

Contemporary Russian possesses a periphrastic – morphological construction alternation – the *po-Dative* Construction and the Genitive Construction. Although the Russian Genitive is highly polyssemous, the alternation is possible only when a noun phrase refers to such notions as names of institutions, projects, campaigns, devices, publishing materials, documents, and jobs.

- (1) *učebnik russkogo jazyka*
book SG.NOM Russian SG.GEN language SG.GEN

- (2) *učebnik po russkomu jazyku*
book SG.NOM PREP Russian SG.DAT language SG.DAT

The fact that this alternation occurs in only a restricted semantic range has led to assumptions that the preposition *po* functions as a means of differentiating the wide semantic range associated with the Genitive Construction (Glovinskaja 2000: 243). Contrary to this, the construction with the preposition *po* has been defined as a means of expressing a general meaning of relatedness (Svedova 1966: 40). Moreover, the construction with *po* has become so widely used that some researchers regard this phenomenon as expanding in usage at the expense of the morphological alternate (Glovinskaja 2000: 240).

Within the theoretical framework of Construction Grammar (Lakoff 1987; Goldberg 1995), this study tests these proposals empirically using quantitative corpus-driven techniques. Specifically, the study employs a multifactorial usage-feature approach which has been developed within Cognitive Linguistics and Construction Grammar in order to capture subtle semantic and sociolinguistic variation in usage (Tummers et al. 2005; Gries 2006; Grondelaers et al. 2007; Glyn & Speelman 2009; Speelman et al. 2009; Glyn & Fischer 2010; Divjak 2010; Glyn & Robinson in press). The results build on Dmitrieva (2005) who examines the question of the spread of the periphrastic construction diachronically.

The study examines 600 occurrences, taken from the Russian National Corpus and from online personal diaries. The examples are analysed for a range syntactic, semantic and socio-discourse features. The results of the feature analysis are subjected to exploratory and confirmatory statistical techniques. Multiple Correspondence Analysis is used to identify patterns in the usage features. The interaction of the different dimensions of language use will reveal how the two different constructions are used. Once patterns of usage are established, logistic Regression Analysis will be employed to confirm usage differences. This statistical technique models the data and uses the analysis to predict the outcome as either *po-Dative* or Genitive. If the model can predict when one construction can be used over another, then the analysis has proven the difference in use between them. The results of these empirical techniques will be interpreted using the analytical framework of Construction Grammar and compared with the existing hypotheses as to the motivation behind the alternation.

References

Divjak, D. (2010). *Structuring the Lexicon: A Clustered Model for Near-synonymy*. Berlin: Mouton.
Dmitrieva, E. (2005). Ob eksiansii v russkom jazyke konstyktcii c predlogom *po*. *Scando-Slavica* 51: 49 - 60.
Glovinskaja, M. J. (2000). Aktivnye processy v grammatike. In *Russkij jazyk konca XX Stoletija* (1985-1995) (V. L. Voronova, M. J. Glovinskaja, J. I. Golanova et al., eds.), Moscow: Jazyki russkoj kultury.
Glyn, D. & Fischer, K. (eds). (2010). *Quantitative Cognitive Semantics. Corpus-driven approaches*. Berlin: Mouton.
Glyn, D. & Robinson, J. (eds). (in press). *Polysemy and Synonymy. Corpus methods and applications in Cognitive Linguistics*. Amsterdam: Benjamins
Glyn, D. (2009). Polysemy, syntax, and variation. A usage-based method for Cognitive Semantics. In *New Directions in Cognitive Linguistics*, (V. Evans, S. Pourcel, eds.), Amsterdam: Benjamins, 77-106.
Gries, St. Th. (2006). Corpus-based methods and Cognitive Semantics: The many senses of *to run*. In *Corpora in Cognitive Linguistics. Corpus-based approaches to syntax and lexis* (St. Th. Gries, A. Stefanowitsch, eds.), Berlin: Mouton, 57-99
Grondelaers, D. et al. (2007). A case for cognitive corpus linguistics. In *Methods in Cognitive Linguistics* (M. Gonzalez-Marquez et al., eds.), Amsterdam: Benjamins, 149-170.
Speelman, D., Tummers, J. & Geeraerts, D. (2009). Lexical patterning in a construction grammar: The effect of lexical co-occurrence patterns on the inflectional variation in Dutch attributive adjectives. *Constructions and Frames* 1:1, 87-118.
Svedova, N. Ju. (1966). *Aktivnye Processy v Sovremennom Russkom Sintaksise*. Moscow: Prosvescschenie.
Tummers, J., Heylen, K. & Geeraerts, D. (2005). Usage-based approaches in Cognitive Linguistics: A technical state of the art. *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory* 1: 225-261.

