The focalizing copula in Colombian Spanish

Kees Hengeveld, Amsterdam Center for Language and Communication

Abstract: This paper discusses a construction in Colombian Spanish in which a form of the copula *ser* 'be' is used as a focus marker. After introducing the construction and its properties, and distinguishing it from the pseudo-cleft construction in Spanish, the question is raised to what extent the different uses of this construction corroborate the organization of the Communicated Content in Functional Discourse Grammar. It is shown that for every unit within the Communicated Content that is predicted to be focalizable, there is indeed a correspoding us of the focalizing copula construction in Colombian Spanish.

1 Introduction

In the variety of Spanish spoken in Colombia, as in other varieties of Caribbean Spanish, focalization of contituents is realized by means of a form of the copular verb *ser* 'be'. The constituent in focus is then the one following the copula. A few examples illustrate this phenomenon. The copula is shown in bold, and the constituent in focus is presented in capitals:[1]

(1) Nosotros compramos   **fue**   EMPANADAS.
     1.PL   buy-IND.PST.PF.1.PL   COP.IND.PST.PF.3.SG   empanada(F)-PL
     'We bought empanadas.' (obs.)

(2) Todos se   van   **es**   A   REÍR.
     all   REFL.3 go.IND.PRS.3.PL   COP.IND.PRS.3.SG   to   laugh.INF
     'They are all going to laugh.' (obs.)

(3) Antes   dec-ían   **era**   QUE YO   AND-ABA
     in.the.past say-IND.PST.IMPF.3.PL COP.IND.PST.IMPF.3.SG CNJ   1.SG   walk-IND.PST.IMPF.1.SG
     CUIDA-NDO   LA   CASA   DE   ELLA.
     taking.care.of-SIM.CV   DEF.F.SG house(F)   of   3.SG.F
     'They used to say that I was taking care of her house.' (Barr.)

The construction has been widely studied, for Colombia most extensively by Méndez Vallejo (2009). Several of the examples in this paper have been taken from this and other earlier work. The main aim of the current paper is, building upon this work, to present a detailed description of this construction within the framework of Functional Discourse Grammar, with a special focus on the units at the Interpersonal Level that can be targeted by this focus marker. Apart from the standard treatment of FDG in Hengeveld & Mackenzie (2008), proposals by Smit (2010) and Hengeveld, Keizer & Giomi (in prep.) regarding the Interpersonal Level will be taken into account in developing the description. But before addressing the issue of the possible targets of the

---

[1] The origin of the examples presented here is given following the free translation. Abbreviations used are *Barr.* (Preseea corpus Barranquilla), *Med* (Preseea corpus Medellín), *obs.* (personal observation), and *elic.* (elicited).

focalizing copula in terms of FDG in Section 4, a number of properties of the construction will be discussed in Section 2. It is furthermore important to distinguish the construction under consideration from the pseudo-cleft construction (Section 3). Conclusions are given in Section 5.

2. Properties of the construction

2.1. Introduction

In discussing the basic properties of the focalizing copula construction in Colombian Spanish, I will give an overview of the forms the focalized constituent may take (Section 2.2), the functions it may have (Section 2.3), the agreement features of the copula (Section 2.4), and the pragmatic function it expresses (Section 2.5).

2.2. Form of the focalized element

As the following examples show, the focalized element may be a noun phrase with a nominal (4) or pronominal (5) head, an Adpositional Phrase (6), an Adjective Phrase (7), an Adverb Phrase (8), a non-finite Verb Phrase (9), a finite Verb Phrase (10), a combination of a Verb Phrase with its complements (11), a non finite complement clause (12), a finite complement clause (13), a non-finite adverbial clause (14) or a finite adverbial clause (15).

(4) Vino **fue** TODA LA FAMILIA.
come.IND.PST.PF.3SG COP.IND.PST.PF.3SG all the family
'The entire family came.' (obs.)

(5) Sali-ó **fue** ÉL.
go.out-IND.PST.PF.3SG COP.IND.PST.PF.3SG 3SG
'HE went out.' (obs.)

(6) Se gobiern-a **es** CON EL EJEMPLO.
REFL govern-IND.PRS.3SG COP.IND.PRS.3SG with the example
'One governs by example.' (obs.)

(7) Ese hotel era **es** ELEGANTE.
DIST hotel be.IND.PST.IMPF.3SG COP.IND.PRS.3SG elegant
'That hotel was elegent.' (obs.)

(8) Ahí mismo reaccion-é **fue** ASÍ BRUSCAMENTE.
there self react-IND.PST.PF.1SG COP.IND.PST.PF.1.SG so abruptly
'At that same moment I reacted abruptly like that.' (Med)

(9) Nos est-án **es** MATANDO.
1PL.ACC be-IND.PRS.3PL COP.IND.PRS.3SG killing
'They are killing us.' (obs.)

(10) Los mí-os **fue** QUE SE QUEMARON.
DEF.M.PL POSS.1SG-M.PL COP.IND.PST.PF.3SG CONJ REFL.3 burn.IND.PST.PF.3.PL
'Mine got burnt.' (obs.)

