctive function" (Hervey 1980: 204).	F	Def. F1b1b.	'Form'	for 'member of an expression (as a class) such that it is a model for a single realisation (in actual communication) of that expression' (Hervey 1980: 204). (Alternative definition to Def. F1b1a.)	This means that we are entitled to conceive of an expression as a class of forms (Hervey 1980: 204).
287	F	Def. F1b2 a0.	'Semete' or 'reference (1st sense)'	for 'semantic image (Def. 23b, Def. F4b) in its capacity of having the particular distinctive function (cf. Def. 7a3) appropriate to a particular signum (Def. 2a1, Def. 24)'. Formal definition: *j*Rs (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 204, Def. 1b2a).		F	Def. F1b2a.	'Reference'	for 'grammatically distinctive function in its capacity of being the particular grammatically distinctive function of a particular image' (Hervey 1980: 204). In formulaic terms $i^{x}\check{R}s^{x}$.	Since grammatically distinctive function is the property by virtue of which entities have an information-bearing potential in the first place (an entity can only be an index if it is, and by virtue of the fact that it is, opposed to at least one alternative index, or to its absence), we can say that reference looks upon the information-bearing aspect of utterances - though substance is, of course, necessarily implied (Hervey 1980: 204).
288	F	Def. F1b2 a1.	'Semetics'	for 'the sub-theory within the signum ontology (Def. F4.4) dealing with semetes (Def. F1b2a0)'.						
289	F	Def. F1b2 a2.	'Semotics'	for 'semologics (Def. F1b2a3), allosemics (Def. 24c1b), semonetics (Def. F1b2a6), and semetics (Def. F1b2a1)'.						
290	F	Def. F1b2 a3.	'Semologics'	for 'the sub-theory within the signum ontology (Def. F4.4) corresponding to logology (Def. 2a4a) in the system ontology (Def. 3a1a) and dealing with contents (Def. 24b)'.						
291	F	Def. F1b2 a4.	'Logologics'	for 'the sub-theory within the signum ontology (Def. F4.4) corresponding to logology (Def. 2a4a) in the system ontology (Def. 3a1a) and dealing with signa (Def. 2a1, Def. 24)'.						

292	F	Def. F1b2 a5.	'Semonete' or 'reference (2nd sense)' (symbolised: R)	for 'semantic image (Def. 23b, Def. F4b) in its capacity of having the particular distinctive function (cf. Def. 7a3) appropriate to a particular denotation (Def. 2c), in its capacity of having the distinctive function (cf. Def. 7a3) appropriate to a particular signum (Def. 2a1, Def. 24)'. Formal definition: R = (ȷ̌ Re)Rs (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 204, Def. 1b2a).							
293	F	Def. F1b2 a6.	'Semonetics'	for 'the sub-theory within the signum ontology (Def. F4.4) dealing with semonetes (Def. F1b2a5)'.							
294	F	Def. F1b2 b.	'Reference (both senses)'	for 'member of a content (Def. 24b) as a class, such that it is a model for a single realisation (Def. F4.7), i.e. an instantiation (Def. F4.6), of that content (Def. 24b)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 204, Def. 1b2b).	Comment: "A reference accounts for the necessary information-bearing aspect without which no act could be construed as a communication-act, let alone the realisation of a signum. Form and reference are merely two equally relevant and equally important ways of looking at the same thing (i.e. utterance). Form and reference as 'tokens' of expression and content respectively, may be conceived as the converse of one another. This is analogous with the way expression and content, themselves, are each other's converse (see Mulder's Def. 24). In intuitive terms this view of form and reference can be explained by pointing out that form accounts for the fact that an utterance is not mere substance, but substance necessarily linked with information-content, whereas reference accounts for the fact that an utterance is not just an information-content, but an information-content necessarily linked to a substance" (Hervey 1980: 204). "We may say that looking at an utterance from the aspect of reference is looking at that aspect of the realisation which links it to the actual piece of information conveyed by ... that realisation" (Hervey 1980: 205).	F	Def. F1b2b.	'Reference'	for 'member of a content (as a class) such that it is a model for a single realisation (in actual communication) of that content' (Hervey 1980: 204-5) (Alternative definition to Def. F1b2a.). In formulaic terms $i^{x}\check{R}s^{x}$.	We may say that looking at an utterance from the aspect of reference is looking at that aspect of the realisation which links it to the actual piece of information conveyed by (i.e. the entity referred to by) that realisation. As mentioned above, form and reference are the converse of one another, and, as such, mutually imply one another; their conjunction (i.e. utterance) is a one-to-one relation between a particular form and a particular reference. The analogy whereby an utterance is a 'token' (member) of a signum to the extent of reproducing its properties, as it were 'in miniature', can be represented in the diagram below (cf. Def. 24): where U = utterance, F = form, R = reference, S = signum, E = expression and C = content and U e S, F e E, and R e C. (The double-headed arrow stands for 'equivalence'.) (Hervey 1980: 204-5).
