

### **Testing dependent and equipollent relations in discourse**

The purpose of this presentation is to evaluate Asher and Vieu's (2005) tests for coordination and subordination as a reliable tool for testing dependent and equipollent relations in FDG. I argue that these relations belong to the outcome of Formulation at the Representational Level, instead of being functions of Discourse Acts at the Interpersonal Level.

At the Interpersonal Level, Moves and Discourse Acts build coherence chunks of discourse that are heavily dependent on contextual factors and participant goals. Coherence combinations of IL units can be highly conventionalized, such as question-answer pairs, repetitions and paraphrases, or lists such as the counting backwards in series of ten numbers in a fish auction. Moreover, the goals of participants may trigger argumentative, narrative, descriptive or expositive chunks of discourse. In its simplest form, for instance, a coherent argumentative discourse contains an argument given in defense of a standpoint that is explicit or abstracted from the context; in its most complex form, the argumentative discourse may approach conventional models as assumed in each culture. Other sources of coherence at the Interpersonal Level involve Pragmatic Functions along the lines recognized in FDG: Focus-Background, Topic-Comment, Contrast-Overlap.

Dependent and equipollent relations are also sources of coherence. However, I believe that they do not depend on participant goals and knowledge of conventional modes, but on meaning relations between propositional contents. Although FDG places these relations at the Interpersonal Level (Hengeveld and Mackenzie 2008), I suggest that they should be placed at the Representational Level. This idea is supported by the fact that we can apply semantic tests to identify dependence and equipollence relations. In particular, I explore the potential of Asher and Vieu's (2005) for this purpose.

Based on analysis of Catalan data, I argue that Asher and Vieu's tests 1 and 2 are a useful tool to test dependence (subordination) and equipollence (coordination) relations in discourse. Tests 3 and 4 are, however, problematic: application of test 3 is sensitive to topic scope, giving different results than test 2 for equipollent relations but not for dependence relations; text 4 only works well with sequential equipollent relations (typically found in narratives), but it is useless for non-sequential ones (a list of independent arguments, for instance). This latter problem can be solved in FDG by placing rhetorical relations such as Narration at the Interpersonal Level.

### **References**

- Asher, Nicholas and Laure Vieu (2005), 'Subordinating and Coordinating Discourse Relations', *Lingua* 115: 519-610.
- Hengeveld, Kees and J. Lachlan Mackenzie (2008), *Functional Discourse Grammar. A typologically-based theory of language structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

## **Construal and the Conceptual Component of Functional Discourse Grammar**

Construal is a phenomenon that has come to be recognised as a vital consideration in the study of meaning in language. It involves describing situations from particular points of view, and may be seen as underlying, for instance, the choice between an active and a passive construction for describing a given scene, or between a verbal and a nominal form for describing a given activity. Understanding what lies behind such choices and what they convey to an Addressee is an issue that is undoubtedly of relevance within Functional Linguistics. Accordingly, the purpose of the present paper is to address the question of how construal may be effectively treated within the framework of FDG.

Construal has already been researched in some depth by linguists in the field of Cognitive Linguistics, who have found the phenomenon to be ubiquitous in language. However, an important difference between Cognitive Linguistic models and the FDG framework lies in the fact that, in the writings of cognitive linguists such as Langacker, conceptualisation is equated with meaning. This stance contrasts sharply with that adopted in FDG (and reflected in the present paper), in which conceptualisation is regarded as prelinguistic and is handled in the Conceptual Component, whereas all aspects of grammar, including semantics, are handled in the Grammatical Component.

Psycholinguistic findings suggest that the following mental activities play a significant role in the operation of the Conceptual Component: (1) message planning, which involves (a) selecting a starting point and (b) designing the remainder of the message; and (2) the shaping of the message in the light of contextual factors. As will become apparent, it is within message planning, in particular, that the role of construal is strongly evident.

In the light of all the above, the operation of construal within the Conceptual Component of FDG will be described with the help of a number of examples. It will, furthermore, be shown how the effects of construal may be manifested at the Representational, Interpersonal and Morphosyntactic Levels.

### An FDG account of Hungarian constituent order

In the following Hungarian examples (from Hegedűs 2004) we can see some of the many nuances in meaning offered by the simple scrambling of LEs constituents in Hungarian:

- (1) *Julcsa a konyhában egy harminc centis késsel belezte ki a csirkét.*  
 Gillian in the kitchen with a knife of thirty cm eviscerated (+id,+s) the chicken  
 $P^I_{Top}(A) P^{I+1}(l)(\sigma^e) P^{M-1}_{Foc}(m)(\sigma^e) P^M(T) P^{M+1}(\pi f) P^F(U)$   
 ‘It was with a knife of thirty centimeters that G. eviscerated the chicken in the kitchen.’
- (2) *Julcsa a csirkét belezte ki a konyhában egy harminc centis késsel.*  
 Gillian the chicken eviscerated (+id,+s) in the kitchen with a knife of thirty cm  
 $P^I_{Top}(A) P^{M-1}_{Foc}(U) P^M(T) P^{M+1}(\pi f) P^{F-1}(l)(\sigma^e) P^F(m)(\sigma^e)$   
 ‘It was the chicken that G. eviscerated with a knife of thirty centimeters in the kitchen.’
- (3) *A konyhában Julcsa csirkét belezett.*  
 In the kitchen Gillian a chicken eviscerated  
 $P^{pre}(l)(\sigma^{ep}) P^I_{Top}(A) P^{M-1}_{Foc}(U) P^M(T)$   
 ‘Gillian eviscerated a chicken in the kitchen.’

This is explained in traditional and generative grammars recognizing a preverbal Focus position. Moreover, generativists suggested that the first part of a clause expresses the Topic.

All this cannot explain three main points of the Hungarian grammar. First, there is no rule explaining the behaviour of verbal particles, like *ki* in the examples. Verbal particles can be partially compared to the adverb of phrasal verbs, but can originate many different word orders (WOs) with all constituents keeping the same form (as if we said in English: \*I downput a book; \*I down the book put; \*I a book put now down etc.). Secondly, it is not clear why some verbs cannot behave as the majority regarding the Focus function: a few never occupy this position, others strongly prefer it, while permitting all other usual WO scramblings (Komlósy 1989). Thirdly, no explanation is given about the WO of postverbal elements: although it is said to be free, scholars sometimes admit that it should not be so.

In my view, the peculiarity of Hungarian WO can be reduced to only one rule: whatever restricts a variable must precede what is restricted. The rule must be applied in the respect of the Focus and Topic hierarchy (Focus position must be filled first, then Topic in  $P^I$ ). If we expand Varga’s assumption (1981), that the more closely an element follows the verb, the less it is stressed, this would imply that the speaker stresses the last constituent of the Clause instead, i.e. the constituent that would represent the Clause’s head, restricted by the other constituents within the Focus and Topic hierarchy.

This is better explained in FDG, because of its hierarchical layered structure and consistent terminology, and seems to offer a comprehensive picture of Hungarian syntax.

