8th
th
INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON
FUNCTIONAL DISCOURSE GRAMMAR

FDG 2024

BOOK OF ABSTRACTS

3-5 July - Federal University of São Carlos, São Carlos, SP, Brazil

Organizers:

ufscar

unesp

UFMS
UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL
DE MATO GROSSO DO SUL

Sponsor:

CAPES

Eighth International Conference on Functional Discourse Grammar

3-5 July 2024

Welcome to the Eighth International Conference on Functional Discourse Grammar, in São Carlos, Brazil, from 3 to 5 July 2024.

The aim of IC-FDG-2024 is to further elaborate the model of Functional Discourse Grammar (FDG) as proposed by Kees Hengeveld and J. Lachlan Mackenzie. A full treatment of FDG may be found in: Hengeveld, Kees and Mackenzie, J. Lachlan 2008. *Functional Discourse Grammar: A typologically-based theory of language structure.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

The conference takes place at the *Federal University of São Carlos*, São Carlos – SP, Brazil.

Organizing Committee
Flavia Bezerra de Menezes Hirata Vale (Chair, Federal University of São Carlos - UFSCar).
Marize Mattos Dall'Aglio Hattnher (São Paulo State University - UNESP),
Michel Fontes (Federal University of Mato Grosso do Sul – UFMS/CPTL)
Taisa Peres de Oliveira (Federal University of Mato Grosso do Sul – UFMS/CPTL)

Programme Committee
Kees Hengeveld (Chair, University of Amsterdam)
Daniel García Velasco (University of Oviedo)
Flavia Bezerra de Menezes Hirata Vale (Federal University of São Carlos - UFSCar).

Sponsor
This conference is financed by the Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior - Brasil (CAPES PAEP Processo 88881.946127/2024-01), with the support of the postgraduate programs PPGL/UFSCar; PPGEL/Unesp/SJRP; PPGLetras/UFMS/CPTL.

Table of Contents

Camila Rodrigues de Amorim, *São Paulo State University* (São José do Rio Preto), Brazil

An analysis of headless relative clauses in Spanish from the Functional Discourse Grammar point of view

Headless relatives are so called because they lack an explicit nominal antecedent, unlike relative clauses with an overt antecedent that modify the referential entity of an external noun phrase (de Vries 2002). In Spanish, two main types of relative structures whose nucleus is absent can be identified: *free relatives* and *semi-free relatives* (Brucart 1999; RAE 2009; Ojea López 2013). While free relatives are characterized by not having any element of their antecedent formally expressed, semi-free relatives have their antecedent partially expressed through the indication of features of gender and number of the entity referred to.

(1)   Quien   dice   eso   miente.
      REL   says-PRS.IND.3SG   DEM   lies-PRS.3SG
      'Whoever says that is lying.' (RAE 2009:3385)

(2)   El   que   diga   eso   miente.
      ART.DEF.SG.M   REL   says-PRS.SBJV.3SG   DEM   lies-PRS.3SG
      'Whoever says that is lying.' (RAE 2009:3385)

The aim of this paper is to analyze, from the perspective of Functional Discourse Grammar (Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2008), the functional and formal properties of headless relative clauses in Spanish. We seek to answer the following questions: i) What are the functional motivations that justify the non-realization of the nucleus at the Morphosyntactic Level?; ii) What is the status of their nucleus at the Interpersonal Level and the Representational Level?; iii) Are the coding differences between free and semi-free relatives functional, that is, do they have Interpersonal and Representational motivation?

Our analysis shows that free relatives are characterized by the absence of an antecedent Referential Subact and a lexical nucleus at the semantic level, which reveals itself as an alignment between Interpersonal and Representational units. In semi-free relatives, on the other hand, the presence of an antecedent Referential Subact at the Interpersonal Level (and the speaker's attempt to evoke a property to this referential element) leads to the presence of an empty nucleus at the Representational Level. It is precisely because of this feature that semi-free relatives are the ones that come closest to relatives with an overt antecedent, acting as restrictive modifiers. On the contrary, in free relative clauses, since the relative predication itself occupies the position of the nucleus, these structures do not constitute cases of "modifiers" in terms of FDG.

References

Brucart, Joseph. M. 1999. La estructura del sintagma nominal: las oraciones de relativo. In Ignacio Bosque & Violeta Demonte (eds.), *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, 395-522. Madrid: Espasa.

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

Ojea López, Ana. 2013. A uniform account of headless relatives in Spanish. *Language Sciences*, 40. 200-211.

Real Academia Española y Asociación de Academias de la Lengua Española. 2009. *Nueva gramática de la lengua española*. Madrid: Espasa.

Vries, Mark de. 2002. *The Syntax of Relativization*. Utrecht.

Felix Berner, *University of Vienna*, Austria

What measure phrases can tell about relative and absolute adjectives – and vice versa

Analysing measure phrase constructions continues to be a point of contention (see e.g. Csirmaz & Stavrou 2017). One particular problem is how to account for the differing behaviour in constructions such as (1) and (2). Constructions with absolute adjectives, as in (1), allow for the deletion of measure phrases without a significant change in meaning, whereas constructions with relative adjectives, as in (2), do not.

(1)   a 2x2 meter **square** table -> a **square** table
(2)   a 3-foot **tall** boy -> #a **tall** boy

This raises the question of a) how to analyse these combinations, and b) how to explain the functional and formal behaviour of these adjectives. This paper proposes a) an FDG (Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2008) analysis of these constructions as head-modifier constructions in the case of absolute adjectives (Complex Property), and as predicate-argument constructions in the case of relative adjectives (Configurational Property). And b), that the relative/absolute distinction of adjectives plays a central role in the analysis of measure phrases, and that, in turn, the analysis of adjective-measure phrase constructions offers valuable insights for the analysis of adjectives in their base form.

Relative adjectives are associated with open-ended scales, while absolute ones are associated with (partially) closed scales (Kennedy & McNally 2005: 354f.) or an either-or distinction. While the latter thus has an absolute standard regardless of its head, the former's standard is relative to the head.

Measure phrases fix the relative adjective's value to an explicit degree value, whereas they only provide further detail about the absolute adjective. Measure phrase and adjective are analysed as a compound in the attributive use. For relative adjectives this compound is a Configurational Property, consisting of a predicate and an argument. For absolute adjectives, this compound is a Complex Property consisting of a head and a modifier. This accounts for the possibility to delete measure phrases combining with absolute adjectives, and the impossibility to do so with relative adjectives. This also explains the non-prototypical behaviour of the measure noun regarding inflection and modification in the attributive use.

In the absence of an explicit value, relative adjectives need a comparison class argument as their standard. Absolute adjectives do not, since they can make use of their scale's endpoint(s). This is captured by analysing relative adjectives in their base form as having a comparison class argument, and absolute adjectives as not having one.

The paper will further discuss an extension of the proposed analysis from the attributive to the predicative use, proposing that in the latter case adjective and measure phrase do not form a compound, thus accounting for differences between attributive and predicative use, such as e.g. conceptualization, formalisation, or stress pattern.

References
Csirmaz, Aniko & Melita Stavrou. 2017. Measure phrases and semi-lexical nouns. In Martin Everaert & Henk van Riemsdijk (eds.), *The Wiley Blackwell companion to syntax*, 2nd edn., 2433-2498. London: Wiley Blackwell.
Hengeveld, Kees & J. Lachlan Mackenzie. 2008. *Functional Discourse Grammar: A typologically-based theory of language structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Kennedy, Christopher & Louise McNally. 2005. Scale structure, degree modification, and the semantics of gradable predicates. *Language* 81(2). 345–381

Roberto Gomes Camacho & Erotilde Goreti Pezatti, *São Paulo State University* (São José do Rio Preto), Brazil

Discourse Acts of Correction in spoken Brazilian Portuguese

Textual processing activities in face-to-face interaction can contain "problems" of formulation and continuity, at least in the Speaker's own conception, which can be reformulated, including corrections. There are two types of correction acts: infirmation, which completely or partially revokes or invalidates information issued in the preceding discourse, and rectification, in which source and rectification utterances follow the same semantic direction (Fávero, Andrade & Aquino 1999: 61). Examples (1) and (2) are cases of infirmation and rectification, respectively.

(1) *ela   viv-e   dança-ndo   a:: Laura   a   Estela*
      she   live-PRS.3.SG   dance-GER   the:: Laura   the   Estela
      a   Laura   não   se   defin-iu
      the   Laura   not   herself   define-PST.3.SG
      'she's always dancing, Laura, or else, Estela. Laura has not defined herself.'
      (SP- D2-360, Fávero, Andrade & Aquino, 1999, p. 61).