The Russian po-Dative – Genitive Alternation. A case study in corpus-driven Construction Grammar

Glyn, Dylan & Dmitrieva, Elena
(Lund University, Helsinki University)

Pronouns as indicators of modality shift: the 'perplexive' construction in Turkish

Göksel, Aslı & Kabak, Baris
(Bogaziçi University, University of Konstanz)

We investigate a hitherto unanalysed type of construction in informal registers of Turkish which we name the 'perplexive' construction. This construction type is used when narrating a past event, brought about by a third person protagonist, that has left the narrator in perplexity, surprise and disbelief. This construction does not have any special morphosyntactic features expressing this function and is string identical to the imperative construction:

- (1) Sen Ayşe-ye sormadan ver eski eşyalar-ı.
you Ayşe-dat without-asking give-away old furniture-acc
(i) 'Give away the old furniture without asking Ayşe.' [imperative]
(ii) 'Guess what!.../she gave away the old furniture without asking Ayşe.' [perplexive]

In (ii), despite the fact that the subject (sen 'you') is marked for the second person singular, it denotes a third person in the narrative discourse. Furthermore, although the verb (ver 'give') is structurally in the imperative mood it unambiguously conveys a past tense reading. Taking the basic insight in Eng (1986) who claims that an overt pronoun encodes (center of) topic shift in Turkish, a pro-drop language, we extend the function of the subject pronoun to cover a more generalised shift: (a) from second to third person, and (b) from the irrealis to the realis mood as the reference point of the narrated event lies unambiguously in the past. We thus claim that the locus of the perspective shift associated with the perplexive is partly encoded in the pronoun (1i), whereas the function of the same pronoun is to indicate a shift in the center of topic in imperatives (1ii).
Drawing on parallelisms with the conditional and narrative uses of imperatives in other languages (e.g., Fortuin 2003; Fortuin & Boogaart frth.), we will show that the imperative, morphosyntactically the least marked construction in Turkish, signifies an impulse, but is otherwise underspecified. The usage of an overt pronoun on the other hand, here encodes an instruction to the hearer to act upon the utterance purely as an attestant, rather than interpret the pronoun as the agent of the action denoted by the verb (see Göksel et al. 2009 for other forms of speaker-to-hearer directives in Turkish).
We thus (i) extend the function of pronouns to areas other than those described in the literature and (ii) argue that the pronoun and the (underspecified) imperative form compositionally encode the perplexity of the speaker thus forcing the hearer to become an unsuspecting witness in a past event and to empathise with him/her.

References

Fortuin, E. (2000). *Polysemy or monosemy: Interpretation of the imperative and dative-infinitive construction in Russian*. Doctoral Dissertation, LLC, Amsterdam University. Amsterdam: LLC Dissertation Series.
Fortuin, E. & Boogaart R. (forthcoming). Imperatives as conditional: From constructional to compositional semantics. *Cognitive Linguistics*.
Eng, M. (1986). Topic switching and pronominal subjects in Turkish. In *Studies in Turkish Linguistics* (D. I. Slobin, K. Zimmer, eds.), John Benjamins.
Göksel, A., Kabak, B. & Revithiadou A. (2009). Prosodic basis of non-local doubling. Ms.
González Meilón, Eva & Hanegreets Hilde
(Leissius University College - University of Leuven)
The present study focuses on the politeness side effects (and pragmatic functions) of the discourse markers *mira* 'look' and *a ver* 'let's see' in contexts characterized by a high degree of argumentation, where language is used as a vehicle to pursue certain communicative goals. Since *ver* 'to see' and *mira* 'to look' have been shown to conceptualize the scene of vision from different perspectives (objective vs. subjective point of view) —each giving rise to different paths of grammaticalization and semantic extensions (Hanegreets 2008; González Meilón & Hanegreets 2010)—, we would like to examine whether and to what extent their conceptual differences are still manifest at a highly grammaticalized discourse level. In addition, the obvious morphological difference between both forms (*mira*-IMPERATIVE vs. (*vamos*) *a ver*-1PL+INF) made us wonder whether dissimilarities in pragmatic functioning would concomitantly result in divergent politeness effects, in terms of more or less face threatening (Brown & Levinson 1987).