### References

- Hegedűs, Rita. 2004. *Magyar nyelvtan. Formák, funkciók, összefüggések*. Budapest: Tinta.
- Komlósy, András. 1989. Fókuszban az igék. *Általános Nyelvészeti Tanulmányok XVII. Tanulmányok a magyar mondattana köréből*: 171-182.
- Varga, László. 1981. A topicról és a fókusz utáni elemek sorrendjéről. *Magyar nyelv* 77.2: 198-200.

## Complementary expected associations in core argument and clause type distinctions

This paper considers some commonalities in the morphosyntactic strategies used to distinguish core arguments and clause types, and elaborates on the idea that these coincidences in the encoding reveal a close relationship of the two elements pertaining to the formulation.

The paper begins with two observations. First, there are not many categories apart from clause types and core arguments which are expressed solely by constituent order. Second, the most relevant factors triggering split ergativity, which can be considered in a complementary expected association, also seem to be decisive in the morphological marking of clause types. Complementary expected associations include Interpersonal (Speech act participant, illocution, information structure) and Representational (tense) factors which typically favourize split ergativity.

Complementary expected associations in split ergativity phenomena

S, O and A alignment	Accusative pattern	Ergative pattern
NP type	1st and 2nd person	3rd person
Clause type	declarative	relative, non-finite
Tense	present	past
Pragmatic function of the clause	foregrounding	backgrounding

In languages which distinguish clause types by morphological means, the expression of person is frequently involved in the distinction of clause types, and this implies not only portmanteau morphemes in which person and clause type are expressed at the same time, but also variations in the position of the various markers. Two issues seem to be relevant here, (a) the  $\pm$ Speech Act Participant, SAP/ feature and (b) the presence of one or two pronominal arguments, so that one single  $-$ SAP/ argument is typical of non-main clauses, whereas two  $+$ SAP/ arguments favour the main clause type character.

As a way of illustration, I would like to review some languages considered in the recent literature which morphologically express clause types (namely, Ecuadorian Siona, Plains Cree, and Old Irish), as well as Old Spanish. (i) Ecuadorian Siona is a clear example in which clause type, subject person and tense are expressed in portmanteau morphemes. (ii) As one of the phenomena in which clause types interact with pronominal markers in Old Irish, person markers in the verbal complex (be they inflectional endings or infixes) may constitute the sole marker of the declarative vs relative clause type distinction, but this formal distinction is systematic in the  $-$ SAP/ persons, and only tendential in the  $+$ SAP/ persons. (iii) The difference between the ‘conjunct’ and ‘independent’ orders in the Plains Cree verbal complex involves the different treatment of  $+$ SAP/ and  $-$ SAP/ pronominal markers. (iv) Finally, in Old Spanish, the ‘analytic’ pattern of the future (which includes a pronominal form between lexical basis and future marker, e.g. *ayudarvos ha* ‘he will help you’) is only used in main clauses, whereas the corresponding ‘synthetic’ variant can appear in dependent clauses.

Clause type (illocution) and core argument pronominal references (person) are typical markers of finiteness. In a FDG perspective, the assumed relationship runs parallel to the interaction of the Interrogative Illocution with a  $(+id, -s)$ -marked Referential Subact. The idea defended in this paper implies a similar interaction between Illocution and Referential Subact, namely, that a  $(+id, +s)$ -marked Referential Subact favours main clause character and, in particular, Declarative Illocution.

## **The typology of polysynthesis in Functional Discourse Grammar**

This paper shows how the strict separation of analysis at the Interpersonal, Representational and Morphosyntactic Levels in the FDG model (Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2008) enable an elegant and systematic treatment of the typology of polysynthesis. Individual languages differ quite markedly with regard to how many and what kinds of elements can go into a word (e.g. Evans & Sasse 2002). Duponceau's (1819) first description centered on holophrasis as the key characteristic of polysynthesis, but current approaches differ in terms of what are considered the crucial feature(s), and as a result may regard different languages as more or less proto-typical (e.g. De Reuse 2009; Mithun 2009).

For FDG, four features constitute synthesis: (i) lexical density (number of lexical elements per word); (ii) anisomorphism between formulation and encoding levels; (iii) internal layering of words; (iv) alignment properties. I show how FDG can characterize constructions and languages as more or less polysynthetic using the parameters below:

1. Lexical density
  - a. Quantitative: A construction/language that allows more lexical morphemes (Roots and Stems) within one Word is more polysynthetic.
  - b. Qualitative: A construction/language that allows more lexical morpheme types (Noun, Verb and Adjective Stems and Roots) within one Word is more polysynthetic.
2. Incorporation type
  - a. Layering: A construction/language that allows larger morphosyntactic units (Linguistic Expressions, Clauses and Phrases) within one Word is more polysynthetic.
  - b. Anisomorphism: A construction/language that allows morphosyntactic units corresponding to larger representational or interpersonal units within one Word is more polysynthetic.
3. Alignment: A construction/language that has less morphosyntactic, representational, and interpersonal restrictions on the type of unit (e.g. units with specific syntactic, semantic and pragmatic functions and animacy; Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2008: 406-409) that may be expressed within a Word is more polysynthetic.

## **References**

- Duponceau, Peter S. 1819. Report of the corresponding secretary to the committee of his progress in the investigation of the language of the American Indians. *Transactions of the Historical and Literary Committee of the American Philosophical Society* 1: xvii–xlvi.
- Evans, Nicholas & Hans-Jürgen Sasse. 2002. Problems of polysynthesis. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Hengeveld, Kees & J. Lachlan Mackenzie. 2008. *Functional Discourse Grammar. A typologically-based theory of language structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mithun, Marianne. 2009. Polysynthesis in the arctic. In: Marc-Antoine Mahieu & Nicole Tersis (eds), *Variations on polysynthesis*, 3-18. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- De Reuse, Willem. 2009. Polysynthesis as a typological feature: an attempt at a characterization from Eskimo and Athabaskan perspectives. In: Marc-Antoine Mahieu & Nicole Tersis (eds), *Variations on polysynthesis*, 19-34. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

### An FDG account of English *get*-passives

In this paper I discuss the treatment of the English *get*-passive construction within the FDG framework. In Guerrero (2009: 279), two main subconstructions in the sense of Goldberg (1995) were posited: the “spontaneous” *get*-passive, in (1), and the “causative” *get*-passive, in (2), where the participants in bold type correspond to the profiled argument roles:

- (1) Syntax: Subj *get* V-*en*  
Semantics: BECOME <**Patient**>
- (2) Syntax: Subj *get* V-*en* (Obl<sub>Ag</sub>)  
Semantics: CAUSE-BECOME <Agent **Patient/Experiencer**>

As pointed out by García Velasco (fc), in FDG the generation of a linguistic expression does not start from the lexicon, and lexemes do not project their syntactico-semantic properties (or argument structure) onto syntax. In this sense, FDG can be regarded as compatible with Goldberg’s constructionist approach, where verbs do not have fixed complementation patterns but can occur in different constructions (see Keizer 2009: 1192).