(2) *então ele   quer   ser cientista...   arqueólogo*
      so   he   want-PRS.3.SG be   scientist...   archeologist
      'so he wants to be a scientist... an archaeologist'
      (SP-D2-360, Fávero, Andrade & Aquino, 1999, p. 62)

In (1), the Speaker overrides the Np *a Laura* by correcting it with *Estela*, stating explicitly that Laura has not yet made up her mind. In (2), the meaning of *scientist* ('cientista') is not fully canceled in favor of *archaeologist* ('arqueólogo') since *archaeologist* ('arqueólogo') is only one type of *scientist* ('cientista').

The two kinds of Subsidiary Acts can perform two rhetorical functions in spoken discourse: infirmative correction and rectifying correction, understood by FDG (Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2008; Giomi & Keizer 2020) as either Correction (properly speaking) or Clarification. Since in FDG theoretical framework these two rhetorical functions are often confused and mixed up, we argue that they should in fact be differentiated: on the one hand assigning to Correction the rhetorical function of revoking the source utterance, which has just been issued; on the other assigning to Clarification the function of just specifying some information that the Speaker believes has been inaccessible to the Addressee's interpretation in the current spoken discourse. Both discourse acts are encoded as Extra-Clausal Constituents at Morphosyntactic Level.

References

Fávero, Leonor Lopes, Maria Lúcia Andrade & Zilda Gaspar Aquino. 1999. A Correção do texto falado: tipos, funções e marcas. In Maria Helena Moura Neves (ed.) *Gramática do Português Falado*. Vol 7, 53-76, São Paulo: Editora da UNICAMP.

Giomi, Riccardo & Evelien Keizer. 2020. Extra-clausal constituents in Functional Discourse Grammar: function and form. *Revista da Abralin*, 19 (3). 159-185.

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

Pablo Cânovas & Michel Fontes, *Universidade Federal de Mato Grosso do Sul* (Três Lagoas), Brazil

A hierarchical approach to the grammaticalization of 'mesmo' in Portuguese

The purpose here is to contribute to the architecture of a hierarchical approach to grammaticalization (Hengeveld 2017; Keizer 2007). In order to do so, this paper describes different uses of *mesmo* in contemporary Portuguese by mapping their functional and formal properties. The intention is to arrange these uses in a cline that reflects, in Functional Discourse Grammar view (Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2008), a combination of contentive and formal changes.

Reviewing some previous researchers (Peres 2020; Pezatti & Peres 2022; 2023), and based on data taken from *Corpus do Português* (Davies & Ferreira 2006), this paper distinguishes five uses of *mesmo,* all of them at the Interpersonal Level: (i) anaphoric proform (or pronoun); (ii) anaphoric and deictic identical identity lexical operator scoping a headless Ascriptive Subact; (iii) emphatic commitment operator of Ascriptive Subacts; (iv) discriminating emphatic operator of Referential Subacts; and (v) Expansive Contrast pragmatic function marker scoping Ascriptive and Referential Subacts and Communicated Contents.

In sum, these different uses of *mesmo*, in Portuguese, can be ordered in a *cline* of lexical-grammatical status, beginning with *'secondary' grammatical elements*, such as the anaphoric pronoun and the identical identity lexical operators, followed by *'primary' grammatical elements* (Keizer 2007). This is a symptom of a grammaticalization process since, in a classical sense, it can be clearly noticed that an item is coming in certain linguistic contexts to serve more grammatical functions (Hopper & Traugott 1993). In FDG, this grammaticalization process can be accounted in a two-way direction: (i) a stepwise and systematic increase in scope relations, from headless Ascriptive Subacts heading Referential Subacts to configurational primitives scoping Ascriptive Subact, Referential Subact, and Communicated Content; and (ii) a stepwise and systematic decrease in lexicality, ranging as follows *proform > lexical operator > operator > function*. These characterize contentive and formal changes of *mesmo* in Portuguese, respectively.

References

Davies, Mark & Michael Ferreira. 2006. *Corpus do Português: 45 million words, 1300s1900s*. 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: Mouton de Gruyter.

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

Hopper, Paul J. & Elizabeth Closs Traugott. 2003. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Keizer, Evelien. 2007. The lexical-grammatical dichotomy in Functional Discourse Grammar. *Alfa* 51(2). 35-56.

Peres, Ana Carolina Teixeira. 2020. *O uso de 'mesmo' em cartas do português brasileiro dos séculos XVIII, XIX e XX*. São José do Rio Preto: UNESP MA dissertation.

Pezatti, Erotilde Goreti & Ana Carolina Teixeira Peres. 2022. Multifuncionalidade de 'mesmo': relação entre função e ordenação morfossintática. *Revista Gragoatá* 27. 146-179.

Pezatti, Erotilde Goreti & Ana Carolina Teixeira Peres. 2023. Os vários usos de 'mesmo' no português brasileiro dos séculos XVIII, XIX e XX. *Revista do GEL* 19. 249-271.

Hongmei Fang,[1] Egbert Fortuin,[2] Rene Genis,[1] Riccardo Giomi,[1] Sune Gregersen,[3]
Lois Kemp,[1] Paula Kyselica,[1] Ezra La Roi,[4] Hella Olbertz,[5] Eugenie Stapert,[3]
Hein van Der Voort,[6] Arok Wolvengrey,[7] Ewa Zakrzewska[1]
[1]*University of Amsterdam*, The Netherlands, [2]*Leiden University*, The Netherlands,
[3]*Kiel University*, Germany, [4]*Ghent University*, Belgium, [5]*Universidade de Santiago de Compostela*, Spain, [6]*Museu Goeldi*, Brazil, [7]*First Nations University of Canada* (Regina), Canada.

A hierarchical approach to habitual expressions

This paper argues that habitual aspect is not a single grammatical category, but a family of related meanings operating at different scopal layers as identified in Functional Discourse Grammar (Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2008). To give a first idea of what we mean by this, consider the following examples:

(1)   I used to be wont to read a book in a few days.
(2)   *I was wont to use to read a book in a few days.

Example (1) contains two habitual expressions: *used to* and *be wont to*. The fact that these can be combined without the sentence being pleonastic means that they must have distinct functions in the sentence.

We define habituality as the unbounded repetition of an event or situation that typically occurs. Within this definition, one could relate habituality to three different layers in FDG:

(i) Habituality at the layer of the Episode: The series of States-of-Affairs constituting the Episode occurs regularly.
(ii) Habituality at the layer of the State-of-Affairs: An individual State of Affairs occurs regularly.
(iii) Habituality at the layer of the Situational Property: A certain type of State of Affairs occurs regularly due to a propensity of an animate participant involved.

Expressions of habituality may furthermore have extended meaning, relevant at yet two other layers:

(iv) Genericity at the layer of the Propositional Content: A Propositional Content is always true;
(v) Multiplicativity ate the layer of the Lexical Property: the Lexical Property is applied multiple times on a single occasion.

We investigate how these different types of habituality and related categories manifest themselves in a sample of ten different languages: Ancient Greek, Coptic, Dolgan, Kwaza, Mandarin, Plains Cree, Portuguese, Russian, Slovak, and Spanish. More specifically, we investigate how different habitual strategies are distributed across the different meanings distinguished above. The hypothesis we investigate follows from the treatment of grammaticalization in FDG. Contentive change is claimed to be a matter of scope increase, a process in which a grammatical element assumes new meanings or functions by moving up step by step along the layered hierarchies. The synchronic correlate of this is that, if a grammatical marker operates at more than one layer, these layers will be contiguous in the hierarchy.

References

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

Bárbara Ribeiro Fante, *University of Oviedo*, Spain

An analysis of adjective modification within the framework of Functional Discourse Grammar

This paper aims to analyze adjectival modification in written Spanish under the scope of Functional Discourse Grammar (Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2008). Specifically, the proposal of this research is to present a method for distinguishing the various types of adjective modifiers in Spanish, starting from the premise that contextual factors influence semantic construction. Our main hypothesis asserts that the form of modifiers, specifically those grammatically marked as adjectives, does not determine their semantic function (and vice versa).

Considering this theoretical perspective, we distinguish cases like (1), (2) and (3):

(1) *Una breve charla*
   INDEF.F brief conversation
   A brief conversation

(2) *Una terrible enfermedad*
   INDEF.F terrible disease
   A terrible disease

(3) *Mi   experiencia personal*
   1SG.POSS experience personal
   My personal experience

Example (1) illustrates a state of affairs (e) charla (conversation) modified by the lexical property breve (brief), which denotes time (t). The function of *breve* is to modify the state of affairs, denoting the intersection between both entities. Example (2) is ambiguous; it can be analyzed as an individual *enfermedad* (disease) (x) modified by the lexical property *terrible* (terrible) (f) denoting intrinsic property in an "individual modification" or this example can be interpreted as a state of affairs modified by a qualitative modifier. Example (4) is different from the other ones since *personal* (personal) does not have the function of modification but one of additional propositional content (p) that provides information about the head. In this sense, the function provided by *personal* seems to imply the existence of a human being who undergoes that experience, and this experiencer can appear in different structures within the discursive context. In this case, it is presented through the adjective *personal*, but it could also be represented by a Prepositional Phrase (Pp), like *experiencia de la persona* (person's experience).