Politeness and discourse markers: a case study of Spanish *mira* (look) and *a ver* (let's see)

Our aim is to study the politeness strategies entailed in the use of *mirar* and *a ver* taking into consideration aspects such as: a) discourse context, b) person reference (T/V-distribution), c) terms of address, d) request strategies etc. To that end, we observe *mirar* and *a ver* in a twofold spoken corpus, consisting of *tertulia* (informal gatherings) and debates. This choice is justified by the fact that in these kind of argumentative exchanges speakers tend to portray their opinions and ideas in a more or less face threatening way with the purpose of imposing their view on a specific subject.

Whereas *mirar* conceptualizes the speaker-hearer relationship from a divergent starting point, *a ver* tends to focus more easily on the possibility of a convergent end point in the discussion. A thorough corpus analysis gives answer to how these conceptual differences can be related to different communicative contexts and how they can be connected to the politeness theory formulated by Brown & Levinson (1987).

References

Brown, P. & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cuenca, M. J. & Marín, M. J. (2000). Verbos de percepción gramaticalizados como conectores, análisis contrastivo español-catalán. In *Revista Española de Lingüística Aplicada* (R. Maldonado, ed.), Logroño: Mugar Linotype, 215-237.

González Melón E. & Hanegreefs, H. (2010). Usos discursivos de los verbos de percepción visual ver y mirar. Paper presented at the XXXIX Simposio Internacional de la Sociedad Española de Lingüística, Santiago de Compostela, 1-4/2/2010.

Hanegreefs, H. (2008). Los verbos de percepción visual. Un análisis de corpus en un marco cognitivo. Doctoral dissertation, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven.

Hopper, P. & Traugott, E. C. (2003). *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lamiray, B. & Swiggers, P. (1992). Patterns of Mobilization: A Study of Interaction Signals in Romance. In *Conceptualizations and Mental Processing in Language* (R. Geiger, B. Rudzka-Ostyn, eds.), Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 649-678.

Martín Zorrquino, M. A. & Portolés Lázaro, J. (1999). Los marcadores del discurso. In *Gramática Descriptiva de la Lengua Española* Vol. 3 (I. Bosque, V. Demonte, eds.), Madrid: Espasa, 4051-4213.

Pons Borderia, S. (1998). Los apelativos oye y mira o los límites de la conexión. In *Marcadores discursivos: teoría y práctica* (M. A. Martín Zorrquino, E. Montolio, eds.), Madrid: Arco, 213-228.

Interpretación y sintaxis de la recomplementación

González-I-Planas, Francesc
(University of Girona)

La recomplementación consiste en la anteposición de uno o varios componentes sintácticos de una oración complementiva, de modo que quedan insertados entre la partícula subordinadora *que*₁ y una segunda partícula *que*₂, aparentemente superflua, a la que llamaremos recomplementadora.

Esta construcción era muy habitual en las lenguas románicas medievales y actualmente pervive en los registros coloquiales del portugués, el gallego, el castellano y el catalán, así como en varias variedades románicas minorizadas de transmisión oral (e.g. occitano, normando, valón).

A pesar de la existencia de estudios previos (e.g. Mascarenhas 2007 para el portugués; Uriagereka 1995 para el gallego; Demonte & Fernández-Soriano 2007 y 2009 para el castellano; Wanner 1998; Paoli 2003; Vincent 2007 para los romances medievales), en éstos no se determina qué motiva la presencia de un segundo complementante. Por este motivo, proponemos un modelo de derivación sintáctica de las oraciones recomplementadas —basado en el modelo cartográfico de la Gramática Generativa (Rizzi 1997; Frascarelli 2007; Cinque & Rizzi 2010)— que parta del análisis interpretativo de estas construcciones.

En este sentido, el análisis de ejemplos contextualizados en un discurso nos ha permitido determinar cómo debe interpretarse la presencia de la partícula *que*₂ de modo que hemos llegado a la conclusión de que hay que distinguir entre dos tipos de oraciones recomplementadas: las oraciones recomplementadas de indicativo (cf. (1)) y las oraciones recomplementadas de subjuntivo (cf. (3)).