(11) Pedro ha esta-do **es** SALIENDO
Pedro have.IND.PRS.3SG COP-PTCP COP.IND.PRS.3SG going.out
CON LA EXNOVIA DE LUIS.
with DEF.F.SG exgirlfiend(F) of Luis
'Pedro has been dating the ex-girlfriend of luis.' (Méndez Vallejo 2015: 65)

(12) Ella va a quer-er **es** DORM-IR.
3SG.F go.IND.PRES.3SG to want-INF COP.IND.PRS.3SG sleep-INF
'She is going to want to sleep.' (obs.)

(13) Me duele **es** QUE ESTA TELA ROC-E CON
me hurt.IND.PRS.3SG COP.IND.PRS.3SG CONJ PROX cloth touch-IND.PRS.3SG with
la herida.
DEF.F.SG wound(F)
'It hurts THAT THIS CLOTH TOUCHES THE WOUND.' (obs.)

(14) Yo le expliqu-é **fue** CÓMO LLEN-AR
1SG 3SG.F.DAT explain-IND.PST.PF.1SG COP.IND.PST.PF.3SG how fill-INF
EL FORMULARIO.
DEF.M.SG form(M)
'I explained to her how to fill out the form.' (Méndez Vallejo 2009: 109)

(15) Me da tristeza **es** PORQUE SE VA.
1sg.dat give.IND.PRS.3SG sadness COP.IND.PRS.3SG because REFL.3 go.IND.PRS.3SG
'I am sad because she is leaving.' (Méndez Vallejo 2009: 109)

Note that in all these cases a simple form of *ser* 'be' is inserted, except when it precedes a finite predicate, in which case a form of *ser* 'be' is used together with the conjunction *que* 'that', as shown in (10). Note furthermore that the focalizing construction may occur within the domain of a subordinate clause, as shown in (16), in which the subordinate clause is given within square brackets:

(16) Toc-a [llam-ar **es** A LA SECRETARIA].
be.necessary-IND.PRS.3SG call.INF COP.IND.PRS.3SG to DEF.F.SG secretary(F)
'It is necessary to call THE SECRETARY.' (Méndez Vallejo 2009: 109)

2.3. Function of the focalized element

As regards its functions, the focalized constituent may be a primary predicate (17)-(18), secondary predicate (19), different kinds of argument (20)-(22), adjunct (23)-(24), or modifier within a noun phrase (25)-(26):

(17) Esto est-á **es** BUENO.
PROX COP-IND.PRS.3SG COP-IND.PRS.3SG nice
'This is nice.' (Albor 1986: 179)

(18) Se me estaba **era** MURIENDO.
REFL.3 1SG.DAT COP-IND.PST.IMPF.3SG COP.IND.PST.IMPF.3SG die.CV
'She was dying on me.' (Med.)

(19) Voy a lleg-ar **es** MOJADA.
go.IND.PRS.1SG to arrive-INF COP.IND.PRS.1SG wet
'I am going to arrive wet.' (obs.)

(20) A mí me preocupa **es** SANDRA.
to 1SG.OBL 1SG.DAT worry.IND.PRS.3SG COP.IND.PRS.3SG Sandra.
'Sandra worries me.' (obs.)

(21) Nosotros compr-amos **fue** EMPANADAS.
1PL buy-IND.PST.PF.1PL COP.IND.PST.PF.3SG empanadas
'We bought empanadas.' (obs.)

(22) Uno depend-e **es** DE DIOS.
one depend-IND.PRS.3SG COP.IND.PRS.3SG of God
'One depends on God.' (Med.)

(23) El cura lleg-ó **fue** AYER.
DEF.M.SG priest(M) arrive-IND.PST.PF.3SG COP.IND.PST.PF.3SG yesterday
'The priest arrived yesterday.' (Méndez Vallejo 2009: 26)

(24) Los niñ-o-s comieron **fue** MUY RÁPIDAMENTE.
DEF.M.PL child-M-PL eat.IND.PST.PF.3PL COP.IND.PST.PF.3SG very rapidly
'The children ate very rapidly.' (Méndez Vallejo 2009: 100)

(25) café **es** MOLIDO
coffee COP.PRS.3SG ground
'ground coffee' (Méndez Vallejo 2009: 97)

(26) Manuel **es** DE EVA
Manuel be.IND.PRS.3SG of Eva
'EVA'S Manuel' (obs.)

2.4. Agreement features of the copula

The copula in the focalizing copula construction often agrees in person/number and tense/aspect features with the main verb. Agreement with tense/aspect features is shown in the following examples. In (27) the verbs agree for the present tense, in (28) for the perfective past tense, in (29) for the imperfective past tense, in (30) for the future tense, and in (31) for the conditional:

(27) Él va a querer **es** DORMIR.
he go.IND.PRES.3SG to want COP.IND.PRES.3SG sleep
'He is going to want to sleep.' (obs)

(28) Las conoc-í **fue** en los bus-es.
3PL.ACC know-IND.PST.PF.1SG COP.IND.PST.PF.3SG in DEF.M.PL bus(M)-PL
'I got to know them on the buses.' (Arias Cortes 2014: 26)

(29) Yo   dormía   **era**   CON MI   MAMÁ Y   MI   PAPÁ.
     1SG sleep.IND.PST.IMPF.1SG   COP.IND.PST.IMPF.3SG with my   mother and my   father
     ' I used to sleep with my mother and father.' (Med.)

