

FDG 2020 Online

Abstracts



6th International Conference on Functional Discourse Grammar

Non-standard forms of additive negation in Mexican Spanish

Morphosyntactic expression of negative polarity in modern standard Spanish is a typical case of *non-strict negative concord* (Haspelmath 1997: 201; van der Auwera & Van Alsenoy 2016: 488). Nevertheless, in Mexican Spanish there are two non-standard expression procedures that do not fit on such a general type: *tampoco no* (1), literally: ‘neither don’t’, and *también no* (2), literally ‘also don’t’, both in a preverbal position:

- (1) [*Eres parte de la corriente y no puedes nadar contra corriente;*]
tampoco no te vas a convert-ir en Gandhi.
neither NEG 2SG.ACC AUX PRP become-INF PRP Gandhi
‘[One is part of the current and cannot swim against the current;] it is not the case that one is going to become Gandhi.’
- (2) [*mi perro no come ni el pollo y*]
también no va a com-er la-s sobra-s.
also NEG AUX PRP eat-INF ART.F-PL leftover-PL
‘[My dog doesn’t eat even chicken, so] he is not going to eat leftovers either’

The aim of this paper is to analyze these specific negative forms within FDG. We postulate that, although *tampoco no* and *también no* are apparently very similar, they differ in structural terms. Whereas *también no* is the exponent of a semantic operation at the Representational Level, *tampoco no* is an encoding phenomenon situated at the Morphosyntactic Level. More specifically, *también no* is a sequence of two separate markers that disjoin the semantic operators conflated by *tampoco* in its standard use: [Addition] and [Negation]. On its part, *tampoco no* is constituted by just one additive negative marker (*tampoco*) plus a second negative word (*no*), which is a dummy element (cf. Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2008: 347) that does not correspond to any semantic material at the Representational Level.

References

- Haspelmath, Martin. 1997. *Indefinite pronouns*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Hengeveld, Kees & J. Lachlan Mackenzie. 2008. *Functional Discourse Grammar: A typologically-based theory of language structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Van der Auwera, Johan & Lauren Van Alsenoy. 2016. On the typology of negative concord. *Studies in Language* 40/3: 473-512.

FDG-based language teaching

FDG can be a powerful instrument for teaching languages. Because it follows Levelt's language processing model (Levelt 1989), FDG offers a complete picture of what the output and the input of a language are, together with their processing. All these elements are particularly important in recent pedagogical literature, as recalled among others by Benati (2017).

I teach to adults at university level, and my task is to teach them language in use and its grammar. Differently from other approaches, descriptive grammar is introduced only very late: I am convinced that it is much easier for students who already know the language in use. FDG helps with this, also because allows to apply the most useful psychological approaches to language learning.

Because all students already have their linguistic models, at any level when I start teaching I ask first them to tell something in their language. Upon this I can introduce the pragmatics of language use, that is the Interpersonal Level of FDG. I try to introduce FDG terminology whenever possible without clashing with other models. I can then explain the importance of approaching a language according to its production. In doing this I can introduce the levels of FDG grammar and the importance of a hierarchy.

After this I stress the importance of the Fund, of the primitives and the templates. Methodologically, this step is very important for the students and introduces the Representational Level. With these few elements, first obtained through the use of students' mother tongue, I start explaining what is the general structure of the layers, introducing the use of bracketing. Operators, modifiers, functions are concepts that must be immediately understood.

At this point I can introduce the language itself. Starting with the use of students' mother tongue highly motivates them in learning, because it gives the conscience of a certain competence. Language presentation and learning is quite smooth, but the degree of explicitation of the grammar depends on the level of the people I am teaching to. Only the Morphosyntactic Level is presented as being very mechanical in its use, so that it requires only practice.

References

- Benati, Alessandro. 2017. The role of input and output tasks in grammar instruction: Theoretical, empirical and pedagogical considerations. *SSLT* 7/3: 377-396.
- Hengeveld, Kees & J. Lachlan Mackenzie. 2008. *Functional Discourse Grammar: A typologically-based theory of language structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Levelt, Willem J.M. 1989. *Speaking: from intention to articulation*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

The non-interrogative sentence-final particle *ne* (呢) in Mandarin

Mandarin Chinese has a rich inventory of sentence-final particles, whose meanings and functions are constantly under debate. The sentence-final particle *ne* (呢) (henceforth SF *ne*) has two uses, an interrogative use and a non-interrogative use. This paper will be devoted to arguing in detail that the non-interrogative SF *ne* is a contradiction marker (glossed as CTR), which signals that the currently presented information is in contradiction with the previously existing assumption held by the speaker, or the addressee, or both. For instance, in (1), the speaker is signaling that the message about the testing on dogs contradicts the addressee's previous assumption that hospitals do not test on dogs.

- (1) **Sentence:** 医院 里 用 狗 做 实验 呢
 yi-yuan *li* *yong* *gou* *zuo* *shi-yan* *ne*.
 hospital inside use dog make experiment CTR
 ‘Hospitals test on dogs.’

Contradiction: Hospitals don't test on dogs. (Previous assumption)
 Hospitals test on dogs. (Current message)

Based on corpus analysis, Fang & Hengeveld (subm.) investigated the rigid sentential sequencing of eight Mandarin sentence-final particles (*ou*, *a*, *ma*, *ba*, *le*, *ne*₁, *ne*₂ and *de*; *ne*₁ is the non-interrogative SF *ne*), and located SF *ne* at the layer of the Communicated Content at the Interpersonal Level. In this paper, I will argue further that SF *ne* is an operator of contradiction at that layer. In the study of negation by Hengeveld & Mackenzie (2018), the category of negation that pertains to the layer of the Communicated Content is “denial”. However, SF *ne* differs from expressions of denial in that it does not indicate negation, as SF *ne* can co-occur with both negative words *bu* and *mei* in a single sentence and its presence does not affect the polarity of the propositional content; instead, *ne* is used to signal a contradiction relationship between the currently presented Communicated Content and the previous Communicated Content contained either in the preceding message or in the context. Therefore, a category of contradiction could be added to the layer of the Communicated Content in the FDG framework to accommodate the expressions that signal this kind of contradiction relationships.

References

- Fang, Hongmei & Kees Hengeveld. Submitted. Sentence-final particles in Mandarin.
Hengeveld, Kees & Lachlan Mackenzie. 2018. Negation in Functional Discourse Grammar. In Evelien Keizer & Hella Olbertz (eds), *Recent developments in Functional Discourse Grammar*. 18-45. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

**The conditional clauses of Spanish and Portuguese introduced by *solo si* and *só se*:
a functional discourse analysis**

The aim of this paper¹ is to describe two conditional connectives, *só se*, in Portuguese, and *solo si*, in Spanish, in order to identify the Functional Discourse Grammar (Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2008) levels and layers on which they operate.

