

FDG 2022

Abstracts

7th International Conference on
Functional Discourse Grammar
Schoorl, The Netherlands
June 28 - July 1, 2022

How real is FDG from a typological and cognitive perspective?

This presentation compares three grammatical models used in current syntactic typology to assess their compatibility with the cross-linguistically prevalent patterns. The models include Standard/Branching Theory, Role and Reference Grammar, and Functional Discourse Grammar. Previous research has suggested that such typological reality may also open the way for new insight into language cognition.

The question of which model of grammatical analysis most realistically represents cognitive structures became a central issue in linguistics during the 1960s cognitive revolution. Generative linguistics made various proposals for a working model in psycholinguistics. As brain imaging techniques became available, however, generative grammar was shown to be incompatible with the results (Kluender and Kutas 1993). More lately, Lakoff's Cognitive Linguistics has offered an analysis based on the conceptual metaphor to avoid using tree structures altogether.

The problem remains unsolved. The makers of the brain-imaging research continue to argue for a need to analyse syntactic structures, proposing a link between cognitive and typological reality. The appropriate model could be extracted through the mass-comparison of languages. The researchers propose Functional (Discourse) Grammar as a gateway to understanding the interaction of structure and function. (Polinsky and Kluender 2007)

Currently, an obstacle for uniting typology and cognitive syntax is that the Standard Theory of generative grammar remains the dominant working model for syntactic typology (Dryer 1992 and later; Hawkins 2004 etc.). Thus, cross-linguistic analyses are interpreted from the perspective of the same model that was found unworkable in brain studies.

Hence my research question: Is the grammatical component of FDG fit for the purpose, that is, does it represent a typological and cognitive reality? Due to the potential vastness of the issue, I limit my investigation to its analysis of the predicate-argument structure of the transitive clause.

Austin (2022) provides a model-neutral reanalysis of Dryer's typological data relating to harmonic correlations, or what Dryer associates with branching theory, finding that the average human language analyses verb as the head, and subject and object as two equal dependants of verb. The attested pattern is familiar from dependency grammar as well as from predicate logic.

I compare the results of the data reanalysis with three grammatical models currently proposed in typology: Standard Theory, Role and Reference Grammar, and FDG. Out of these, FDG is found to be compatible with the typological data and to be of interest for psycholinguistics.

References

- Austin, Patrik. 2022. A semantic and pragmatic explanation of harmony. *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 54 (1): in press.
- Dryer, Matthew. 1992. The Greenbergian word order correlations. *Language* 68 (1): 81-138.
- Hawkins, John A. 2004. *Efficiency and complexity in grammars*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kluender, Robert & Marta Kutas. 1993. Subjacency as a processing phenomenon. *Language and Cognitive Processes* 8 (4): 573-633.
- Polinsky, Maria & Robert Kluender. 2007. Linguistic typology and theory construction: Common challenges ahead. *Linguistic Typology* 11 (1): 273-283.

Habitual constructions in Mandarin Chinese

In Functional Discourse Grammar (FDG, Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2008), grammatical categories such as TAMEP (tense-aspect-mood-evidentiality-polarity) are organized in a layered hierarchy. This paper aims to explore three habitual constructions in Mandarin Chinese and try to see how they operate in the TAMEP hierarchical structure of FDG. The three constructions in question are the *guan-yu* construction ‘to be in the habit of’ as in (1a), the *ai* ‘love’ construction as in (1b), and the *V-lai-V-qu* ‘V-come-V-go’ construction as in (1c).

- (1) a. *Ta guan-yu gan zhe-xie tao ren xian de shi-qing*
3SG HAB do these make person annoy ATTR affairs
‘He is in the habit of doing things that annoy people.’
- b. *Wo ai yun-chuan*
1SG love seasick
‘I tend to get seasick.’
- c. *Wo kai le men suo, zai nuo da de, kong-dang-dang de*
1SG open pfv door lock LOC so big ATTR empty ATTR
gong-yu zhong zou lai zou qu.
apartment inside walk come walk go
‘I unlocked the door, and walked to and fro in a huge empty apartment.’
(From the novel *Surfacing from the Sea* by Wang Shuo)

In order to find out which layer each construction pertains to in the TAMEP hierarchy, I adopted the Complement Clause Test (Hengeveld et al. 2021) (a diagnostic specifically designed to identify the layer at which a habitual expression operates), as well as the test of co-occurrence with elements of other grammatical categories when relevant. It has been found that the *guan-yu* construction pertains to the layer of the Episode, that the *ai* construction pertains to the layer of the Configurational Property, and that the *V-lai-V-qu* construction pertains to the layer of the Lexical Property.

This confirms the findings by Hengeveld et al (2021) that habituality is not a single category but applies at different layers, just as e.g. modality, evidentiality, and tense.

References

- Hengeveld, Kees, Cerys Clarke & Lois Kemp. 2021. A layered approach to (past) habituality in English. *Linguistics in Amsterdam* 14 (1): 65-80.
- Hengeveld, Kees & J. Lachlan Mackenzie. 2008. *Functional Discourse Grammar: A typologically-based theory of language structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lexeme-frame combination in Functional Discourse Grammar

The proposal in García Velasco & Hengeveld (2002) to separate lexemes from frames and dispense with the notion of predicate frame has been applied in different ways and in various contexts in FDG-related work. As a consequence, apparently different phenomena receive similar formal treatment, which raises the question whether it is indeed appropriate to use the same technical solution in all cases. Examples include: valency alternations, part of speech systems (in languages with flexible lexemes), morphological conversion, object omission, derivational morphology (affixation), coercion, and instances of formulaic language or semi-fixed constructions by means of Partially Instantiated frames (PIFs; Keizer 2016). The first part of this presentation will thus provide a survey of the constructions and grammatical processes which have been accounted for on the basis of the flexible combination of lexemes and frames.

