PRAGMATIC FRAMES, THE THETIC-CATEGORICAL DISTINCTION AND SPANISH CONSTITUENT ORDER

Elena MARTÍNEZ CARO[1]

- ABSTRACT : Spanish constituent ordering has been often characterised as the result of the interplay of discourse-pragmatic, semantic and syntactic factors. The purpose of this paper is to investigate constituent ordering in Spanish taking into account a series of pragmatic and semantic considerations as generally discussed in Functional (Discourse) Grammar. More particularly, constituent ordering in Spanish will be analysed from the perspective of the proposal made by Hannay (1991) on the modes of message management in the framework of Functional Grammar and the related distinction of thetic-categorical judgements, plus other areas in Functional Discourse Grammar such as the assignation of pragmatic functions and the establishment of special positions. The research for this study is based on the analysis of two sets of material of Peninsular Spanish, describing the language of adult educated native speakers.

- KEYWORDS: Peninsular Spanish; constituent order; pragmatic functions; special positions; thetic-categorical distinction.

1 Introduction

Functional Discourse Grammar (FDG) is a functional-typological approach to language which analyses the discourse act (considered as the basic unit of analysis) in terms of independent pragmatic, semantic, morphosyntactic, and phonological modules, which interact to produce the appropriate linguistic forms (HENGEVELD; MACKENZIE, 2006, p.668). These modules are understood as levels of linguistic organisation within the grammar and are called interpersonal, representational, morphosyntactic and phonological levels. A separate morphosyntactic level is thus postulated within the grammar in this model, although given "the functional orientation of FDG, the expectation is that often the ordering properties of languages can be explained in terms of the meaning and use of linguistic units" (HENGEVELD; MACKENZIE, 2006, p.675).

---

1 UCM – Universidad Complutense de Madrid – Departamento de Filología Inglesa I – Avda. Complutense, s/n – 28040 – Madrid – Spain. E.mail address: e.martinezcaro@filol.ucm.es

The purpose of this paper is to look at constituent ordering in Spanish taking into account considerations related to the interpersonal and morphosyntactic levels of linguistic organisation in FDG, and, to a lesser extent, the representational level. In fact, the issue of Spanish constituent ordering has been often characterised as the result of the interplay of discourse-pragmatic, semantic and syntactic factors (LÓPEZ GARCÍA, 1996, p.467). Specifically, the various syntactic configurations in Spanish will be analysed from the perspective of the modes of message management proposed by Hannay (1991) in the framework of Functional Grammar (FG) and the related distinction of thetic-categorical judgements, in addition to other areas in FDG such as the assignation of pragmatic functions and the establishment of special positions. With regard to this area of special positions, Butler (2003, p.174) notes that "much more work needs to be done in FG on the meanings carried by position" and that there is a need in this respect for a dissociation of position and function.

The research for this study is based on the analysis of two sets of material of Peninsular Spanish, describing the language of adult educated native speakers. These materials comprise ten surveys (or interviews) from the corpus *El habla de la ciudad de Madrid* (*The speech of the city of Madrid*, CCM), on the one hand, and a collection of examples taken from the book *Hablemos de la vida* (*Let's talk about life*, HV) based on a series of formal conversations between a Spanish journalist and a philosopher, on the other.[2]

The paper is organised as follows. Section 2 gives a brief overview of FDG considerations concerning the distinction and assignation of pragmatic functions, together with Hannay's proposal of five modes of message organisation, which can be seen as pragmatic frames relevant for formulation within the interpersonal level in FDG. Sections 3 and 4 look at the pragmatic meanings associated with elements which occur in initial and final clause positions, respectively. Section 5 examines Spanish structures which can be characterised either as all-new utterances, with a clausal focus, or as pragmatically neutral utterances with no pragmatic assignation onto any of their constituents. Finally, section 6 considers the distinction between thetic and categorical utterances and how this distinction can explain differences in sentence form in Spanish.

2 Pragmatic functions and pragmatic frames

The interpersonal level, within the grammatical component of FDG, accounts for the choice of strategies the speaker makes, more or less unconsciously, in

---

[2] The CCM texts are non-surreptitious and include 12 informants (7 men and 5 women) with ages ranging from 16 to 76 (cf. ESGUEVA; CANTARERO, 1981). The coding of the examples includes the page number and, in the CCM Corpus, the dialogue number (E stands for *encuesta,* 'interview' or 'dialogue').

order to achieve his/her communicative aims, with regard to "both the speaker's purposes and to the addressee's likely current state of mind" (HENGEVELD; MACKENZIE, 2006, p.671). Within this level of representation, pragmatic functions such as Topic[3] and Focus are assigned. Focus is understood as 'communicative salience' and is subdivided into three types according to the different factors responsible for this communicative salience:

> The speaker's strategic selection of new information (*New Focus*); the speaker's desire that the addressee should attend particularly to a Subact (*Emphatic Focus*); the speaker's desire to bring out the particular differences and similarities between two or more Communicate Contents (*Contrastive Focus*). (HENGEVELD; MACKENZIE, 2006, p.672-3, my italics, EMC)

Whereas every communicated content will necessarily have a focused subact, not all communicative contents will have a topic.[4] Little discussion can be found yet in the literature of FDG about subdivisions of the Topic function.

Following current practice in FG (see DIK, 1997a, b) and further work within FDG, I take the view that the Topic and Focus functions must be tied to the expression plane so that "only if regular formal evidence can be established for the presence of a pragmatic function is assignment possible" (ANSTEY; MACKENZIE, 2005, p.277).

FDG assumes a set of pragmatic frames relevant for formulation within the interpersonal level. Although these frames have not been developed in detail yet in the model, a possible way to formulate them is in terms of the modes of message management proposed for FG in Hannay (1991) (see also HANNAY; MARTÍNEZ CARO, Forthcoming.). Hannay's proposal implies that underlying the speaker's choice of pragmatic functions and the constituent ordering is the speaker's decision to organise the message according to a specific mode of message management. Hannay (1991) distinguishes five message modes which he calls the all-new mode, the topic mode, the reaction mode, the neutral mode and the presentative mode. I shall come back to each of these modes in the following sections.

In the recognition of his message strategies, Hannay (1991) takes as starting point the syntactic variation in the first constituent of the English clause. In this

---

[3] Following common practice in FG, initial capitals are used when reference is made specifically to F(D)G pragmatic functions and lower-case letters for general reference to the relevant concepts.