(30) (Context: I don't believe that Lola has money.)
     Tendrá   dinero **ser-á**   LA   FAMILIA.
     have.IND.FUT.3SG money COP-IND.FUT.3.SG DEF.F.SG family
     'THE FAMILY will have money.' (Mendez Vallejo 2015: 68)

(31) Tu podrías   **sería**   VENIR   A   AYUDARME.
     you can.IND.COND.2.SG be.IND.COND.3.SG come   to   help.me
     'You could COME OVER TO HELP ME.' (Mendez Vallejo 2009)

Examples such as (30)-(31), in which the future and conditional tenses are used, are quite exceptional and not accepted by all speakers.

      There is not always tense/aspect agreement in the construction. This is a result of the fact that the present tense is sometime used as a default tense for the copula in the focalizing construction. Some examples of this phenomenon are given in (32)-(34):

(32) Me   i-bas   **es**   A   MORDER.
     1SG.ACC go-IND.PST.IMPF.2SG COP.IND.PRES.3SG to   bite
     'You were going to bite me.' (obs.)

(33) y   siempre me   ve-rá   **es**   ENTRE
     and   always 1SG.ACC see-IND.FUT.2SGPOL COP.IND.PRS.3SG   between
     PARCHE   ES   DE   MAN-ES
     party   COP.IND.PRS.3SG of   man-PL
     'And you will always see me in a male party.'

(34) Usted   debería   pon-er-se   **es**   UNA
     2SG.POL must.IND.COND.3SG put.on-INF-REFL   COP.IND.PRES.3SG   INDEF.F.SG
     CAMISA   VIEJ-A-Ø.
     shirt(F)   old-F-SG
     'You should put on an old shirt.' (obs.)

In these examples a copula in the present tense combines with verbs in the imperfective past tense (32), future tense (33), and conditional tense (34). I will return to these cases without tense/aspect agreement in Section 3.

      As for person/number agreement, the picture is slightly more complicated, as this depends of the role of the focalized constituent in the sentence. If this constituent is a subject, there is agreement in both person and number in the first and second person, as in the following examples:

(35) Llam-é   **fuí**   YO.
     call-IND.PST.PF.1SG COP.IND.PST.PF.1SG   1SG
     'I called.' (Bosque 1999: 26)

(36) Me   las   pag-as   **eres**   TÚ.
1sg.dat   3PL.F.ACC   pay-IND.PRS.2SG   COP.IND.PRS.2SG   2SG
'You pay those to me.' (Méndez Vallejo 2009: 155)

In cases of a third person plural subject, however, the third person singular form of the copula is preferred:

(37) Se   van   **es**   [Carlos   y   José].
REFL   go.IND.PRS.3PL   COP.IND.PRS.3SG   Carlos   and   José
'Carlos and Jose are leaving.' (Méndez Vallejo 2009: 157)

Undergoers may be marked in two ways in Spanish, without a preposition or with the preposition *a*, depending on the animacy and specificity of the Undergoer. In constructions with plural bare Undergoers, the singular form of the copula is again clearly preferred (38):

(38) Margarita   compr-ó   **fue**   UNAS   FALDA-S.
Margarita   buy-IND.PST.PF.3SG   COP.PST.PF.3SG   some.F.PL   skirt(F)-PL.
'Margarita bought some skirts.' (Méndez Vallejo 2009: 167)

If the focal constituent is a prepositional phrase, the singular third person form of the copula is the only option:

(39) Las   conocí   **fue**   EN   LOS   BUS-ES.
them   know.IND.PST.PF.1SG   COP.PST.PF.1SG   in   DEF.M.PL   bus-PL
'I got to know them in the buses.' (Arias Cortes 2014)

(40) Torres   capturó   **fue**   A   LOS   LADRÓN-ES.
Torres   catch.IND.PST.PF.3SG   COP.IND.PST.PF.3SG   U   DEF.M.PL   thief-PL
'Torres caught the thiefs.' (Méndez Vallejo 2009: 169)

2.5. The pragmatic function expressed

The construction under review here is one that expresses focus, as shown in examples like (41)-(42):

(41) (Context: Anticipating telling a certain story to expected visitors.)
Todos   se   van   **es**   A   REÍR.
all   REFL.3   go.IND.PRS.3PL   COP.IND.PRS.3.SG   to   laugh.INF
'They are all going to laugh.' (obs.)

(42) (Context: telling about a holiday.)
Ese   hotel   era   **es**   ELEGANTE.
DIST   hotel   be.IND.PST.IMPF.3SG   COP.IND.PRS.3SG   elegant
'That hotel was elegent.' (obs.)

6

Earlier accounts (e.g. Bosque 1999: 3, see the discussion in Curnow & Travis 2004: 7-8) have claimed that the construction expresses contrast. And indeed, contrastive examples can be found easily:

(43) (Context: talking about who brought what to a party.)
Nosotros compramos   **fue**   EMPANADAS.
1.PL   buy-IND.PST.PF.1.PL   COP.IND.PST.PF.3.SG   empanada(F)-PL
'We bought empanadas.' (obs.)