This brief initial analysis proposes that, despite the common formality shared by the adjectives *breve, terrible* and *personal,* their semantic function is distinctive. In this sense, we intent to propose more precise criteria for the classification of types of adjective modification within the framework of Functional Discourse Grammar.

References

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

Michel Fontes, *Universidade Federal de Mato Grosso do Sul* (Três Lagoas), Brazil

Revisiting adverbial conjunctions in FDG

This paper reviews the Functional Discourse Grammar treatment of adverbial conjunctions. Hengeveld & Mackenzie (2008) sustain a well-known distinction between lexical and grammatical conjunctions (Hengeveld & Wanders 2007): while Grammatical Conjunctions are morphosyntactic expressions of semantic and/or rhetorical functions, Lexical Conjunctions correspond to Configurational Properties headed by a one-place Property predication frame, with a predicate taking a single argument with the semantic function Reference (e.g. Pérez Quintero 2013).

By associating Hengeveld & Mackenzie's (2008) view on Lexical/Grammatical Conjunctions and Oliveira's (2014) proposal to adverbial conjunctions in Portuguese, this paper aims at further developing FDG's approach to adverbial conjunctions in three main points. The first one reviews Hengeveld & Wanders's (2007) criteria for determining the lexical-grammatical status of adverbial conjunctions, suggesting, in addition to modification and combinability of lexical and grammatical conjunctions, some new criteria, as compositionality and the degree of fusion (or fixedness) of their internal constituent structure (Bybee 2010), which can more adequately mirror their stages in the (diachronic) processes involved in their formation.

The second proposition concerns the representation of Lexical Conjunctions, specifying their configuration in two types of semantic relations, as predicate-argument and as head-modifier, which figures as an additional point in offering better representations to the basis of adverbial conjunctions formation.

The third and final point distinguishes, besides Lexical and Grammatical Conjunctions, a new group of adverbial conjunctions, with an in-between position in terms of lexical-grammatical distinctions and also in terms of internal constituent structure, demanding aligned multilevel representations for the formulation of these adverbial conjunctions and the distinction of a new type of primitive, the semi-fixed conjunctional pattern, which, as member associated to the class of semi-fixed patterns (Keizer 2013), can be represented as follows: $[(Gw_i) (Gw_i: que_{Conj} (Gw_i))]_{conect}$.

References

Bybee, Joan. 2010. *Language, usage and cognition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Hengeveld, Kees & Gerry Wanders. 2007. Adverbial conjunctions in Functional Discourse Grammar. In Mike Hannay & Gerard Steen (eds), *Structural-functional studies in English grammar: in honor of Lachlan Mackenzie*. 211-227. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

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: Benjamins.

Oliveira, Taisa Peres. 2014. Conjunções adverbiais no português. *Revista de Estudos da Linguagem* 22. 45-66.

Pérez Quintero, María Jesús. 2013. Grammaticalization vs. Lexicalization: the Functional Discourse Grammar view. *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses* 67. 97-121.

Talita Storti Garcia, *São Paulo State University* (São José do Rio Preto), Brazil

Additive correlatives in Portuguese: an FDG account

This research aims to investigate the functional motivations of additive correlatives in Portuguese under Functional Discourse Grammar theory (Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2008). The additive correlatives are classified as emphatic expressions of additive coordination or they are commonly conceived as a construction other than coordination and subordination (Módolo 1999; Rosário 2018) because they contain "correlative pairs". In Portuguese, in these cases, it is marked by discontinuous pairs *não só.... mas também* and *não só... como também* 'not only...but also' and *tanto...como* 'both...and', in which the first one necessarily follows the second, as seen in (1):

(1) **não só** o homem ainda pode trabalhar **mas** a mulher **também** pode
not only the man still can work **but** the woman **also** can
fazer qualquer coisa para ajudar a sua família e também a sociedade
do any thing to help the her family and also the society
'not only the man can still work, but also the woman can do anything to help her family and the society too'

Under the Functional Discourse Grammar theory, this research aims to investigate: (i) which Interpersonal, Representational, Morphosyntactic and Phonological categories do the members of additive correlation belong to? (ii) what are the differences between the different additive correlative pairs in Portuguese? (iii) does the correlative construction configure a single Discourse Act? (iv) in this case, would there be one or two Communicate Contents? The corpora analyzed include the Corpus do *Português Oral* and *Projeto da Norma Linguística Urbana Culta* (NURC).

The data reveal that the correlative additive configures a single Discourse Act. In this case, only two Rhetorical functions were observed, that is, Motivation and Correction. At the Representational Level, the elements joined by correlative pairs are always the same type: Propositional Content, State-of-Affairs, Configurational Property, Individual, Location and Time. At the Morphosyntactic Level, the elements involved in additive correlation can configure Clauses or Phrases, the latter being more frequent than the former. The two units, together, form a single Linguistic Expression. Considering the interdependence between the elements of the correlative pair, we can recognize the process of Equiordination, in which the two units are mutually dependent. At the Phonological Level, the correlative forms a single Utterance containing two Intonational Phrases with two different intonational contours, one ascending in the first element and another one descending in the second member of the correlation.

References
Hengeveld, Kees & J. Lachlan Mackenzie. 2008. *Functional Discourse Grammar: A typologically-based theory of language structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Módolo, Marcelo. 1999. *Correlação: Estruturalismo versus Funcionalismo. (Pré) publications: forskning og undervisning*. Danmark: Romansk Institut, Aarhus Universitet.
Rosário, Ivo da Costa. 2018. Construções correlatas aditivas são estruturas de coordenação? In Maria Angélica Furtado Cunha, Edvaldo Balduíno Bispo & José Romerito Silva (eds.), *Variação e mudança em perspectiva construcional,* 1st edn. 210-250. Natal: Editora UFRN.

Daniel García Velasco, *University of Oviedo*, Spain

Interjections in Functional Discourse Grammar

This presentation will pay attention to one particular type of expressive unit, interjections, drawing evidence from the behaviour of both primary and secondary interjections in English and, particularly, Spanish.

The frames proposed by Hengeveld & Mackenzie (2008) for expressives do not contain positions for the addressee and the Communicated Content (CC), as these do not communicate information in the strict sense, but rather give expression to the speaker's feelings or emotions and function as Discourse Acts (DA) themselves. Interactives, however, are addressee-directed and therefore representations include a variable for that participant. Hengeveld & Mackenzie (2008: 77-78) note that '[m]any interactives can be expanded with a Communicated Content', as in the following example:

(1)   *Congratulations on winning the race!*
      $(A_I: [(F_I: Congratulations_{Int} (F_I)) (P_I)_S (P_J)_A (C_I: –on winning the race– (C_I))] (A_I))$

However, nothing is said about expressives that can be expanded with a CC. Indeed, interjections cannot be easily expanded in English (**ouch my finger, *gosh it's cold*), which contrasts with Spanish, in which both primary and secondary interjections may be expanded with a syntactic group. The following Spanish examples involve primary interjections only:

(2)   a. *¡Ay!*
         'Ouch!'
      a'.*¡Ay   del   que no   me   haga   los   deberes!*
         Ouch   of_he that not me   do.3.SBJV   the   homework
         'If you don't do your homework, there will be consequences'
      b. *¡Uy!*
         'Oops!'
      b'.*¡Uy   si   te   pillo!*
         Oops   if   you   get.1.IND
         'If I get you, you'll see'

As noted by RAE-ASALE (2009: 2484) when interjection *ay,* which is typically associated with pain or annoyance, is followed by a prepositional group, it can be more readily interpreted as a threat. Additionally, and in spite of the fact that these units do not derive from argument-taking lexemes, there is a morphosyntactic dependency between the interjection and the syntactic group that follows: the preposition cannot be changed (e.g. *caramba *de*) and the expansion cannot generally stand alone (e.g. *(*caramba*) *con el niño*). All in all, this presentation will provide a detailed description of English and Spanish interjections and will suggest an FDG analysis which is compatible with their different semantic and morphosyntactic properties.

References
Hengeveld, Kees & J. Lachlan Mackenzie. 2008. *Functional Discourse Grammar: A typologically-based theory of language structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Real Academia Española; Asociación de Academias de la Lengua Española (RAE-ASALE) 2009. *Nueva gramática de la lengua española*. Madrid: Espasa.

Kees Hengeveld, *University of Amsterdam*, The Netherlands
Sentential constituent order in A'ingae

A'ingae is a language isolate spoken in the border region of Colombia and Ecuador. Constituent order is consistently predicate final in subordinate clauses, but relatively free in main clauses. The only position in main clauses that is really fixed is the second one, which hosts a limited number of pronominal clitics and cliticizing particles that attach to the first constituent in the clause, as shown in (1).