[4] As the other levels of linguistic organisation, the interpersonal level is conceived of as a hierarchical structure whose highest layer is the Move, which consists of one or more Acts, which in turn may contain several Communicated Contents, and they in turn may contain multiple Subacts. It is interesting to note about Acts that there is a default correlation between these and clauses. Finally, the Communicated Content is defined as "everything that the speaker wishes to evoke in his or her communication with the addressee" (HENGEVELD; MACKENZIE, 2006, p.672).

paper I look at both initial and final clause positions in Spanish, since both of these can typically house special pragmatic functions. There appears to be a need to consider the clause-final position with the same degree of detail as the clause-initial position. Butler (2003, p.179), along the same lines, comments on the relative lack of work in FG on "what happens at and after the ends of clauses".

3 Pragmatic meanings associated with the initial position in Spanish

The initial position is closely associated in Spanish, as in other languages, with the Topic function. Spanish shows restrictions on the placing of focal information in P_1, and in particular on permitting that the focal information may coincide with the subject phrase (cf. LAMBRECHT, 1987a, p.223 for a discussion of the same restriction in French).[5] In highly marked contexts we may indeed find focus-initial constructions but in these the focus does not normally represent a brand-new or unused entity; rather, it denotes information that can be inferred or somehow related to the framework of the present discussion, and at the same time that the speaker wants to present as the *informational point* of the utterance. In addition to these less representative foci, other prominent elements which do occur more commonly in initial position are contrastive topics, as we shall see in the following section.

The topic initial position normally results in a configuration corresponding to Hannay's (1991) *topic mode*. This involves the selection of a topical element for special treatment as the Topic and providing the new focal information later in the clause.

3.1 Contrast and the topic mode

Particularly frequent in initial position are elements showing *contrast*. Both in the standard model of FG and in FDG, the parameter of contrast is related to the parameter of focality, by the distinction of one subtype of Focus called Contrastive Focus (cf. DIK, 1997a; HENGEVELD; MACKENZIE, 2006, p.672-673). However, although contrastive elements do involve some sort of salience (and thus can be viewed as one type of Focus), it could be similarly argued that the contrast is *also* associated with the Topic function, as the contrasted elements are in fact referents exhibiting high topicality (cf. LAMBRECHT, 1987a), their referent being typically maintained in the subsequent discourse. This partial overlapping between the notions of focality and topicality, and its implications

---

[5] This is in consonance with a strong tendency to place the main sentence stress in final position, even in contexts of final non-lexical elements (cf. MARTÍNEZ CARO, 1999).

for the recognition of a notion of emphasis, has been the object of study in the FG literature (cf. e.g. HANNAY, 1983; MACKENZIE; KEIZER, 1991; MARTÍNEZ CARO, 1999, p.79-81).

For my purposes in this paper, I will consider the contrastive elements in P_1 in Spanish seen in this section as *Contrastive Topics* for their clearly topical character and the fact that they are placed in P_1, the obvious topic position in this language. The utterances in which they appear are seen as typical exponents of Hannay's *topic mode*, with the focus information associated with (some element of) the rest of the clause, normally in final position. However, as will be seen below, the analysis of the data also suggests that the notion of contrast can indeed be seen to conflate with focality, and, in those cases, it would be more appropriate to refer to Contrastive Focus (cf. section 4.2 below).

Depending on whether the initial element in the utterance, i.e. the topic, is the subject or the object, the resulting order will be SV(O) or (O)VS. Initial objects functioning as topics trigger subject inversion especially in contexts where the postverbal subject is focalised, the verb acting as a kind of pivot or 'fulcrum' between the two arguments and guaranteeing a certain balance in the clause.

Following Dik's requirement that the assignation of pragmatic functions in a language has to be necessarily associated with some clear formal treatment, the data suggest that Spanish exhibits very clear evidence that these contrastive elements are singled out by formal properties. First of all, their initial position in P_1 is already a clear indication of this special treatment, especially with elements such as objects, predicates or adverbials that do not occupy this position in a less pragmatically-conditioned order. In addition to this, one important requirement of non-subject arguments fronted in initial position appears to be that their status as non-subject constituents has to be made explicit (cf. LÓPEZ GARCÍA, 1996, p.477). In the case of objects, their object status is often clearly marked by the presence of the preposition *a* marking the dative case with animate objects or the use of clitics in a later position of the clause, referring back to these initial NPs (cf. 1a). This is however not an absolute requirement of fronted objects showing contrast in Spanish, as can be seen in (1b):

(1)   a.   B: el único punto que yo veo positivo es que los chiquillos empiecen a hablar francés desde que son..., desde que tienen cuatro años.

A: ¿Y español?

B: Español también,	*además*	***español***	*lo*	*hablan*	*en su casa*,
	besides	Spanish	it:ACCUS	speak:3PL	at their home

(CCM: E18, 317)[6]

---

6   Note that the relevant utterance in the examples is marked in italics and the constituent receiving the assignation of pragmatic function in bold type.

'B:The only thing that I find positive is that kids start speaking French from the moment they are…, from the moment they are four years old.

A: And Spanish?

B: Spanish too, besides Spanish is spoken at home/Spanish they speak at home'

b. [El ingenio es una habilidad brillante, muy atractiva, pero muy tramposa.

'Wit is a brilliant, very attractive ability, but very deceitful as well.']

Lo mismo	*pienso*	*yo.* (HV: 22)
The same	think	I

'*I* think the same'

In (1a), the context is a French school in Madrid where the informant works. In this context the language used in the school (French) is contrasted with the language the school children use at home (Spanish). This is a contrast based on a double opposition. In (1b), on the contrary, we have a comparison in the sense of a parallelism (MARTÍNEZ CARO, 1998b, p.233) where *lo mismo* ('the same') directly links up with an idea mentioned in the previous stretch of discourse and in this way is used by the speaker to express agreement.[7]

Apart from prepositional and adverbial phrases (both as adjuncts or prepositional complements of the verb) which are also frequently brought to initial position for contrast, subjects can also be used as contrasting referents. To distinguish these from other, ordinary, subjects which are pragmatically neutral, spoken Spanish needs to single out these subjects with the use of special strategies. Particularly with lexical phrases, this involves separating them from the rest of the clause by some filler or discourse marker such as *pues* (roughly, 'well') or raising them to a main clause from an embedded one in the same sentence, as in (2) (cf. DOWNING, 1997; MARTÍNEZ CARO, 1998b):

(2) A: ¿Cómo es el aeropuerto de Moscú, así...? (...) ¿Hay un aeropuerto sólo o hay varios?

B: Pues no lo sé. No sé... V... pues he visto mejores que el de Moscú, o sea... el,

el de Madrid	*no*	*creo*	*que,*	*que*
the-one in Madrid	NEG	think:1SG	that,	that

sea	*inferior*	*al*	*de Moscú,*	*ni mucho menos ¿no?*
is:SUBJ	inferior	to-the-one	in Moscow	

(CCM: E9, 162)

'A: What is Moscow Airport like...? (...) Is there only one airport or several?