(44) (Context: many go to a football match just to drink and shout, but others don't.)
Van   **es**   a ve-r   fútbol.
go.IND.PRS.3PL   COP.IND.PRS.3.SG   to see-INF   soccer
'They go to see soccer.' (Arias Cortes 2014: 32)

Note, however, that focus and contrast are not mutually exclusive, and indeed, in (43) and (44) the constituents in uppercase are both focal and contrastive. What we do not find is that the construction is used for contrastive topics. So all four examples (41)-(44) express focus, sometimes in combination with contrast, but since focus is the shared value here, the construction may be considered a focalizing one. This is also the conclusion arrived at by Arias Cortes (2004: 29-33).

3. The focalizing copula construction versus the pseudo-cleft construction

The focalizing copula construction bears similarity to the pseudo-cleft construction, from which it historically derives. Consider the following examples of a pseudo-cleft construction (45) and the focalizing copula (46) construction:

(45) Lo.que compramos   **fue/fueron**   EMPANADAS.
what   buy.IND.PST.PF.1.PL   COP.IND.PST.PF.3.SG/3.PL empanadas
'What we bought were empanadas.'

(46) Compramos   **fue**   EMPANADAS.
buy.IND.PST.PF.1.PL COP.IND.PST.PF.3.SG   empanadas
'We bought empanadas.' (obs.)

As shown by Curnow & Travis 2004), the pseudo-cleft construction is biclausal, while the focalizing copula construction is monoclausal.

This difference is reflected in the fact that negative polarity items, such as *nada* 'nothing', in one clause cannot be licensed by negation in the other clause in the pseudo-cleft construction, as shown in (47):

(47) *Lo.que no   puedo   ver   **es**   NADA.
      what   NEG   can.IND.PRS.1.SG see   be.IND.PRS.3.SG   nothing
      'What I can't see is anything.' (Curnow & Travis 2004: 2)

The same is not true for the focalizing copula construction, as shown in (48):

(48) No   puedo   ver   **es**   NADA.
      NEG can.IND.PRS.1.SG see   be.IND.PRS.3.SG   nothing
      'I can't see anything.' (Curnow & Travis 2004: 2)

The difference between the biclausal nature of the pseudo-cleft construction and the monoclausal nature of the focalizing copula construction, is furthermore reflected in the fact that clitic raising is not possible in the pseudo-cleft construction (49), but is possible in the focalizing copula construction (50), as shown by Arias Cortes (2014: 21):

(49) a. Lo.que quier-o   es   mirar=me   en   el
          what   want-IND.PRS.1.SG be.IND.PRS.3.SG   watch-INF=REFL.1.SG in   DEF.M.SG
          espejo.
          mirror
          'What I want is to look at myself in the mirror.' (Arias Cortes 2014: 21)
      b. *Lo.que me=quiero   es   mir-ar   en   el
          what   REFL.1.SG=want-IND.PRS.1.SG   be.IND.PRS.3.SG   watch-INF   in   DEF.M.SG
          espejo.
          mirror
          'What I want is to look at myself in the mirror.' (Arias Cortes 2014: 21)
(50) a. Quier-o   **es**   MIR-AR=ME   EN   EL   ESPEJO.
          want-IND.PRS.1.SG be.IND.PRS.3.SG   watch-INF=REFL.1.SG in   DEF.M.SG mirror
          'I want to look at myself in the mirror.' (Arias Cortes 2014: 21)
      b. Me=quiero   **es**   MIR-AR   EN   EL   ESPEJO.
          REFL.1.SG=want-IND.PRS.1.SG   be.IND.PRS.3.SG   watch-INF   in   DEF.M.SG mirror
          'I want to look at myself in the mirror.' (Arias Cortes 2014: 21)

The monoclausality of the focalizing copula construction indicates that it has undergone grammaticalization with respect to the pseudo-cleft construction. Grammaticalization is also reflected in other aspects of the construction. As noted in Section 2.4, the copula may take on the default values of present tense and third person singular in in the focalizing copula construction, whereas this is not the case in pseudo-cleft constructions. This was illustrated in Section 2.4 with examples (32) and (37), which are repeated here as (51) and (52):

(51)   Me   ibas   **es**   A   MORDER.
         1.SG.ACC   go.IND.PST.IMPF.2.SG   be.IND.PRES.3.SG   to   bite
         'You were going to bite me.' (obs.)

(52)   Se   van   **es**   CARLOS Y   JOSÉ.
         REFL.3   go.IND.PRS.3PL   be.IND.PRS.3SG   Carlos   and   José
         'Carlos and Jose are leaving.' (Méndez Vallejo 2009: 157)

In the pseudo-cleft construction this type of disagreement would be impossible:

(51)   Lo.que   me   ibas   a hac-er   **era/*es**
         what   1.SG.ACC   go.IND.PST.IMPF.2.SG   to do-INF   be.IND.PST.IMPF.3.SG/be.IND.PRS.3.SG
         mord-er
         bite-INF
         'What you were going to do was bite me.'

(52)   Los   que   se   van   **son/*es**
         DEF.M.PL   SUB   REFL.3   go.IND.PRS.3.PL   be.IND.PRS.3SG/be.IND.PRS.3SG
         CARLOS   Y   JOSÉ.
         Carlos   and   José
         'Carlos and Jose are leaving.' (Méndez Vallejo 2009: 157)

It is not uncommon for copulas to develop into focus markers. Heine & Kuteva (2002 : 95-96) list several examples, one of which is repeated here:

Papiamentu (Kouwenberg & Muysken 1995: 220-221)

(53)   Mi **ta**   Pedro/grandi/na kas.
         1SG COP   Pedro/big/LOC house
         'I am Pedro/big/in the house.'