(1)   Matachima gi kundaseye tsun'jen.
        [matachi=ma]=ngi   kundase=ye tsun-'je
        matachi.clown=ACC.REAL=1 converse=INFdo-IMPF
        'I'm going to tell you about the Matachi clown.' [20060104-AQ-Matachi-0000.0]

Given the existence of this set of clitics, the initial position in the clause can also easily be identified, and may be occupied by constituents of any level of complexity. Ignorative pronouns, when used interrogatively, must always occupy the first position.

However, the constituent carrying the second position clitic may be preceded by yet another constituent, as shown in (2).

(2)   Ñaja asithaen gi kinikhuve daye.
        [ña=ja]   [asi'thaen]=ngi   kinikhu=ve   da=ye
        1.SG=CONTR think=1   tree=ACC.IRR   become=INF
        'I am thinking of changing into a tree.' [20040215-03-LC-Unfendyu'ndyu-027]

This constituent, which must then be assumed to be in preclausal position, is either a linker from a limited set, a new or contrastive topic, as in (2), or a combination of both.

The final position in main clauses is most commonly occupied by a predicate phrase, and these are most commonly verb phrases, but all other main types of constituents may end up in this position as well. The same holds for the clause medial position, which may host any type of constituent. The question then is what determines the distribution of constituents in the clause-medial and clause-final positions. I will show that the information-structural status of the constituents plays an important role in this question.

In accounting for the facts of A'ingae, I will use the approach to constituent ordering advocated in Functional Discourse Grammar (FDG, Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2008), but taking the modifications proposed in Hengeveld & Keizer (subm.) into account, in particular, the introduction of an additional Sentence layer at the Morphosyntactic Level.

The A'ingae data can very well be accomodated in this model. The preclausal position within the sentence provides a home for the limited set of preclausal constituents, while at the same time the second position clitics occupy the P2 position within the Clause rather than in the Sentence. The extrasentential positions are then available for Subsidiary Discourse Acts.

References
Hengeveld, Kees & Evelien Keizer. (subm.). General principles of linearization in Functional Discourse Grammar.
Hengeveld, Kees & J. Lachlan Mackenzie. 2008. *Functional Discourse Grammar: A typologically-based theory of language structure.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lois Kemp, *University of Amsterdam*, The Netherlands

Criteria for distinguishing four FDG evidential categories: English evidential *-ly* adverbs

This paper will use tests to confirm the division of English evidential adverbs into the four FDG evidential subcategories: Reportative, Inferential, Deductive, and Event Perception noted in Hengeveld & Hattnher (2015). I will discuss the four evidential categories and present the division of eleven frequent English evidential adverbs into the categories as listed in Kemp (2018).

Firstly, Peterson's (2017) contingency and contradiction test is applied to one adverb from each evidential subcategory. Each adverb is included in a first clause, while the second clause either echoes the meaning of the evidential in the sense of confirming the existence of the knowledge base or it contradicts the existence of the knowledge base. This test demonstrates the chameleon-like behaviour of English evidential adverbs as the adverb can change category according to the surrounding context..

Secondly, tests are used to support Hengeveld & Hatthner's (2015) view that the reportative subcategory is a category 'in its own right', that is, different from the other three categories. The reportative is indeed on the Interpersonal Level, while the Inferential, Deductive, and Event Perception are on the Representational Level. A challengeability test showing whether only the scoped information is challenged or the reportative together with the scoped information reveals whether the adverb acts on the Interpersonal Level or the Representational Level. Furthermore, to support the different status of the reportative, AnderBois's (2014) notion of 'reportative exceptionality' is discussed.

Thirdly, the scope of the evidential adverb as reflected in its clausal position in relation to other items supports the allocation of adverb into the four subcategories. The FDG hierarchy dictates scope relations in such a way that an element on a higher layer will scope over elements on any lower layer.

Finally, the results of the analysis of the co-occurrence of an evidential adverb with complement-taking predicates, with other modifiers, and with another evidential *-ly* adverb in a clause provides evidence for the layering of the adverbs.

References

AnderBois, Scott. 2014. On the exceptional status of reportative evidentials. *Proceedings of SALT* 24. 234–254.

Hengeveld, Kees & Marize Mattos Dall'Aglio Hattnher. 2015. Four types of evidentiality in the native languages of Brazil. *Linguistics* 53(3). 479–524.

Kemp, Lois. 2018. English evidential *-ly* adverbs in main clauses: A functional approach. *Open Linguistics* 4. 743–61.

Peterson, Tyler. 2017. Problematizing mirativity. *Review of Cognitive Linguistics* 15(2). 312–342. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Arnaldo Lima, *Federal Institute of Education, Science and Technology of São Paulo*, Brazil

Is overlapping a grammatical strategy? Functional-discursive analysis of utterances produced in nonfluent aphasias

This paper aims at describing the strategy of overlapping along the process of utterance production in interactive contexts between people with and without aphasia. Overlapping is broadly defined as a simultaneous speech by two or more conversational participants, irrespective of whether it is perceived by the interactants as an interruption. As a whole, this phenomenon is described in terms of its pragmatic and discursive functions, as (i) the desire to start a turn before another one, without missing the opportunity to talk, (ii) the necessity of making specific contributions to what is being said, (iii) the uncertainty whether the current speaker intends to continue, and the like (Moerman 1988; Murray 1988, and references therein). From evidence provided by Discourse and Conversation Analysis, one may coherently claim that overlapping is a common, therefore normal, aspect of human interaction, which has nothing to do with a sign (or symptom) of language alterations caused by linguistic-cognitive impairment. Nonetheless, according to Lima (2023) in aphasiological contexts, the act of overlapping, over and above pragmatic-discursive aspects, can also bring to light features dealt with within grammar. According to the author, given the dynamicity of language functioning, such grammatical aspects would not be easily perceived in non-aphasic speech.

As for the Principle of Formal Encoding, as conceived of by Functional Discourse Grammar ([Henceforth: FDG] Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2008; Keizer 2015), it is coherent to propose that overlapping, although pragmatic-discursive in nature, is a strategy dealt with within the Interpersonal Level (therefore, in the grammar proper of a language). However, corollary to this conclusion, a central question arises: does the strategy of overlapping constrain the Operation of Encoding? If so, how does it impinge on the operations dealt with within the Grammatical and Phonological Levels?

In order to round off this proposal, it is important to emphasize that the answer for such a question need to be sought in dialogical situations, in contexts which two or more people are interacting. This is especially challenging to FDG, since the theory deals mostly with monologic utterances. Nevertheless, this challenge should be accepted, mostly because its potential to help linguists to achieve a more fine-grained comprehension of grammar.

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: Oxford University Press.

Lima, Arnaldo Rodrigues de. 2023. *Telegraphic style utterances in nonfluent aphasias: a functional-discursive analysis*. Campinas: UNICAMP Doctoral Thesis. https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12733/10546

Moerman, Michael. 1988. *Talking culture: Ethnography and conversation analysis*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Murray, Stephen. 1988. The sound of simultaneous speech, the meaning of interruption. *Journal of Pragmatics* 12. 115-116

Matthias Mittendorfer, *University of Vienna*, Austria

Exploring the prosody of information packaging in British English: an FDG account

This paper investigates the prosodic realisation of the information-structural categories Topic, Focus, and Contrast (as well as their combinations) in British English. Many accounts assume Bolinger's (1965) distinction between an A-accent (H* L-L%) for Focus and a B-accent ((L+)H* L-H%) for Topic. Nevertheless, considerable controversy exists around the prosodic realisation of these categories. It has even been argued "that the categories may be indeterminate [… and] the speaker's intentions with regard to the topic-focus articulation of his utterance thus cannot necessarily be determined by the context" (Hedberg 2006: 377). However, underlying this lack of consensus rather appears to be a methodological problem – that of unambiguously identifying notions of information packaging in natural data. In the present paper, I argue that this problem can, at least in part, be circumvented by a precise pragmatic analysis of the data. The Question-under-discussion approach proposed by Riester et al. (2018), places strict discourse-based constraints on the analysis of natural data and thus prevents the problem of finding operationalizable definitions of Topic and Focus in earlier accounts. Based on this methodological tool, the current paper aims to answer the following questions:

RQ1: Can a refined analysis of natural data using QUDs contribute to our understanding of the relationship between information packaging and prosody?

RQ2: What is the prosodic realisation of Topic, Focus, and Contrast?

RQ3: How can the interface between information packaging and prosody best be modelled in Functional Discourse Grammar?

These questions will be investigated by analysing 100 utterances taken from the British component of the International Corpus of English. The data are annotated both in Praat using the ToBI framework and in terms of information packaging following the QUD approach. In a final step, the individual analyses have been combined, showing a, to some extent more stable, correlation between prosody and notions such as Topic and Focus. The results of the empirical analyses are then presented within FDG.