(1) Rosa me espetó muy indignada que₁ los informes, que₂ cómo que a Madrid cuándo hay que mandarlos.

“Cuándo va a ser?” —me dijo— “¡El lunes! Será que no lo sabía nadie, ¿no?” (De la Mota 1995)

(2) Contexto: A y B (= Rosa) hablan de unos informes que B ha encargado al departamento donde trabaja

A: A Madrid, ¿cuándo hay que mandarlos?

B: ¡¿Cómo que a Madrid cuándo hay que mandarlos?! ¿Cuándo va a ser? ¡El lunes! Será que no lo sabía nadie, ¿no?

En (1), la partícula *que*₂ delimita el discurso reproducido de los elementos oracionales que no aparecen en el discurso original de (2), pero que en la nueva situación comunicativa conviene reintroducir porque no son compartidos por el interlocutor.

(3) He dicho que₁ los invitados que₂ se sienten delante de la mesa.

(4) Los invitados, que₂ se sienten delante de la mesa.

En cambio, (3) contiene una oración imperativa en discurso indirecto, en la que aparece un elemento prominente en la periferia izquierda (un tópico), el cual queda insertado entre *que*₁ y *que*₂. Este tipo de oraciones recomplementadas difieren de (1) en que la partícula *que*₂ ya aparece en la oración imperativa del contexto original en el seno de una oración matriz, como se muestra en (4). Por lo tanto, en (3), *que*₂ es una partícula relacionada con el modo subjuntivo y la interpretación imperativa de la frase.

References

Cinque, G. & Rizzi, L. (2010). The cartography of syntactic structures. In *Oxford handbook of linguistic analysis* (B. Heine, H. Narrog, eds.). Oxford, New York: OUP, 51–65.

De la Mota Goritz, C. (1995). *La representación gramatical de la información nueva en el discurso*. Tesis doctoral. Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.

Demonte, V. & Fernández Soriano, O. (2007). La periferia izquierda oracional y los complementantes del español. In *Vernetzungen: Kognition, Bedeutung, (kontrastive) Pragmatik* (J. Cuartero, M. Emsel, eds.), Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 133–147.

Demonte, V. & Fernández Soriano, O. (2009). Force and finiteness in the Spanish complementizer system. *Probus* 21 (1): 23–49.

Frascarelli, M. (2007). Subjects, topics and the interpretation of referential pro. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 25 (4): 691–734.

Mascarenhas, S. (2007). Complementizer doubling in European Portuguese. Ms. Institute for Logic, Language and Computation, Amsterdam.

Paoli, S. (2003). *COMP and the left-periphery: Comparative evidence from Romance*. Tesis doctoral. University of Manchester.

Rizzi, L. (1997). The fine structure of the left periphery. In *Elements of grammar: Handbook in generative syntax* (L. Haegeman, ed.). Dordrecht: Kluwer, 281–337.

Uriagereka, J. (1995). An F position in Western Romance. In *Discourse configurational languages* (K. E. Kiss, ed.), New York, Oxford: OUP, 153–175.

Vincent, N. (2007). Il problema del doppio complementatore nei primi volgari d'Italia. Ms. The University of Manchester.

Wanner, D. (1998). Les subordonnées à double complémentateur en roman médiéval. In *Atti del XXI Congresso Internazionale di Linguistica e Filologia Romana / Centro di studi filologici e linguistici siciliani, Università di Palermo, 18–24 settembre 1995*, Vol. I: *Grammatica storica delle lingue romanze* (G. Ruffino, ed.), Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 421–433.

What snowclones reveal about actual language use in Spanish: a constructionist view

González García, Francisco
(University of Almería)

This paper explores the theoretical and descriptive implications of snowclones in present-day Spanish for constructionist approaches. A snowclone, as originally defined in Pullum (2004) for English, refers to “a multi-use, customizable, instantly recognizable, time-worn, quoted or misquoted phrase or sentence that can be used in an entirely open array of different variants”. Specifically, this term is used to capture the connection between a generic formula such as “gray is the new black” (a version of the schema “X is the new Y”) and new variants produced from it such as e.g. “comedy is the new rock ‘n’ roll”. Drawing on naturally-occurring data trawled from the web by means of systematic web searches, our investigation of snowclones in Spanish reveals that these are very often shaped out of well-known slogans in advertising, as in (1)-(4) below.