B: Well, I don't know. I don't know... I mean, I have seen better ones than the one in Moscow, for instance... the one in Madrid, I don't think it is any worse than the one in Moscow, do you?'

---

7 Notice that I am considering the fronted objects that are referred back by a clitic pronoun such as the one in (1a) as integrated in the structure of the clause, and not dislocated in the sense that they belong to a different discourse act (cf. MARTÍNEZ CARO, 2006).

In the case of non-lexical subjects, the appearance of the subject pronoun (i.e. non-lexical subject) is sufficient indication of its topical character, since given (and thus pronominal) subjects are normally non-explicit in Spanish when the context or verb inflections prevent ambiguity:

(3) *Entonces,* *después de* *eso,* *me* *fui* *a* *casa,*
     Then,   after   that   PRON went:1SG   to   home,

     él *se* *marchó* *a* *la suya,* allí a llorar su último día de soltero y… y
     he   PRON left:3SG   to   his

     es, *bueno,* ***yo*** *me* *fui* *a* *la peluquería;* (CCM: E7, 111-12)
      well,   **I**   PRON went:1SG   to   the hairdresser's

     'And then, after that, I went home; *he* went to his, to enjoy his last day as a bachelor and… and, well, *I* went to the hairdresser's'

3.2 Signalling emphatic given topics in Spanish

A common construction in spoken Spanish is that which involves the fronting of a constituent (typically an object) denoting a referent topic introduced previously into the discourse, lending at the same time a certain degree of emphasis or prominence to this topic expression.[8] See the following examples:

(4) a. A: ¿Me puedes hablar de lo que piensas hacer en el futuro con tu carrera?
     'Can you tell me about your plans for the future with your degree?'
     B: ***Eso*** *actualmente* *no* *lo* *puedo, no* *lo* *puedo señalar.*
       that:N at_present NEG it:N can:1SGNEG it:N can:1SGsay:INF
     (CCM: E5, 87)
     'That I cannot, I cannot say at the moment'

   b. [A: ¿Me puedes hablar un poco de este Madrid que va creciendo tanto?
     'Can you tell me something about this city of Madrid which is growing so much?']
     B: Pues   ***este crecimiento en Madrid*** *yo* *le* *veo* *normal*
       Well   this growth in Madrid   I   it:ACCUS see.1SG normal
     ¿no?   (CCM: E5, 91)
     don't you think?
     'Well, this growth in Madrid, I see it as something natural, don't you think?'

In (4a), for example, the non-lexical topic expression *eso* ('that') represents textually given information, which in Spanish would typically be omitted (in the

_____
8 See the distinction between topic referent and topic expression in Lambrecht (1987a, p.222).

case of given subjects) or referred to anaphorically by means of a clitic pronoun (in the case of objects representing given information). Thus, in a context of no emphasis a typical answer to A's question in (4a) would simply be: *Actualmente no lo puedo señalar*. The presence of these topic expressions in first position is taken as indication that they receive some degree of emphasis or prominence on the part of the speaker, hence the term *emphatic given topics*[9] (cf. MARTÍNEZ CARO, 1998a; MARTÍNEZ CARO, 1999). Silva-Corvalán (1984, p.2) seems to take a similar view of these preverbal arguments, observing an interesting correlation between intonation and constituent ordering in Spanish: "[C]ertain [complements] are placed in preverbal position because, in this position, the intonation contour of the sentence allows the assignation of prominence to preverbal constituents that do not transmit new information." (my translation, EMC).[10]

The speaker's main motivation in presenting this topic referent in an emphatic way is, just as with the contrastive topics seen above, to make use of a *topic mode* of discourse organisation by which the topic, placed initially, is clearly distinguished from the focus or new information transmitted in the clause, towards the end of the clause. This progression from the given or known information (topic) to the new or unknown information (focus) contributes to the discourse coherence (cf. SILVA-CORVALÁN, 1984, p.6), the preverbal argument functioning as a textual link with preceding discourse. It is, for this reason, a very frequent pattern, which can be represented in the following way:

(5)   TOP - FOC
                |
        EMPTOP - FOC[11]

3.3 The focus marking function and the reaction mode

As has been suggested for spoken French (LAMBRECHT, 1987a, p.223), but unlike English, a principle governing Spanish constituent order is that which states that a preverbal (especially lexical) subject can virtually never be associated with the Focus function. Although exceptional in statistically-frequency terms, there do exist focus-initial constructions but in these the focus is almost never a subject. When these focus-initial constructions occur, governed by what Givón (1988) calls the 'principle of task urgency', they are almost always associated

---

[9] See the discussion of similar examples in English and Dutch in Hannay (1983, p.220).

[10] "[C]iertos [complementos] son colocados en posición preverbal porque, en esta posición, el contorno entonacional de la oración permite asignar prominencia a constituyentes preverbales que no comunican información nueva." (SILVA-CORVALÁN, 1984, p.2)

[11] This representation follows Daneš' (1974) pattern of simple linear thematic progression.

with the variety of spontaneous spoken Spanish (see SIEWIERSKA, 1998, p.260). This can be best represented by Hannay's *reaction mode*, whereby the speaker decides to present the focal information at the very beginning of the clause, in P_1, and place the topical information at a later position or, alternatively, choose not to mention it at all.

As stated above, the data suggest that these initial elements with a focus status do not normally denote a brand-new or unused entity, but are rather related to information which can be inferred by taking into consideration the framework of the present discussion in the actual discourse, and which, at the same time, the speaker wants to present as the *informational point* of his/her utterance. In the following example, the referent of the phrase *En Cercedilla* denotes a place in the mountains near Madrid which can be related (at least by someone knowledgeable of Madrid and its outskirts) to the discourse topic being talked about at the moment of speaking:

(6) [(About the place where the informant spent the summer in Spain, in the mountains near Madrid)

A: ¿En qué parte de la sierra?

A: 'Where exactly in the mountains?']

B: **En Cercedilla**   *hemos veraneado*   *cuarenta años.* (CCM: E15, 260-61)

   In Cercedilla   have.1PL spent-the-summer   forty years

'*In Cercedilla* we have spent our summer holidays for forty years.'

As mentioned by Hannay 1991, utterances falling within the reaction mode may contain some sort of given, or at least inferable, information, without the assignation of a Topic function at all. As indicated in the context of (6) (in square brackets), the verbal phrase *hemos veraneado* clearly refers to information that has been mentioned in the preceding discourse (in A's question *¿Y en el verano usted veraneaba, o...?*, 'And in the summer, did you go away, or…?'). In spite of this topical status, however, neither this nor the satellite *for forty years* can be assigned the Topic function since they are not terms.