References

Bolinger, Dwight L. 1965. *Forms of English: Accent, morpheme, order*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hedberg, Nancy. 2006. Topic-focus controversies. In Valéria Molnár & Susanne Winkler (eds.), *The architecture of focus*, 373–397. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hedberg, Nancy, & Juan M Sosa. 2007. The prosodic structure of topic and focus in spontaneous English Dialogue. In Chungmin Lee, Matthew Gordon, & Daniel Büring (eds.), *Topic and focus: Cross-linguistic perspectives on meaning and intonation*, 101–120. Dordrecht: Springer.

Riester, Arndt, Lisa Brunetti, & Kordula De Kuthy. 2018. Chapter 14: Annotation guidelines for Questions under Discussion and information structure. In Evangelia Adamou, Katharina Haude & Martine Vanhove (eds.), *Information Structure in Lesser-described Languages: studies in Prosody and Syntax,* 403–444. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Ozan Mustafa, *University of Graz*, Austria

The inferential construction: an FDG account

This paper deals with a type of focus construction that has received some modest attention over the last three decades, namely the so-called 'inferentials' as in (1). Inferentials consist of a matrix clause with *it + be +* a complement clause and may fulfil various discourse-pragmatic functions depending on the context, but typically express an explanation or reason for a preceding statement (e.g. Calude & Delahunty 2011). Declerck (1992) essentially considers inferentials to be semantically specificational and explains their usage in terms of an inferred variable and a corresponding value. In example (1), the speaker uses the inferentials to clarify what value (best) satisfies an inferred variable (e.g. a reason, cause, result, etc.).

(1) For a PI, lying is an important job skill. *It's not that I'm inherently dishonest; it's just that sometimes it pays to preserve wriggle room.* (COCA)

Based on data from the *Corpus of Contemporary American English* (COCA), the paper investigates the use of inferentials in English. Following Declerck (1992), it delimits inferentials to specificational utterances only (contra e.g. Calude & Delahunty 2011), and proposes different analyses for utterances like (2-5), despite their functional and formal parallels. The juxtaposition between these various constructions is essential in defining inferentials more precisely.

(2) It might be that some remaining supporters of the Archon helped it along. (COCA)
(3) It's just as if he's, like, trolling around for anything. (COCA)
(4) It's not like the suburbs are going to go away. (COCA)
(5) Not that I care. (COCA)

The paper addresses (i) what the form and functions of the English inferential construction are and (ii) how Functional Discourse Grammar (FDG) can help to account for the similarities and differences between the inferential construction and other constructions such as (2)-(5). In FDG, inferentials so far have been analyzed only at the Interpersonal Level with an emphasis operator and optionally a negation operator on the Communicated Content (Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2008: 106, 2018: 38). This paper proposes an alternative analysis with two (co-indexed) Propositional Contents in a specificational configuration, one of which representing an absent variable. With regard to negative inferentials, it is argued that the negation operator goes to the overall specificational configuration at the Representational Level (contra Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2018: 38), as the meaning of the negation can be explained in terms of rejecting a value for the inferred variable.

References
Calude, Andreea S. & Gerald P. Delahunty. 2011. Inferentials in spoken English. *Pragmatics* 21(3). 307-340.
Declerck, Renaat. 1992. The inferential it is that-construction and its congeners. *Lingua* 87. 203-230.
Hengeveld, Kees & J. Lachlan Mackenzie. 2008. *Functional Discourse Grammar: A typologically-based theory of language structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
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/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Hella Olbertz, *Universidade de Santiago de Compostela*, Spain
Marize M. Dall'Aglio Hattnher, *São Paulo State University* (São José do Rio Preto), Brazil

Frequentative and iterative constructions in Brazilian Portuguese

This paper concerns the periphrases formed with *ficar* 'stay', *viver* 'live' and *andar* 'walk' with the gerund of a lexical predicate as used in Brazilian Portuguese (BP); the first two periphrases have a frequentative meaning and the *andar*-construction is iterative. The description will be based on corpora, mainly on *Iboruna* (oral, ca. 768,000 words).

All three constructions occur in the present and past tenses. Whereas *ficar* and *andar* occur in both the perfective and imperfective past, the *viver*-construction allows for imperfective aspect only, a property which it shares with habitual *costumar,* without being habitual itself (Amaral 2013). In actual use, the meaning of the periphrases depends on the lexical aspect of the Situational Property: in (1a) the meaning of *ficar* is frequentative but in (1b) it is durative:

(1)   a. *eles fica[m] fazendo pergun:ta[s]*
         they stay.3PL do.GER questions
         'they keep asking questions' (Iboruna 3, masc, 8, F1)
      b. *[ele] fica esperando na porta do banco*
         he stays.3SG wait.GER at door of.the bank
         '[he] keeps waiting in front of the bank' (Iboruna 58, fem, 35, F1)

The aim of this presentation is to present preliminary semantic descriptions of these constructions and test them on the basis of their interaction with periphrastic expressions of other temporal, aspectual and modal distinctions, thus assessing their semantics in terms of FDG (Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2008). The following examples illustrate the different ways in which the periphrases interact with *ter que* 'have to' + infinitive:

(2)   *minha mãe teve que ficar pasando pomada*
    my mother had.PFV.3SG to stay.INF smear.GER ointment
    'my mother had to keep smearing ointment [on a scar]' (Iboruna 37, masc, 15, F2)

(3)   *Tite anda tendo que dar desculpa[s] pra tudo*
    Tite walk.3SG have.GER to give.INF excuses for everything
    'Tite keeps having to make excuses for everything' (CdP NOW, Blog, 2013)

(4)   *eu vivia tendo que descolorir o cabelo duas vezes*
    I lived.IPFV.1SG have.GER to bleach.INF the hair two times
    'I keep having to bleach my hair twice' (CdP NOW, Blog, 2012)

As the modal periphrasis precedes *ficar* but follows *andar* and *viver,* we hypothesize that the *ficar*-construction operates at a lower layer of the Representational Level than the others.

References

Amaral, Patricia. 2013. How to live and keep dying. In Chad Howe, Sarah E. Blackman & Margaret Lubbers Quesada (eds.), *Selected Proceedings of the 15th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium,* 269-280. Sommerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
Hengeveld, Kees & J. Lachlan Mackenzie. 2008. *Functional Discourse Grammar: A typologically-based theory of language structure.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pedro Henrique Truzzi de Oliveira, *São Paulo State University* (São José do Rio Preto), Brazil

The Grammatical Component and the Contextual Component: an analysis of Brazilian Portuguese phoric locatives

The present work aims to analyze the interaction between the Grammatical Component and the Contextual Component in Functional Discourse Grammar (Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2008) by looking at the functioning of phoric locatives in Brazilian Portuguese. According to Mackenzie's (2017) consideration, FDG not only accounts for objectivity, at the Representational Level, and subjectivity, at the Interpersonal Level but also for intersubjectivity, noticed in the relation between the Interpersonal and Representational levels and their respective strata in the Contextual Component (cf. Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2014).

Connolly (2007) postulated context types, the two main being the situational context and discursive context. Discursive context manages the information which was previously uttered by the interactants, also called cotextual information. It can be either narrow by alluding to previous sentences in the same text, or broad, by alluding to sentences which were indeed produced, but on other texts somehow mentioned in the present interaction. On the other hand, situational context manages the information obtained directly from the communicative event. It can also be distinguished into narrow, concerning the physical situation where both participants are, or broad, when it concerns highly inferable information.

Later, Hengeveld & Mackenzie (2014) postulate the existence of four strata in the Contextual Component, each stratum correlated with each level of the Grammatical Component. In their assumption, the interpersonal context should only modify interpersonal formulation and so on, allowing, as well, for the use of the same notation from the Grammatical Component in the representation of contextual information, as we can see below.

(1) **a Pernambucanas($\underline{x}_i$)** *dá_ do_tamanho do shopping($\underline{x}_j$) nem tinha*
the Pernambucanas has_ the_size of.the shopping.mall NEG there.was
*shopping($\underline{x}_j$) aqui em Rio Preto naquela época que eu fui **lá($\underline{x}_j$)***
shopping.mall here in Rio Preto in.that time that I went there
The Pernambucanas has the (same) size of the shopping mall, there wasn't a shopping mall here in Rio Preto that time that I went there (to Pernambucanas)

The analysis allowed us to distinguish four types of phoric locatives to show different usages in the context of a discourse production: cotextual anaphorics, cotextual cataphorics, narrow situational anaphorics and broad situational anaphoric. We look forward to verifying, too, to what extent contextually available information is motivated by intersubjective agreement of Speaker and Addressee, allowing us to account for intersubjectivity in FDG.

References

Connolly, John H. 2007. Context in Functional Discourse Grammar. *Alfa* 51. 11-32.