There has also been a certain amount of controversy in the implementation of the proposal with respect to the order of combination of frames and lexemes. Initially, García Velasco & Hengeveld (2002) seemed to suggest that frame selection is a bottom-up process guided by the lexical semantics of predicates themselves. However, Hengeveld & Mackenzie (2016) have made it clear that frames are selected first and lexemes inserted afterwards in the dynamic implementation of the grammar. This is not a mere architectural issue, as the order of selection of frames and lexemes is relevant to identify appropriate constraints preventing unacceptable combinations in the grammar. Additionally, Hengeveld & Mackenzie (2021) have proposed a new revised architecture of FDG in which the Fund now allows bottom-up processes and operations, which would make both possibilities initially compatible. The second part of the presentation will thus concentrate on this issue.

In short, the contribution will try to provide answers to at least the following questions:

- Which grammatical processes should / should not be captured by means of FDG's flexible system of lexeme and frame combination?
- How should the combination lexemes and frames be constrained?
- What is the consequence of allowing bottom-up processes in the Fund for lexeme-frame combination?
- What are the similarities and differences between frames (PIFs in particular) in FDG and constructions in Construction Grammar?
- How do PIFs compete with coercion in FDG's treatment of derivational morphology?

In all, this presentation is meant to clarify the complex process of frame and lexeme combination in the light of recent developments in FDG.

References

- García Velasco, Daniel & Kees Hengeveld. 2002. Do we need predicate frames? In Ricardo Mairal Usón & María Jesús Pérez Quintero (eds.), *New perspectives on argument structure*. 95-123. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hengeveld, Kees & J. Lachlan Mackenzie. 2016. Reflections on the lexicon in Functional Discourse Grammar. *Linguistics* 54: 1135-1161.
- Hengeveld, Kees & J. Lachlan Mackenzie. 2021. Interfaces, mismatches, and the architecture of Functional Discourse Grammar. In Lucía Contreras García & Daniel García Velasco (eds.), *Interfaces in Functional Discourse Grammar: Theory and applications*. 15-57. Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton.
- Keizer, Evelien 2016. Idiomatic expressions in Functional Discourse Grammar. *Linguistics* 54: 981-1016.

Talita Storti Garcia & Erolde Goreti Pezatti,
São Paulo State University, São José do Rio Preto, Brazil

The multifunctionality of *mas* in Portuguese

The purpose of this presentation is to show the multifunctionality of *mas*, identifying the role it assumes when it does not indicate adversative or opposition as a linking element between two clauses. The results show that the combination of linguistic units through *mas* always indicates interpersonal strategies; it preserves, however, its power of assigning the most salient information status to the unit that it operates or scopes on. Four usages of *mas* were detected at different layers of the Interpersonal Level, two as an operator and two as a function.

On the one hand, as an operator, it acts at the Movement layer to indicate the introduction, resumption or conclusion of a subject in the current discourse, as illustrated by (1).

- (1) serve como concepção de vida.
'it serves as a conception of life.'
mas vamos falar em termos de aplicações práticas. (BR87:EconomiaSociedade)
'but let's talk in terms of practical applications'

At the Discourse Act layer, it acts as an Emphasis operator, to indicate the Speaker's emphatic commitment to the Discourse Act content, as exemplified by (2).

- (2) é o que eu te disse que adorei, *mas adorei!* (BR80:ArteUrbana)
'That's what I told you I loved it, but I loved it!'

On the other hand, as a function marker, by combining two Discursive Acts with different communicative statuses, it signals the rhetorical function Concession, as postulated by Hengeveld & Mackenzie (2008: 52). Pezatti & Mackenzie (2022: 79) add that the usage of *mas* in this function is characterized by concessiveness at the Interpersonal Level and addition at the Representational Level, a combination that can be represented as follows: NI: Conc+NR: Addition (\wedge), as in (3).

- (3) estive em Timor naquela altura, *mas eu não participei.* (TL99:Timor)
'I was in Timor at the time, but I did not participate'

By combining two lexical Subacts necessarily explicit, it characterizes the pragmatic function Contrast, allowing Portuguese to clearly distinguish the Parallel Focus and the Counterpresuppositional Focus pointed out by Dik (1997: 331-332), as (4).

- (4) então viu que eu que estava ali, *sentado, mas adormecido* (MO86:Chuva),
'then he saw that I was there, sitting, but asleep'

References

- Dik, Simon C. 1997. *The theory of Functional Grammar*. Vol. 1, *The structure of the clause*. Ed. 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.
Pezatti, Erolde & J. Lachlan Mackenzie. 2022. A coordenação na Gramática Discursivo-Funcional. *Linguistik online* 113 (1): 59-89.

Cosubordination in Functional Discourse Grammar

Little attention has been paid so far to cosubordination in Functional Grammar (FG) and Functional Discourse Grammar (FDG), a notable exception being van der Auwera (1997) within the context of FG. Hengeveld & Mackenzie (2008: 309) mention the phenomenon only in passing within the context of FDG. In this paper I will propose a detailed treatment of cosubordinate constructions in FDG. The basic format of cosubordinate constructions is given in (1):

(1) $(\pi \text{ b}_1: [(a_1) (a_2)] (b_1) \sigma (b_1))$

As shown in (5), cosubordination arises when two semantic layers of like rank, here represented as (a), are jointly dependent on a higher layer, here represented as (b). This dependency can be shown by the fact that (a₁) and (a₂) share the operators (π) and modifiers (σ) that pertain to (b).