4 Pragmatic meanings associated with the final position in Spanish

The final position in Spanish, which I see as a special P_0 position, is typically related to focus constituents and, in general, with information which is to be presented as the *informational point of the utterance* by the speaker. Because Spanish exhibits a relatively high degree of syntactic flexibility and its prosody is not generally exploited for indicating information structuring, the speaker may use different constructions for the final placement of focus elements. In this section

I shall be looking at the main pragmatic meanings associated with a number of these final-focus constructions.

4.1 Referent introduction and the presentative mode

Presentative utterances are special in that, on the one hand, they introduce a referent into the discourse, by assigning it a certain degree of prominence (or focus), and on the other, they can also be seen as all-new utterances reporting an event which is presented as a compact piece of information, each of its elements conveying new information. They can thus be seen as predicate focus (or narrow-focus) structures, on the one hand, and as sentence focus (or broad-focus) structures, on the other (cf. LAMBRECHT, 1987b; SIEWIERSKA, 1991, p.160-1; CRUTTENDEN, 1986, p.81). The predicate-focus interpretation is preferred here on the grounds that the introduced referent seems to be clearly singled out for prominence and its reference typically maintained in the subsequent discourse. The whole point of the presentative construction is to introduce the new referent in a prominent position. The act of predicating something about this referent is best carried out independently of this utterance in another act (LAMBRECHT, 1987a, p.254). This follows the requirement that each act should contain one piece of new information or focus.

The referent-introducing function is associated with semantically highly intransitive clauses containing verbs which generally state the existence (or absence) of entities and is typically seen to relate in Spanish to VS structures, as in (7). Looking into the matter in greater detail, in fact, the best syntactic configuration for the expression of this function in Spanish appears to be 'verb + (lexical) phrase, including generally not only bare VS structures, but also (X)VO and XVS structures. This last type of sequence presents an initial preverbal element which serves to set the scene or ties the introduction of the referent to some previous discourse (what HANNAY, 1991 calls 'Stager'), e.g. (8):

(7) *Existen*   ***tres mil***   ***especialidades matemáticas***. (HV: 95)
    exist:3PL   three thousand   specialisations mathematic
    'There exist three thousand   specialisations within mathematics.'

(8) *por eso*   *apareció*   ***el aburrimiento***. (HV, 25)
    for that-reason   appeared   the boredom
    'For that reason, boredom appeared.'

In spite of the possible connective function of this P_1 element, if there is one, referent-introducing constructions typically lack a topic element. These

utterances can easily be characterised as belonging to Hannay's presentative mode.

Apart from impersonal VO constructions with *haber* (lit. 'have', with the sense of 'there + to be'), VO with a referent-introducing function also includes clitic-verb-object sequences where the only lexical phrase is the final noun phrase, as in (9):

(9)   (about the wedding presents the informant has received)

me	*han*	*regalado*	*también*	**la cafetera**
me: DAT	have.3pl	given	too	the coffee-machine

de acero	*inoxidable,*	muy bonita, (CCM: E7, 120)
of steel	stainless	very pretty

'I was also given the coffee machine made of stainless steel, very pretty.'

A recurrent feature of the postverbal, typically lexical, phrase occurring in these referent-introduction utterances is that it denotes an inanimate entity with a non-agentive role and typically presented as a non-volitional, entirely unaffected participant. On the contrary, if a NP appears initially in these referent-introducing utterances (and in other related structures such as those containing perception verbs), this will typically denote an animate referent, usually human, with dative case coding and frequently representing a clitic pronoun, like in (9). The affectivity status is, however, maintained, as with the final new referent.

In Spanish, the subject is inverted without the need to fill the initial-position slot, as in English or Dutch for instance, since this language allows the verb to occupy the sentence initial position –like other Romance languages (with the notable exception of French). In verb-initial sentences, I take the view that the P_1 remains unfilled, as argued elsewhere (MARTÍNEZ CARO, 2006), (HANNAY; MARTÍNEZ CARO, Forthcoming.), on the grounds that the verb does not possess the pragmatic features typically associated with elements which are placed in this special pragmatic position (like topic or focus).

4.2 Signalling the focus in final position

As several authors have noted, Spanish has a strong preference for a distribution of information in which given (or topical) information typically precedes new (or focal) information (the *theme-rheme* order postulated long ago by Mathesius) (cf., among others, OCAMPO, 1995). A great number of utterances following this basic distribution of information in Spanish can be characterised as belonging to the topic mode. In these the initial element, placed in P_1, is assigned the Topic

function and the new information is found finally in the utterance. In some of these utterances the focus of information 'naturally' comes at the end, since this coincides with an element (or elements) whose unmarked position is the postverbal, and often, final one (like objects or satellites). In other cases, however, the speaker explicitly chooses to postpone an element to final position to create a focus effect on that element (cf. HANNAY; MARTÍNEZ CARO, Forthcoming). Such focus-marking constructions may present, in final position, a New Focus or a Contrastive Focus.

Patterns presenting a typical topic-focus distribution include examples (1a) and (1b) seen in section 3.1 above, where the final elements *en su casa* and *yo* are focalised, by marking the contrasting differences between them and other (explicit or implicit) discourse elements. These are OVS and OVX constructions where, as we saw, the object was brought to initial position to clearly assign it the Topic function.

Other utterances with an element with Focus function do not appear to have an obvious topic element but adopt a pattern which resembles, however, that in presentative or all-new utterances, in semantically intransitive clauses with a single lexical phrase with the Focus function. Examples of this type of utterance with a final New Focus (10) or Contrastive Focus (11) are the following:

(10) [(About the informant's children and their fondness for music)
     Pero, ¿toca alguno el piano?
     'But, does any of them play the piano?']
     *Está   estudiando   **la… la cuarta***. (CCM: E12, 210)
     is   studying   the… the fourth
     'My fourth child is studying (piano).'

(11) (About the wedding presents the informant has received)
     cuatro bandejas de plata que no te sirven para nada;
     *te   sirve   mucho   mejor   **el acero   inoxidable*** (CCM: E7, 119)
     you:DAT   does   much   better the steel   stainless
     'four silver trays which aren't useful at all, far more useful is stainless steel'

In (11) there is a clear contrast (in the sense of strict opposition) expressed by the speaker between 'silver' and 'stainless steel'.