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

Hengeveld, Kees. & J. Lachlan Mackenzie. 2014. Grammar and context in Functional Discourse Grammar. *Pragmatics* 24. 203-227.

Mackenzie, J. Lachlan. 2017. Objetividade, subjetividade e intersubjetividade na perspectiva da Gramática Discursivo-Funcional. In Mariangela Rios de Oliveira & Maria Maura Cezario (eds.), *Funcionalismo linguístico - diálogos e vertentes*, 47-66. Niterói: Eduff.

Carolina da Costa Pedro, *São Paulo State University* (São José do Rio Preto), Brazil

Structures with *sino* in European Spanish: an FDG approach

The aim of this paper is to account for the pragmatic and semantic structure of the different uses of the adversative coordinating conjunction *sino* in Spanish from the perspective of Functional Discourse Grammar (Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2008) with data from Corpus del Español del Siglo XXI (CORPES). This conjunction can be used only in negative contexts, where the entity following *sino* replaces the negated entity:

(1) **No** *se* *trata* *de* *un* *deporte* *de* *masas* **sino** *de* *élites*
NEG SE.IMPERS be.about of INDEF sport of masses but of elites
'It's not about a sport of the masses but of elites.'

The following representation shows Contrast as a pragmatic function at the Interpersonal Level (IL) and the negation, as well as the combination of coordination and positive polarity expressed by *sino* at the Representational Level (RL):

(2) IL: $(V_1)_{Foc}$ $(V_2)_{Foc\text{-}Contr}$
RL: $(neg\ v_1) \land (pos\ v_2)$

There is a further context of use of *sino* in (1). The correlative construction *no solo...sino también* 'not only ... but also' as in (3):

(3) **no solo** *era* *elegante* *en* *el* *porte*
NEG only COP.PST.3SG elegant in DET bearing
sino también *en* *las* *maneras*
but also in det manners
'he was not only elegant in his bearing but also in his manners, words and gestures.'

The second part presents additional information. The addition of a second negation in both parts yields the correlative *no solo no...sino tampoco* 'not only not ... but also not'. Consider the following example:

(4) **no solo no** *le* *gustaba* *que* *fuese* *organizada,*
NEG only NEG 3.SG like.PST COMP COP.PST.SBJV organize.PTCP
sino tampoco *que* *hablase* *alto*
but neither COMP speak.PST.SBJV loud
'he not only didn't like that I am organized, but he also didn't like that I have a loud voice [...]'

At the RL, it is necessary to add a negation operator to both the first and the second element and an emphatic operator at the IL is required. In my paper, I will account of the scopal differences illustrated in the examples above, in order to arrive at more specific analyses.

References
CORPES Real Academia Española. *Corpus del Español del Siglo XXI*. https://www.rae.es/banco-de-datos/corpes-xxi
Hengeveld, Kees & J. Lachlan Mackenzie. 2008. *Functional Discourse Grammar: A typologically-based theory of language structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Edson Rosa, *São Paulo State University* (São José do Rio Preto), Brazil

Frustrativity in indigenous languages of South America: an FDG analysis proposal

The aim of this paper is to present, from the perspective of Functional Discourse Grammar (Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2008), a typological analysis proposal of the frustrativity phenomenon in a sample of 30 indigenous languages of South America.

Although frustrativity occurs in several languages (Overall 2017; Campbell & Grondona 2012, Aikhenvald 2012), its definition as a linguistic category is not entirely clear in linguistic studies. Definitions of frustrative often overlap with other linguistic concepts and categories, such as aspect, concessivity, conditionality, contrastivity, and epistemic modality, making it challenging to understand its real behavior and its semantic classification in languages.

Considering that frustrative involves the breaking of expectations of an expected result within the scope of a completed action (Overall 2017), a sentence like "He almost arrived" may be defined as a frustrative aspect referring to an unrealized action in the past, whereas the sentence "He didn't plant (and had a crop)", on the other hand, involves the breaking of expectations, but, in this case, it occurs due to unexpected events, not action incompletion.

Our hypothesis is that the different frustrative uses reflect the differences in scope that make up the layers and levels of grammar. Table 1 illustrates our proposal for the classification of frustrativity values regarding the semantic and pragmatic levels of FDG.

Layer	Aspect	Frustrative
Lexical property	Ingressive aspect	
Configurational property	Prospective aspect	
State-of-affairs	Frustrative aspect	Volitional frustrative
Episode		Temporal frustrative
Propositional content		Epistemic frustrative
Communicated content		Reporting frustrative
Illocution		Illocutionary frustrative
Discourse act		Evaluative frustrative

Tab. 1. Correlation between aspect and frustration in the FDG representational layers

In summary, the data shows that frustrativity proper always involves an unfulfilled expectation in relation to a completed action, whereas frustrative aspectuality involves only the interruption of a process. Frustrative has semantic and pragmatic uses. Evidence supporting this proposal comes from Giomi (2023), who distinguishes: semantic frustrative and pragmatic frustrative. This demonstrates that several uses, classified as equivalent or merely epistemic and evaluative (Overall 2017), are in fact different and belong to distinct Representational layers.

References

Aikhenvald, Alexandra. Y. 2012. *The languages of the Amazon*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Campbell, Lyle & Verónica Grondona. 2012. *The indigenous languages of South America*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
Giomi, Riccardo. 2023. *A Functional Discourse Grammar Theory of Grammaticalization*: *Formal changes*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
Hengeveld, Kees & J. Lachlan Mackenzie. 2008. *Functional Discourse Grammar: A typologically-based theory of language structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Overall, Simon. 2017. A typology of frustrative marking in Amazonian languages. In Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald & Robert M. W. Dixon. *The Cambridge Handbook of Linguistic Typology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pablo Rosário, *São Paulo State University* (São José do Rio Preto), Brazil

Modality in the layered approach of the clause: the uses of *(ser) capaz de/que*

Assuming, according to Functional Discourse Grammar (Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2008), that grammatical categories as tense, aspect, modality and evidentiality are organized in terms of hierarchical layers, this research proposes an analysis of the construction *(ser) capaz de/que* [(be) capable of] in Brazilian Portuguese, seeking to characterize the variability of modal values expressed by this structure. To illustrate the construction, consider the following occurrences from *Corpus of Portuguese* (https://www.corpusdoportugues.org/):

(1) a. *Até   agora   você não **foi   capaz   de***
     So   far   you neg COP.PRS.3SG capable of
     desenvolver um   argumento   convincente.
     develop.INF INDF   argument   convincing
     'So far you haven't been able to develop a convincing argument.'

   b. ***É   capaz   que   os   dois amanheçam***
     COP.PRS.3SG capable   COMP   DET two   dawn.SBJV.NONPST.3SG
     estatelados   na   Paulista.
     sprawled.M.PL in.DET.F   Paulista
     'It's possible that the two of them will dawn sprawled on Paulista *Avenue'*

   c. ***Capaz   que,   se   a   Cecilia falasse,   algo***
     capable   COMP   if   DET Cecilia say.SBJV.PST something
     a   mulher   ainda diria   que   não
     DET woman   yet   say.COND COMP   NEG
     'It is likely that, if Cecilia said something, the woman would still say no'

As occurrences show, the adjectival modal construction *(ser) capaz de/que* can convey different modal domains. In (1a) the construction denotes ability and expresses facultative modality. In (1b-c) the construction expresses epistemic modality and, in this case, is related to possibility/probability. As can be observed, this construction encodes, in Portuguese, different modal categories of different representational layers, just like its cognate in Spanish (Grández-Ávila, 2010). It is also possible to observe that semantic differences correlate to different formal configurations at the Morphosyntactic Level: when the construction modal expresses the facultative modality as in (1a), it embeds subordinate Clauses with Verbal Phrases formed by non-finite verbs, and, when expresses epistemic modality (as in 1b-c), it embeds subordinate Clauses with verbal phrases formed by finite verbs. This correlation between semantics and form is expressed by the increase in complexity of the clausal complement of the construction, which may or may not have absolute tense encoded, depending on the layer involved in it.

References

Grández Ávila, Magaly. 2010. *A functional approach to the subjectification of facultative meaning: The case of capaz in American Spanish*. Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam MA thesis.

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

Monielly Serafim & Roberto Gomes Camacho, *São Paulo State University* (São José do Rio Preto), Brazil

Identifiability, specificity and their encoding: the case of proper names

In FDG, proper names are understood as the lexical head of the Subact of Reference, and they are marked by the [+id] operator to capture the fact that they are inherently identifiable, and, in certain languages, this operator is encoded by a definite article (Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2008: 117). The idea that proper names are inherently identifiable (or definite) is present in many different works in a variety of approaches; however, some linguists question this position, defending that proper names are neither definite nor indefinite (see Anderson 2003, 2004, 2007), because in some languages vocatives or names in naming constructions (e.g., *He is called John*) are never used with definite articles, while proper names in argument position are always accompanied by an article (e.g., Greek).