295	F	Def. F2.	'Class of equivalent logetes (Def. F1b0a) (or: utterances: Def. F1a, first sense)'	for 'the set of all and only the logetes (Def. F1b0a) (or: utterances: Def. F1a, first sense) which are members of a given signum (Def. 2a1, Def. 24) as a class' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 205, Def. 2).		F	Def. F2.	'Class of equivalent utterances'	for 'the set of all and only the utterances that are members of a given signum (as a class)' (Hervey 1980: 205).	A signum can now be treated either simply as an entity (in opposition to other entities), or as a class of allomorphs (see Def. 24), or as a class of equivalent utterances (Hervey 1980: 205).
296	F	Def. F2.1.	'Class of equivalent logonetes (Def. F1b0b) (or: utterances: Def. F1a, second sense)'	for 'the set of all and only the logonetes (Def. F1b0b) (or: utterances: Def. F1a, second sense) which are members of a given signum (Def. 2a1, Def. 24) as a class' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 205, Def. 2).	Comment: "A signum can now be treated ... as a class of equivalent utterances" (Hervey 1980: 205).					

297	F	Def. F2a.	'Class of equivalent morphetes (Def. F1b1a0) (or: forms: Def. F1b1b, first sense)'	for 'the set of all and only the morphetes (or: forms, Def. F1b1b, first sense) which are members of a given signum (Def. 2a1, Def. 24) as a class' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 205, Def. 2a).		F	Def. F2a.	'Class of equivalent forms'	for 'the set of all and only the forms that are members of a given expression' (Hervey 1980: 205).	That is to say, we may conceive of an expression as a class of equivalent forms (Hervey 1980: 205).
298	F	Def. F2a1.	'Class of equivalent morphonetes (Def. F1b1a4) (or: forms, Def. F1b1b, second sense)'	for 'the set of all and only the morphonetes (or: forms, Def. F1b1a4, second sense) which are members of a given signum (Def. 2a1, Def. 24) as a class' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 205, Def. 2a).	Comment: "... we may conceive of an expression as a class of equivalent forms" (Hervey 1980: 205).					
299	F	Def. F2b.	'Class of equivalent semetes (Def. F1b2a0) (or: references, Def. F1b2b, first sense)'	for 'the set of all and only the semetes (Def. F1b2a0) (or: references, Def. F1b2b, first sense) which are members of a given signum (Def. 2a1, Def. 24) as a class' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 205, Def. 2b).		F	Def. F2b.	'Class of equivalent references'	for 'the set of all and only the references that are members of a given content' (Hervey 1980: 205).	That is to say, we may conceive of a content as a class of equivalent references (Hervey 1980: 205).
300	F	Def. F2b1.	'Class of equivalent semonetes (Def. F1b2a5) (or: references, Def. F1b2b, second sense)'	for 'the set of all and only the semonetes (Def. F1b2a5) (or: references, Def. F1b2b, second sense) which are members of a given signum (Def. 2a1, Def. 24) as a class' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 205, Def. 2b).	Comment: "... we may conceive of a content as a class of equivalent references" (Hervey 1980: 205). Defs. 3a, 3b, and 3c in Hervey (1980: 205-206) provide definitions for form class, reference class, and form-reference class. These definitions are no longer needed in the extended version, since they are superseded by the notions morphonete (Def. F1b1a1) and semonete (Def. 1b2a1). They do not therefore appear in the Postulates for Extended Axiomatic Functionalism.					
301					Comment: "... we may conceive of a content as a class of equivalent references" (Hervey 1980: 205). Defs. 3a, 3b, and 3c in Hervey (1980: 205-206) provide definitions for form class, reference class, and form-reference class. These definitions are no longer needed in the extended version, since they are superseded by the notions morphonete (Def. F1b1a1) and semonete (Def. 1b2a1). the Postulates for Extended Axiomatic Functionalism.	F	Def. F3a.	'Form class'	for 'the set of all and only the utterances whose forms have phonologically equivalent images' (Hervey 1980: 205).	In formulaic terms $\{i\}^{p}R\{s\}^{x}$, where $\{i\}^{p}$ is the set of images corresponding to a particular phonological form ^{p}, that is to say, of images having one and the same phonologically distinctive function dp, and $\{s\}^{x}$ is a class of distinctive functions in grammar (cf. Mulder's Def. 24a). Alternatively, the notion 'form class' can be expressed by the formula $(\{i\}Rd^{p})R(\{s\}^{x})$. In informal terms, a form class is constituted by the whole set of utterances whose images correspond to the same phonological form - i.e. it is a class of utterances that are 'formally similar' with regard to phonological features. For instance, every utterance which has the phonological form /her/ (in English) belongs to the form class {'/her/'} – regardless of whether it accounts for a realisation of the sign 'hare' or of the sign 'hair' (i.e. regardless of differences in grammatically distinctive function) (Hervey 1980: 205).