5 Sentence focus structures and other related structures

A common feature shared by the structures dealt with in this section is that they lack the bi-partite division of most of the utterances seen in the previous two sections and their starting-point element (P_1) is not typically associated with the Topic function. Some authors characterise them as all-new utterances, where focus can be seen to affect the whole of the utterance; others regard them as 'pragmatically-neutral' utterances with no pragmatic assignation onto any of its constituents.

5.1 The contrary-to-expectation function

As seen above, one of the three subtypes of Focus distinguished in FDG is Contrastive Focus. In the standard model, Contrastive Focus was further subdivided into Parallel Focus and Counter-presuppositional Focus (cf. DIK, 1997a). The latter type involves a contrast between the speaker's and the addressee's pragmatic informations. In the case of confirmation, rather than contrast, between these pragmatic informations one could speak of *Confirmation Focus* (cf. MARTÍNEZ CARO, 1999, p.193ff; LÓPEZ GARCÍA, 1996, p.492).

In Spanish, there appears to be sufficient evidence for a distinction between the two subtypes of Contrastive Focus, in terms of formal treatment. Whereas Parallel Focus is predominantly associated with the placement of the contrastive element in the P_1 initial special position (cf. MARTÍNEZ CARO, 1999, p.112-113), the formal devices used to express a counter-presuppositional focus involve a wider range of strategies, by which the placement of the counter-presuppositional element in the P_0 final position combines with the use of the focus marker *sí*, special focus constructions such as pseudo-clefts and the use of syntactic parallelism (cf. MARTÍNEZ CARO, 1999, p.162, 168ff).

Interestingly, in a great number of utterances expressing counter-presuppositional contrast the scope of the focus is the whole predication (and would be thus characterised by Lambrecht (1987b) as 'sentence focus structures'), especially (but not exclusively) those whose formal treatment involves the use of *sí*. The same tendency, even to a greater extent, was found for utterances expressing Confirmation Focus (MARTÍNEZ CARO, 1999, p.193). López García (1996, p.493) relates sentence-focus utterances with the expression of information which is contrary to expectation, and predicate-focus utterances (in Lambrecht's (1987b) terms) with the expression of a simple contrasting function. However, as he says, the distinction between the two types of utterances is not always easy to establish.

The strong preference in Spanish for the topic-focus distribution can be also seen to apply even in these utterances expressing a counter-presuppositional contrast, involving a whole-predication focus. In a number of these, a common pattern was found with an initial topic element, sometimes separated from the rest of the clause, and thus clearly marking the topic-focus (in this case broad focus) sections in the predication. As an illustration see the following example:

(12) A: ¿Le gusta Francia?

B: Pues..., no me gusta demasiado.

A: ¿París tampoco?

B: Claro, hace muchos años que he estado, en realidad todo esto hace más de cincuenta años, porque luego ya me puse yo enferma y ya...

| *París* | *sí* | *lo* | *recuerdo* | *muy bien*, (CCM: E15, 249) |
| Paris | FOC | it:ACCUS | remember:1SG | very well |

'A: Do you like France?

B: Erm..., I don't like it very much.

A: Not even Paris?

B: Well, I was there a long time ago, in fact all this was more than fifty years ago, because after that I got ill and then... Paris I do remember (it) very well.'

In the preceding context to (12), A asks B what foreign countries she knows, to which A answers that she only knows France, partly because many years ago it was quite uncommon to go abroad. To this she adds (in 12) that she travelled to France about fifty years ago and for that reason she does not recall the places very well. In this context, the utterance containing the referring expression 'Paris' in initial position (marking it as topic) contrasts with this previous assumption.

5.2 The attitude-reporting function and the neutral mode

One common construction in Spanish with subject-verb inversion is that which involves an extraposed (typically clausal) subject in constructions reporting an attitude or stance, often "not overtly attributed to any person" (BIBER et al., 1999, p.661). These are attributive VXS constructions which lack the initial dummy element that is obligatory in languages such as English (dummy *it*) or Dutch (*het*):

(13) a. *Es verdad*   *que somos*   *seres contradictorios.* (HV: 78)

     Is true   that are.1PL   contradictory beings

     'It is true that we are contradictory beings.'

b. *Es curiosa*   *la relación con el tiempo.* (HV: 83)

     Is curious   the relation with time

     'The relation with time is curious.'

A large number of these constructions have a clausal subject which tends to be a much more complex element than the initial verb and complement. Following the principle of LIPOC (cf. DIK, 1997a, p.411), this clausal subject gets placed in final position. However, less complex NP subjects also tend to appear finally, as in (13b). The syntactic factor of end weight appears not to be the only motivation for the final position of the subject. Combinations of verb-object (rather than verb-predicate) sequences do also occur in Spanish with the same pragmatic function, where the (delexical) verb and the object show a special bonding which favours their positioning together (cf. TOMLIN 1986, p.73-101ff; LÓPEZ GARCÍA, 1996, p.458), as in *Da miedo la realidad* (lit. gives fear the reality, 'One is frightened by reality') (cf. HANNAY; MARTÍNEZ CARO, Forthcoming).

The motivation for this kind of construction seems to be for the speaker to announce that there is something that s/he has a certain attitude to and then saying what this is (HANNAY, 1991), hence the label 'attitude-reporting' for its function. Similar constructions in English (as *It was absolutely amazing to be there, (wasn't it?)*, cf. HANNAY, 1991, p.144) have been characterised by Hannay (1991) as *neutral mode* utterances. In these, the speaker decides not to make use of the P_1 position for pragmatic purposes, "and just builds up to the Focus", the main clause predicate mainly serving to introduce some kind of speaker attitude (HANNAY, 1991, p.147).

5.3 The event-reporting function

Utterances with this function comprise "reports of events, expressions of single, non-complex pieces of information where none of the discourse referents is imbued with pragmatic saliency" (SIEWIERSKA, 1991, p.161) or seen as utterances where all the information is thus equally salient (HANNAY, 1991, p.146). They have been referred to in the literature as 'neutral descriptions' (by Kuno, cf. SASSE, 1987), 'event-reporting utterances' (SASSE, 1987) or 'all-new predications' (DIK et al., 1981) and they enter into what Hannay calls *all-new mode*.

Depending on the number of referents participating in the event, event-reporting utterances are commonly expressed in Spanish by VS, clitic-VS or clitic-VSO patterns (cf. CASADO VELARDE, 1993, pp.27-28), thus closely associated with VS patterns. See for instance the following examples provided by Casado Velarde (1993, pp.27-28):

(14) a. *Se   ha   estropeado   el ordenador.*
   REF has broken_down the computer

   'The computer is not working.'

b. *Me   ha   dado   el profesor   una   buena   nota.*
   me:DAT   has   given   the teacher   a   good   mark
   'The teacher has given me a good mark.'