Typologically, languages differ greatly in how they encode proper names, but definiteness marking of proper names can also vary within a language, which calls out Anderson's hypothesis. In Brazilian Portuguese, for instance, one may choose to use the article or to omit it in the exact same linguistic and situational context (2):

(2) a. O   João chegou.
         DEF.SG João arrived
         'João arrived'.

     b. João chegou.
        João arrived.
        'João arrived'.

Many researchers claim that there is no functional motivation for the use/absence of the article in (2). This actually supports the hypothesis that names are inherently definite, as the Speaker's choice to use the article or to leave it out does not play a role in constructing an identifiable referent; i.e., identifiability is present regardless of its encoding.

This type of variation regarding the morphosyntactic encoding of proper names is also present in other Romance languages, such as Italian and Spanish, and it is attributed to different factors, such as familiarity, anaphoricity, etc. Because there is no comprehensive study of proper names and definiteness in Romance (at least not to our knowledge), the aim of this paper is to answer the following question: is there a functional trigger for morphosyntactic marking in Romance Languages? By answering this general question, we hope to find grounds to answer two more FDG-specific questions: i) are proper names inherently identifiable/specific?; ii) if proper names are indeed inherently identifiable/specific, should the operator [+id, +s] be indicated at the Interpersonal Level even when there is no marker at the Morphosyntactic Level?

References

Anderson, John. 2003. On the structure of names. *Folia Linguistica* 37. 347–398.
Anderson, John. 2004. On the grammatical status of names. *Language* 80. 435–474.
Anderson, John. 2007. *The grammar of names*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Hengeveld, Kees & J. Lachlan Mackenzie. 2008. *Functional Discourse Grammar: A typologically-based theory of language structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Vítor Silva, *São Paulo State University* (São José do Rio Preto), Brazil

A Sixth Subtype of Evidentiality? Reconsidering Non-Witnessed Markers in FDG

Non-witnessed evidentials indicate that the speaker did not perceive, through one of the senses, a State of Affairs taking place. They differ from deduction, inference, reportativity, and quotation in not being restricted to (some kind of) inferred or reported information but rather presenting a general meaning of lack of sensory perception.

Hengeveld & Mackenzie (2008) and Hengeveld & Hattnher (2015) group non-witnessed evidentials with markers of sensory acquired information into the same subtype of evidentiality, called 'event perception', which operates at the layer of the State of Affairs. According to Hengeveld and Hattnher (2015), sensory perception shows restrictions of Relative Tense and it is limited to contexts of Simultaneity between the moment when a State of Affairs takes place and the time when the speaker learns it. However, in this work, I will argue that non-witnessed evidentiality is better understood as an operator at the layer of the Episode and as an evidential subtype on its own, independent of sensory evidentials. Examples like (1) and (2) motivate this claim since they show that non-witnessed evidentials actually are *not* restricted to contexts of Simultaneity:

(1)   Paraguayan Guaraní (Pancheva & Zubizarreta 2019: 17)
       *o-vá-**ta**=**ra'e***
       3SG-move-**POST**=**NWIT**
       'He is going to move.' [non-witnessed]

(2)   Mapuche (Smeets 2008: 254)
       *füta-nge-**wye-rke**-y-Ø*
       husband-VBLZ-**ANT-NWIT**-IND-3
       'She had been married.' [non-witnessed]

In these examples, the speaker did not perceive the State of Affairs taking place and used =*ra'e* and -*rke*, respectively, to mark the lack of sensory perception. In (1), the event is posterior (indicated by -*ta*) to the moment when the information was learned; and in (2), anterior (marked by -*wye*) to it. In (2), since relative tense and evidentiality are expressed by the same morphological strategy —by suffixes — their relative order in the Verbal Phrase can be taken as a mirror of their semantic scope. Then, we can say that the non-witnessed evidential -*rke* has scope over the anterior tense marker -*wye* because the former occupies a more peripheral position than the latter. Therefore, data like (1) and (2) suggest that 'event perception' should be split into two subtypes: *sensory evidentiality*, restricted to Simultaneity and operating at the layer of the State of Affairs; and *non-witnessed evidentiality*, having Relative Tense under its scope and thus operating at the layer of the Episode

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 Hattnher. 2015. Four types of evidentiality in the native languages of Brazil. *Linguistics* 53 (3). 479-524.
Pancheva, Roumyana & Maria Luisa Zubizarreta. 2019. On the role of person features in the evidential-temporal connection. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics/Revue canadienne de linguistique* 64(4). 673-708.
Smeets, Ineke. *A grammar of Mapuche*. Vol. 41, Walter de Gruyter, 2008.

Nathalia Pereira de Souza-Martins, *São Paulo State University* (São José do Rio Preto), Brazil

The ordering of post-head modifiers and arguments of relational nouns in Brazilian Portuguese

This paper aims to describe the internal ordering of Nps headed by relational nouns that have at least two expressed arguments, as in (1), or one argument and one modifier, as in (2), in the post-head zone in Brazilian Portuguese.

(1) *a   entrada de   pessoas na   universidade particular (Iboruna database)*
    DEF entry   of   people in.DEF university   private
    'the entry of people into the private university'

(2) *o   filho mais velho   do   gerente (Iboruna database)*
    DEF son   more old   of.DEF manager
    'the manager's eldest son'

We propose the following research questions: 1) in the presence of two (or more) arguments or an argument and a modifier of a relational noun in the post-head zone, what position does each of them tend to occupy in relation to the head noun? 2) is it the semantic nature of the arguments (in terms of semantic functions) and/or of the modifiers that most often defines their positions? 3) can pragmatic and morphosyntactic factors play a role in determining or influencing the order of the arguments and the modifiers? In order to answer these questions, we adopt Hengeveld & Mackenzie's (2008) Functional Discourse Grammar (henceforth FDG) as the main theoretical support for this study.

Our first hypothesis is that the arguments with an agent function (*Actor*, in FDG) are placed closer to the head noun followed by the arguments with a patient function (*Undergoer*, in FDG) and those, by the arguments with a locative function (*Locative*, in FDG). This ordering preference is also reflected in the stages of linearization, so that arguments with an Actor function are assigned positions first, followed by arguments with an Undergoer and Locative functions (Hengeveld & Keizer, in preparation). Our second hypothesis predicts that arguments precede modifiers, based on the fact that, if the former make up a semantic unit with the head (a Configurational Property, in FDG), then they are more intrinsically related to it and iconically should occupy the morphosyntactic position closest to the head.

As preliminary results, we make two points. Firstly, in the presence of two arguments, the order Actor + Undergoer/Locative is the most frequent in Brazilian Portuguese. In terms of linearization, the head (the predicate) and its arguments tend to remain in the medial field. Secondly, in the presence of an argument and a modifier, the order modifier + argument is the most frequent, a result that contradicts our initial hypothesis. This is due to the fact that arguments generally display a more complex morphosyntactic structure, so in the ordering of Nps with an argument and a modifier the morphosyntactic motivation seems to prevail in terms of frequency. Regarding linearization, head, modifier and argument stay in the medial field.

References
Hengeveld, Kees & Evelien Keizer. General principles of linearization in Functional Discourse Grammar. In preparation.
Hengeveld, Kees & J. Lachlan Mackenzie. 2008. *Functional Discourse Grammar: A typologically-based theory of language structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Juan Prete Tojeira-Ramos, *São Paulo State University* (Araraquara), Brazil
Lisângela A. Guiraldelli, *Ituverava Educational Foundation*, Brazil

The phonological coding of the finite predicative subordinate construction in Portuguese

The purpose of this study is to investigate, from the theoretical perspective of Functional Discourse Grammar (FDG) (Hengeveld & Mackenzie, 2008), the phonological coding of the finite predicative subordinate construction in Portuguese.

These constructions are morphosyntactically made up of a Noun Phrase Subject, a Verbal Word in copula form, and a finite predicative subordinate Clause. Semantically, these structures are characterized by having an *identificational predication frame*, formed by "two arguments designating the same entity" (Keizer 2015: 305).

This work is justified because there is no analysis of the phonological characterization of this type of structure in the current literature, since the work focuses on the functional and morphosyntactic aspects of these constructions (see, for example, Rodrigues 2001; Souza & Guiraldelli 2016). To this end, the research universe is made up of real occurrences of usage taken from the corpus of the *Spoken Portuguese: Geographical and Social Varieties* Project. For an acoustic treatment of the data, Praat software was used.

It was observed, in line with the work of Souza & Guiraldelli (2016), that the construction under investigation is formulated by the Speaker as a Contentive Communicative Discourse Act. Based on the analyses carried out during the course of this study, it was found that the finite predicative subordinate construction is ultimately phonologically encoded as an Intonational Phrase, which, in hierarchical terms, is part of an Utterance. In this linguistic phenomenon, there is an alignment between the Interpersonal Level and Phonological Level, since the construction formulated pragmatically as a Discourse Act is encoded phonologically as an Intonational Phrase.