I will here argue that a lexical-constructional characterization grounded in FDG could account for the semantic and syntactic properties of the English *get*-passive, overcoming some of the problems posed by the constructionist approach in trying to address some of the still unresolved questions concerning the nature of the construction.

The subconstructions in (1) and (2) would correspond to two different predication frames within the FDG framework, as represented in (3a) and (3b) in a simplified form:

- (3) a. one-place: [(f<sub>1</sub>: *get* (f<sub>1</sub>) [(f<sub>2</sub>: ♦<sub>Adj Pred</sub> (f<sub>2</sub>)) (x<sub>1</sub>)<sub>U</sub>] ]
- b. two-place: [(f<sub>1</sub>: *get* (f<sub>1</sub>) [(f<sub>2</sub>: ♦<sub>Adj Pred</sub> (f<sub>2</sub>)) (x<sub>1</sub>)<sub>U</sub> by (x<sub>2</sub>)<sub>Ac</sub>] ]

In both cases, the construction arises from the insertion of an adjectival predicate (Adj Pred) into a *partially instantiated frame* in the sense of Keizer (fc), where the lexical filler of f<sub>1</sub> is given. The selection of the appropriate frame will be determined by the semantics of the verb, whose meaning definition should specify at least information about the semantic function and type entity of the participants (see Honselaar & Keizer 2009: 1233).

### References

- García Velasco, D. 2016. A flexible lexicon for Functional Discourse Grammar. *Linguistics* 54.5 (in press; special issue on the Lexicon in FDG, edited by I. Genée & E. Keizer).
- Goldberg, A. 1995. *Constructions. A Construction Grammar approach to argument structure*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Guerrero, P. 2009. Semantic and pragmatic constraints on the English *get*-passive. In C. S. Butler & J. Martín Arista (eds), *Deconstructing constructions*. 271-294. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Honselaar, W. & E. Keizer. 2009. Lexicon and frames in FDG: a treatment of Dutch *bekend zijn* ‘to be familiar, well known’, *behandelen* ‘to treat’ and *trouwen* ‘to marry’. *Lingua* 119.8: 1212–1241.
- Keizer, E. 2016. Idiomatic expressions in Functional Discourse Grammar. *Linguistics* 54.5 (in press; special issue on the Lexicon in FDG, edited by I. Genée & E. Keizer).
- Keizer, E. 2009. Verb-preposition constructions in FDG. *Lingua* 119.8: 1186-1211.

Marize Mattos Dall’Aglío Hattner, *State University of São Paulo / CNPq*,  
São José do Rio Preto, Brazil  
Hella Olbertz, *University of Amsterdam*, Netherlands

### **On objective and subjective epistemic modality again: modal verbs**

Modality can be defined as the marking of a State of Affairs or a Propositional Content “for being underdetermined with respect to its factual status, i.e. neither positively or negatively factual” (Narrog 2005: 697). This definition is compatible with the FDG approach to modality as proposed by Hengeveld (2011: 583), who deviates from Hengeveld & Mackenzie (2008: 154-155) in separating the domain of modality from that of evidentiality.

Our paper deals with epistemic modality, discussing the old problem of how to establish the difference between objective and subjective modality, particularly with respect to modal verbs. According to Hengeveld (2011) and later publications, objective modality operates on the Episode, whereas subjective modality operates on the Propositional Content. The subtle difference between objective and subjective modality was discussed in detail by Hengeveld (1988), who showed that (objectively epistemic) complement constructions with modal adjectives behave differently from (subjectively epistemic) adverbial constructions in the sense that objective epistemic modality can be in the scope of (i) interrogation, (ii) hypothetical modality, (iii) negation and (iv) tense, whereas this does not hold for expressions of subjective epistemic modality.

However, the objective-subjective dichotomy has hardly been elaborated on within F(D)G in the context of modal verbs, so that in practice the distinction is often made on the basis of intuition rather than on that of operationalized criteria (cf. also Nuyts 2001: 383-385). What adds to the confusion is the fact that Hengeveld & Mackenzie (2008: 175) claim that “grammatical encoding of this type of modality is generally restricted to a realis versus irrealis opposition.” On the other hand, the only FDG-contribution on modal auxiliaries, Hattner & Hengeveld (2015), just takes the objective-subjective dichotomy for granted.

In our paper we compare epistemic modal expressions in Brazilian Portuguese (BP), Spanish (S) and English (E), which express epistemic possibility (E *may/can*, S/BP *poder*), probability (BP *dever*, E *should*) and certainty (E *must*, S *deber*) in order to clarify (i) which of the criteria proposed by Hengeveld (1988) are relevant for modals, and (ii) whether the matter of objectivity-subjectivity differs depending on the modal domains (possibility, probability and certainty), and (iii) whether the result is related to the difference between epistemic modality and inferential evidentiality (cf. e.g. Hattner & Hengeveld 2015).

### **References**

- Hattner, Marize Mattos Dall’Aglío & Kees Hengeveld. 2015. The grammaticalization of modal verbs in Brazilian Portuguese. *Journal of Portuguese Linguistics* 15.1: 1-14.
- Hengeveld, Kees. 1988. Illocution, mood and modality in a functional grammar of Spanish. *Journal of Semantics* 6: 227-269.
- Hengeveld, Kees. 2011. The grammaticalization of tense and aspect. In: Bernd Heine & Heiko Narrog (eds), *The Oxford handbook of grammaticalization*, 580-594. Oxford: OUP.
- Hengeveld, Kees & J. Lachlan Mackenzie. 2008. *Functional Discourse Grammar. A typologically-based theory of language structure*. Oxford: OUP.
- Narrog, Heiko. 2005. Modality, mood, and change of modal meanings: a new perspective. *Cognitive Linguistics* 16.4: 677-731.
- Nuyts, Jan. 2001. Subjectivity as an evidential dimension in epistemic modal expressions. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33.3: 383-400.

### **Functional Discourse Grammar and grammar writing**

FDG has been designed as a model of the grammatical competence of individual language users. The question I want to raise in this paper is whether FDG, in its current form, could also be used as a model for the elaboration of reference grammars of individual languages. In this sense the paper re-addresses a question already discussed by Dik (1989) in the context of Functional Grammar, though from a different perspective, as the emphasis in the current paper is less on matters of principle and more on matters of practical application. The example this paper is applied to is Kofán, an endangered indigenous language of Colombia and Ecuador.

The first point I will make is that a person consulting a grammar is like someone parsing a language. Initially, the top-down perspective of language production in FDG should be changed into the bottom-up perspective of language parsing. This means that a reference grammar based on FDG should start out, in its overall structure, with providing an overview of the phonological system, the morphological units, and the syntactic structures of the language before embarking on the description of the functional and meaningful aspects of the language.