Some statements expressing background descriptions in which no referent is presented as participating in the event (such as weather expressions) are typically expressed as subject-less impersonal sentences in Spanish, with V or VO structures, e.g. *Llueve* ('it rains') or *Hace calor* ('it is (lit. 'does') hot').

The lack of Topic assignment in these cases is taken as an indication that the primary purpose of the speaker is not to present the referents but rather to establish the event in which the referents are involved (cf. BUTLER, 2003, p. 84; SIEWIERSKA, 1991, p.161).

5.4 Some related structures

Also typically lacking a Topic function and describing a compact event are related structures in Spanish with experiencer predicates, including those involving body parts. These are also frequently expressed by (clitic-)VS patterns where the clitic tends to denote the entity (usually a person) receiving the sensation and the subject is an affected entity. In spite of these obvious similarities, they are not easily characterised as event-reporting utterances, and are therefore treated here as a special group.

In this type of statement, the initial clitic pronoun with dative case marking indicates the animate entity receiving the sensation or inner state (the experiencer participant with predicates involving body parts) or the affectivity process.[12] See for instance (15) and (16), from Casado Velarde (1993, p.27):

(15) *Me   gusta   mucho   la idea de 'entrenamiento'.* (HV: 108)
     me:DAT   pleases   very_much   the idea of 'training'.
     'I like the idea of 'training' very much.'

(16) *Me   duelen   las muelas.*
     me:DAT   hurt: PRES:3PL   the teeth
     'My teeth hurt.'

---

[12] This can partly explain the common occurrence in Spanish of IO-V-DO structures (cf. GUTIÉRREZ, 1978, p.40; LÓPEZ GARCÍA, 1996, p.461).

6 Spanish constituent order and the thetic-categorical distinction

Thetic statements appear "at any point in a text where information is not given about someone or something, but about an entire state of affairs" (SASSE, 1987, p.535), presenting the state of affairs as a compact piece of information. Categorical statements, on the contrary, present states of affairs as analysable into different information units, selecting one of the participants in that state of affairs and predicating something about it (SASSE, 1987, p.558). As a defining rule, the defining criterion for thetic sentences is that they present information about situations rather than about entities (LAMBRECHT, 1987b, p.372).

Taking into consideration the pragmatic functions associated with the major types of Spanish constructions seen in sections 3-5 above and putting these in relation with the thetic-categorical distinction, we can observe a number of interesting correlations. In general terms, a *thetic judgement* appears to govern the referent-introducing function, the (so called) attitude-reporting function, the event-reporting function and (generally understood) the contrary-to-expectation function. A *categorical judgement*, on the other hand, generally governs the expression of contrast, utterances with Emphatic Given Topics and syntactic configurations where the speaker wishes to clearly mark the (New or Contrastive) Focus finally after having provided some topical information towards the beginning of the clause.

A correlation can similarly be established between the thetic-categorical distinction and Hannay's message modes. Whereas a *thetic judgement* is seen to capture the presentative, neutral and all-new modes, a *categorical judgement* is basically seen to relate to the topic mode.

There are, however, exceptions in this apparently neat picture. On the one hand, utterances involving a reaction mode, although definitely less important from a statistical point of view, seem difficult to assign to either thetic or categorical types of judgements. They commonly lack a topic element, but they are not easily classified as belonging to the presentative or all-new modes, and thus not to a thetic type of statement either. On the other hand, certain types of utterances seem to share features of both thetic and categorical statements. Thus, utterances with the function of signalling a focus in final position may enter into categorical or thetic types, as we saw in 4.2. And although utterances expressing a counter-presuppositional contrast have been generally classified as sentences with a broad, clausal, focus, in some cases, as we saw, an initial topic element seems to establish a bi-partite division in the sentence. They can be seen as involving a conflation between the topic and the all-new message modes. In the end, as suggested by Casado Velarde (1993), often the same proposition may be expressed thetically or categorically by the speaker, by

choosing to initiate his/her message with a topic and then proceed with the focus information or by presenting the state of affairs as a compact event involving no obvious parts.

Lambrecht (1987b, pp.370-71) identifies two types of *thetic* sentences, associated with two main types of context: (a) those related to sentences with an event-reporting function and others with an experiencer predicate, discussed in sections 5.3 and 5.4 above, and (b) those with a referent-introducing function in presentative constructions. Even though these two types appear to share the same form (in very general terms, VS patterns in Spanish), their discourse function is different:

> While the presentational sentences serve to introduce the NP referent into the discourse and to make it available for future reference, the referents introduced via the S[entence] F[ocus] structures [thus those discussed in 5.3 and 5.4 above] … may be pragmatically non-salient discourse participants which perhaps will never be mentioned again in subsequent discourse. (LAMBRECHT, 1987b, p.370-71. My clarifying comment, EMC)

These two types of thetic utterances are also distinguished by Hannay (1991), who appears to associate each of the two with the *presentative mode* and the *all-new mode*, respectively.

We now turn to the way the thetic-categorical distinction is actually realised in the linearization pattern of the Spanish clause, taking into account some semantic properties of the constituents involved. Thetic judgements are commonly expressed through intransitive clauses or in clauses which appear to have only one lexical NP and where the subject appears postverbally in the prominent final position.[13] These include clitic-verb-Subject sequences where the clitic is typically associated with an animate entity carrying the role of experiencer with verbs denoting sensations and the VXS sequences with the attitude-reporting function mentioned above (cf. 5.2). There seem to be restrictions, therefore, on the occurrence of non-subject NPs in these thetic VS structures (cf. SASSE, 1987, p.537).

That the postverbal position of the subject in presentative utterances is the most obvious reflection of the thetic interpretation associated with these sentences and the focal status of the final NP can be seen by the fact that, in this type of sentence, the speaker may choose to turn the utterance judgement into a categorical one, by merely placing the subject position in P_1, as in:

---

[13] The VO sequence in syntactically-impersonal sentences with *haber* ('have') such as *Hay un hombre en la puerta* ('There's a man at the door') is an exception in Spanish. Interestingly, speakers of some Peninsular dialects seem to treat this postverbal object as a subject, as can be seen by the use of a verbal plural form when the postverbal object is also plural, as evidence of subject-verb agreement:?*Habían dos hombres en la puerta* ('There were two men at the door').

(17) *Entraba*   *el coche,*   *había*   *unos ujieres,*

came_in:IMP:3SG   the car   there_was:IMP:3SG   some porters

que llamaban: «¡Señores de tal!»,   y   ***los señores***   *salían,*

           and   the Mr_and_Mrs   went_out:IMP:3PL

se subían al coche y salían rápidamente.   *Venía*   *otro coche,*

                                               came:IMP:3PL   another car

y llamaban: salían y «¡Señores de tal!», daban la vuelta y salían por el otro lado.