(54)   **Ta** e   buki m'- a   duna-bu.
         FOC the   book 1SG-PAST give-2SG
         'I gave you THE BOOK.'

The regular use of the copula is shoen in (53), the focalizing use in (54).
        Mandarin is another language in which the copula (*shi*) has developed into a focus marker. The copular use of *shi* is illustrated in (55), the focalizing use in (56):

Mandarin (Teng 1979: 102, 104)

(55)   Ta   **shi**   yige yao fan   de
         3SG.M COP   one   want food NR
         'He is a beggar.'

(56) a. **Shi** wo mingtian dao Niu Yue qu.
FOC 1SG tomorrow to New York go
'I am going to New York tomorrow.'

b. Wo **shi** mingtian dao Niu Yue qu.
1SG FOC tomorrow to New York go
'I am going to New York TOMORROW.'

c. Wo mingtian **shi** dao Niu Yue qu.
1SG tomorrow FOC to New York go
'I am going TO NEW YORK tomorrow.'

4 The Colombian focalizing copula construction in Functional Discourse Grammar

4.1 Introduction

In this section I will provide an account of the construction in Functional Discourse Grammar. In Section 4.2 I present a basic representation of the construction, constrasting it with that of the pseudo-cleft construction. Section 4.3 shows that modifiers at the Interpersonal Level cannot be focalized and argues that this follows from the basic representation provided in Section 4.2. In Section 4.4 I then address the question which units at the Interpersonal Level can be focalized.

4.2 Basic representation of the construction

Before moving to the representation of the focalizing copula constructions, let me first discuss the treatment of pseudo-cleft constructions in FDG. In this theory, this type of construction is treated as a bi-clausal identificational structure, as shwon in (58), which represents example (45), repeated here as (57):

(57) Lo.que compramos **fue/fueron** EMPANADAS.
what buy.IND.PST.PF.1.PL COP.IND.PST.PF.3.SG/3.PL empanadas
'What we bought were empanadas.'

(R_I) $(R_J)_{Foc}$
(58) $(e_i: [\quad (x_j: (e_j: (s_i: [(f_i: comprar (f_i)) (x_i)_A (x_j)_U] (s_i)) (e_j))) \quad (x_j: -empanadas- (x_j))] (e_i))$

In this representation it is shown that there are two Referential Subacts (R_I) and (R_J) targeting the same Individual (x_j), which receives two different descriptions at the Representational Level. This characterizes identificational constructions: the same Individual is referred to twice with different descriptions. In the construction two States-of-Affairs are involved: the main State of Affairs (e_i), capturing the identificational relation between *lo que compramos* and *empanadas*, and the embedded State of Affairs (e_j), which captures the embedded predication *we bought (x_j)*. Both

are expressed as clauses, hence the construction is bi-clausal in nature.

As shown in Section 2, the facts concerning the licensing of negative polarity items and clitic raising show that the focalizing copula construction is monoclausal in nature. This means that example (46), repeated here as (59), may be represented as in (60).

(59) Compramos   **fue**   EMPANADAS.
      buy.IND.PST.PF.1.PL COP.IND.PST.PF.3.SG   empanadas
      'We bought empanadas.' (obs.)

                                        $(R_J)_{Foc}$
(60) $(e_i: [(f_i: comprar (f_i)) (x_i)_A \quad (x_j: empanadas (x_j))_U] (e_i))$

As shown in (60), there is no embedded State-of-Affairs involved in this construction, and there is a single Referential Subact corresponding to a single unit at the Representational Level, as this is not an identificational construction.

4.3. Restrictions on IL constituents

The basic representation predicts that only elemts that have a counterpart at the Representational Level may occur as the focus in this construction. Thus, the manner adverbial in (61) and the temporal adverbial in (62) can be focalized without problem, but modifiers at the Interpersonal Level, such as the illocutionary adverb in (63) or the attitudinal adverb in (64), cannot:

(61) Los   niñ-o-s   comieron   **fue**   MUY RÁPIDAMENTE.
      DEF.M.PL   child-M-PL   eat.IND.PST.PF.3PL   COP.IND.PST.PF.3SG   very rapidly
      'The children ate very rapidly.' (Mendez Vallejo 2009: 100)
(62) El   cura   lleg-ó   **fue**   AYER.
      DEF.M.SG   priest   arrive-IND.PST.PF.3SG   COP.IND.PST.PF.3SG   yesterday
      'The priest arrived yesterday.' (Mendez Vallejo 2009: 26)
(63) #Marta   no   deb-ería   habl-ar   **es**   FRANCAMENTE.
      Marta   NEG   must-IND.COND.3SG   spreak-INF   be.IND.PRS.3SG   frankly
      'Marta shouldn't speak frankly.' (Camacho 2006: 15)
(64) *Marta no   viene   **es**   INFELIZMENTE.
      Marta not come.IND.PRS.3SG   COP.IND.PRS.3SG   unfortunately
      'Unfortunately Marta is not coming.'