In Functional Discourse Grammar, conditional clauses are analyzed at the Representational and Interpersonal Levels. At the Representational Level, they operate at the Propositional Content layer and perform a *condition* semantic function. In this case, there is a dependency relationship between a subsidiary clause and a nuclear clause, in which the subsidiary clause functions as a modifier of the nuclear clause, as can be seen in (1):

- (1) *solo si* *mueve* *pieza*, [...] *podrá* *contar con*
COND move.PRS.3.SG piece be_able_to.FUT.3.SG count.INF with
respaldo de España (1996, ORAL, Reportajes)
support from Spain
'Only if he moves a piece, [...], will he be able to count on the support of Spain'

Conditional clauses can also perform a rhetorical function at the Interpersonal Level (Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2008: 53-56; Keizer 2015: 261). In this case, there is a dependency relationship between a subsidiary and a nuclear Discourse Act in which the subsidiary Discourse Act develops the speaker's strategy to achieve a communicative goal, which may be correcting information, adding information, etc. as can be seen in (2):

- (2) *Eu acordo cedo, né? Só se eu dormir bem tarde* [...] (DID-RJ-234)
1.SG wake_up.PRS.1.SG early, right COND 1.SG sleep.INF very late
'I wake up early, right? Only if I sleep very late [...]'

Our main hypothesis is that the conditional connectives in Portuguese and Spanish *só se* and *solo si*, which are considered by many authors, such as Montolío (1999), to be a complex conjunction, are in fact simple conjunctions (*si* and *se*) and can signal both a condition semantic function and a condition rhetorical function. These conditional clauses are under the scope of the elements *só* and *solo*, which perform a pragmatic restrictive contrast function.

The investigation is based on two corpora: the NURC Project, which contains oral texts from Portuguese, and the Corpus de Referencia del Español Actual (CREA), which contains texts of different origin from European and American Spanish.

References

- 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: University Press.
Montolío, Estrella. 1999. Las construcciones condicionales. In Ignacio Bosque & Violeta Demonte (eds), *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*. vol.3, 3642-3737. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe.

¹ This study was financed by the Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior (CAPES) – Finance code 88887.373122/2019-00.

A hierarchical approach to the lexicalization of *ainda bem*

The aim of this paper is to investigate the lexicalization process in the context of the Functional Discourse Grammar model (Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2008), offering an account on the emergence of periphrastic forms by lexicalization (cf. Brinton & Traugott 2005).

In order to do so, this research deals with the periphrastic form *ainda bem* as in (1) and pursues a twofold analysis: (i) one that describes functional and formal properties of *ainda bem* in contemporary Portuguese, and (ii) another one concerned with the representation, in FDG terms, of the lexicalization of *ainda bem* in the diachrony of Portuguese.

- (1) A: *e tudo correu bem.*
and everything run.PST.3SG well
'and everything went well.'
B: *ainda bem!*
thanks_god
'thanks God!' (Davies & Ferreira 2006)

In (1), A's Initiation Move provokes a reaction from B, who demonstrates his/her sympathy in relation to A's assertion (that 'everything went well'). B's reaction Move is headed by the periphrastic form *ainda bem*, a fixed form (Keizer 2013) that corresponds to a Lexeme of the Interpersonal Level, specifically to an interjection functioning as the head of the Illocution of an Interactive Act. (2) brings out a representation of this form in the Interpersonal Level.

- (2) (M₁: [(A₁: [(F₁: *ainda_bem*_{Int} (F₁)) (P₁)_S (P₂)_A] (A₁))] (M₁))

This paper argues that the form *ainda bem* emerges, in Portuguese history, from a set of different combinations between the words *ainda* 'still' and *bem* 'well'. These combinations can be mapped in terms of different scope relations contracted by *ainda* in association with *bem*. Our main conclusion is that the lexicalization of *ainda bem* entails fusion of an item (*ainda*) to a host (*mais*), loss of compositionality and reinterpretation of morphosyntactic boundaries. Based on the FDG hierarchical approach (cf. Hengeveld 2017), these can be represented in terms of a *contentive change*, with rearrangements in scope relations, and of a *formal change*, as a shift from a *head-dependent relation* to a *single lexical primitive*.

References

- Brinton, Laurel & Elizabeth Traugott. 2005. *Lexicalization and language change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Davies, Mark & Michael Ferreira. 2006. *Corpus do Português: 45 million words, 1300s-1900s*. Available online at <http://www.corpusdoportugues.org>.
- Hengeveld, Kees. 2017. A hierarchical approach to grammaticalization. In Kees Hengeveld, Heiko Narrog & Hella Olbertz (eds), *The grammaticalization of tense, aspect, modality, and evidentiality. A functional perspective*. 13-38. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Hengeveld, Kees & J. Lachlan Mackenzie. 2008. *Functional Discourse Grammar: A typologically-based theory of language structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Keizer, Evelien. 2013. The X is (is) construction: an FDG account. In J. Lachlan Mackenzie & Hella Olbertz (eds), *Casebook in Functional Discourse Grammar*. 213-248. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Interpersonal lexemes as Lexical Deeds

While the lexemes inserted at the Representational Level (RL) are consistently analyzed as Lexical Properties, lexemes ascribed to the Interpersonal Level (IL) are not modelled as a separate type of linguistic unit in FDG but are assumed to be inserted into the relevant slots of pragmatic structure without heading a specific type of variable. This is illustrated in (1) (Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2008: 81), where the performative predicate *promise* restricts the head of the Illocution and the adverb *sincerely* is analyzed as a modifier of the same layer:

- (1) *I promise you sincerely that this is not a trick.*
(A_I: [(F_I: promise_v (F_I): *sincerely*_{Adv} (F_I)) (P_I)_S (P_J)_A (C_I)_Φ] (A_I))

This treatment of interpersonal lexemes represents the only case in which a linguistic unit is inserted at the relevant level of representation without heading a specific type of variable. There is no explanation for this exception in Hengeveld and Mackenzie (2008) (nor elsewhere in the FDG literature), nor do there appear to be particular theoretical reasons why interpersonal lexemes should be treated differently from all other types of linguistic units.