(CCM: E15, 257)

'The car came in, there were some concierges who called out: «Mr and Mrs such and such!», and those Mr and Mrs went out, got into the car and left quickly. Another car came and they called out: they went out and «Mr and Mrs such and such!», they turned round and left by the other side.'

In (17), where the speaker is describing her outings to the opera a long time ago, the two thetic utterances at the beginning of this extract serve to present compact events, part of which are entities (SASSE, 1987, p.559): *Entraba el coche*, *había unos ujieres*. The VS and VO structures in these two utterances, where the single entity involved is presented postverbally, contrast with the SV order chosen for *los señores salían*, which is no longer presented as thetic utterance but as a categorical one (i.e. as a topic mode), in which the entity involved, formally introduced in the previous utterance, is treated here as a topic and thus placed initially, in a preverbal position. Notice also the use of the definite article *los* indicating the definite character of the expression. Therefore, it is not merely the semantic nature of the verb which contributes to the thetic (or more specifically presentative) status of these sentences, but mainly, as Sasse (1987) notes, the discourse-pragmatic criteria associated with the referent introduced (in this case, the characterisation of *los señores* as a given topic) and the choice of the appropriate syntactic configuration.

Categorical judgements, in turn, tend to be expressed through more obvious transitive clauses with often more than one NP. Typical syntactic configurations are SVO and OVS, or even SVX. The OVS sequences comprise the grammaticalised construction with fronted objects placed in P_1 and referred to anaphorically by means of an unstressed pronominal form in the rest of the clause (cf. section 3.1). In sum, as noted by Lambrecht (1987a) for spoken French and by López García (1996) for Spanish, it appears that one of the criteria conditioning Spanish constituent order, and indeed the VS/SV alternative, is the relative number of lexical arguments of the verb.

Although VS can be used in categorical statements as we have seen, it is only generally in thetic statements that the VS with an intransitive verb and

with a single lexical phrase (representing an argument) is found. Considering Spanish a dominant SVO language[14] and one in which the SV(O) order generally signals the normal type of categorical expression, one finds VS thus ideally suited for expressing theticity "because it moves the subject away from a position where it is most naturally interpreted as the 'theme' (or 'topic') of the utterance" (SASSE, 1987, p.542).

Both the thetic and categorical type of utterances mentioned can generally be captured by the dominant functional pattern proposed elsewhere for Spanish: P_1 cVSOX $P_\emptyset$ (see MARTÍNEZ CARO, 2006; HANNAY; MARTÍNEZ CARO, Forthcoming).[15] A subgroup of categorical statements, those which present a preverbal element in P_1 and still keep the preverbal subject, like in (18), cannot be captured by the functional pattern presented above:

(18) *En la escuela,*   *los profesores*   *debemos intentar*   *que el alumno*   *sepa*
     in the school,   the teachers   must:1PL try:INF   that the student   knows:SBJV

     que va   *progresando*   (HV, 81)
     that goes   progressing

     'At school, teachers have to try and make the student know that s/he is making progress'

In order to cover these syntactic configurations, an alternative and supplementary pattern was proposed for Spanish: P_1 ScVOX $P_\emptyset$.

There does not seem to be a one-to-one relationship in Spanish between the type of statement in terms of the thetic/categorical distinction and the syntactic form of the construction. Thetic statements are generally expressed via a VS order in Spanish but not all VS constructions in this language are in fact instances of clear thetic statements. Likewise categorical statements are commonly expressed by SV(O) patterns in Spanish but other patterns like OV(S) do also occur (cf. HANNAY; MARTÍNEZ CARO, Forthcoming). The different pragmatic meanings expressed may result in different types of formal treatment, although, as Lambrecht (1987b, p.369) notes, the contrast between categorical and thetic judgements is not necessarily expressed in grammatical form.

7 Summary and conclusion

In this paper I have attempted to account for certain considerations belonging to the interpersonal and representational levels in FDG which condition Spanish

---

[14] See, for instance, Siewierska (1997, p.551); Delbecque (1991); Gutiérrez (1978).

[15] In this pattern, *c* stands for clitic and P Ø is understood as a final special pragmatic position with Focus function.

constituent ordering. Looking at the correlation between special positions in this language (the initial and the final positions) and the semantic-pragmatic status of the elements which can occur in them, the pragmatic functions which appear to mainly condition syntactic variation in Spanish are: the contrasting function, the signalling of emphatic topics, the focus marking function, the referent-introducing function and the contrary-to-expectation function. Two further functions with a thetic character are the attitude-reporting function and the event-reporting function, more pragmatically neutral.

Putting this in relation to Hannay's (1991) work on the modes of message management in the framework of Functional Grammar and the related distinction of thetic-categorical judgements, a *thetic judgement* appears to govern the referent introduction function, the (so called) attitude-reporting function, the event-reporting function and (generally understood) the contrary to expectation function. A *categorical judgement*, on the other hand, generally governs the expression of contrast, utterances with Emphatic Given Topics and syntactic configurations where the speaker wishes to clearly mark the (New or Contrastive) Focus finally, after having provided some topical information towards the beginning of the clause.

One of the purposes of this paper has been to contribute to the consideration that Spanish constituent ordering is characterised as the result of the interplay of discourse-pragmatic, semantic and syntactic factors. Inasmuch some of the considerations discussed in this paper touch upon aspects concerning the informative status of the terms and predicates in the linguistic expression (situational, contextual and interactional factors), they may seem to belong to the contextual component. However, given that the discourse-pragmatic functions considered here are directly responsible for formal aspects of the utterances in Spanish, I would propose that information concerning these functions and the type of judgement involved should be located, as much as possible, within the grammatical component of FDG itself. Hannay's modes of message management are seen as pragmatic frames relevant for formulation within the interpersonal level in FDG. Likewise, in a FDG of Spanish, the topical or focal status of subacts will be reflected in the encoding of these subacts at the morphosyntactic (and, presumably, phonological) levels. Pragmatic functions such as New Focus, Contrastive Focus or Emphatic Given Topic and Contrastive Topic need to be assigned at this interpersonal level. Finally, the templates relevant for the morphosyntactic encoding in this language would need to specify, in addition to slot positions for other elements, special positions such as P_1 and P_0 for elements which are pragmatically relevant for some of these pragmatic frames.

Acknowledgement

MARTÍNEZ CARO, E. Estruturas pragmáticas, distinção tético-categorial e a ordenação de constituintes no espanhol. *Alfa,* São Paulo, v.51, n.2, p.119-142, 2007.