302					Comment: "... we may conceive of a content as a class of equivalent references" (Hervey 1980: 205). Defs. 3a, 3b, and 3c in Hervey (1980: 205-206) provide definitions for form class, reference class, and form-reference class. These definitions are no longer needed in the extended version, since they are superseded by the notions morphonete (Def. F1b1a1) and semonete (Def. 1b2a1). They do not therefore appear in the Postulates for Extended Axiomatic Functionalism.	F	Def. F3b.	'Reference class'	for 'the set of all and only the utterances whose respective references relate to the same denotatum' (Hervey 1980: 206).	Utterances denoting the (qua entity) same denotatum belong, regardless of their formal properties, to the same reference class (Hervey 1980: 206).

303					Comment: "... we may conceive of a content as a class of equivalent references" (Hervey 1980: 205). Defs. 3a, 3b, and 3c in Hervey (1980: 205-206) provide definitions for form class, reference class, and form-reference class. These definitions are no longer needed in the extended version, since they are superseded by the notions morphonete (Def. F1b1a1) and semonete (Def. 1b2a1). They do not therefore appear in the Postulates for Extended Axiomatic Functionalism.	F	Def. F3c.	'Form-reference class'	for 'the set of all and only the utterances with phonologically equivalent images and with the same denotatum', i.e. 'the intersection of a given form class and a given reference class' (Hervey 1980: 206).	
304	F	Def. F3d.	'Cenete'	for 'member of a figura (Def. 2b) (as a class) such that it is a model for a single realisation (Def. F4.7), i.e. an instantiation (Def. F4.6), of that figura (Def. 2b)'. Formal definition: iRd.						
305	F	Def. F3e.	'Cenetics'	for 'the sub-theory within the signum ontology (Def. F4.4) dealing with the description of cenetes (Def. F3d)'.						
306	F	Def. F3f.	'Cenotics'	for 'cenologics (Def. F3g), allocenics (Def. 23a2), and cenetics (Def. F3e)'.						
307	F	Def. F3g.	'Cenologics'	for 'the sub-theory within the signum ontology (Def. F4.4) corresponding to cenology (Def. 2b1a) in the system ontology (Def. 3a1a)'.						
308	F	Def. F3h.	'Morphontics'	for 'morphotics (Def.F1b1a2) and cenotics (Def. F3f)'.						
309	F	Def. F4.	'Delete' or 'denotatum'	for 'member of a denotation (Def. 2c) (as a class) such that it is a model for a single realisation (Def. F4.7), i.e. an instantiation (Def. F4.6), of that denotation (Def. 2c)'. Formal definition: jRe. Alternative definitions: 'model for an ostensible (Def. F4b1) entity denoted (cf. Def. 4a) by utterances (Def. F1a, Def. F1b0a, Def. 1b0b)'; 'model for an ostensible (Def. F4b1) entity expressed by an index (Def. 2) as an item (i.e. as a member of an index (Def. 2) as a class of items)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 206, Def. 4).	Comment: In extended axiomatic functionalism, a delete (denotatum) is a model for a "piece of information". Entities which are such "pieces of information" "may be objects, qualities, processes, relations, or complex circumstances. They may, furthermore, be 'real' entities, 'candidates for reality', or purely abstract or fictional" (Hervey 1980: 206).	F	Def. F4.	'Denotatum'	for 'denotable denoted by utterances' (Hervey 1980: 206).	The entity which constitutes the actual piece of information to which an utterance refers is the denotatum of that utterance. Such entities may be objects, qualities, processes, relations, or complex circumstances. They may, furthermore, be 'real' entities, 'candidates for reality', or purely abstract or fictional (Hervey 1980: 206).
310	F	Def. F4.0.	'Deletics'	for 'the sub-theory within the signum ontology (Def. F4.4) dealing with deletes (Def. F4)'.						

311	F	Def. F4.1.	'Delotics'	for 'delologics (Def. F4.2), allodelics (Def. 23c3), and deletics (Def. F4.0)'.						
312	F	Def. F4.2.	'Delologics'	for 'sub-theory within the signum ontology (Def. F4.4) corresponding to delology (Def. 2c1a) in the system ontology (Def. 3a1a)'.						