The differential analysis of RL and IL lexemes is not only undesirable from a theoretical viewpoint but also brings along undesirable implications for explaining the grammatical properties of the latter type of lexical expressions. First, certain interpersonal lexemes may fall within the scope of other lexical or grammatical specifications: for instance, Keizer (2018: 75) notices that the illocutionary modifier *frankly* can in turn be modified “by *quite* (very frequently), *very* and *just*”. Clearly, this entails that the lexeme in question must necessarily constitute a separate variable of the IL. Second, interpersonal lexemes may be coordinated with each other (e.g. the two performative predicates in (2)), which, again, is only possible if each of these lexemes corresponds to a separate interpersonal variable:

- (2) *I declare and direct that it shall be lawful for independent candidates, along with candidates sponsored by political parties, to contest presidential, parliamentary and local council elections.* (GloWbE: www.english-corpora.org/glowbe)

In order to overcome such problems and restore the parallelism with representational lexemes, I will suggest that interpersonal lexemes be redefined as heads of a distinct layer of the IL, which I will refer to as the Lexical Deed. Empirically, the advantages of this proposal will be illustrated with a variety of authentic corpus examples from English.

References

- Hengeveld, Kees & J. Lachlan Mackenzie. 2008. *Functional Discourse Grammar. A typologically-based theory of language structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Keizer, Evelien. 2018. Interpersonal adverbs in FDG: The case of *frankly*. In Evelien Keizer & Hella Olbertz (eds), *Recent developments in Functional Discourse Grammar*. 48-88. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Placement at the layer of the Linguistic Expression

Unlike most functional theories of language, Functional Discourse Grammar offers a sophisticated mechanism for the linear ordering of elements within the clause, phrase and word, based on a set of placement rules which, in accordance with the directional function-to-form nature of the theory as a whole, apply in a top-down, hierarchical manner (Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2008: 309-310). What is missing, however, is a system for the placement of elements at the layer of the Linguistic Expression (Le). This paper will address three important issues relating to the linear placement of elements at this layer, in particular the placement of “extra-clausal constituents” (or ECCs; Dik 1997: 310-311):

1. Which positions need to be distinguished at Le? What is the status of these positions (absolute/ relative/ neither)?
2. Which elements go into the extra-clausal positions; what counts as an ECC?
3. In what order are the Le positions filled? Which factors determine placement at Le?

As far as the first question is concerned, we will argue that, in addition to the two extra-clausal positions so far adopted in FG/FDG (a pre-clausal and a post-clausal position), a third position needs to be distinguished for extra-clausal element interrupting the host clause (the “interpolated” position). In addition, we will consider the hypothesis that, given the fact that the placement of ECCs is less hierarchy-driven and more flexible, ECC positions should not be regarded as expandable (allowing for relative positions), but rather as repeatable.

As for the second question, we will assume (again as a working hypothesis) that ECC status is triggered by the interpersonal status of an element as either a separate (Subsidiary) Discourse Act or an operator, modifier or function at the layer of the Move or Discourse Act, i.e. elements that are usually syntactically non-integrated, positionally mobile, and (in the default case) prosodically independent.

As for the factors determining the placement of ECCs, we will show that hierarchical organization only plays a limited role at the Le layer (which is why it may be more appropriate to speak of position repetition, rather than expansion). Instead, other considerations need to be taken into account, such as (i) the rhetorical function of the Subsidiary Discourse Act (e.g. Orientation vs. Correction); (ii) the main clause element “targeted” by the ECC (e.g. in the case of Asides); (iii) the informational status of the elements involved (e.g. separating topic from comment); and (iv) processing factors (such as complexity, incrementality and self-monitoring).

The analyses offered will be based data from various corpora of English (the British National Corpus, (BNC; Davies 2004), the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA; Davies 2008) and the News on the Web Corpus (NOW; Davies 2015)) as well as on data from other (typologically unrelated) languages.

References

- Dik, Simon C. 1997. *The theory of Functional Grammar. Part I: The structure of the clause.* 2nd, revised edn. 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.

The classification of adverbs

The class of adverbs contains a large number of subcategories, ranging from adverbs of manner to illocutionary adverbs. What all adverbs have in common is that they modify a non-nominal head. This head may be lexical in nature (e.g. an adjective modified by a degree adverb), or compositional (e.g. a Propositional Content modified by an inferential adverb).

The first aim of this paper is to draw earlier lines of work on adverbs in the F(D)G together and show how adverbs may receive a comprehensive classification in FDG. Adverbs will be classified in terms of the class of modifiers they belong to, adverbs being the lexical realizations of these modifier classes. The classification takes the distinction between Interpersonal and Representational modifiers into account, and within the Interpersonal and Representational Levels considers each of the individual layers within those levels. At every layer multiple semantic domains of modifiers may be relevant, such that the final classification will be based on three parameters: level, layer, and semantic domain.

In order to determine to which layer an adverb belongs, use will be made of the selection restrictions imposed by adverbs, their behaviour in subordinate clauses (see e.g. Keizer 2019, and the scope relations between them. The following examples illustrate this:

- (1) *The meeting was/*is/*will be held recently.*
- (2) a. *I regret [that she left recently].*
b. **I saw [her leave recently].*
- (3) *Reportedly she probably left recently.*

Recently may be classified as an adverb operating at the layer of the Episode. The fact that it is only compatible with the past tense (1) confirms this, as absolute tense is an operator at the Episode layer. Another piece of confirmation is that *recently* may appear in the complement of *regret*, which denotes an Episode, while it may not appear in the complement of *see*, which denotes a State of Affairs in its immediate perception reading. Finally, (3) shows that *recently* falls within the scope of *reportedly* and *probably*, from which one may deduce that these adverbs must act at layers higher than the Episode.

The classification of adverbs obtained applying these tests will then be used to study morphosyntactic differences between these classes from a typological perspective. The differences that are hypothesized to exist in Hengeveld (1997) will be tested against this new classification using a broad typological sample. They concern:

- (i) The existence of adverbs: Adverbs for lower layers are more likely to exist than adverbs for higher layers.
- (ii) Morphological differences between adverbs: Adverbs for lower layers are less likely to receive specialized adverbial marking than adverbs at higher layers.
- (iii) Syntactic differences: Adverbs for higher layers occupy more peripheral positions than adverbs for lower layers.

The two parts of the paper are expected to strengthen one another, as the theoretical part inspires the typological part, which itself is used to validate the proposed classification.

References

- Hengeveld, Kees. 1997. Adverbs in Functional Grammar. In Gerd Wotjak (ed.), *Toward a Functional Lexicology / Hacia una lexicología funcional*. 121-136. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Keizer, Evelien. 2019. The problem of non-truth-conditional, lower-level modifiers: a Functional Discourse Grammar solution. *English Language and Linguistics* 2019.