Once these units have been described, a top-down perspective is adequate, as, once the formal units of a language have been identified, parsing does not necessarily proceed in a strict bottom-up direction. However, given that the reader of the grammar has first been confronted with the relevant formal units, it makes sense to describe functions and meanings as these are associated with these formal units in order for the parsing to be adequate. So my proposal will be to separately describe the Discourse Act and its components, the Referential Subact and its components, and the Ascriptive Subact and its components.

The organization proposed above forces one to consider a number of additional issues, some of which feed back into the process of FDG theory formation. The most important one concerns the status of modifiers, which include the set of traditional domains of grammar generally identified as Adjective Phrases, Adverbial Phrases, and Adpositional Phrases. These generally optional units have not been given a systematic separate interpersonal status in Hengeveld & Mackenzie (2008), but Rijkhoff (2014) argues in favour of a separate class of Modifying Subacts, next to Ascriptive and Referential Subacts. Accepting this proposal would solve a number of problems in current FDG, among them the fact that an interpersonal modifier like *fortunately* is currently represented directly at the Interpersonal Level without having a representational counterpart, despite the fact that it has a clear representational content. Modifying Subacts should not be treated in a separate chapter but wherever they are relevant, as they always depend on the presence of another layer of linguistic organization.

Finally, I will consider the question in what sense a grammar written on the basis of the FDG framework differs from traditional grammars.

- Dik, Simon C. 1989. Functional Grammar and its relevance to grammar writing. In: Gottfried Graustein & Gerhard Leitner (eds), *Reference grammars and modern linguistic theory*, 33-55. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Hengeveld, Kees & J. Lachlan Mackenzie. 2008. *Functional Discourse Grammar. A typologically-based theory of language structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rijkhoff, Jan N. M. 2014. Modification as a propositional act. In: María de los Ángeles Gómez González, Francisco José Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez & Francisco González-García (eds), *Theory and practice in functional-cognitive space*, 129-150. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

### Negation in FDG

The purpose of this paper is to examine the relevance for FDG of ideas first launched in Dik (1997: Chapter 8) concerning the various layers of Functional Grammar at which polarity operators can apply. Dik showed that negation can apply at the FG layers of the Clause, Proposition, Predication, Predicate, and Term.

FDG has introduced a number of additional layers in comparison to FG, which are also potential hosts of the negative operator. These concern the Episode and the Configurational Property at the Representational Level, and the various layers at the Interpersonal Level. We will argue that a true negative operator is only relevant at the Representational Level, and applies to the layers of the Propositional Content, the Episode (with several restrictions), the State-of-Affairs, the Configurational Property, and the Lexical Property. We will illustrate all these types and show how their scope properties, and sometimes their formal manifestation, warrant their identification in the grammar.

Apart from negation, however, we also find many categories that, without negating in the strict sense, do express a shade of negativity. Thus, at the Interpersonal Level we find instances of actional negation (Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2008: 148f), Illocutions such as Prohibitive and Dishortative, the rejection of Communicated Contents, and the metalinguistic negation of Ascriptive Subacts and possibly also Referential Subacts. An example of rejection is given in (1):

- (1) A: I have the feeling you don't like me  
B: I don't "not like you"

An example of metalinguistic negation at the layer of the Ascriptive Subact is given in (2), taken from Horn (1989: 429):

- (2) John is not happy, he is ecstatic.

At the Representational Level, we find further instances of negativity: zero-quantification and antonymy.

We will present all these cases and show that, when we include negativity in our classification, actually all layers distinguished in FDG can be given a negative flavour.

### References

- Dik, Simon C. 1997. *The theory of Functional Grammar. Part II: Complex and derived constructions* (Functional Grammar Series 21). Edited by Kees Hengeveld. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hengeveld, Kees & J. Lachlan Mackenzie. 2008. *Functional Discourse Grammar. A typologically-based theory of language structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Horn, Laurence R. 1989. *A natural history of negation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

### **Interpersonal adverbial modifiers in FDG: function, distribution, analysis**

One of the notable features of Functional Discourse Grammar is that it distinguishes various hierarchically organized interpersonal and representational layers, each provided with its own slot for modifiers relevant at the layer in question. In true function-to-form fashion the linear placement of these modifiers is determined by the layer to which they belong, with the ordering of elements taking place in a top-down, outward-inward manner (Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2008: 311). The model, in other words, predicts (or at least constrains) the possible positions in which each modifier can occur.

On the basis of examples such as (1) and (2), the paper will test some of these predictions by examining the function and distribution of a small set of English interpersonal adverbs: *finally*, *frankly*, *(un)fortunately*, *allegedly* and *sadly*.

- (1) a. I *frankly* don't care what these scientists are out to prove. (BYU-BNC, religious)  
b. What she is saying, with her big white collars, is, "I am a clean, controlled and decent Christian woman. I believe in marriage and the family. And smacking. You, *frankly*, are a bit of a slut." (BYU-BNC, pop-lore)
- (2) Yeah it's just a little bit muddy that's all. *Unfortunately*. (BYU-BNC, meeting)

The specific research questions will be as follows:

- What is the distributional behaviour of the selected adverbs: (i) in which intra-clausal ( $P^I$ ,  $P^M$ ,  $P^F$ ) and extra-clausal ( $P^{Pre}$ ,  $P^{Post}$ , parenthetical or free standing) positions do they occur; (ii) in which embedded contexts do they occur?
- What is the exact interpersonal function and scope of these adverbs, in particular when occurring in different positions?
- What kind of analysis is needed to account for the different functional and formal features of these adverbs?

The methodology used will be that of qualitative corpus research, using data from a number of written and spoken corpora (BNC, COCA, SBC-SAE and the Fisher Corpus). On the basis of these data (and, where relevant, their prosodic contours), an analysis will be proposed which (ideally) can account for the different positions and phonological features of intra-clausal (example (1a)) and extra-clausal (example (1b)) IL adverbs, with the former being analysed as modifiers of a particular IL layer (the analysis so far adopted for such adverbs; e.g. Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2008: 82, 313), and the latter as separate Discourse Acts. These Discourse Acts may then either be dependent (example (1b)) or independent (example (2)). If dependent, the Discourse Act will be assigned a rhetorical function which not only captures its general interpersonal function, but which also triggers its specific morphosyntactic and phonological features (distribution and prosodic contour).

### **References**

Hengeveld, Kees & J. Lachlan Mackenzie. 2008. *Functional Discourse Grammar. A typologically-based theory of language structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

### **An FDG analysis of the English evidential expression *apparently*.**

An analysis of the evidential expression *apparently* can reveal not only the type of evidence expressed but also the scope of the expression. The focus of the present research will be on modern British English but the data does allow for reference to slightly earlier usages.

The poster will consider scope relations of *apparently* at both the Representational Level and the Interpersonal Level which will include reportativity. Unlike Keizer (2015: 115-116) which labels only non-verbal categories of modifiers expressing source of information as evidentials, this poster will include reportatives in the category of evidential expressions. Hengeveld and Hattner (2015: 517) also refers to reportatives as evidentials but does draw “a sharp line between reportativity on the one hand, and event perception, deduction and inference on the other.”