313	F	Def. F4.3.	'Semantics'	for 'semotics (Def. F1b2a2) and delotics (Def. F4.1)'.						
314	F	Def. F4.4.	'Signum ontology'	for 'morphontics (Def. F3h) and semantics (Def. F4.3)'.						
315	F	Def. F4.5.	'Semiotics'	for 'system ontology' (Def. 3a1a) and 'signum ontology (Def. F4.4)'.						
316	F	Def. F4.6.	'Ontete' or 'instantiation'	for 'cenete (Def. F3d), morphete (Def. F1b1a0), morphonete (Def. F1b1a4), logete (Def. F1b0a), logonete (Def. F1b0b), semete (Def. F1b2a0), semonete (Def. F1b2a5), or delete (Def. F4)'.	Comment: See also: manifestation (Def. 26o), realisation (Def. F4.7).					
317	F	Def. F4.7.	'Realisation'	for 'allont (manifestation) (Def. 26o), or ontete (instantiation) (Def. F4.6)'.						
318	F	Def. F4a.	'Denote'	for 'refer to by virtue of conventions relevant to semiotic systems (Def. 1c, Def. 5)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 206, Def. 4a).	Comment: See discussion in Dickins 1998: 117-125.	F	Def. F4a.	'Denote'	for 'refer to by virtue of specific conventions' (Hervey 1980: 206).	

319	F	Def. F4b.	'Semantic image'	for 'model for the unique form of a single actually or potentially ostensible (Def. F4b1) entity which is capable of being expressed by the instantiation (Def. F4.6) of a least one denotation (Def. 2c)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 206, Def. 4b), or for 'model for the unique form of a single entity which is capable of being the instantiation (Def. F4.6) of a denotation (Def. 2c)'; or for 'model for an actually or potentially ostensible (Def. F4b1) entity capable of being expressed by an index (Def. 2) as an item (i.e. as a member of an index (Def. 2) as a class of items)'. Symbolised: *j*. Alternative definition to Def. 23b.	Comment: "By "potentially ostensible entity" is meant an entity which, although its existence has not been instanced in a concrete sense (e.g. a fictional entity), would be ostensible in certain specifiable ways. For instance, an entity unicorn, would if it 'existed', be ostensible via direct evidence of sight" (Hervey 1980: 206).	F	Def. F4b.	'Denotable'	for 'actually or potentially ostensible entity capable of being expressed by the realisation of at least one index' (Hervey 1980: 206).	By 'potentially ostensible entity' is meant an entity which, although its existence has not been instanced in a concrete sense (e.g. a fictional entity), would be ostensible in certain specifiable ways. For instance, an entity unicorn, would, if it 'existed', be ostensible via direct evidence of sight (Hervey 1980: 206).
320	F	Def. F4b1.	'Ostensible'	for 'distinct from at least one other entity or from its own absence' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 206, Def. 4b1).	Comment: "It will be noted that 'ostension' is interpreted here in terms of the functional principle, whereby any 'positive' term acquires its identity 'negatively', through opposition to other terms" (Hervey 1980: 206). Hervey's Def. 5 (Mulder and Hervey 1980: 206) provides a definition for denotation in standard axiomatic functionalism. The rather different notion of denotation in extended axiomatic functionalism is defined in these postulates by Def. 2c. Hervey's Defs. 5a and 5b (Mulder and Hervey 1980: 206) provide a definition for denotation class in standard axiomatic functionalism. Like the notions form class, reference class, and form-reference class (see comment above; Hervey's definitions 3a, 3b and 3c), these notions are not required in the extended version. Hervey's Def. 6 (Mulder and Hervey 1980: 206-207) provides a definition of morph in terms of the intersection of a particular form class (Hervey's Def. 3a: Mulder and Hervey 1980: 205) and a particular class of equivalent utterances (Hervey's Def. 2: Mulder and Hervey 1980: 205). A similar definition would not hold for extended axiomatic functionalism. This numbered definition does not therefore appear in these postulates. The rather different notion of morph in extended axiomatic functionalism is defined in Def. 26d (cf. also Mulder and Hervey 1980: 61, Def. 24a1). Hervey's Def. 6a (Mulder and Hervey 1980: 207) provides a definition for homomorphy in standard axiomatic functionalism. This is superseded in the current postulates by Def. 26a.	F	Def. F4b1.	'Ostensible'	for 'distinct from at least one other entity, or from its own absence' (Hervey 1980: 206).	It will be noted that 'ostension' is interpreted here in terms of the functional principle, whereby any 'positive' term acquires its identity 'negatively', through opposition to other terms (Hervey 1980: 206).