Note that (63) is only ungrammatical under the intended reading in which *francamente* is an illocutionary adverb. If interpreted as a manner adverb, the sentence is grammatical, as also argued by Camacho (2006).

4.4. The units in Focus

Hengeveld, Keizer & Giomi (in prep.) present a revised representation of the Communicated Content in Functional Discourse Grammar, partly based on Smit (2010). This representation is given in (65):

(65) $(C_1:$ [Communicated Content
         $(R_1)/(T_1)_\Phi$ Referential/Ascriptive Subact
         $(Cm_1:$ [Comment
              $(T_1)_\Phi$ [Ascriptive Subact
                   $(T_1)_\Phi$ Ascriptive Subact
                   $(R_1)_\Phi$ Referential Subact
                   $(C_1)_\Phi$ Communicated Content
              $] (T_1))_\Phi$ Ascriptive Subact
              $(R_1:$ [Referential Subact
                   $(T_1)_\Phi$ Ascriptive Subact
                   $(R_1)_\Phi$ Referential Subact
                   $(C_1)_\Phi$ Communicated Content
              $] (R_1))_\Phi$ Referential Subact
              $(C_1)_\Phi$ Communicated Content
        $] (Cm_1))_\Phi$ Comment
      $] (C_1))$ Communicated Content

The Communicated Content is the domain for the assignment of the pragmatic function Focus, which, just like Topic, cannot be assigned outside this domain. This means that the initial prediction is that all components of the Communicated Content in (65) should be able to occur as the Focus in the focalizing copula construction. This includes the Referential/Ascriptive Subact that together with the Comment constitutes the Communicated Content, and that we I will call here the topical Subact.

Before checking this prediction, it is additionally important to stress that, as argued by Smit (2010), the topical Subact and the Comment may occur on their own, in presentative and thetic constructions respectively. Furthermore, there is recursion involved, such that the Comment may contain a Communicated Content again, and the Referential Subact may contain both a Communicated content and further Referential Subacts, and the same holds for Ascriptive Subacts. Taken these properties into account, the different focus assignment possibilities are listed in (66):

(66) 1. $(C_1:$ $[(\mathbf{R_1/T_1})_{\mathbf{Foc}}] (C_1))$
     2. $(C_1:$ $[(\mathbf{Cm_1})_{\mathbf{Foc}}] (C_1))$
     3. $(C_1:$ $[(\mathbf{R_1/T_1})_{\mathbf{Foc}} (Cm_1)_\Phi] (C_1))$
     4. $(C_1:$ $[(R_1/T_1)_\Phi (\mathbf{Cm_1})_{\mathbf{Foc}}] (C_1))$

5. $(C_1$: $[(R_1/T_1)_\Phi\,(Cm_1$: $\mathbf{(T_1)_{Foc}}\,(R_1)_\Phi\,(C_1)_\Phi]\,(Cm_1))_\Phi]\,(C_1))$
6. $(C_1$: $[(R_1/T_1)_\Phi\,(Cm_1$: $(T_1)_\Phi\,\mathbf{(R_1)_{Foc}}\,(C_1)_\Phi]\,(Cm_1))_\Phi]\,(C_1))$
7. $(C_1$: $[(R_1/T_1)_\Phi\,(Cm_1$: $(T_1)_\Phi\,(R_1)_\Phi\,\mathbf{(C_1)_{Foc}}]\,(Cm_1))_\Phi]\,(C_1))$
8. $(C_1$: $[(R_1/T_1)_\Phi\,(Cm_1$: $(T_1$: $[\mathbf{(T_1)_{Foc}}\,(R_1)_\Phi\,(C_1)_\Phi]\,(T_1))_\Phi\,(R_1)_\Phi\,(C_1)_\Phi]\,(Cm_1))_\Phi]\,(C_1))$
9. $(C_1$: $[(R_1/T_1)_\Phi\,(Cm_1$: $(T_1$: $[(T_1)_\Phi\,\mathbf{(R_1)_{Foc}}\,(C_1)_\Phi]\,(T_1))_\Phi\,(R_1)_\Phi\,(C_1)_\Phi]\,(Cm_1))_\Phi]\,(C_1))$
10. $(C_1$: $[(R_1/T_1)_\Phi\,(Cm_1$: $(T_1$: $[(T_1)_\Phi\,(R_1)_\Phi\,\mathbf{(C_1)_{Foc}}]\,(T_1))_\Phi\,(R_1)_\Phi\,(C_1)_\Phi]\,(Cm_1))_\Phi]\,(C_1))$
11. $(C_1$: $[(R_1/T_1)_\Phi\,(Cm_1$: $(T_1)_\Phi\,(R_1$: $[\mathbf{(T_1)_{Foc}}\,(R_1)_\Phi\,(C_1)_\Phi]\,(R_1))_\Phi\,(C_1)_\Phi]\,(Cm_1))_\Phi]\,(C_1))$
12. $(C_1$: $[(R_1/T_1)_\Phi\,(Cm_1$: $(T_1)_\Phi\,(R_1$: $[(T_1)_\Phi\,\mathbf{(R_1)_{Foc}}\,(C_1)_\Phi]\,(R_1))_\Phi\,(C_1)_\Phi]\,(Cm_1))_\Phi]\,(C_1))$
13. $(C_1$: $[(R_1/T_1)_\Phi\,(Cm_1$: $(T_1)_\Phi\,(R_1$: $[(T_1)_\Phi\,(R_1)_{Foc}\,\mathbf{(C_1)_{Foc}}]\,(R_1))_\Phi\,(C_1)_\Phi]\,(Cm_1))_\Phi]\,(C_1))$

I will now illustrate all these possibilities, following the numbering in (66)

1. $(C_1$: $[\mathbf{(R_1/T_1)_{Foc}}]\,(C_1))$

This frame represents presentative sentences, in which there is only a topical Subact with the focus function. Example (67) shows that the focalizing copula construction may be used to express this type of Focus.