*Apparently* as in (1) can modify the Communicative Content at the Interpersonal level and, as such, be labeled reportative.

(1) *Apparently*, it has started snowing.

Thus, in (1), the adverb *apparently* can indicate that the speaker’s communicative act relays information produced by another speaker.

Table 1. *Scope relations at the Interpersonal Level*

Discourse Act > Illocution > <b>Communicative Content</b> > Referential Subact > Ascriptive Subact
--

As noted by Hengeveld and Mackenzie (2008: 152), in other situations, (1) can be construed as deduction based on visual sensory evidence within the immediate surroundings. Snow on someone’s clothes could be viewed as evidence of weather conditions. In this reading, there are “two states of affairs: the perceived one and the deduced one” (Hengeveld & Hattner 2015: 486). *Apparently* then modifies the Episode layer at the Representational level.

Table 2. *Scope relations at the Representational Level*

Propositional Content > <b>Episode</b> > State of Affairs > Configurational Property > Property
---

In exploring the type of evidentiality expressed by *apparently* and its scope through FDG, the poster will consider many instances of *apparently* found in various corpora and British newspapers.

### **References**

- Hengeveld, K. & M. Hattner. 2015. Four types of evidentiality in the native languages of Brazil. *Linguistics* 53.3: 479-524.
- Hengeveld, K. & J. L. Mackenzie. 2008. *Functional Discourse Grammar. A typologically-based theory of language structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Keizer, E. (2015). *A Functional Discourse Grammar for English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

### **Discourse markers in reported speech: a contrastive analysis of English and Spanish**

The present study reports on work currently being carried out on markers such as *well* in English and *pues* in Spanish in the particular context of reported speech (Borreguero *et al.* 2016).

One of the features of these elements, which may be called ‘discourse markers’ (DMs), is that they can be deleted in indirect speech without affecting the propositional content of the utterance, since they do not add anything to that propositional content. In fact, DMs are often, but not always, banned from indirect speech (see 2a-b):

- (1) *Mira*, no voy a hacer lo que me dices.  
‘*Look*, I am not going to do what you’re telling me.’
- (2) a. Dijo que no iba a hacer lo que yo decía.  
‘She said that she wasn’t going to do what I was telling her.’  
b. \*Dijo que, *mira*, no iba a hacer lo que yo decía.  
‘\*She said that, *look*, she wasn’t going to do what I was telling her.’

A second type of reported speech is direct (or quoted) speech, which allows the speaker to reproduce a third person’s speech ‘literally’. With respect to DMs, it is interesting to see that they are indeed accepted in direct speech. In fact, our preliminary analysis of spoken narratives taken from corpora suggests that DMs are particularly productive in the boundaries of direct speech, especially at the beginning, and they seem to function as ‘quotation markers’, introducing direct speech in the two languages considered:

- (3) And I said *well* when did you last contact them? (BNC: D97, 1962)
- (4) fue al de la autoescuela y le dicee *oye* apúntame para examen // (L.15.A.2., 1316)  
‘he went to the driving-school teacher and he goes *listen* enrol me in the exam’

Our findings emerge from an empirical analysis of a database extracted from different corpora of naturally-occurring conversations.

Although DMs have been widely studied in the literature, where their multifunctionality has been stressed, a much less common function associated with them is the one described here as elements introducing direct speech.

Our aim in this paper is (a) to explore the functions of DMs and other similar devices in direct speech in English and Spanish, and (b) to give a plausible treatment of this phenomenon in FDG morphosyntactic terms.

We claim that examples such as (3) consist of a nuclear discourse act (the one containing the quoted speech) and a subsidiary discourse act, containing the reporting verb. Inside the nuclear discourse act, DMs introduce the quoted speech. Since they do not represent lexical strategies but grammatical ones, they are seen as operators, modifying the whole discourse act. On the other hand, because of their function as ‘reportatives’, serving to indicate the source of the information and allowing the speaker to distance him/herself from the reported information (Keizer 2015: 80-81), they can be considered modifiers.

Borreguero, M., I. Fiorentini & E. Martínez Caro. 2016. Discourse markers in reported speech: a contrastive analysis of Spanish, Italian and English. Paper presented at *LPTS 2016*. University of Valencia.

Keizer, E. 2015. *A Functional Discourse Grammar for English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

## **Transparency in Norwegian and Icelandic: language contact vs. language isolation**

This research studies language contact as a possible cause of differences between languages in their degree of transparency, i.e. in the extent to which they show one-to-one meaning-to-form mappings (Hengeveld & Leufkens subm.). As transparency is assumed to facilitate intelligibility and learnability, it is plausible that in situations of language contact transparent forms are preferred (Kusters 2003; Trudgill 2011). It has therefore been hypothesized that language contact leads to increasing transparency, whereas language isolation may cause growing opacity (Leufkens 2013, 2015).

The present study tests this hypothesis by investigating the degree of transparency of Norwegian and Icelandic. These two languages are both descendants of Old Norse and hence in many ways relatively similar, but differ in the degree of language contact that they have been exposed to over the centuries. Whereas Norwegian has experienced extensive contact with Low German and Danish, Icelandic has developed in a relatively isolated setting (Haugen 1976; Kusters 2003; Trudgill 2011). It is therefore predicted that Norwegian shows a higher degree of transparency than Icelandic. Based on a set of opacity features formulated in Functional Discourse Grammar (Leufkens 2013, 2015), which measure violations of a transparent one-to-one relation between units at the Interpersonal, Representational, Morphosyntactic and Phonological Level, the degree of transparency of the two languages is determined.

The results show first of all that Norwegian and Icelandic are both highly opaque languages. At the same time, a comparison between the languages demonstrates that, as predicted, Norwegian is more transparent than Icelandic. This difference seems to be due to an increase in transparency in Norwegian and a small rise in opacity in Icelandic since the Old Norse period. To a large extent, the increased transparency of Norwegian seems to be the result of an overall simplification of the inflectional morphology of the language. It is commonly argued that the mainland Scandinavian languages have undergone such simplification due to language contact (Haugen 1976; Trudgill 2011). In this way, the findings directly support the hypothesized relation between language contact and transparency.