Given the large number of layers constituting the Representational Level in FDG, this means that cosubordination may come in many types, only one of which is illustrated in (2), as compared to (3) (Foley & Van Valin (1984: 259):

- (2) Max went to the store and bought some beer.
(3) Max went to the store, but did he buy some beer?

In (2), with conjunction reduction, the two conjuncts have to share the same illocutionary value, in this case declarative. In (3), on the other hand, each of the conjuncts can have its own illocutionary value, declarative and interrogative, respectively. Example (2) is a case of cosubordination, example (3) is a case of coordination.

I intend to show that clausal cosubordination may apply at six different layers at the Representational Level: the layers of the Lexical Primitive, the Lexical Property, the Configurational Property, the State-of-Affairs, the Episode, and the Propositional Content. This approach expands considerably on the RRG approach to cosubordination advanced in Foley & Van Valin (1984), itself based on Olson (1981), in which only three types of clausal cosubordination are recognized. This is a consequence of the fact that in RRG only three clausal layers are distinguished: Nucleus, Core, and Periphery, while in FDG there is a more detailed division into layers.

Finally, I will argue that cosubordination applies within noun phrases as well, not only at the three different representational layers currently recognized (that of the Lexical Primitive, the Lexical Property, and of the Entity type denoted by the noun phrase, but also at an additional layer, for which co-subordination facts provide new evidence.

References

- Foley, William A. & Robert D. Van Valin Jr. 1984. *Functional syntax and universal grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Hengeveld, Kees & J. Lachlan Mackenzie. 2008. *Functional Discourse Grammar: A typologically-based theory of language structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Olson, Michael Leon. 1981. *Barai clause junctures: Toward a functional theory of inter-clausal relations*. PhD Dissertation, Australian National University.
van der Auwera, Johan. 1997. Cosubordination. *Working Papers in Functional Grammar* 63.

The multifunctionality of *actually*: a Functional Discourse Grammar account

A considerable number of studies have been devoted (partly or wholly) to the different uses of the adverb *actually* (see e.g. Aijmer (2002), Haselow (2012, 2013) and references therein). Although there is considerable agreement on the main discourse functions *actually* can perform (marking counterexpectancy, contrast or elaboration, or as a pragmatic softener or topic shift indicator), there is little consensus on which subtypes to distinguish, and how these subtypes, and the functions they perform, are related to the formal properties of *actually*: its syntactic status (intra- or extra-clausal) and linear position (within the clause or vis-à-vis a host clause), and its prosodic realization (in terms of integration and prosodic contour). As a result, conclusions concerning the relation between position and prosody are often contradictory, and the overall picture that emerges is still messy and incomplete.

Although some of the work that has been done on *actually* is theoretical in nature (e.g. Watts 1988, Smith & Jucker 2000; Haselow 2012, 2013), there has been no attempt, so far, to capture all the properties of *actually*, systematically and consistently, in an overarching theoretical model. The present paper will use the theory of FDG in an attempt create some order in the current chaos. On the basis of corpus data from *The International Corpus of English-Great Britain* (ICE-GB) and *The British National Corpus* (BYU-BNC), it will be argued that FDG, with its comprehensive approach and hierarchical organization, does not only enable us to capture the major discourse-pragmatic functions of *actually* (and the relation between them), but, in addition, makes it possible to show how these functions, in a function-to-form manner, trigger different syntactic and prosodic realizations.

References

- Aijmer, Karin. 2002. *English discourse particles: Evidence from a corpus*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Haselow, Alexander. 2012. Subjectivity, intersubjectivity and the negotiation of common ground in spoken discourse: Final particles in English. *Language & Communication* 32 (3): 182-204.
- Haselow, Alexander. 2013. Arguing for a wide conception of grammar: The case of final particles in spoken discourse. *Folia Linguistica* 47 (2): 375-424.
- Smith, Sara W. & H. Andreas Jucker. 2000. *Actually* and other markers of an apparent discrepancy between propositional attitudes of conversational partners. In Gisle Andersen & Thorstein Fretheim (eds.), *Pragmatic markers and propositional attitude*. 207-237. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Watts, Richard J. 1993 [1988]. A relevance-theoretical approach to commentary pragmatic markers: the case of *actually*, *really* and *basically*. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 38 (1-4): 235-259.

Contributions of FDG to account for nonfluent cases of aphasia

The absence and substitution of functional words as well as the misuse of free and bound morphemes in the discourse constitute the main symptoms of nonfluent cases of aphasia. Additionally, nonfluent speech tends to be syntactically shorter, halting, and filled with hesitations and pauses. The majority of neurolinguistic studies have associated this set of symptoms with the clinical category of *agrammatism*, also referred to as *Broca's aphasia*. Despite the severity of the cases, people with nonfluent aphasia seem to have lost either an essential part of the language system or the language itself, that is, 'its generative capacity'. (Berndt 1990). From this point of view, within the scope of *Linguistic investigations*, the tenets of Generative Grammar have impinged on the theoretic-methodological aspects of agrammatism and its related phenomena. Conversely, the Enunciative-Discursive Neurolinguistics (henceforth: DN; see Novaes-Pinto 1999) does not conceive of language as a generative system, nor does it understand grammatical shortcomings as a transparent sign of a specific brain lesion. In this context, the principles of Functional Discourse Grammar (henceforth: FDG; see Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2008 and Keizer 2015) become relevant to the study of nonfluent cases of aphasia. This paper sets out to demonstrate, on the one hand, how the FDG framework enables broader linguistic / grammatical analyses of this type of aphasic speech and, on the other hand, how aphasiological data can spawn new insights into the development of FDG theory¹. Summing up, the discussion leads to the following conclusions: First, an analysis grounded on the FDG framework can make explicit to which extent people with aphasia are able to evoke and employ – though not always successfully express – grammatical properties. We claim that FDG provides the analyst with the means to describe individual aspects of utterances in minute detail, allowing for a much more fine-grained identification from where (i.e., which level of grammar representation) determined problems of a specific case stem from. Secondly, considering that the linguistic production in nonfluent aphasia lacks - to various degrees - structural and formal properties, the encoding and the conveyance of a communicative intention are more consequential of the interplay between the (aphasic and non-aphasic) interlocutors. Since (non-) aphasic interlocution processes differ considerably from those in non-pathological conditions, we claim that, if taken into an enunciative standpoint, this type of interaction can shed light on the necessity to conceive of a more dialogic dynamic for the operations of *Formulation* and *Encoding*. In such a way, aphasiological data can contribute to the discussion of what the FDG model needs to foresee to attain typological, pragmatic, and cognitive adequacy.