■ RESUMO: A ordenação de constituintes no espanhol tem sido freqüentemente caracterizada como o resultado de um jogo entre fatores discursivo-pragmáticos, semânticos e sintáticos. O propósito deste trabalho é investigar a ordenação de constituintes no espanhol levando em conta uma série de considerações semânticas e pragmáticas discutidas na Gramática (Discursivo-)Funcional. Mais particularmente, a ordenação de constituintes em espanhol será analisada pela perspectiva da proposta feita por Hannay (1991) sobre as formas de gerenciamento da informação no arcabouço da Gramática Funcional e a distinção relacionada entre julgamentos téticos e categoriais, além de outras áreas da GDF, tais como a atribuição de função pragmática e o estabelecimento de posições especiais. A pesquisa para este estudo baseia-se na análise de duas amostras do espanhol peninsular, descritivas da linguagem de falantes nativos escolarizados adultos.

■ PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Espanhol peninsular; ordem de constituintes; funções pragmáticas; posições especiais; distinção tético-categorial.

References

ANSTEY, M. P.; MACKENZIE, J. L. (Ed.). *Crucial readings in Functional Grammar*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2005.

BIBER, D. et al. *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. London: Longman, 1999.

BUTLER, C.S. *Structure and function:* a guide to three major structural-functional theories. Part 2: From clause to discourse and beyond. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2003.

CASADO VELARDE, M. *Introducción a la gramática del texto en español*. Madrid: Arco Libros, 1993

CRUTTENDEN, A. *Intonation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

DANEŠ, F. Functional Sentence Perspective and the organisation of the text. In: _____. (Ed.). *Papers on functional sentence perspective*. Prague: Academia, 1974. p.106-28.

DELBECQUE, N. *Gramática española:* Enseñanza e investigación. Salamanca: Ediciones de la Universidad de Salamanca, 1991.

DIK, S.C. *The theory of Functional Grammar*. Part 1: The structure of the clause. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1997a.

_____. *The theory of Functional Grammar*. Part 2: Complex and derived structures. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1997b.

DIK, S.C. et al. On the typology of focus phenomena. In: HOEKSTRA, T. VAN DER HULST, H., MOORTGAT, M. (Ed.). *Perspectives on Functional Grammar*. Dordrecht: Foris, 1981.

DOWNING, A. Discourse pragmatic functions of the theme constituent in spoken European Spanish. In: CONNOLLY, J. H. et al. (Ed.). *Discourse and pragmatics in Functional Grammar*. Berli: Mouton de Gruyter, 1997. p. 137-161.

ESGUEVA, M., CANTARERO, M. (Ed.). *El habla de la ciudad de Madrid:* materiales para su estudio. Madrid: CSIC, 1981.

GIVÓN, T. The pragmatics of word order: predictability, importance and attention. In: HAMMOND, M., MORAVCSIK, E. A., WIRTH, J. R. (Ed.). *Studies in syntactic typology*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1988. p. 243-84.

GUTIÉRREZ, M.L. *Estructuras sintácticas del español actual*. Madrid: Sociedad General Española de Librería, 1978.

HANNAY, M. The focus function in Functional Grammar: questions of contrast and context. In: DIK, S.C. *Advances in Functional Grammar*. Dordrecht: Foris, 1983. p.207-223.

_____. Pragmatic function assignment and word order variation in a functional grammar of English. *Journal of Pragmatics,* v.16, p.131-55, 1991.

HANNAY, M.; MARTÍNEZ CARO, E. Last things first? A FDG approach to clause-final focus constituents in English and Spanish. In: GÓMEZ-GONZÁLEZ, M. Á., MACKENZIE, J. L., GONZÁLEZ-ÁLVAREZ, E. (Ed.). *Languages and cultures in contrast:* new directions in contrastive linguistics. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, Forthcoming.

HENGEVELD, K., MACKENZIE, J. L. Functional Discourse Grammar. In: BROWN, K. (Ed.). *Enciclopedia of language and linguistics*. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2006. v.4, p.668-676.

LAMBRECHT, K. On the status of SVO sentences in French discourse. In: TOMLIN, R. S. (Ed.). *Coherence and grounding in discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1987a. p.217-261.

_____. Sentence focus, information structure and the thetic-categorical distinction. In: ANNUAL MEETING OF THE BERKELEY LINGUISTICS SOCIETY, 13, 1987, Berkeley. *Proceedings…* Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society, 1987b. p.366-82.

LÓPEZ GARCÍA, A. *Gramática del español.* Madrid: Arco Libros, 1996. v.2, cap.21.

MACKENZIE, J. L.; KEIZER, M. E. On assigning pragmatic functions in English. *Pragmatics,* v.1, n.2, p.169-215, 1991.

MARTÍNEZ CARO, E. Adelantamiento de complementos argumentales en español: diferenciación pragmática. In: CIFUENTES HONRUBIA, J. L. (Ed.). *Estudios de lingüística cognitiva.* Alicante: Universidad de Alicante, 1998a. v.2, p.731-742.

_____. Parallel focus in English and Spanish: evidence from conversation. In HANNAY, M; BOLKESTEIN, M., (Ed.). *Functional Grammar and verbal interaction.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1998b. p.215-242.

_____. *Gramática del discurso:* foco y énfasis en inglés y en español. Barcelona: PPU, 1999.

_____. Constituent order in Spanish: a Functional Grammar perspective. In: CARRETERO, M. et al. (Ed.). *A pleasure of life in words:* a festchrift for Angela Downing. Madrid: Universidad Complutense, 2006. p.187-213.

OCAMPO, F. The word order of two-constituent constructions in spoken Spanish. In: DOWNING, P., NOONAN, M. (Ed.). *Word order in discourse.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1995. p.425-47.

SASSE, H.-J. The thetic/categorical distinction revisited. *Linguistics*, v.25, n.3, p.511-580, 1987.

SIEWIERSKA, A. *Functional Grammar.* London: Routledge, 1991.

_____. Variation in major constituent order: a global and a European perspective. In: _____. (Ed.). *Constituent order patterns in the languages of Europe.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1997. p.475-551.

_____. Polish main clause constituent order and FG pragmatic functions. In HANNAY, M., BOLKESTEIN, M. (Ed.). *Functional Grammar and verbal interaction.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1998. p.243-66.

SILVA-CORVALÁN, C. Topicalización y pragmática en español. *Revista Española de Lingüística*, v.14, n.1, p.1-19, 1984.

TOMLIN, R. S. *Basic Word Order:* functional principles. London: Croom Helm, 1986.