## **References**

- Haugen, Einar. 1976. *The Scandinavian languages: an introduction to their history*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Hengeveld, Kees & Sterre Leufkens. subm. Transparent and non-transparent languages.
- Kusters, Wouter. 2003. *Linguistic complexity: The influence of social change on verbal inflection*. PhD dissertation, Leiden University.
- Leufkens, Sterre. 2013. The transparency of creoles. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 28.2: 323-362.
- Leufkens, Sterre. 2015. *Transparency in language: A typological study*. PhD dissertation, University of Amsterdam.
- Trudgill, Peter. 2011. *Sociolinguistic typology: Social determinants of linguistic complexity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Taísa Peres de Oliveira, *University of Mato Grosso do Sul*, Três Lagoas, Brazil  
Andreia Dias de Souza, *Institute of Mato Grosso do Sul*, Três Lagoas, Brazil

### **Subject alignment in Brazilian Portuguese**

This paper offers an account on subject expression in Brazilian Portuguese (BP) within the multi-layered model of Functional Discourse Grammar, as developed by Hengeveld & Mackenzie (2008). In general, Portuguese subject assignment may be classified as a non-transparent feature in the sense that there is no grammatical alignment mapping pragmatic / semantic formulation and formal units in the syntactic configuration of a linguistic expression. This results in a non-bijective alignment, for there is no correspondence between formal units at the Morphosyntactic level and Interpersonal and Representational information.

This opaque relation holds as the general rule for standard BP. Nevertheless, vernacular BP is evolving to express subjects in a more transparent way. First, subjects may be expressed by an ellipsis due to verbal morphology and agreement rules. On the other hand, BP is undergoing a neutralization of its pronominal system and of its inflectional paradigm (Cavalcante & Duarte 2008). In this case, subject must be codified by a lexical or pronominal form. In both cases, subject is expressed by a one-to-one correlation between structural and pragmatic and semantic information.

These possibilities can be formalized within the layers of FDG, revealing a bijective alignment between Interpersonal, Representational and Morphosyntactic levels. The motivations for the transparent realization of subjects are determined by pragmatic and semantic factors. Topic continuity, informativeness and clarity, neutralization of verbal agreement and reduction of pronominal paradigms are the factors that may influence the degree of transparency / opacity of subject realization. As a general result, we noticed that first person singular and third person singular are more susceptible to be expressed in a more opaque way, opposed to first person plural and the forms indicating second person, that are more transparent. (This research is supported by FUNDECT.)

### **References**

- Cavalcante, Sonia & Maria Eugenia Lamoglia Duarte. 2008. The subject position in Brazilian Portuguese: the embedding of a syntactic change. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* 14: 54-61.
- Hengeveld, Kees & John Lachlan Mackenzie. 2008. *Functional Discourse Grammar. A typologically based theory of language structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

### **Towards a subcategorization of quantifying nouns in FDG**

Hengeveld & Mackenzie (2008: 135) include *Quantity* (variable: *q*) among the semantic categories which are relevant for the Representational Level of FDG. The aim of this paper is to provide a subcategorization of such a category in some grammatically relevant semantic subclasses. At this first sight I will focus on quantifying lexical units (prototypically nouns) which tend to occur in configurational heads.

Hengeveld & Mackenzie (2008: 268) briefly pointed to a first subdivision in this category saying that the term *Quantity* covers both amounts and numbers, depending on the uncountable/ countable dichotomy. Such an initial approach must be complemented with a second parameter at least: the definite/indefinite nature of quantification. A definite amount noun denotes the measurement of some physical dimension (height, volume, weight, etc.) in accordance to a previously established standard. A definite numeral noun designates a quantity identifiable with a specific digit. In other cases, quantification must be considered as indefinite.

There are several interconnections among these subclasses, whose grammatical consequences should be analyzed in language-specific terms. For instance, some quantifying nouns in English admit an interpretation as an indefinite amount (<sup>ia</sup>q) or as an indefinite numeral (<sup>in</sup>q), depending on the nature of their Reference argument:

- (1)    a. A fistful of sugar                      b. a fistful of cards

It is especially relevant the relationship which exists between definite numeral nouns and numeral operators. It is well known that many languages of Australia and of New Guinea have a very small set of numeral operators which rarely go beyond six (cf. Laycock 1975: 219f). Nevertheless, common enumerations are perfectly possible thanks to a parallel *tally-system* of numeral nouns normally associated to body parts: fist, hand, finger, etc.

- (2)    (Kayardild, Pama-Nyungan; Evans 1995: 242)  
         *Kiyarrng-ka    marl-d*  
         two-NOM      hand-NOM  
         ‘ten’ (“two hands”)

To conclude, it may be thought that a subcategorization of the semantic category *Quantity* based on two parameters (amount/number and definite/indefinite) sheds light on many grammatical phenomena and, therefore, is necessary for FDG. Subclasses of *Quantity* in configurational heads depend not only of the quantifying noun, but also of the semantic properties of the Reference argument. This supports the idea that a configurational head operates at the Representational Level as a whole.

### **References**

- Evans, Nicholas D. 1995. *A a grammar of Kayardild*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.  
Hengeveld, Kees & J. Lachlan Mackenzie. 2008. *Functional Discourse Grammar. A typologically-based theory of language structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.  
Laycock, D. C. 1975. “Observations on number systems and semantics”. In: Stephen A. Wurm (ed.), *New Guinea area languages and language study*, I, 219-233. Canberra: Australian National University.

## Morphology in FDG from a comparative theoretical perspective

This paper localizes the treatment of morphological phenomena within FDG from a comparative theoretical point of view. Out of this metatheoretical perspective, recent advancements and additional suggestions for a further development of FDG relating to linguistic morphology are addressed. Recently, Stewart (2016) presented fifteen contemporary morphological theories (from A-Morphous Morphology to Word Syntax) and characterized them according to their respective places on the five-point continua exemplified in Table 1, the latter trying to apply the criteria to the theory of FDG (H[engeveld]&M[ackenzie] 2008).

Tabel 1. *Continuum table for FDG (based on Stewart 2016)*

Morpheme-based			Θ			Word/lexeme-based
Formalist			Θ			Functionalism
In-grammar		Θ				In-lexicon
Phonological formalism			Θ			Syntactic formalism
Incremental				Θ		Realizational

Continuum 1 “concerns the basic units around which morphological activity is assumed to be organised” (Stewart 2016: 5). The relevant morphosyntactic FDG primitives suggest a middle mark on this scale, as Words are made up of other Words or smaller morphemic units corresponding to Lexemes, operators and/or functions at the higher levels. Continuum 2 “has to do with a broader perspective on what linguistic theory and analysis are supposed to accomplish” (Stewart 2016: 5). Despite its name and top-down organization, FDG actually “occupies a position halfway between radically functional and radically formal approaches to grammatical analysis” (H&M 2008: 26), hence the middle mark on this scale as well. Continuum 3 “refers to the ‘location’ of morphology in the architecture of grammar” (Stewart 2016: 6). The mark here derives from FDG distinguishing in-grammar inflection, in-lexicon lexeme derivation but also in-grammar syntactic derivation (García Velasco & Keizer 2014: 162-163), thus adhering to a more complicated version of the Split Morphology Hypothesis. Continuum 4 reflects FDG’s fairly unique formalism across its disparate levels of language structure, while placement on the last continuum involves the controversial, potentially hybrid nature of FDG as a pattern (realizational) and/or process (incremental) model. Comparing now FDG’s specifications with the table for Autolexical Syntax in Stewart (2016: 15) reveals differences on all continua except the first, which is interesting because the two theories are said to display various similarities (H&M 2008: 31). However, for FDG at least some of the marks might yet migrate as a result of current debate and future research. Pertinent topics include the new ways in which well-known concatenative morphological phenomena are treated differently in the FDG architecture as well as a focus on non-concatenative morphology like all kinds of base modification, reduplication and conversion, i.e. typologically widespread processes which largely still await (further) in-depth FDG treatment.