References

- Berndt, Rita Sloan. 1990. Preface. In Lise Menn & Loraine K. Obler (eds.), *Agrammatic aphasia: A cross-language narrative sourcebook*. xxv-xxvii. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- 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.
- Novaes-Pinto, Rosana do Carmo. 1999. *A contribuição do estudo discursivo para uma análise crítica das categorias clínicas*. PhD thesis. Campinas: State University of Campinas.

¹ São Paulo Research Foundation (FAPESP), grant numbers: 2017/2677-2 and 2019/24150-8

Privative constructions in Functional Discourse Grammar

This paper will explore privative constructions (i.e. constructions employing the notion of ‘withoutness’) as expressions of sentential negation. Here are some illustrations:

- (1) Finnish (Vilkula 2015: 468)
Tule tai ole tule-ma-tta.
come or be.IMP.2S come-INF-ABE
‘Either come or don’t come! (lit. ‘Come or be without coming’)
- (2) Portuguese (personal knowledge)
A casa está sem limpar há duas semanas.
the house is without clean.INF ago two weeks
‘The house hasn’t been cleaned for two weeks.’
- (3) Scottish Gaelic (personal knowledge)
Bha e fhathast gun till-eadh.
was he still without return-ing
‘He still hadn’t returned.’

The relevant representational frame is as follows, where VN stands for ‘verbal noun’:

- (4) $(e_1: (f_1: [(e_2: (f_2: \blacklozenge_{VN} (f_2)) (e_2))_{Priv} (x_i)_U] (f_1)) (e_1))$

The construction involves some degree of insubordination of the nominalized/deverbalized verb since it is understood as the principal verb of its clause. The paper’s main aim is to understand the *raison d’être* of this construction in languages which also have regular negation constructions. In English, the privative is used only as a ‘negative circumstance’ (Hengeveld 1998: 357), as in *She left without saying goodbye*, but in Finnish, Estonian, Hungarian, Portuguese and Gaelic, an $(e_2)_{Priv}$ can be predicated of an Individual. The hypothesis will be explored that where the expression of basic negation is limited to finite clauses, the expression of negation through the privative construction is suppletive in nature and prevalent in non-finite or non-verbal contexts (cf. Vilkula 2015: 465 for Finnish). Languages such as Kayardild (Australia), where discursive factors may be involved, will also be considered. A final question will be if the entire construction is negative or just the underlying conceptualization. This will include an examination of the claimed (Michael 2014) development of Proto-Arawakan privative **ma-* into the standard negation marker in various extant Arawak languages.

References

- Hengeveld, Kees. 1998. Adverbial clauses in the languages of Europe. In Johan van der Auwera (ed.) *Adverbial constructions in the languages of Europe*. 335-419. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Michael, Lev. 2014. A typological and comparative perspective on negation in Arawak languages. In Lev Michael & Tania Granadillo (eds.) *Negation in Arawak languages*. 241-300. Leiden: Brill.
- Vilkula, Maria. 2015. Negation in Finnish. In Matti Miestamo, Anna Tamm & Beáta Wagner-Nagy (eds.), *Negation in Uralic languages*. 457-485. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

The ordering of the noun phrase post-nuclear modifiers in Brazilian Portuguese

The main goal of this paper² is to verify what determines the ordering of constituents at the noun phrase level in Brazilian Portuguese, focusing on its post-nuclear modifiers. At the post-head zone of the NP, there are some possible combinations of different modifiers, which is conducive to investigating the basic word order. This variability can be seen in the following examples:

- (1) a. *Uma mesa de madeira bem grande* (Iboruna: AC-050, DE, L.249)
A table of wood really big
'A really big wooden table.'
- b. *Uma mesa bem grande de madeira*
A table really big of wood
'A really big wooden table.'

The existence of equally acceptable expressions in Brazilian Portuguese, such as (1a-b), raises the following research questions: What is the basic word order of post-nuclear NP modifiers in Brazilian Portuguese? Is it the pragmatic, the semantic, or the morphosyntactic nature of the modifiers that mainly triggers the order of the elements? Are there competing motivations (Du Bois 1985)? How can the variation be explained?

A possible answer to these research questions depends on the following hypotheses:

First, the basic word order of Brazilian Portuguese is predominantly motivated by the semantic nature of the NP modifiers, which means that a more objective modifier stays closer to the head than a more evaluative one, thus displaying a mirror image of the English language (see Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2008 and Rijkhoff 2008). Second, cases that deviate from this preferred order can be explained in terms of the influence of pragmatic factors, such as Focus, Contrast, emphasis, and of morphosyntactic factors, such as complexity, which means that there may be some competing motivations in the ordering process.