Meaning, scope and orientation of evidential *-ly* adverbs in main clauses

In this talk, I will first present diagnostics for identifying the meanings of evidential *-ly* adverbs occurring in main clauses, and the corresponding FDG evidential categories. To apply Peterson's (2017) diagnostic test of contingency and contradiction, constructed sentences with evidential *-ly* adverbs will firstly be used. Secondly, I will apply a diagnostic of sentence position and selectional restrictions to certain evidential adverbs.

The first diagnostic is applied to an adverb of the reportative evidential category. Here, a denial of the existence of the knowledge base for a reportative evidential leads to the non-fulfilment of expectations set by the evidential *reportedly*, which makes the sentence seem odd. The oddness in the diagnostic of contradiction is seen to confirm the meaning of the evidential. In the second test, Peterson's diagnostic is applied to *apparently*, which is categorized in three FDG evidential categories: reportative, inference and deduction.

The second set of diagnostics involve adverb placement and selectional restrictions, and highlight the distinction between the evidential meaning and manner meaning of the same *-ly* adverb form. It will be shown that the placement correlates with the difference in the meaning, scope and orientation of the non-evidential manner *-ly* adverb *visibly* and evidential adverb *visibly*.

Conclusions arising from tests on evidential *-ly* adverbs in main clauses.

1. By applying the diagnostics of contingency and contradiction to sentences with *-ly* evidential adverbs, the FDG categories of evidentiality can be adequately identified.

2. The application of the diagnostics applied to *apparently* shows that the adverb's interpretation is dependent on the context in which the adverb occurs. A change in context can shift the meaning of the evidential adverb in a sentence to another category.

3. The diagnostics of position and selectional restrictions has highlighted the difference in main clauses between evidential and manner *-ly* adverbs in meaning, scope and orientation/anchoring. *Visibly* as an evidential *-ly* adverb has broader scope and is speaker-anchored.

4. It appears from the diagnostic of position of the evidential *-ly* adverb in a main clause that an *-ly* adverb that scopes only over a predicate does not express evidential meaning, whereas an *-ly* adverb that scopes over a predication expressed by a verb with its arguments can express evidentiality.

References

- Hengeveld, Kees & J. Lachlan Mackenzie. 2008. *Functional Discourse Grammar. A typologically-based theory of language structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hengeveld, Kees & Marize Mattos Dall'Aglio Hattner. 2015. Four types of evidentiality in the native languages of Brazil. *Linguistics* 53/3: 479-524.
- Peterson, Tyler. 2017. Problematizing mirativity. *Review of Cognitive Linguistics* 15/2: 312-342.

**Variation in function, scope and position:
A reassessment of the status of the English discourse connective *however* in FDG**

In very general terms, the English discourse connective *however* can be said to overtly signal a contrastive (or concessive) relation between two (or more) units of discourse. In addition to this linking function, *however* may serve to put emphasis on particular elements within a discourse unit, which is reflected in the placement of this connective in different syntactic positions (see, e.g., Bondi 2004; Dupont 2015; Lenker 2010, 2014). Thus, while *however* can be said to have scope over the entire discourse unit it is attached to when it occurs in initial or final position (i.e. in the left or right periphery of a discourse unit), this discourse connective can be said to draw attention to particular elements within the discourse unit (i.e. to elements immediately preceding or following *however*) when it occurs in medial position. By using data from the British National Corpus (BNC) and the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA), this paper aims to investigate how the different scopes and discourse-organizational functions of *however*, as well as the various syntactic positions this connective can occur in, can be accounted for in an FDG analysis.

In the current version of FDG (Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2008), *however* is analyzed as an operator at the Interpersonal Level which serves the basic function of expressing contrast, either between two Discourse Acts or between two Moves (Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2008: 59-60). This paper argues that the analysis of *however* as an operator at the layer of the Discourse Act (or Move) is too restrictive in that it fails to account for the varying degrees of scope *however* can take with regard to the Discourse Act to which it is attached, as well as for the various syntactic positions *however* can occupy at the Morphosyntactic Level (i.e. P^{pre}, P^{centre} and P^{post}). Therefore, an alternative, more detailed analysis is proposed in this paper which makes a twofold distinction between *however* functioning either (i) as a separate (i.e. Subsidiary) Discourse Act when it has scope over the entire Discourse Act it is attached to (i.e. the Nuclear Discourse Act), or (ii) as an operator at the layer of the Discourse Act when its scope is more specific in that it additionally triggers the use of an emphatic operator within the Discourse Act of which it is part (i.e. at the layer of the Subact). Each of these two analyses is captured at the Morphosyntactic Level through the placement of *however* in a particular syntactic position, i.e. P^{pre} or P^{post} in the case of (i) and P^M in the case of (ii). Through this more fine-grained analysis of *however*, the present paper ultimately aims to provide a testing ground for further research on the status of other English discourse connectives in an FDG analysis.

References

- Bondi, M. 2004. The discourse function of contrastive connectors in academic abstracts. In K. Aijmer & A. Stenström (eds), *Discourse patterns in spoken and written corpora*. 139-156. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Dupont, M.. 2015. Word order in English and French: The position of English and French adverbial connectors of contrast. *English Text Construction* 8/1: 88-124.
- Hengeveld, K. & J.L. Mackenzie. 2008. *Functional Discourse Grammar*. Oxford: OUP.
- Lenker, U. 2010. *Argument and rhetoric: Adverbial connectors in the history of English*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Lenker, U. 2014. Knitting and splitting information: Medial placement of linking adverbials in the history of English. In S.E. Pfenninger, O. Timofeeva, A. Gardner, A. Honkapohja, M. Hundt & D. Schreier (eds), *Contact, variation, and change in the history of English*. 11-38. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

The German modal *sollen* – a diachronic corpus study within the framework of FDG

The German modal verb *sollen* can express a great variety of semantic and pragmatic functions. It is attested since the earliest documented stage of the language, Old High German (700-1050 AC), and has been in use ever since. The present paper is the result of a quantitative historical corpus study investigating the development of *sollen* over a period of a 1000 years, namely between 1000 and 2000 AC. This time range spans four diachronic stages of German: (late) Old High German, Middle High German, Early New High German and New High German. For each of these stages a different corpus was considered. The time frame was divided into time slices of 50 years each. For every time slice, 50 instances of *sollen* were randomly drawn from the respective corpus. The semantic or pragmatic function of *sollen* was determined for every instance. In this way, the first emergence of every function of *sollen* in the corpora could be tracked, leading to a specific order in the emergence of functions. Results indicate that the grammaticalization of *sollen* has been following regular patterns that can be captured within the framework of FDG.