García Velasco, D. & E. Keizer. 2014. Derivational morphology in Functional Discourse Grammar. In: M. A. Gómez González, F. J. Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez & F. González-García (eds), *Theory and practice in functional-cognitive space*, 151-175. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Hengeveld, K. & J. L. Mackenzie. 2008. *Functional Discourse Grammar*. Oxford: OUP.

Stewart, T.W. 2016. *Contemporary morphological theories: a user’s guide*. Edinburgh: EUP.

## **The interaction of the English present perfect with relative and absolute time adverbials in Functional Discourse Grammar**

The English present perfect (PrP), with and without adverbial specification, is one of the most widely studied constructions of the English language, and yet there are still questions that need to be addressed in order to arrive at a satisfactory description of this tense aspect combination that accounts for its varied language use. One of the elements often discussed but rarely modelled in detail is that of its interaction with various adverbials that relate to the temporal make-up or construal of the State of Affairs or the Episode as a whole. This is especially true when it comes to the comparatively recent recognition of its felicitous co-occurrence with temporal adverbials that anchor the verb phrase to a completely bygone, more or less specific point or period of time in the past, like in

- (1) **More than 10 years ago** Salomaki et al. **have demonstrated** that epidural fentanyl provided better analgesia than intravenous fentanyl after thoracic surgery. (COCA, ACAD, 2007)

The aim of the present paper is to, based on examples taken from the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA), examine this interaction by focusing on adverbials functioning as modifiers at the layer of the Episode, the State of Affairs, and the Configurational Property, as well as the inner and outer phasal aspect of the predication, in combination with the PrP. This includes those adverbials typically addressed in connection with the PrP, such as e.g. *already*, as well as those adverbials that are typically said to be incompatible with the PrP, like the completely bygone relative time modifier *before dinner*, or the absolute one *in 1998* (cf. e.g. Klein 1992). Specifically, the following two questions will be addressed:

- How does the Present operator at the layer of the Episode in combination with the phasal operator Perfect interact in creating the various readings assigned to utterances in the PrP?
- What are the functions and scopes of the different adverbials contributing to these readings at various levels, in particular when their function seems to run counter to that typically assigned to the PrP?

The difference made between modifiers at the level of the Configurational Property and those at the level of the State of Affairs provides a promising basis for an analysis of at least two different readings of the PrP (cf. the analysis of the French Passé Simple in combination with adverbials in Vet 1990). That both occur within the scope of the external structure of the event as specified by the Present operator on the layer of the Episode leads to the overall perception of an event in the past that is situated in a discourse on one mental construct relevant to the presence, which is one of the most central ways the PrP can be understood.

## **References**

- Declerck, Renaat. 2006. *The grammar of the English verb phrase*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Klein, Wolfgang. 1992. The present perfect puzzle. *Language* 68: 525-552.
- Vet, Co. 1990. Aktionsart, aspect and duration adverbials. In: Harm Pinkster & Inge Genée, (eds), *Unity in Diversity. Papers presented to Simon Dik on his 50<sup>th</sup> birthday*, 279-289. Dordrecht: Foris.

### **Transparency and opacity in the expression of subject pronoun and verb agreement in the indigenous Portuguese of the Upper Xingu (Brazil)**

This paper aims at investigating transparency and opacity in the expression of subject pronoun and verb agreement in the contact Portuguese of the Indigenous Reserve of the Upper Xingu region (Mato Grosso, Brazil) from an FDG perspective (Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2008). The paper will deal with the possible motivations that may explain both the (lack of) verbal agreement and why the subject pronoun is sometimes (or always) expressed in the sentence.

The research corpus consists of 14 interviews with indigenous representatives of the Yawalapiti, Kamaiurá and Suya groups, totalling 630 minutes of recording. The surveys were collected between 1977 and 1978 by Ligia Beraba, Inês Duarte, Charlotte Emmerich, Margarete Emmerich, Christina Gomes and Marta Scherre and transcribed for word.

As the situation of the Upper Xingu is linguistically complex, i.e. languages from different typological families are being spoken in the same space (Arawak, Karib, Tupi-Guarani, Tupi and isolated groups), I defend as a main hypothesis that the speakers, when they use the Portuguese to communicate with each other, will first use more transparent forms in order to be maximally intelligible. This is based on the idea that there is a diachronic pattern, in which “languages start out transparently and acquire opacity later on” (Leufkens 2015: 1; Hengeveld 2011). Transparency here is defined, according to Hengeveld (2011) and Leufkens (2015), as the one-to-one relation between meaning and form, which can be observed with regard to the alignment between the Interpersonal, Representational and Morphosyntactic levels. Opacity, on the other hand, is defined as a one-to-many relation between these levels, or as a one-to-zero relation that occurs when material is inserted at the lower levels without presenting any counterpart at the highest levels of the grammar.

When the language has two alternatives to express the subject, i.e. the subject may be doubly marked (lexically and through verbal suffix) or expressed only by verbal suffix, we conclude that it has a cross-reference system, and therefore, it is considered an opaque language regarding the subject expression, since it has two referential subacts at the Interpersonal level that correspond to a single semantic unit (individual) at the Representational level. When the double marking is obligatory in the language for expressing subject, we say that the verbal suffix is not referential by itself, since it does not contribute to the meaning of the sentence (Hengeveld 2012). It is just a verbal agreement marker.

In sum, the analysis shows that the contact Portuguese presents cases of cross-reference and also cases of neutralization of verbal agreement. The degree of opacity tends to increase in the Portuguese of Xingu to the extent that the speakers start having more contact with Portuguese, as well as in the Portuguese acquisition process, in which children first acquire the most transparent structures, as in the case of regular verbs, and only then they begin to deal with opaque structures, which are cognitively more complex.

### **References**

- Hengeveld, K. & J. L. Mackenzie. 2008. *Functional Discourse Grammar. A typologically-based theory of language structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hengeveld, K. 2011. Transparency in Functional Discourse Grammar. *Linguistics in Amsterdam* 4.2: 1-22.
- Hengeveld, K. 2012. Referential markers and agreement markers in Functional Discourse Grammar. *Language Sciences* 34: 468-479.
- Leufkens, S. 2015. *Transparency in language*. Utrecht: LOT Publications.

### **Transparency and opacity in Brazilian Portuguese: operations in the Morphosyntactic Level**

This study is part of a larger project that compares the degree of transparency of Brazilian and European Portuguese, under the scope of Functional Discourse Grammar – FDG (Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2008). Considering that transparency is a direct relation between form and meaning, the aim of the project is to investigate the Brazilian and European varieties of Portuguese in order to establish to what extent the phenomenon of languages in contact can contribute to the transparency of a language.