A still incipient analysis of the data supports the hypotheses mentioned above: the ordering of the NP modifiers in Brazilian Portuguese tends to be motivated by their semantic nature. Marginal cases, which do not meet this basic order, tend to be explained in terms of differences in morphosyntactic complexity, while the influence of pragmatic motivations does not seem to be significant. These conclusions, however, are provisional, from an ongoing study, and deserve further reflection.

References

- Du Bois, John. 1985. Competing motivations. In John Haiman (ed.), *Iconicity in syntax*. 342-365. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hengeveld, Kees & J. Lachlan Mackenzie. 2008. *Functional Discourse Grammar: A typologically-based theory of language structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rijkhoff, Jan. 2008. Layers, levels and contexts in Functional Discourse Grammar. In Daniel García Velasco & Jan Rijkhoff (eds.), *The noun phrase in Functional Discourse Grammar*. 63-115. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

² Grant #2020/00492-4, 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 001*.

Asymmetrical pseudoclefts in Spanish – towards an FDG account

Pseudoclefts are identificational copula constructions, which consist of a free relative clause and an NP or a nominal clause. Their function is to focalize the component that follows the free relative. In example (1) the second part is a nominal clause:

- (1) a. *Lo_que quiero es jugar.*
 what want.1SG COP.3SG play.INF
 ‘What I want is to play.’ (*As* [football], 2003. CREA, press)

The free relative can be characterized as a clause “in which an individual (x_i) is identified through the state-of-affairs in which it is involved” (Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2008: 241). A somewhat simplified representation of (1a) is (2), the first part of which reflects this property of (x_j), which again is identical with the head of the nominal clause that follows.

- (2) IL: (R_I) (T_I) (R_J) (R_K)_{Foc}
 RL: (x_j : (f^e_i: [(f_i: querer (f_i)) (x_i)_A (x_j)_U]) (f^e_i)^x) (x_j : (f^e_j: [(f_j: jugar (f_j) (x_i)_A]) (f^e_j)) (x_j))

Consequently, (1a) can be reversed, which, however, will affect the focus function:

- (1) b. *Jugar es lo que quiero.*
 ‘To play is what I want.’

In Spanish, pseudoclefts may involve modal semi-auxiliaries such as *poder* ‘can, may’, in which the combining infinitive appears in the nominal clause.

- (3) *Te puedes emborrachar si quieres*, ‘You may get drunk if you wish,’
lo_que no puedes es salir luego por la carretera
 what not can.2SG COP.3SG leave.INF afterwards along the road
 ‘what you may not is drive after that.’ (*El Mundo* 2007. CORPES, press)

In such cases, the reversal of the pseudocleft becomes difficult, because, as opposed to *querer* ‘want’, *poder* ‘can, may’ is not a lexical verb: (4a) is grammatical, (4b) is not.

- (4) a. *¿Qué quieres?*
 what want.2SG
 ‘What do you want?’
 b. **¿Qué puedo?*
 what may.1SG
 ‘What may I?’

Being not fully grammatical either, we consider *poder* a lexical auxiliary (Olbertz 2016).

In addition, (3) illustrates a general property of pseudoclefts. There is a polar contrast between *poder* in the immediate context and *poder* in the free relative clause. We will account for this and analogous lexical oppositions by assigning the pragmatic function of Contrast to the Ascriptive Subact (T_I).

References

- Hengeveld, Kees & J. Lachlan Mackenzie. 2008. *Functional Discourse Grammar: A typologically-based theory of language structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
 Olbertz, Hella. 2016. Lexical auxiliaries Spanish: How and why? *Linguistics* 54 (5): 947-979.

Grammaticalization of *ana* for the expression of modality in Rapa Nui

According to FDG, grammaticalization of TAM elements occurs from a lower to a wider scope, and the opposite is not possible. In the case of modality, as a category that operates at the Representational Level, the strata pathway is the following:

- (1) Propositional Content < Episode < State of Affairs < Configurational Property

According to this proposal, modal elements rendering more than one meaning must have developed from operating in a lesser scope towards other meanings in a wider range, without the possibility of “skipping” a stratum. As we will show in this paper, this is the case of *ana*, a marker used, among other functions, to express several modal meanings in Rapa Nui.

- (2) *Ra'e koe ana aŋa to'u tarea, ki oti,*
first 2SG MOD make POSS.2SG homework SUB finish
ana kori i te pirototo.
MOD play OBJ ART ball
'First, you have to do your homework; then you can play soccer.'

This paper aims to show that the diversification of modal uses of *ana* in Rapa Nui can be explained as a diachronic change of distribution over the continuous scope, which is reflected synchronically in the stratal division of the FDG. Likewise, I intend to provide evidence to prove that the FDG model is useful to describe the grammaticalization of the modal elements in a language of a different typology and phylogenesis. To do this, I analyze synchronic evidence of the diverse modal meanings of *ana*. Since we do not count on diachronic evidence, the present analysis is synchronic, following proposals as that by Dall'Aglio Hattner & Hengeveld (2016).

The corpus used for this presentation is composed of examples extracted from published narrations in Rapa Nui, a questionnaire of modal forms, and examples taken from previous grammatical descriptions. The classification of modality, follows Hengeveld & Mackenzie (2008), as well as the modifications by Hengeveld (2011) and Dall'Aglio Hattner & Hengeveld (2016).

In conclusion, it is possible to sustain that the modal meanings of *ana* are distributed contiguously in the strata of the Representational Level, starting from those with a lesser scope to those with a wider one. Considering that this is what usually happens in languages that undergo processes of diachronic change, it is possible to infer that a similar development must have taken place in the history of the Rapa Nui language.