FDG makes specific predictions concerning pathways of grammaticalization (Hengeveld, 2014): The process of grammaticalization is initiated through a content word that loses its lexical meaning and evolves into a grammatical element. The specific position of this element is not restricted, or in other words, grammaticalized lexical items can enter the FDG hierarchy at any layer. But once an item has been grammaticalized, it can only move upwards in the hierarchy. Grammaticalization thus corresponds to a diachronic increase in semantic or pragmatic scope. Apart from that, grammatical elements are restricted to ‘move one step at a time’ – skipping a layer is not possible. Thus, a function of the State-of-Affairs can only grammaticalize into a function of the Episode, not of the Propositional Content. On the other hand, a jump from any layer of the Representational Level (RL) to any layer of the Interpersonal Level (IL) is possible.

Based on these assumptions, and Heine and Narrog’s (2009) overlap model, a possible source function for every function of *sollen* could be identified. Pairs of source and goal function adhere to the predictions made by the FDG approach to grammaticalization: Source and goal function are always located on adjacent layers within one level, or the source function is located at the RL while the goal function is located at the IL. In concrete, *sollen* evolved from a marker of deontic modality into a futurity auxiliary in MHG, which then later became used as expressing different types of epistemic modality in ENHG. In the NHG period, it also grammaticalized into the IL, taking on abundant illocutionary functions a.o. Over the course of its development, *sollen* could be used as an operator on nearly all FDG layers from the Configurational Property to the Discourse Act, in the predicted diachronic order. This paper is the first to test FDG’s approach to grammaticalization in full on a large data set. The research question can be answered in a confirmative way: The diachronic development of *sollen* is in line with the predictions made by FDG.

References

- Heine, Bernd & Heiko Narrog. 2009. Grammaticalization and linguistic analysis. *The Oxford handbook of linguistic analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hengeveld, Kees 2017. A hierarchical approach to grammaticalization. In Kees Hengeveld, Heiko Narrog & Hella Olbertz (eds), *The grammaticalization of tense, aspect, modality and evidentiality: A functional perspective*. 13-38. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Basic negation in six European languages

Hengeveld & Mackenzie (2018) identify 12 layers in the hierarchical structure of FDG at which the polarity operator Neg or equivalent can appear; in many languages Neg can appear at several different layers. The claim to be examined here is that in each language system one of these layers can be identified as the locus for its ‘basic negation’, the formulation strategy it uses for its simplest and most straightforward occurrences. After a theoretical discussion of how the same underlying conceptualization (with two incompatible ‘simulations’, to one of which the speakers commits; Kaup 2009) can be subject to different formulation strategies, six strategies for basic negation will be identified. The body of the presentation will argue that an example of each can be found among the languages of Europe: Illocution (F₁) in Scottish Gaelic, Propositional Content (p₁) in Spanish, Episode (ep₁) in English, State-of-Affairs (e₁) in German, Configurational Property (f^c₁) in Finnish, and Lexical Property (f^l₁) in Czech.

The basic data that the presentation will address are the following translational equivalents:

- (1) Scottish Gaelic

<i>Chan</i>	<i>eil</i>	<i>Màiri</i>	<i>air</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>h-obair-dachaigh</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>dhèan-amh.</i>
NEG.DECL	be.DEP	Mary	PRF	3SG.POSS.F	homework	PART	do-NMLZ
- (2) Spanish

<i>María</i>	<i>no</i>	<i>ha</i>	<i>hecho</i>	<i>su</i>	<i>tarea.</i>
Mary	NEG	AUX.3SG	do.PTCP	3SG.POSS	homework
- (3) English
Mary has not done her homework.
- (4) German

<i>Maria</i>	<i>hat</i>	<i>ihre</i>	<i>Hausaufgaben</i>	<i>nicht</i>	<i>ge-mach-t.</i>
Mary	AUX.3SG	3SG.POSS	homework	NEG	PTCP-do-PTCP
- (5) Finnish

<i>Maria</i>	<i>ei</i>	<i>ole</i>	<i>teh-nyt</i>	<i>koti-tehtäv-ä-än.</i>
Mary	NEGVERB	be.CONNEG	do-PTCP	home-assignment-PARTV.PL-3SG.POSS
- (6) Czech

<i>Marie</i>	<i>(si)</i>	<i>ne-dělal-a</i>	<i>domáci</i>	<i>úkol-y.</i>
Mary	DAT.REFL	NEG-do.PST.PFV-3SG.F	domestic-ACC.PL	work-ACC.PL

Using the FDG architecture, additional data will be added to test the hypothesis that the six languages differ in the way proposed. The argument will hopefully pave the way towards a more general typologization of languages in terms of how they structurally handle negation.

Non-Leipzig glosses: CONNEG = connegative; DEP = dependent; NEGVERB = negative verb; PART = particle; PARTV = partitive.

References

- Hengeveld, Kees & J. Lachlan Mackenzie. 2018. Negation in Functional Discourse Grammar. In Evelien Keizer & Hella Olbertz (eds), *Recent developments in Functional Discourse Grammar*. 18-45. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kaup, Barbara. 2009. How are pragmatic differences between affirmative and negative sentences captured in the processes and representations in language comprehension? In Uli Sauerland & Kazuko Yatsuhiko (eds), *Semantics and pragmatics: From experiment to theory*. 162-185. Basingstoke UK: Palgrave.

A FDG analysis of conditional self-curses

This paper analyzes within the FDG framework a particularly complex construction, that has scarcely been studied, in which there is a conventional implicature that allows it to be interpreted as an indirect discourse act. In the construction, a clause with implicative features functions as the apodosis of a conditional construction. The apodosis usually precedes the protasis because it is the Topic of the sentence, unlike what happens in prototypical conditional constructions, in which the apodosis functions as the Focus (cf. Haiman 1978). In fact, the apodosis clause modifies or reinforces the illocutionary force of the indirect discourse act expressed, which can be interpreted as an assertion (1) or as a promise (2):

- (1) *Moge* *God mij* *verdoemen als* *ik* *lieg!*
3SG.PRS.SBJV-may God ACC.1SG INF-damn COND.CONJ NOM.1SG 1SG.PRS-lie
'May God damn me if I lie!' (Dutch)
- (2) *¡El diablo me* *lleve* *si* *pelo os*
the devil ACC.1SG 3SG.PRS.SBJV-take COND.CONJ hair ACC.2PL.FORMAL
dexo *en la cabeza!*
1SG.PRS.IND-leave on the head
'May the devil take me if I leave any hair on your head!'
(Classical Spanish: *Segunda Celestina* 347)

The construction is old-fashioned, but still attested in modern languages, such as English, Spanish, Dutch, Gumer, Norwegian or Turkish. This construction, among other constructions with an implicative or with an optative illocutionary force, is in decline since the Late Modern Period in cultures where institutions were progressively secularized. In these cultures, a referentialist conception of language has been imposed on the performativist conception of language, which attributes to words (and, by extension, to optatives and imperatives) the power to influence the world. If a curse had not implied a real risk at some point, this construction would not have been born at all (cf. Núñez Pinero 2020: 46-56).