The scope for this paper is the relation of transparency in the Morphosyntactic Level, once its operations can contribute to the opaqueness of a language (Hengeveld, 2011a). The objective of this paper is to investigate if contact of Portuguese with other languages makes emerge a more transparent grammar, taking into account the analyses of an encoding level. In order to achieve this objective, we investigated parameters as: 1) expletive elements; 2) tense copying; 3) raising; 4) grammatical gender, declination, conjugation; 5) agreement; 6) fusional morphology.

The *corpus* was composed by the *Minimum Corpora* used by PGPF (Project of Grammar of Spoken Portuguese), that constitutes a sample of the material collected by the Project of the Educated Urban Norm (NURC/Brazil), and by *IBORUNA*, the online database of the Linguistic Sample Project of São Paulos's Upstate (ALIP).

The expectation was that Brazilian Portuguese, as a more transparent variety, would not present all these types of operations, which are related to opaqueness. Nevertheless, this is not what happens. That may be due to two different reasons. Firstly the test may not be sensitive to the variations of formality that happen in the grammar of the Brazilian variety. Secondly, it may not be the case to identify the Brazilian variety as more transparent than the European one, but to identify it as less opaque, when restricting the analyses to the Morphosyntactic Level. Maybe it would be able to contribute to the debate about the differences between the two varieties, caused by the context of long historical contact of the Brazilian Portuguese with other languages.

### **References**

- Hengeveld, K. 2011. Introduction: transparency in Functional Discourse Grammar. *Linguistics in Amsterdam* 4.2: 1-22.
- Hengeveld, K. & J. L. Mackenzie. 2008. *Functional Discourse Grammar: a typologically-based theory of language structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

## **A FDG account of premodification in the *of*-binominal noun phrase**

Premodification patterns play a central role in the categorization of *of*-binominal noun phrases in general (Brems 2011: 191), and in particular in the analysis of the evaluative binominal noun phrase (EBNP; *a beast of a man*). On the one hand, this is because the EBNP sometimes demonstrates non-canonical premodification: modifiers in front of the first noun can be selected by the second noun (e.g. *a **bitchy** iceberg of a women*; e.g. Aarts 1998: 132-133), and on the other hand, because some of the EBNPs have evolved into evaluative modifiers (EM; *a helluva woman*), with [N<sub>1</sub> of a] integrating itself into the pre-existing premodification patterns (Ten Wolde & Keizer 2016).

This talk will present a Functional Discourse Grammar (Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2008; Keizer 2015) analysis of the premodification patterns of the EBNP family of binominals and will discuss the role premodification plays in their grammaticalization. In particular, this talk will focus on the following research questions:

- 1) What is the premodification distribution behavior of the key members of this binominal family?
- 2) How would an FDG analysis and FDG ordering principles account for the shifting premodifier patterns in this family of constructions?

The paper comprises two parts. First, based on an empirical study of corpus data from the *Corpus of Contemporary American English* (COCA) and the *Corpus of Historical American English* (COHA), which is categorized using a zone-based, linear premodification approach (Ghesquière 2014), the development of the premodification distributional patterns of the EBNP, EM, and other historically related constructions (i.e. NP+PPs, head-qualifiers) will be analyzed. The second part will draw on the empirical data i) to support or refute the proposed grammaticalization account and ii) to provide an FDG explanation of the proposed development of the EBNP and of the premodification distributions found, in particular focusing on FDG syntactic ordering principles.

## **References**

- Aarts, Bas. 1998. English binominal noun phrases. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 96: 117-158.
- Brems, Lieselotte. 2011. *Layering of size and type noun constructions in English*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Ghesquière, Lobke. 2014. *The directionality of (inter)subjectification in the English noun phrase*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hengeveld, Kees & J. Lachlan Mackenzie. 2008. *Functional Discourse Grammar. A typologically-based theory of language structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Keizer, Evelien. 2015. *A Functional Discourse Grammar for English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ten Wolde, E. & E. Keizer. To appear. Structure and substance in Functional Discourse Grammar: the case of the binominal noun phrase. *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia*.

### **Quotative indexes and reported discourse in Bohairic Coptic narratives**

This contribution is based on a corpus of narrative texts, the *Martyrs Acts* (ed. H. Hyvernat 1886/1977), written in Bohairic Coptic (Afro-Asiatic). Originally, the *Martyrs Acts* must have been intended to be read aloud to the pilgrims visiting the shrine of the martyr on the occasion of his festival. Not surprisingly, many features of these texts are characteristic of oral texts.

Quotative indexes form a separate category of Linguistic Expressions and have been enjoying growing scholarly interest in recent years (see e.g. Güldemann & Von Roncador (eds.) 2002; Güldemann 2008; Buchstaller & Van Alphen (eds.) 2012; Buchstaller 2014; see also Hengeveld 1994 for an early FG account). Their importance for oral literature has also been amply acknowledged (e.g. Foley's (1999: 221) striking characterization: "aural punctuation marks"). Quotative indexes in Coptic have not yet been the subject of a systematic linguistic investigation.

There are three types of quotative indexes in Bohairic Coptic. The aim of the present contribution is to chart and explain the relations between each of these three types of expressions and the types of reported discourse they introduce. The starting point is the assumption that the selection of an appropriate index should be interpreted as facilitating the strategic organization of the text and thus as pertaining to the Interpersonal Level in FDG (Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2008): the Narrator selects an appropriate expression in order to achieve his specific communicative aims. Two factors which have been shown to play a role in reported discourse are evidentiality on the one hand and mimetic effects on the other (see Buchstaller 2014: 37-50; see also Wierzbicka 1974 for an early account). The question will be examined whether these factors are also at work in Coptic.

### **References**

- Buchstaller, I. 2014. *Quotatives: new trends and sociolinguistic implications*. Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell.
- Buchstaller I. & I. van Alphen (eds). 2012. *Quotatives: cross-linguistic and cross-disciplinary perspectives*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Foley, J. M. 1999. *Homer's traditional art*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Güldemann, T. 2008. *Quotative indexes in African languages: a synchronic and diachronic survey*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Güldemann, T. & M. von Roncador (eds). 2002. *Reported discourse: a meeting ground for different linguistic domains*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Hengeveld, K. & J. L. Mackenzie. 2008. *Functional Discourse Grammar. A typologically-based theory of language structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [Hengeveld, K.]. 1994. Ik heb zoiets van: "Ze bekijken het maar!". In: F. G. van Werkgem, *Dubbel Nederlands: 23 opstellen voor Simon C. Dik*, 8-12. Dordrecht: ICG Printing.
- Hyvernat, H. 1977 [1886]. *Les Actes des martyrs de l'Égypte*, reprint. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag.
- Wierzbicka, A. 1974. The semantics of direct and indirect discourse. *Papers in Linguistics* 7: 267-307.