(67) Hay **es** UN TIPO EN EL JARDÍN.
PRS.PRS.3SG COP.IND.PRS.3SG INDEF.M.SG person(M) in DEF.M.SG garden(M)
'There is someone in the garden.'

2. $(C_1$: $[\mathbf{(Cm_1)_{Foc}}]\,(C_1))$

This frame represents thetical sentences, in which there is no topical constituent, just a focal Comment, which is all new. The type is illustrated in (68).

(68) (Qué pasó?)
Fue QUE LLEGÓ EL TREN.
COP.IND.PST.PF.3SG SUB arrive.IND.PST.PF.3SG DEF.M.SG train(M)
'The train arrived.' (elic.)

3. $(C_1$: $[\mathbf{(R_1/T_1)_{Foc}}\,(Cm_1)_\Phi]\,(C_1))$

This type of configuration is called a Topic-central categorical in Smit (2001). A new topic is introduced, followed by a Comment within the same Discourse Act.

(69) No, salió **fue** LUCÍA.
no go.out.IND.PST.PF.3SG COP.IND.PST.PF.3SG Lucía
'No, LUCIA went out.' (Méndez Vallejo 2009: 118)

4. $(C_1: [(R_1/T_1)_\Phi \textbf{(Cm}_1\textbf{)}_{\textbf{Foc}}] (C_1))$

This type is known as categorical. A non-focal topical constituent is combined with a Comment that is focal as a whole. This is shown in (70).

(70) Estaba   **era**   LEYENDO   LO.QUE ME   MANDARON
      be.IND.PST.IMPF.1SG   COP.PST.IMPF.3SG   read.CV   what   1SG.ACC   send.IND.PST.PF.3PL
      'I was reading what they sent me.' (Méndez Vallejo 2009: 105)

5. $(C_1: [(R_1/T_1)_\Phi (Cm_1: \textbf{(T}_1\textbf{)}_{\textbf{Foc}} (R_1)_\Phi (C_1)_\Phi] (Cm_1))_\Phi] (C_1))$

Type 5 and 6 represent identificational focus. In type 5 an Ascriptive Subact is focal, as illustrated in (71):

(71) Debe   ser   que   está   **es**   FLOJ-O.
      must.IND.PRS.3SG   COP.INF   SUB   COP.IND.PRS.3SG   COP.IND.PRS.3SG   weak-M
      'It must be that it is loose.' (Mendez Vallejo 2009: 96)

6. $(C_1: [(R_1/T_1)_\Phi (Cm_1: (T_1)_\Phi \textbf{(R}_1\textbf{)}_{\textbf{Foc}} (C_1)_\Phi] (Cm_1))_\Phi] (C_1))$

In the second type of identificational focus, a Referential Subact is focal. The sentence in (72) illustrated this type:

(72) Nosotros compr-amos   **fue**   EMPANADAS.
      1.PL   buy-IND.PST.PF.1PL   COP.IND.PST.PF.3SG   empanadas
      'We bought EMPANADAS.' (obs.)

7. $(C_1: [(R_1/T_1)_\Phi (Cm_1: (T_1)_\Phi (R_1)_\Phi \textbf{(C}_1\textbf{)}_{\textbf{Foc}}] (Cm_1))_\Phi] (C_1))$

Complement clauses (with their own focus structure) are represented at the Interpersonal Level as embedded Communicated Contents. These may receive Focus too, as shown in (73):

14

(73) Me duele   **es**   QUE ESTA TELA ROC-E   CON
      me hurt.IND.PRS.3SG   COP.IND.PRS.3SG   CONJ PROX cloth touch-IND.PRS.3SG with
      la   herida.
      DEF.F.SG   wound(F)
      'It hurts that this cloth touches the wound.' (obs.)

8.   (C$_1$: [(R$_1$/T$_1$)$_\Phi$ (Cm$_1$: (T$_1$: [**(T$_1$)$_{Foc}$** (R$_1$)$_\Phi$ (C$_1$)$_\Phi$] (T$_1$))$_\Phi$ (R$_1$)$_\Phi$ (C$_1$)$_\Phi$] (Cm$_1$))$_\Phi$] (C$_1$))

We now turn to Subacts within Subacts. Main Ascriptive Subacts may be internally complex. Thus, *loca por mí* 'crazy about me' is an Ascriptive Subact that is build on the combination of a further Ascriptive Subact and a Referential Subact. This embedded Ascriptive Subact may also be focalized, as illustrated in (74):

(74) (Ella está enferma por tí? 'Is she sick about you?'
      No, ella   está   **es**   LOC-A-Ø   por   mí.
      No, 3SG.F   COP.IND.PRS.3SG   COP.IND.PRS.3SG   crazy-F-SG by   1SG.OBL
      'No, she is crazy about me.' (elic.)