References

- Dall'Aglio Hattner, Marize & Kees Hengeveld. 2016. The grammaticalization of modal verbs in Brazilian Portuguese: A synchronic approach. *Journal of Portuguese Linguistics* 15 (1): 1-14.
- Hengeveld, Kees & J. Lachlan Mackenzie. 2008. *Functional Discourse Grammar: A typologically-based theory of language structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hengeveld, Kees. 2011. The grammaticalization of tense and aspect. In Bernd Heine & Heiko Narrog (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Grammaticalization*. 580-594. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Proper names in apposition in Brazilian Portuguese

This paper analyses the role of proper names in loose and close appositions in Brazilian Portuguese. Loose or non-restrictive appositions are, in general, characterized as two co-referential phrases separated, in speech, by a pause and, in writing, generally by a comma. Close or restrictive appositions are constructions in which the nominal elements are juxtaposed or linked by the preposition *de* ‘of’ and are not co-referential, as one of the two elements functions as a modifier of the other.

The fact that loose appositions have two instances of Reference does not pose a problem to FDG, as it fits the definition of a proper name being a Subact of Reference. However, previous studies in different languages (Keizer 2007, 2008; Lemson 2016; Serafim & Camacho 2020) point out that, in close appositions, each of its nominal components is ascriptive and the Noun Phrase as a whole is used to refer. This is an issue for the analysis of the proper name in FDG, as it implies that the proper name is non-referential; and, at the Representational Level (RL), they are used as modifiers. The aim of this paper, therefore, is to provide a suitable FDG analysis for these non-prototypical uses.

To account for these properties, we propose that, at the Interpersonal Level, the name is an instance of Ascription (T_I), as the speaker must evoke a label. The lexeme itself enters the RL as the head of a Lexical Deed (D_I), a category postulated by Giomi (2020), occupying the slot of the modifier (1b). This implies considering it a case of reflexive language, attested by the paraphrase (1c), which also ascribes a label to an entity introduced previously (Serafim 2021).

- (1) a. *o fotógrafo Paulo Pampolin*
the photographer Paulo Pampolin
the fotographer Paulo Pampolin’.
- b. RL: (x_i: (f_j: fotógrafo (f_j)) (x_i): (D_I: - Paulo Pampolin - (D_I) (x_i))
- c. *O fotógrafo chama-se Paulo Pampolin*
the fotographer call-REFL Paulo Pampolin
‘The photographer is called Paulo Pampolin’.

References

- Giomi, Riccardo. 2020. Headedness and modification in Functional Discourse Grammar. *Glossa* 5 (1): 1-32.
- Hengeveld, Kees & J. Lachlan Mackenzie. 2008. *Functional Discourse Grammar: A typologically-based theory of language structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Keizer, Evelien. 2007. *The English noun phrase: The nature of linguistic categorization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lemson, T. M. S. C. 2016. *Aposições restritivas no português brasileiro escrito contemporâneo*. Doctoral dissertation, Universidade Federal do Ceará.
- Serafim, Monielly & Camacho, Roberto Gomes. 2020. Aposições restritivas e não restritivas: correlações pragmáticas e semânticas. *Estudos Linguísticos* 49 (2): 1051-1068.
- Serafim, Monielly. 2022. A Functional Discourse Grammar account of proper names in Portuguese. *Journal of Portuguese Linguistics* 21 (1): 1-31.

³ 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*.

⁴ Research productivity fellowship, National Council for scientific and Technological Development, CNPq – Code 301837/2019-8

The scope of existential negation in FDG

This paper analyzes a specific type of existential construction in which an inherently negative existential term is used (1).

- (1) Guajá (Magalhães 2007: 247)
na'axi kwarahý-a
NEG.EX sun-N
'There is no sun'.

In a sample of 21 languages, several of them present a marker to express the negation of several types of predicates, including the existential one. Still, some languages have an exclusive marker for the expression of inexistence, as (1). This paper focus on these negative existential markers, often described by the reference grammars as the result of a lexicalization process involving the general negative marker and a lexical item.

Regarding the grammatical change of negative existentials, Croft (1991) identifies three synchronic stages in a language: Type A: The negation of existential predication is done by a negation marker; Type B: The negation of the existential predicate is done by a unique existential negation marker; Type C: There is an existential negation predicate that turns into the verbal negation marker. The languages analyzed here are Type B or C, or are in a stage between A~B or B~C.

In order to investigate this process in FDG terms, we use Hengeveld & Mackenzie's (2018) classification of the types of negation, according to which negation can occur in any layer of the formulation. We intend to demonstrate that it is possible to define a directionality of the change based on the decrease and increase in semantic scope within the layers of FDG (Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2008). Although the lexical-grammatical status of the negative existential varies across languages, the data show that these markers express other negative values besides the inexistence as there is an increase in their scope. Besides, they all seem to respect the directionality of the change from an outermost layer to an innermost layer of the Representational Level when in stage A~B and later, their scope increases in stages B~C

References

- Croft, William. 1991. The evolution of negation. *Journal of Linguistics* 27 (1): 1-27.
Hengeveld, Kees & J. Lachlan Mackenzie. 2018. Negation in Functional Discourse Grammar. In Evelien Keizer & Hella Olbertz (eds.), *Recent developments in Functional Discourse Grammar*. 17-45. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Hengeveld, Kees & J. Lachlan Mackenzie. 2008. *Functional Discourse Grammar: A typologically-based theory of language structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Magalhães, Marina Maria Silva. 2017. *Sobre a morfologia e a sintaxe da língua Guajá (Família Tupí-Guarani)*. PhD thesis. Brasília: University of Brasília.