321					Hervey's Defs. 5a and 5b (Mulder and Hervey 1980: 206) provide a definition for denotation class in standard axiomatic functionalism. Like the notions form class, reference class, and form-reference class (see comment above; Hervey's definitions 3a, 3b and 3c), these notions are not required in the extended version.	F	Def. F5.	'Denotation'	for 'correspondence with a particular denotation class' (cf. Def. 28) (Hervey 1980: 206).	
322					Hervey's Defs. 5a and 5b (Mulder and Hervey 1980: 206) provide a definition for denotation class in standard axiomatic functionalism. Like the notions form class, reference class, and form-reference class (see comment above; Hervey's definitions 3a, 3b and 3c), these notions are not required in the extended version.	F	Def. F5a.	'Denotation class'	for 'the set of all and only the denotata denoted by respective members of one and the same class of equivalent utterances (signum)' (Hervey 1980: 206).	

323					Hervey's Defs. 5a and 5b (Mulder and Hervey 1980: 206) provide a definition for denotation class in standard axiomatic functionalism. Like the notions form class, reference class, and form-reference class (see comment above; Hervey's definitions 3a, 3b and 3c), these notions are not required in the extended version.	F	Def. F5b.	'Denotation class'	for 'the set of all and only the denotata denoted (see Def. 4a) by respective utterances belonging to the same signum' (Hervey 1980: 206).	A denotation class may be an open set, which is not to say that such a set is not circumscribed. Conventions are, by definition, operative in setting a limit to the potential membership of any given denotation class, in the sense that certain entities may, and others definitely may not, belong to that class. Semantic description has as its task the determination and description of these conventional limitations such as they are, i.e. the faithful representation (as far as possible) of the conventionally governed denotation classes of signa (Hervey 1980: 206).
324					Comment: Cf. extended axiomatic functionalism, Def. 26d.	F	Def. F6.	'Morph'	for 'the set of all and only the utterances belonging to the intersection of a particular form class and a particular class of equivalent utterances (signum)' (Hervey 1980: 206-7).	In case a given class of equivalent utterances intersects with two or more form classes, each of the resulting (phonologically variant) morphs is an allomorph with respect to the signum in question (cf. Def. 24a1a) (Hervey 1980: 206-7).
325	F	Def. F7a1.	'Hyperonym' or 'superordinate'	for 'denotation (Def. 2c), the set of semantic forms (Def. 23b1) of whose allodeles (second sense) (Def. 23c2) considered in relation to, and properly including, the set of semantic forms (Def. 23b1) of allodeles (second sense) (Def. 23c2) of another denotation (Def. 2c)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 207, Def. 7a1).	Comment: Def. F7a1 and all subsequent definitions are to be interpreted in the light of the proposed framework for semantic protocolisation presented in Dickins (1998: 103-117) and the additional comments related to this in Dickins (1998: 128-138). The provisional nature of the proposed framework for semantic protocolisation is also stressed, alongside the expectation that further development of this framework will entail changes to Def. F7a1 and all subsequent definitions. In particular, it may be that forms of words such as "the set of semantic forms (Def. 23b1)" (in Def. F7a1, and other definitions), should be rephrased along the lines, "the set of (global) referential entities/situations of the semantic forms" (cf. Dickins 1998: 1031-117 for a discussion of the notion referential entity and associated notions). This would make specific allowance for comparison of denotations (Def. 2c) corresponding to delos (Def. 2c1) of differing degrees of complexity (cf. Def. 6c); e.g. it would make it possible to describe forms such as "The adult horse ate the grass" as compared with "The grass was eaten by the stallion" in terms of a hyperonym (Def. F7a1)-hyponym (Def. F7a2) relationship (cf. Dickins 1998: 103-117).	F	Def. F7a1.	'Hyperonym'	for 'signum whose denotation class properly includes the denotation class of another signum' (Hervey 1980: 207).	In a case like the relation between the denotation classes of 'flower' and 'rose', the former properly includes the latter. Thus 'flower' can be said to be a hyperonym of 'rose' (Hervey 1980: 207).
326	F	Def. F7a2.	'Hyponym'	for 'denotation (Def. 2c), the set of semantic forms (Def. 23b1) of whose allodeles (second sense) (Def. 23c2) considered in relation to, and properly included in, the set of semantic forms (Def. 23b1) of allodeles (second sense) (Def. 23c2) of another denotation (Def. 2c)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 207, Def. 7a2).		F	Def. F7a2.	'Hyponym'	for 'signum whose denotation class is properly included in the denotation class of another signum' (Hervey 1980: 207).	In the example cited above, 'rose' is a hyponym of 'flower' (Hervey 1980: 207).