This construction is especially interesting for FDG because the grammatical intentions are encoded in the message (cf. Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2008: 48). The conditional self-curses are systematically interpreted as promises and assertions in those languages due to certain grammatical features. In this paper I analyze these features, how they vary depending on whether the construction is interpreted as an assertion or as a promise, and I propose a FDG representation that reflects them.

References

- Haiman, John. 1978. Conditionals are Topics. *Language* 54/3: 564-589.
Hengeveld, Kees & J. Lachlan Mackenzie. 2008. *Functional Discourse Grammar: A typologically-based theory of language structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Núñez Pinero, Lorena. 2020. *Las construcciones desiderativas en español clásico*. PhD thesis: Universidad Complutense de Madrid.

The variable readings of American Spanish reportative *dizque*

American Spanish *dizque* (< ‘s/he says-that’) is an interpersonal adverb with a reportative meaning, i.e. it serves the speaker to indicate that the source of (part of) the Communicated Content is external to her or him.

- (1) *Dizque él lo va a pagar*
dizque he it go.3SG to pay
‘Reportedly he is going to pay’ (Mexico)

While in (1) it modifies the entire Communicative Content, it is used much more frequently for the modification of Referential and Ascriptive Subacts. In these cases it acquires an attitudinal meaning component (‘allegedly’, ‘so-called’):

- (2) *Ellos los mandaron llamar dizque para hacer una reunión*
they them required.3PL call dizque for make a meeting
‘They had them gather allegedly to have a meeting’ (Colombia)

Ascriptive Subacts modified by means of *dizque* are typically contained in Referential Subacts, such as *dietas* in the following example. In such contexts, *dizque* behaves as a particle.

- (3) *a pesar de las dizque dietas me era difícilísimo conservar el peso;*
despite the dizque diet.(F).PL me.DAT was very difficul t maintain the weight
‘in spite of the so-called diets I found it extremely difficult to keep in shape’ (Mexico)

Dizque cannot be modified, which has often been adduced as evidence of its grammaticalization. However, the lexical adjective *llamado* ‘so-called’ is not modifyable either:

- (4) *las *bastante / *muy / *simplemente llamadas dietas*
the quite very just so-called.F.PL diet.(F).PL

There are cognates of *dizque* in Brazilian Portuguese (*diz que*) and Galician (*disque*), neither of which can modify Ascriptive Subacts (Sanromán Vilas 2020). Therefore, the modification of Ascriptive Subacts may be seen an innovation. For FDG this means that the development of modifiers over time is different from that of grammatical formatives. Whereas the latter are expected to increase their scope, which in FDG is the essence of grammaticalization (Hengeveld 2017), this is not necessarily so in the case of modifiers. In addition, it has become clear that one of the criteria used in FDG for the distinction of grammatical from lexical items, the impossibility of modification, is not entirely reliable.

The intended presentation will be based on a closed corpus of written texts from which a varied sample of cases will be extracted, in order to find out which (additional) complications arise and how FDG can be used to solve them.

References

- Hengeveld, Kees 2017. A hierarchical approach to grammaticalization. In Kees Hengeveld, Heiko Narrog & Hella Olbertz (eds), *The grammaticalization of tense, aspect, modality and evidentiality: A functional perspective*. 13-37. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Sanromán Vilas, Begoña. 2020. Do evidential markers always convey epistemic values? A look into three Ibero-Romance reportatives. *Lingua* 238: 1-26.

**Non-intentional agentivity in the periphrasis *pasar a + inf* ‘accidentally/by accident’
from the perspective of Functional Discourse Grammar**

In the context of Southern Chilean Spanish, the construction *pasar a* ‘go on to do / move to’ + infinitive can introduce a modification in the agentive interpretation of certain predicates:

- (1) *Pedro pasó a derramar el agua*
Pedro move.PST.PFV.IND.3SG to spill.INF the water
‘Pedro spilt the water accidentally’

The verb *pasar* does not meet all the criteria to regard it as an auxiliary verb, according to Olbertz (2016). In fact, *pasar* imposes selection restrictions, i.e. the actor must refer to an animate entity and the lexical predicate must describe a controllable event, such as activities or active realisations. In addition, it loses its lexical meaning of ‘proceed to an action or to a place’; it is limited to expressing that the main event is understood as “accidental”, and it makes up a single clause unit with the main verb, which is reinterpreted as achievement.

The semi-auxiliary comes to affect the lexical meaning of the central predicate to the Representational Level (RL) and its range is projected from the Configurational Property stratum. Specifically, *pasar a* ‘accidentally/by accident’ behaves as a lexical operator (Hengeveld 2017) that, in addition to altering the lexical property of the verb, changes the volitional interpretation of the Actor, nullifying this feature. Therefore, in the formalisation it is marked as involuntary (invol):

- (2) NR: (invol f_i: [(f_j: quebrar (f_j)) (x_i: Juan (x_i))_A (x_j: vidrio (x_j))_U] (f_i))

In conclusion, the periphrasis *pasar a* + infinitive, among other possibilities, is a way of expressing involuntariness, which has an effect in the Configurational Property stratum of the Representational Level. As a periphrastic semi-auxiliary, it takes predicates that indicate agentive realisations or activities and it changes the lexical properties of said predicates turning them into achievements.

References

- Hengeveld, Kees. 2017. A hierarchical approach to grammaticalization. In Kees Hengeveld, Heiko Narrog & Hella Olbertz (eds), *The grammaticalization of tense, aspect, modality and evidentiality: A functional perspective*. 13-37. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Olbertz, Hella. 2016. Lexical auxiliaries in Spanish: How and why? *Linguistics* 54/5: 947-979.

**Having several non-embedded gerund structures in Spanish,
do they constitute different cosubordination patterns?**

Traditionally, two basic types of syntactic linkage were recognized: coordination and subordination. From a functional-typological perspective, both RRG and FDG have incorporated a third type, *cosubordination*. Nevertheless, whereas cosubordination is a central topic for RRG, very little and marginal attention has been paid to this issue within FDG so far. This paper aims to contribute to a FDG development of cosubordination taking as a starting point the Spanish non-embedded sequences headed by a *simple gerund* or a *composed gerund*.