Classification of nouns in English and German

In English, a noun can be classified in three ways: via classifier adjectives or nouns (*electric train*), compounding (*icecream*) or with a post-modifier/complement prepositional phrase, in particular a head-classifier like *a student of medicine*. A considerable amount of research has been dedicated to compounding (e.g. Bauer 2004; Giegerich 2004), some research has discussed the existence of the classifier nouns and adjectives (e.g. Ghesquière 2014; Davidse & Breban 2019), while considerably fewer sources have looked at the head-classifier construction (i.e. Keizer 2007; ten Wolde *forthc.*). In German, on the other hand, the classifying function tends to heavily rely on compounding (*Medizinstudent* ‘medical student’), although premodifiers (*dreiköpfige Familie* ‘family of three’, literally ‘three-headed family’) and post-nominal modification are also allowed. The latter comes in a variety of forms like genitive attributes (*Student der Medizin* ‘student of medicine’) and different prepositional phrases (e.g. *Sinn für Humor* ‘sense of humor’ and *Verkauf von Waren* ‘sale of goods’).

Based on English and German corpora data, this paper explores methods of classification and, in particular, discusses i) how head-classifier constructions relate to compounding and adjectival-classifier noun constructions in English and German, and ii) if and how the corresponding distinctions in English relate to those in German. For this purpose, a number of parameters are investigated, such as (restrictions on) the nouns involved, semantic restrictions on the alternations, and formal differences between constructions. Some central questions to be addressed are the fact that in English, in some cases, the pre- and post-nominal positions appear to be in free distribution (*medical student* and *student of medicine*), while in other cases they are not (*electric train* but **train of electricity*). In comparison, while compounds and adjectival premodifiers do not seem to be freely distributed in German, compounding and genitive attribution (e.g. *Lehrerberuf* and *Beruf des Lehrers* ‘teaching profession’) as well as different post-nominal modifiers are sometimes found to alternate (e.g. Zifonun 2010: 147; Kopf 2021). The corpus research findings then lead to a Functional Discourse Grammar proposal for capturing the features of the different construction types.

References

- Bauer, Laurie. 2004. Adjectives, compounds and words. *Nordic Journal of English Studies* 3 (1): 7-22.
- Davidse, Kirsten & Tine Breban. 2019. A cognitive-functional approach to the order of adjectives in the English noun phrase. *Linguistics* 57 (2): 327-371.
- Ghesquière, Lobke. 2014. *The directionality of (inter)subjectification in the English noun phrase*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Giegerich, Heinz J. 2004. Compound or phrase? English noun-plus-noun constructions and the stress criterion. *English Language and Linguistics* 8 (1): 1-24.
- Keizer, Evelien. 2007. *The English noun phrase: The nature of linguistic categorization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kopf, Kristin. 2021. Genitiv- und von-Attribute: Bestimmung des Variationsbereichs. In Marek Konopka, Angelika Wöllstein & Ekkehard Felder (eds.), *Determination, syntaktische Funktionen der Nominalphrase und Attribution*, 135-172. Heidelberg: Heidelberg University Publishing.
- Ten Wolde, Elnora. *Forthc.* *The English binominal noun phrase: A cognitive-functional approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zifonun, Gisela. 2010. Possessive Attribute im Deutschen. *Deutsche Sprache* 38 (2): 124-153.

Insultive constructions: A crosslinguistic exploration from the perspective of FDG

While several linguists have investigated the lexis and pragmatics of derogatory expressions (e.g. Labov 1972; Culpeper 1996), virtually no attention has been devoted to the question whether natural languages may have grammaticalized means of indicating that an utterance is intended as an insult to the Addressee. This paper addresses this empirical question and its implications for the theory of FDG, namely whether and under which conditions the existence of specialized insultive constructions would entail that an abstract predicate ‘Insultive’ should be added to the inventory of grammaticalized Illocutions recognized by FDG.

We hypothesize that a grammaticalized abstract predicate ‘INSULT(ive)’ must be assumed to trigger those constructions which are restricted to direct insults to the Addressee, i.e. which (i) only occur in Discourse Acts consisting of a bare Noun or Adjective Phrase; and (ii) are only used with derogatory epithets – cf. (1a-b), from *Tukang Besi* – or, when occurring with non-derogatory ones, trigger a coercion effect such that the epithet will nevertheless be understood as an insult – cf. (2), from Hebrew:

- (1) a. *Pa’i-’u la!*
stupid-2.SG.POSS M
‘You idiot!’
- b. **pande-’u la*
clever-2.SG.POSS M
(“ungrammatical, since this is not an insult”: Mark Donohue, p.c.)
- (2) *ya xatixat ga’on*
PTC piece.of genius
‘You genius!’ (where *ga’on*, ‘genius’ is interpreted ironically; Fishman, ms.)

Criterion (i) is meant to tell apart genuine markers of Insultive Illocution from constructions with more general pejorative uses (e.g. English *you N*, which also occurs in utterances with full predicative content, cf. *You fools are incredible*). Criterion (ii) excludes constructions that are not strictly reserved for the expression of contempt towards the Addressee (cf. again English *you N*, as used in *You darling*). In the light of these criteria, we have found evidence of specialized insultive constructions for at least eleven languages from five different families.

Note finally that insults could in principle be analyzed as a subtype of vocatives on the grounds that, in the latter too, the entire lexical content of the utterance is formed by a bare nominal. To avoid such analytical ambiguities, we have further restricted our definition of ‘Insultives’ to constructions that cannot co-occur with a vocative interjection or particle or, if they do, are always set off from this element by means of a prosodic pause – suggesting that the vocative and the Insultive constitute two separate Discourse Acts. Vocative+insultive combinations turned out to be impossible in at least *Tukang Besi*, Finnish and Swedish (Mark Donohue, Johanna Laakso, Jussi Ylikoski, p.c.); other languages, such as Persian and Spanish, have insultive markers that can co-occur with vocatives, but only as two separate Intonational Phrases (Célia Nadal Pasqual, Mohammad Rasekh-Mahand, p.c.).