327	F	Def. F7a1a.	'Direct hyperonym' or 'direct superordinate'	for 'first denotation (Def. 2c) which is a hyperonym (Def. F7a1) of a second denotation (Def. 2c), without also being a hyperonym (Def. F7a1) of any third denotation (Def. 2c) which is itself a hyperonym (Def. F7a1) of the second denotation (Def. 2c)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 207, Def. 7a1a).	Comment: If denotation (Def. 2c) A is a hyperonym (Def. F7a1) of denotation (Def. 2c) B, but there is no other denotation (Def. 2c) C which is also a hyperonym (Def. F7a1) of denotation (Def. 2c) B and a hyponym (Def. F7a2) of denotation (Def. 2c) A, denotation (Def. 2c) A is a direct hyperonym of denotation (Def. 2c) B.	F	Def. F7a1a.	'Direct hyperonym'	for 'signum whose denotation class properly includes that of a given signum without properly including the denotation class of any hyperonym of the given signum'; i.e. 'hyperonym (of signum x) that is not a hyperonym of a hyperonym of signum x' (Hervey 1980: 207).	This means, in fact, that, although in a given system a signum may have hierarchies of hyperonyms of increasing 'generality' (each with a denotation class properly including that of the one below it in the hierarchy, e.g. 'horse', 'equine', 'mammal', 'vertebrate', 'animal', etc., only the 'lowest' hyperonym in the hierarchy is a direct hyperonym of a given signum (e.g. in the above example only 'equine' is a direct hyperonym of 'horse'). A given signum may have several independent hierarchies of hyperonyms, with a direct hyperonym at the 'base' of each of these hierarchies – that is to say, a signum may have several direct hyperonyms (Hervey 1980: 207).
328	F	Def. F7a2a.	'Direct hyponym'	for 'first denotation (Def. 2c) which is a hyponym (Def. F7a2) of a second denotation (Def. 2c), without also being a hyponym (Def. F7a2) of any third denotation (Def. 2c) which is itself a hyponym (Def. F7a2) of the second denotation (Def. 2c)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 207, Def. 7a2a).	Comment: If denotation (Def. 2c) A is a hyponym (Def. F7a2) of denotation (Def. 2c) B, but there is no other denotation (Def. 2c) C which is also a hyponym (Def. F7a2) of denotation (Def. 2c) B and a hyperonym (Def. F7a1) of denotation (Def. 2c) A, denotation (Def. 2c) A is a direct hyponym of denotation B (Def. 2c). Hervey includes a definition for the notion semantic feature (Mulder and Hervey 1980: 208, Def. 7a1b). This notion is not required in the extended version. Hervey includes a definition for the notion of synonym (Mulder and Hervey 1980: 208, Def. 7b). This is not required in the extended version, since it is covered by Defs. 28, 28a, and 28b.	F	Def. F7a2a.	'Direct hyponym' for 'signum whose denotation class is properly included in that of a given signum without being properly included in the denotation class of any hyponym of the given signum'; i.e. 'hyponym (of a signum x) that is not a hyponym of a hyponym of signum x'. [207]	for 'signum whose denotation class is properly included in that of a given signum without being properly included in the denotation class of any hyponym of the given signum'; i.e. 'hyponym (of a signum x) that is not a hyponym of a hyponym of signum x' (Hervey 1980: 207)	While a signum may have several hierarchies of hyponyms of increasing 'specificity' (each with a denotation class property including that of the next one below it in the hierarchy) only the 'highest' member of that hierarchy is a direct hyponym. For instance, given the signum 'equine', its hyponyms 'horse', 'male horse', 'colt' etc., form a hierarchy of increasing 'specificity'. Only the 'highest' of these, namely 'horse', is a direct hyponym of 'equine' (Hervey 1980: 207).
329					Comment: On the basis of the rather different definition in extended axiomatic functionalism of signum (Def. 24.) as compared to the definition of signum in standard axiomatic functionalism, the notion 'semantic feature' does not makes sense in extended axiomatic functionalism, and has therefore been removed from the extended axiomatic functionalism postulates.	F	Def. F7a1b.	'Semantic feature'	for 'the possession, by a given signum, of a particular direct hyperonym' (Hervey 1980: 208).	Semantic features may be symbolised by placing the direct hyperonym in question - which is a signum in its own right ñ between asterisks (e.g. *equine* as a semantic feature of 'horse', by virtue of the fact that 'equine' is a direct hyperonym of 'horse'). An adequate and economical way of characterising the denotation class (i.e. the semantic purport) of a signum – within, and relative to, a given system of signa – is by specifying its direct hyperonyms (which by implication specify its total set of hyperonyms) in such a way that the set of direct hyperonyms is unique to the signum in question (and to its synonyms, if any). The set of semantic features *woman*, *un-married person* describes the semantic purport of 'spinster' by specifying its denotation class in an unambiguous way (Hervey 1980: 208).