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. Oxford University Press.

Rodrigues, Angélica Terezinha Carmo. 2001. A prototipicidade das orações predicativas. *Scripta* 5(9). 197-202.

Souza, Cibele Naidhig de & Lisângela A. Guiraldelli. 2016. A oração predicativa. In Erotilde Goreti Pezatti (ed.), *Construções subordinadas na lusofonia: uma abordagem discursivo-funcional*, 75-92. São Paulo: Editora Unesp.

Sybil Vachaudez, *Institut Jean Nicod/Ecole Normale Supérieure/CNRS* (Paris), France

An FDG analysis of reflexive constructions in NGT (Sign Language of the Netherlands)

Reflexivity displays substantial cross-linguistic variation, having been studied from a variety of linguistic frameworks, for the most part applied to spoken languages (e.g., Chomsky 1981, Faltz 2016/1977). Giomi (2021) proposes an FDG typology based on semantic and pragmatic properties: I) two-place reflexives featuring a two-place frame with two overtly expressed arguments and the relevant participant being encoded twice; II) one-place reflexives featuring a one-place frame where the relevant participant is encoded once and the predicate acts as intransitive; and III) a hybrid type combining an intransitive-like predicate and the linguistic encoding of two arguments.

While research on reflexive constructions in sign languages (SLs) is limited (cf. Lillo-Martin (1995), Kimmelman (2009), and Kayabaşı & Abner (2022)), the distinct use of visual space for referencing and verbal agreement in SLs presents unique opportunities for linguistic analysis. This study presents the first corpus-based study of reflexivity in NGT and the first study of reflexivity in a SL from an FDG perspective based on data extracted from Corpus NGT.

Seven reflexive constructions were identified for NGT in this study, including two previously undocumented ones, in bold: i) ZELF constructions with a pronominal sign, *ii) ZELF constructions without a pronominal sign,* iii) constructions with a reflexivized agreeing verb, iv) constructions with a reflexivized agreeing verb and a pronominal sign, v) EIGEN constructions, vi) constructions with a pronominal sign and vii) constructions with object omission. I argue that the first five constitute specialized reflexive constructions. Furthermore, I show that FDG can successfully account for reflexivity in a SL and that NGT possesses all three types of reflexive constructions proposed by the model: two-place reflexives, one-place reflexives, and mixed reflexives. The findings underscore the richness and complexity of SLs, contributing to the valorization of these languages and to broader discussions on language variation and typology.

References

Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on government and binding*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.

Faltz, Leonard M. 2016/1977. *Reflexivization: A Study in Universal Syntax*. London: Routledge.

Giomi, Riccardo. 2021. A Functional Discourse Grammar typology of reflexives, with some notes on reciprocals. In Lucía Contreras-García & Daniel García Velasco (eds.), *Interfaces in Functional Discourse Grammar: Theory and Applications*, 175-228. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Kayabaşı, Demet & Natasha Abner. 2022. On the Reflexive KENDİ in Turkish Sign Language. *Frontiers in Psychology* 13, 1-17.

Kimmelman, Vadim. 2009. *Reflexive pronouns in Russian Sign Language and Sign Language of the Netherlands*. Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam MA thesis.

Lillo-Martin, Diane. 1995. The point of view predicate in American sign language. In Karen Emmorey & Judy S. Reilly (eds.), *Language, Gesture and Space*, 155-170. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Elnora ten Wolde, *University of Graz*, Austria

Distinguishing between purpose and result adverbials in FDG: a case of *so* and *so that*

The English subordinators *so* and *so that* mark both purpose (1) and result (2), making this distinction fundamental. Previous research has proposed a number of criteria for distinguishing between the two: For purpose, i) the subordinate clause denotes the main clause agent's intended result, ii) the event in the subordinate clause is not yet realized and frequently marked with a modal verb, and iii) the subordinate clause can be fronted, clefted and negated. In contrast, result subordinate clauses i) are the unintentional result of the event in the main clause, ii) denote completed events, and iii) cannot be fronted, clefted or negated (e.g. Verstraete 2007).

(1) *He promptly ordered loudspeakers mounted in certain sections of the ball park **so that** fans could go there...*(purpose)[1]
(2) *He touched his cheek in confusion, **so that** dabs of wet clay rubbed off...*(result)

A larger corpus study shows that in the case of *so* and *so that*, the distinction between result and purpose is far from clear-cut (Kaltenböck & ten Wolde 2022). In (3), the speaker presents a SoA in the main clause and the purpose of this SoA in the secondary clause. There is no potential intender, so this must be speaker purpose, not main clause agent. A second issue is imperatives. They encode speaker (not agent) intention by definition, but in the case of (4), the subordinate clause states the purpose of the imperative. Finally, although modal verbs are discussed in relation to purpose clauses, they are used relatively frequently in result clauses (5).

(3) *School climate and working conditions **need to be** optimum **so that** pupils may learn and achieve.*
(4) ***Take** a cooking class **so that** you can learn to prepare food the way that you like it…*
(5) *Inventories are high, **so** buyers **should** get a good deal.*

The aim of this paper is to explore this fuzzy boundary between purpose and result exhibited in the corpus data and propose a heuristic for operationalizing the distinction. More specifically, it addresses the questions:

1) How would FDG capture the distinction between purpose and result? Does the theory allow us to draw a line between these functions in the ambiguous cases?
2) Can FDG explain how the semantics and pragmatics of the subordinate clause restricts (or licenses) the syntactic features of these sentences (e.g. restrictions on modality)?

FDG with its different levels, interlocking layers and clearly defined variables offers a tool to account for the different syntactic features; it should be able to 'unravel' the fuzziness.

References

Kaltenböck, Gunther & Elnora ten Wolde. 2022. Just so story: On the recent emergence of the purpose subordinator *just so*. *English Language and Linguistics* 26(4). 889-915.
Verstraete, Jean-Christophe. 2007. *Rethinking the Coordinate-Subordinate Dichotomy: Interpersonal Grammar and the Analysis of Adverbial Clauses in English*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

---

[1] All examples are from the Corpus of Historical American English (COHA) unless specified otherwise.

Elnora ten Wolde, *University of Graz*, Austria
Evelien Keizer, *University of Vienna*, Austria

Classifier constructions in English, German and Dutch: Compounds vs. Head-classifier constructions

Classifying constructions, such as *fire arms* or *a man of faith*, serve the purpose of specifying the type of entity denoted, whereby the classifying noun (phrase) functions as a conceptual restriction of the property, not the referent set (cf. Gunkel & Zifonun 2009: 209). In this paper we will compare the use of compounds (*fire arms*) and constructions with a post-modifier (head-classifier constructions or HCCs; *man of faith*) in three languages: English, German and Dutch. What is interesting about these constructions in English is that, despite the difference in form, they can often be used without a clearly discernible difference in meaning. Nevertheless, data from the BYU-BNC Corpus show that there often is a clear preference for one of the two constructions: *stone wall* (309)/*wall of stone* (4); *date of birth* (138)/*birth date* (9); *prisoner of war* (194) / *war prisoner* (4). Corpus data from German and Dutch, on the other hand, show that these languages have a clear preference for compounding in all these cases.

In a paper on English classifier constructions (Keizer & ten Wolde 2024), we argued that there are sufficient functional and formal differences between HCCs and compounds (in terms of the relation between head and modifier, the type of classifier noun, and the modifiability of the classifying noun) to conclude that we are dealing with two separate constructions, each with its own FDG analysis. These analyses, however, did not account for the different subtypes of HCC constructions (intrinsic (e.g. *wall of stone*), taxonomic (e.g. *beast of burden*) and head-qualifier (e.g. *man of substance*)); as such, not all HCCs completely conform to the analysis proposed.

Using corpus data from corpora of contemporary English, German and Dutch, the present study will explore the differences between the various classifier constructions in these languages, addressing the following questions:

1) What alternations are available in the three languages, which preferences can be observed?
2) Is there a correlation between the choice of construction (in any of the three languages) and the type of relation between the two nouns?
3) When an alternation is possible, what determines the choice for a particular form (pragmatic, semantic or processing factors; genre; degree of conventionalization)?

Finally, FDG analyses will be proposed that capture any of the differences and correlations observed in those cases where systematic function-form relations can be found in one or more of the languages investigated.

References

Keizer, Evelien & Elnora Ten Wolde (to appear 2024). English head-classifier constructions. In Elise Mignot et al. (eds), *Nouns and the Morphosyntax/Semantics Interface*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gunkel, Lutz & Gisela Zifonun. 2009. Classifying modifiers in common names. *Word Structure* 2(2). 205-218.