References

- Culpeper, Jonathan. 1996. Towards an anatomy of impoliteness. *Journal of Pragmatics* 25 (3): 349-367.
- Fishman, Alon. Manuscript. *Ya xatixat*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Tel Aviv.
- Labov, William. 1972. Rules for ritual insults. In William Labov (ed.), *Language in the Inner City*. 297-353. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Backchannels in Functional Discourse Grammar

This paper aims at describing and discussing the discourse device of backchannels in British English using the Interpersonal and Phonological Level of FDG. Such dialogic features pose a particular challenge for FDG, since usually the framework is applied to monologic utterances. Firstly, the general concept of backchannels is explored, to assess their functional and formal properties. In a second step, backchannel frames are proposed, which allow the functional properties to be formalised according to FDG's Interpersonal Level, while the form will be represented by FDG's Phonological Level.

The main results show that backchannels can be divided into two classes for form and function respectively. Regarding their functions, it is argued that backchannels are deployed with REGULATIVE and/or SUPPORTIVE means. The REG function is predominantly used to regulate the narration of the active Speaker. Consider example (1) as an illustration of a typical regulative backchannel, a short signal with rising intonation to indicate continued attention:

- (1) S: You've got to put it at chest height ...
A: Mm
S: ... make sure it's not knocked or covered by clothing (BNC)

The SUP function, however, provides a subjective and qualitative feedback by the Addressee, evaluating the Speaker's ongoing utterance and intentions, as well as their attitude. An example of a supportive backchannel is given in (2), where the statement by the active Speaker is reinforced by the Addressee:

- (2) S: Oh, Hindus Carl, they are not Muslim...
A: No, they aren't.
S: ... all three are devout Hindus, vegetarian and don't drink alcohol. (BNC)

Concerning their form, backchannels are either generic (context-free; e.g. (1)) or specific (context-bound; e.g. (2)). The two abbreviations (REG/ SUP) resurface as pragmatic functions in the proposed backchannel frame at the Interpersonal Level.

The analysis of the data also shows that the grammatical formalisation of backchannels can be worked in-between the holistic units of formalisation of the Speaker's Move. The benefit of portraying the conversation in this manner is the possibility to evaluate the Speaker's interpersonal communicative behaviour (i.e. the illocution and various pragmatic functions deployed in the Discourse Act) and compare it to the interpersonal communicative intentions of the backchannel employed by the Addressee. In (1) above, for example, the REG function is triggered by the Discourse Act *you've got to put it at chest height*. On the other hand, the REG function can be interpreted as triggering the active Speaker to continue the narration. In this way it becomes possible to relate speaker-bound discourse units and their functions to listener-bound backchannels and their functions. As a final step, the results also allow for new insights into the notion of backchannels in general, as well as their implementation into the FDG framework.

Reference

Coleman, John, Ladan Baghai-Ravary, John Pybus & Sergio Grau. 2012. *Audio BNC: the audio edition of the Spoken British National Corpus*. Phonetics Laboratory, University of Oxford. <http://www.phon.ox.ac.uk/AudioBNC> (last accessed 09.04.2022)

Constituent order in Bohairic Coptic: a FDG account

The aim of the present contribution is to construct and discuss an FDG model for constituent ordering in the verbal clause in Bohairic Coptic. It is meant as the final part of my study of Coptic alignment. In (Zakrzewska in prep.) I describe the main strategies for argument expression in Bohairic and argue that the synchronic variation that can be observed in this domain points to language change in progress, a change that is triggered by the loss of a canonical (morphological) passive. Within the theories of FG and FDG, this implies the lack of subject assignment and a shift from morphosyntactic alignment to representational alignment, specifically to a subtype of representational alignment sensitive to the semantic functions of the categories involved (Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2008: 319-321).

In the present contribution, I intend to discuss in more detail how argument expression interacts with the rules for constituent ordering. The FDG model, which I intend to apply for this purpose, is a dynamic model of the encoder's linguistic operations during the construction of specific Linguistics Expressions, whereby the encoder realizes his or her communicative intentions by means of optimally selected strategies provided by a given language. For this reason, the FDG model differs dramatically from the traditional, static and abstract labels of constituent order types, such as SVO, VSO, VOS, VO vs. OV etc., which proved largely inadequate for capturing the particularities of Coptic constituent order. The dynamic FDG model allows to account for diverse factors that influence the ordering in an actual expression, including the functions of the individual constituents in the information structure (i.e. their pragmatic functions) and their syntactic complexity (heaviness). As several motivations can compete with one another, the actual outcome is not right away predictable (see Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2008, Hengeveld 2013, Keizer 2015, Giomi & Keizer 2020 and Keizer 2020).

References

- Hengeveld, Kees & J.Lachlan Mackenzie. 2008. *Functional Discourse Grammar: A typologically-based theory of language structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hengeveld, Kees. 2013. A new approach to clausal constituent order. In J.Lachlan Mackenzie & Hella Olbertz (eds.), *Casebook in Functional Discourse Grammar*. 15-38. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Giomi, Riccardo & Evelien Keizer. 2020. Extra-clausal constituents in Functional Discourse Grammar: function and form. *Revista da Abralín* 19 (3): 159-185.
- Keizer, Evelien. 2015. *A Functional Discourse Grammar for English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Keizer, Evelien. 2020. The placement of extra-clausal constituents in Functional Discourse Grammar. *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses* 80: 89-121.
- Zakrzewska, Ewa D. (in prep.). Differential argument marking and alignment shift in Coptic.