330					Hervey's Defs. 5a and 5b (Mulder and Hervey 1980: 206) provide a definition for denotation class in standard axiomatic functionalism. Like the notions form class, reference class, and form-reference class (see comment above; Hervey's definitions 3a, 3b and 3c), these notions are not required in the extended version.	F	Def. F7b.	'Synonym'	for 'signum whose denotation class totally overlaps with (is identical to) the denotation class of another signum' (Hervey 1980: 208).	Such pairs of signa as 'viper' and 'adder' ó whose respective denotation classes cannot, to my knowledge, be shown to be non-identical (i.e. any member of the one class is a member of the other, and vice versa) – are synonyms. It should be noted that synonymy does not preclude differences of – not wholly conventionally governed - meaning between realisations of these signa in actual communication. Such differences may be accounted for on other, non-denotational, levels of meaning (in terms of connotative or associative meaning), but do not affect the semantic properties of signa as such, these properties being, by definition, fully conventional properties of meaning (Hervey 1980: 208).
331	F	Def. F7c.	'Paronym'	for 'first denotation (Def. 2c), the set of semantic forms (Def. 23b1) of whose allodeles (second sense) (Def. 23c2) considered in relation to the set of semantic forms (Def. 23b1) of allodeles (second sense) (Def. 23c2) of a second denotation (Def. 2c), and the sets of semantic forms (Def. 23b1) of allodeles (second sense) (Def. 23c2) of the first and second denotations (Def. 2c) not including one another, but these sets of semantic forms (Def. 23b1) of allodeles (second sense) (Def. 23c2) being properly included in the sets of semantic forms (Def. 23b1) of allodeles (second sense) (Def. 23c2) of a third denotation (Def.	Comment: The denotations (Def. 2c) *rose* and *tulip* are thus paronyms with respect to the denotation (Def. 2c) *flower*. In this case, the semantic forms (Def. 23b1) of the sets of allodeles (second sense) (Def. 23c2) of *rose* and *tulip* do not include one another; in fact they do not intersect at all. Partial overlap may also hold between the allodeles (second sense) (Def. 23c2) of paronyms, as in the case, for instance, of the denotations (Def. 2c) *red* and *orange* (adapted from Mulder and Hervey 1980: 208).	F	Def. F7c.	'Paronym'	for 'one of two or more signa whose denotation classes do not include one another, but are properly included in the denotation class of a given signum' (Hervey 1980: 208).	The signum 'flower' has a denotation class that properly includes that of both 'rose' and 'tulip'. Thus the latter two, whose denotation classes do not include one another (in fact they do not intersect at all) are paronyms of each other with regard to their common hyperonym 'flower'. Partial overlap may hold between the denotation classes of paronyms, as in the case, for instance, of 'red' and 'orange' (Hervey 1980: 208).
332	F	Def. F7c1.	'Paronymy set'	for 'set of two or more paronyms (Def. 7c) the sum of the semantic forms (Def. 23b1) of whose allodeles (second sense) (Def. 23c2) exhausts the set of the semantic forms (Def. 23b1) of the allodeles (second sense) (Def. 23c2) of their common hyperonym (Def. F7a1)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 208, Def. 7c1).		F	Def. F7c1.	'Paronymy set'	for 'set of two or more paronyms the sum of whose denotation classes exhausts the denotation class of their common hyperonym' (Hervey 1980: 208).	For example, the signs 'stallion', 'mare', 'filly' and 'colt' ó the sum of whose denotation classes exhausts that of their common hyperonym 'horse' ñ constitute a paronymy set (Hervey 1980: 208).
333	F	Def. F7c2.	'Exclusive paronyms'	for 'paronyms (Def. 7c) the sets of the semantic forms (Def. 23b1) of whose allodeles (second sense) (Def. 23c2) do not intersect' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 208, Def. 7c2).	Comment: The denotations (Def. 2c) *stallion*, *mare*, *filly* and *colt* are all exclusive paronyms (Def. 7c), since there is no overlap between the members of the sets of the semantic forms (Def. 23b1) of their allodeles (second sense) (Def. 23c2) (adapted from Mulder and Hervey 1980: 209).	F	Def. F7c2.	'Exclusive paronyms'	for 'paronyms with non-intersecting denotation classes' (Hervey 1980: 209).	In the above example, the signs 'stallion', 'mare', 'filly' and 'colt' are all exclusive paronyms, since there is no overlap between any two of their respective denotation classes (Hervey 1980: 209).