Hengeveld & Mackenzie (2008: 163-164) implicitly assume that the correlate of cosubordination at the Representational Level is an Episode made up of two or more States-of-Affairs (SoA). This is a valid but insufficient approximation, because Spanish non-embedded gerund structures may also express events that are clearly located outside the absolute time zone of the independent clause. I assume that, in such cases, cosubordinative Linguistic Expressions correspond to a Propositional Content composed by a set of different Episodes:

- (1) *Hab-iéndo-se incorpor-ado a la empresa en 1980,*
AUX-GRND-REFL.3 join-PTCP to ART.F.SG company in 1980
se jubil-ó en 2017.
REFL.3 retire- PST.3SG in 2017
'Having joined the company in 1980, (s)he retired in 2017'

In addition, we may find cosubordinate clauses that operate at the Interpersonal Level. I will argue that a cosubordinative Linguistic Expression of this kind corresponds to a Move conformed by a set of different Discourse Acts. The non-embedded gerund clause would function as a pragmatic *premise* explicitly uttered by the Speaker in order to justify the Discourse Act encoded by the main clause.

- (2) *Viv-iendo tu familia en Boston,*
live- GRND your family in Boston
¿por qué no estudi-as en Harvard?
why NEG study-PRS.2SG in Harvard
'Living your family in Boston, why don't you study at Harvard?'

In sum, there are at least three subtypes of non-embedded gerund structures. Two of them are located at the Representational Level, as SoA or Episodes. The third one, with a wider scope, intervenes at the Interpersonal Level as a Discourse Act. Nevertheless, such a semantic and pragmatic plurality is not directly rendered at the Morphosyntactic Level. All the aforementioned types may be described as clauses that intervene in the encoding of a Linguistic Expression. Thus, I suggest that, as far as Spanish non-embedded gerund structures are concerned, cosubordination constitutes a single morphosyntactic pattern.

Reference

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

A Functional Discourse Grammar *just so* story

This paper tracks the development of the conjunction *just so* and investigates this construction's link to the network of formally and functionally related conjunctions *so* and *so that*. Corpus examples from 19th century American English show *just so* used as an adverb of manner, sometimes fronted, as in (1), or as an adverb indicating a comparison (i.e. *in the same way*), as in (2).

- (1) *Very impertinent, miss! just so you always are.* (COHA)
- (2) *If man never had an inclination to drink strong drink, yet he may get into company where they are drinking, [...] and be tempted to take a little and the first glass will create a desire for another, and so he goes on till he gets to be a perfect drunkard: just so you may suppose the Christians, when they get together to worship God, and drink in largely of his heart-reviving Spirit, must feel well [...].* (COHA)

By the mid-19th century, *just so* had developed into a conjunction, indicating condition (equivalent to *as long as*), as in (3), and purpose, as in (4). This development culminates in the recent emergence of a discourse marker, *just so you know*, developing out of the purpose use. This discourse marker has adopted a range of pragmatic functions, in particular that of signalling topic shift as in (5).

- (3) *“Faith, Sidony, I don't care how the man arrives, just so he does,” Sorcha said impatiently.* (COHA)
- (4) *I definitely need more Legos, so we need to have kids just so I can justify the toys.* (COHA)
- (5) *Generally waste products that result from cellular activities. And just so you know, what you're looking at here is the pith.* (COCA)

Looking at the bigger picture, one of the questions this study addresses is how this conjunction use of *just so* has developed. The transition from conjunction to pragmatic marker has been documented in other forms, such as *so* (e.g. Bolden 2009; Brinton 2017); however, the transition from *just so* as an adverb of manner to conjunction is unclear. There are multiple potential scenarios for this development; one of the more plausible ones links it to *so* and *so that*.

Drawing on corpus data from the *Corpus of Contemporary American English* and the *Corpus of Historical American English*, this study will track the development of the *just so* conjunction and pragmatic marker in the shifting relations of the conjunction network. An FDG analysis raises many additional questions such as the status of *so* and *so that* and their relation to *just so*, and the role/status of *just* in each category. Ultimately this paper will discuss which grammaticalization path is most plausible and how these changes might be modelled by FDG.

References

- Bolden, Galina B. 2009. Implementing incipient actions: The discourse marker ‘so’ in English conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 41: 974-998.
- Brinton, Laurel J. 2017. *The evolution of pragmatic markers in English: Pathways of change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Prototypical and non-prototypical uses of proper names in Portuguese

According to Functional Discourse Grammar (FDG, Hengeveld & Mackenzie, 2008), a proper name has reference but not meaning, which results in the formulation of this category as instantiator of a Subact of Reference. At the Representational Level, the evoked referent is designated by its relevant semantic category in the form of an absent head layer, which implies the impossibility of the proper name to receive restrictive modification at this level.

Keizer (2008) proposes an alternative approach to Hengeveld and Mackenzie's (2008) to explain this category. If on the one hand proper names do not actually assign a property at the Representational Level, on the other they have a set of mental extensions, probably different for each speaker, represented by all entities known as *Peter*, for example. The consequence of this position is that her proposal consists of a semantic representation of the proper name that is not defined as an absent head at the Representational Level, but one that contains a lexical head without the corresponding f-variable

There are a range of uses of proper names in Portuguese, including names modified at the RL (1) and names in a 'naming construction' (2) that do not fall under any description in FDG.

- (1) *O que nós ouvimos foi o Brasil velho*
the.M what 2.PL hear:PFV;2.PL be:PFV;2.PL the.M Brazil old
falando para um Brasil novo. (PORT:B BR cascavilha.com.br)
talk:GER to a.M Brazil new.
'What we heard was the old Brazil talking to a new Brazil.'

- (2) *Eu tenho onze anos e*
1.SG have:PRS:1.SG eleven year:PL and
minha melhor amiga se chama Maria Victoria.
my:F best friend REFL call:PRS:3.SG Maria Victoria
'I am eleven years old and my best friend is called Maria Victoria.'

Considering this diversity of uses in Portuguese, the aim of this paper² is to propose a set of criteria related to referentiality, ascription, modification and identifiability that result in a continuum of uses of proper nouns. It is also possible to establish their possible representations in the FDG. Proper names can be used as Subacts of Reference, in the most prototypical cases, and Subacts of Ascription, in less prototypical uses. Their behavior at the RL can also be quite diverse, including as an absent head, in its prototypical use, and as a lexical head, an empty head, and a Discourse Act in non-prototypical uses.