334	F	Def. F7c3.	'Overlapping paronyms'	for 'paronyms (Def. 7c) the sets of the semantic forms (Def. 23b1) of whose allodeles (second sense) (Def. 23c2) do intersect' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 208, Def. 7c3).	Comment: The denotations (Def. 2c) *red* and *orange* illustrate the case of overlapping paronymy; whilst certain hues belong only to the set of the semantic forms (Def. 23b1) of allodeles (second sense) (Def. 23c2) of *red* and certain other hues only to the set of the semantic forms (Def. 23b1) of the allodeles (second sense) (Def. 23c2) of *orange*, there are also certain intermediate hues that belong to an overlapping area (adapted from Mulder and Hervey 1980: 209).	F	Def. F7c3.	'Overlapping paronyms'	for 'paronyms with overlapping denotation classes' (Hervey 1980: 209).	The colour terms 'red' and 'orange' illustrate the case of overlapping paronymy ñ while certain hues belong only to the denotation class of 'red' and certain other hues only to the denotation class of 'orange', there are also certain intermediate hues that belong to an overlapping area (Hervey 1980: 209).
335	F	Def. F7c1a.	'Antonym'	for 'member of a set of paronyms (Def. 7c) containing only two terms' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 208, Def. 7c1a).	Comment: The bipolar semantic contrast displayed by antonyms is the result of the fact that all the members of the sets of the semantic forms (Def. 23b1) of the allodeles (second sense) (Def. 23c2) belonging to a certain "field" - i.e. the set of the semantic forms (Def. 23b1) of the allodeles (second sense) (Def. 23c2) of their common hyperonym (Def. F7a1) - are members of either one or the other, or possibly both, of the sets of the semantic forms (Def. 23b1) of the allodeles (second sense) (Def. 23c2) of the antonyms in question (adapted from Mulder and Hervey 1980: 209).	F	Def. F7c1a.	'Antotym'	for 'member of a set of paronyms containing only two terms' (Hervey 1980: 209).	The bipolar semantic contrast displayed by antonyms is the result of the fact that all the denotata belonging to a certain 'field' (i.e. the denotation class of their common hyperonym) are members of either one or the other (or possibly both) of the denotation classes of the antonyms in question (Hervey 1980: 209).
336	F	Def. F7c2a.	'Exclusive antonyms'	for 'antonyms (Def. 7c2a) whose allodeles (second sense) (Def. 23c2) have non-intersecting sets of semantic forms (Def. 23b1)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 210, Def. 7c2a).	Comment: The denotations (Def. 2c) *dog* and *cat* would appear to be exclusive antonyms with regard to their common hyperonym (Def. F7a1) *animal* (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 210). Compare, however, the arguments presented regarding the semantic relationship between *cat* and *animal* in Cruse (1986: 141), and discussed in Dickins (1998: 225-226).	F	Def. F7c2a.	'Exclusive antonyms'	for 'antonyms with non-intersecting denotation classes' (Hervey 1980: 210).	The signs 'bachelor' and 'spinster' are exclusive antonyms with regard to their common hyperonym 'unmarried adult human' (Hervey 1980: 210).
337	F	Def. F7c2b.	'Overlapping antonyms'	for 'antonyms (Def. F7c1a) whose allodeles (second sense) (Def. 23c2) have overlapping sets of semantic forms (Def. 23b1)' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 210, Def. 7c2b).		F	Def. 7c2b.	'Overlapping antonyms'	for 'antonyms with overlapping denotation classes' (Hervey 1980: 210).	The signs 'woman' and 'girl' display a bipolar semantic contrast within the field of their common hyperonym 'human female'; however, as well as there being human females that are positively assignable only to the denotation class of 'woman', and human females assignable only to the denotation class of 'girl', there are also cases where both appellations are equally applicable (i.e. there is an area of overlap between the respective denotation classes) (Hervey 1980: 210).
338	F	Def. F7c1b.	'Paronymy series'	for 'paronymy set (Def. F7c1) with three or more members' (cf. Mulder and Hervey 1980: 211, Def. 7c1b).	Comment: "Sets of colour terms in various languages give a paradigm example of paronymy series" (Mulder and Hervey 1980: 211).	F	Def. F7c1b.	'Paronymy series'	for 'paronymy set with three or more members' (Hervey 1980: 211).	Sets of colour terms in various languages give a paradigm example of paronymy series (Hervey 1980: 210).