References

- Hengeveld, Kees & J. Lachlan Mackenzie. 2008. *Functional Discourse Grammar: A typologically-based theory of language structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Keizer, Evelien. 2008. Reference and ascription in Functional Discourse Grammar: An inventory of problems and some possible solutions. In Daniel García Velasco & Jan Rijkhoff (eds), *The noun phrase in Functional Discourse Grammar*. 181-219. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

² Grant #2019/13578-7, São Paulo Research Foundation (FAPESP); This study was financed in part by the Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior – Brasil (CAPES) – Finance Code 88887.373446/2019-00.

A functional discourse study of the uses of *caralho* (cock) in Brazilian Portuguese

The use of swearwords to express surprise, anger, offense and similar seems to be very common in languages (cf. e.g. Jay & Janschewitz 2008; Mackenzie 2019). In Brazilian Portuguese, swearing seems to be very common (Houaiss 2001) and it is responsible for the formation of several constructions, such as intensifiers, interjections and other interactional elements. Thus, this paper aims at analyzing, from the perspective of Functional Discourse Grammar (Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2008), the uses of *caralho* ‘cock’ in Brazilian Portuguese, taking into account its pragmatic, semantic and morphosyntactic properties, in order to prove that this element has undergone grammaticalization, assuming more grammatical and interactive functions. The examples below represent some of the possible uses of *caralho*:

- (1) *O jogador brasileiro correu pra caralho ontem!*
 the player brazilian run.PST.3SG for cock yesterday
 ‘The Brazilian player ran so much yesterday!’ (*Corpus do Português*)
 (f_i : correrv (f_j): [(f_j: pra caralho_{Adv} (f_j)) (f_i)_φ])

In (1), the prepositional expression *pra caralho* functions as an intensifying adverb at the Representational Level modifying the content of the verb *correr*.

- (2) *Que caralho é isso?*
 what cock be.PRS.3SG that
 What the fuck is that? (*Corpus do Português*)
 (A_I: [(F_I: INTERR (F_I)) (P_I)_S (P_I)_A (C_I: [(EmoEmph +id-s R_I)_{Foc} (R_I)] (C_I))] (A_I))

In (2), the expression *do caralho* ‘fucking’ indicates the “speaker’s emotionally charged emphasis on the unit to which it applies” (Mackenzie 2019: 78). It is used to highlight the speaker’s annoyance with something that appears in the form of an interrogative. As proposed by Mackenzie (2019), we also argue that this use is better analyzed as an emotional emphasis operator that applies to Reference Subacts with the pragmatic function Focus.

The analysis proposed here shows that the term *caralho* has undergone grammaticalization (in terms of Hengeveld 2011), presenting changes in both form (from lexeme to operator) and content (from lexical element referring to the male genital to a strategy used to express the speaker’s emotional charge, such as anger or surprise). This paper represents an advance in the study of profanity in Portuguese: the FDG model shows that the various uses of the word *caralho*, which are often mistakenly categorized on the basis of a mixture of semantic and morphosyntactic criteria, are actually distinct and belong to different levels of grammar.

References

- Hengeveld, K. 2011. The grammaticalization of tense and aspect. In B. Heine & H. Narrog (eds), *The Oxford handbook of grammaticalization*. 580-594. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hengeveld, K. & J.L. Mackenzie. 2008. *Functional Discourse Grammar: A typologically-based theory of language structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Houaiss, A. 2001. *Dicionário Houaiss da língua portuguesa*. Rio de Janeiro: Objetiva.
- Jay, T. & K. Janschewitz. 2008. The pragmatics of swearing. *Journal of Politeness Research* 4: 267-288.
- Mackenzie, J. L. 2019. The syntax of an emotional expletive in English. In J.L. Mackenzie & L. Alba-Juez (eds), *Emotion in discourse*. 54-86. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

**The honorific system of the Korean language
from a Functional Discourse Grammar point of view**

In 2008 the Functional Discourse Grammar (FDG) was published by Kees Hengeveld and J. Lachlan Mackenzie to provide a basic linguistic theory in order to research about the grammar structure of a single language. Therefore, the main aim of this paper is the usage of the FDG as a basic linguistic theory to describe the honorific system of the Korean language.

To gain examples of the honorific system within the Korean language several sources were used. Everyday conversations, phone calls, and themed dialogs from the *Sejong Corpus* illustrate the functional point of view on the different layers of the FDG. Besides the *Sejong Corpus*, also written sources within the Corpus Query System *Sketchengine* and already existing works on Korean Grammar were included. Formal illustrations are based on the FDG framework and my own analysis of the data used.

The results show that Korean as a discourse orientated language especially offers on the first level of the FDG, the Interpersonal Level, interesting insights on its honorific system. One of them is the insertion of operators in the head position of Participants. Not only that the head of Participants will be marked lexically within the Korean language, it is in the most cases followed by an operator, that also represents the relation between speaker and addressee. For example:

- (1) 경은 씨는 언제부터 드라마 봤어요?
Kyeongeun ssi-neun eonje-buteo deurama bw-asseo-yo?
Kyeongeun HON.TOP when-since drama watch.PERF.DECL.
'Mr. Kyeongeun, since when have you been watching dramas?'
(adapted from: Talk to Me in Korean 2013: 4)

In the provided example the lexical head Kyeongeun is marked by the honorific operator *ssi*, which is the most frequently used honorific operator in terms of the head of Participants. Furthermore, the verb ending illustrated the declarative sentence type in the haeyo-level of the honorific system to adapt the honorific expression to the whole sentence.

Although, the Interpersonal Level contains most phenomena regarding the honorific system of the Korean language, the influences of this system can also be found on the Representational Level, in form of specific quantity operators, or the Morphosyntactic Level in terms of the clause agreement.

In conclusion it can be said, that this paper shows that the FDG as a basic theory not only leads to a benefit in describing the grammar system of a single language, but also enables to focus on the FDG to a further extend by pointing out language specific features, like in this case the honorific system of the Korean language.

References

Hengeveld, Kees & J. Lachlan Mackenzie. 2008. *Functional Discourse Grammar: A typologically-based theory of language structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Talk To Me In Korean. 2013. *Iyagi - Natural Talks in Korean 41-50* (with Translation).
<https://books.google.co.kr/books?id=bAVRAwAAQBAJ&pg=PA115&dq=iyagi+41-50+talk+to+me+in+korean&hl=de&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwj0w5TsqdbiAhWIw4sBHaJPCtMQ6AEIJzAA#v=onepage&q=iyagi%204150%20talk%20to%20me%20in%20korean&f=false> [Access on: 07th of June 2019]