9.   (C$_1$: [(R$_1$/T$_1$)$_\Phi$ (Cm$_1$: (T$_1$: [(T$_1$)$_\Phi$ **(R$_1$)$_{Foc}$** (C$_1$)$_\Phi$] (T$_1$))$_\Phi$ (R$_1$)$_\Phi$ (C$_1$)$_\Phi$] (Cm$_1$))$_\Phi$] (C$_1$))

The Referential Subact contained within such a complex Ascriptive Subact may also be focalized:

(75) (Ella está loca por tí?'Is she crazy about you?)
      No, ella   está   loc-a-ø   **es**   POR JUAN.
      No, 3SG.F   COP.IND.PRS.3SG   crazy-F-SG   COP.IND.PRS.3SG   by   Juan
      'No, she is crazy about Juan.' (elic.)

10.   (C$_1$: [(R$_1$/T$_1$)$_\Phi$ (Cm$_1$: (T$_1$: [(T$_1$)$_\Phi$ (R$_1$)$_\Phi$ **(C$_1$)$_{Foc}$**] (T$_1$))$_\Phi$ (R$_1$)$_\Phi$ (C$_1$)$_\Phi$] (Cm$_1$))$_\Phi$] (C$_1$))

As a third component within a main Ascriptive Subact we may also find an embedded clause, represented at the Interpersonal Level as a Communicated Content. This unit may also be focalized:

(76) (Ella está loca por escuchar música?'Is she crazy about listening to music?)
      No, ella   está   loc-a-ø   **es**   POR LE-ER   LIBRO-S.
      No, 3SG.F   COP.IND.PRS.3SG   crazy-F-SG   COP.IND.PRS.3SG   by   read-INF   book-PL
      'No, she is crazy about buying books.' (elic.)

11. $(C_1: [(R_1/T_1)_\Phi (Cm_1: (T_1)_\Phi (R_1: [\textbf{(T_1)}_{\textbf{Foc}} (R_1)_\Phi (C_1)_\Phi] (R_1))_\Phi (C_1)_\Phi] (Cm_1))_\Phi] (C_1))$

Turning now to constituents that may occur within a main Referential Subact, we find the same pattern. First of all, Ascriptive Subacts contained within such as Referential Subacts may be focalized by means of the focalizing copula construction:

(77) En   la   tienda   venden   café   **es**   MOLID-O-Ø.
      in   DEF.F.SG   shop(F) sell.IND.PRS.3PL   coffee(M)   COP.IND.PRS.3SG   ground-M-SG
      'In the shop they sell ground coffee.' (Méndez Vallejo 2009: 97)

12. $(C_1: [(R_1/T_1)_\Phi (Cm_1: (T_1)_\Phi (R_1: [(T_1)_\Phi \textbf{(R_1)}_{\textbf{Foc}} (C_1)_\Phi] (R_1))_\Phi (C_1)_\Phi] (Cm_1))_\Phi] (C_1))$

Referential Subacts within Referential Subacts may also be focalized:

(78) entre   parche   **es**   DE   MAN-ES.
      between   patch   be.IND.PRS.3SG   of   man-PL
      'in a male group of friends' (Arias Cortes 2014)

13. $(C_1: [(R_1/T_1)_\Phi (Cm_1: (T_1)_\Phi (R_1: [(T_1)_\Phi (R_1)_{Foc} \textbf{(C_1)}_{\textbf{Foc}}] (R_1))_\Phi (C_1)_\Phi] (Cm_1))_\Phi] (C_1))$

And finally, Communicated Contents embedded within a Referential Subact, such as the relative clause in (79), may also be focalized:

(79) (En esa tienda venden café importado de Brazil? 'Do they sell coffee imported from Brazil in that shop?)
      No, vend-en   café   **es**   PRODUC-IDO   POR
      no   sell-IND.PRS.3PL   coffee   COP.IND.PRS.3SG   produce-PTCPL   by
      CAFICULTORES   en   Colombia.
      coffee.farmers   in   Colombia
      'No, in that shop they sell coffee produced by coffe farmers in Colombia.'

5. Discussion and Conclusion

Hengeveld, Keizer & Giomi (in prep.) propose a number of modifications in the treatment of the Interpersonal Level in FDG:

(i)   Following Smit (2010), the Communicated Content is subdivided in a topical part and a Comment, with the topical element either evoking the entitiy the Comment is about, or

providing the setting for the rest of the Communicated Content. The topical part may be a real Topic, when languages mark topics grammatically, or a Referential or Ascriptive Subact that is topical in nature but not marked as such. The Comment may be seen a the functional counterpart of what in generative work is called the VP.

(ii)   Following Mackenzie (2019), Olbertz & Vázquez (2022) and Mittendorfer (in prep.), they abandon the earlier assumption that every Discourse Act may contain only one Communicated Content. Instead, Communicated Contents can be coordinated and can be embedded within the Comment and within Subacts.

(iii)   They allow for Referential Subacts to recur within Ascriptive Subacts, and not only within Referential Subacts. This accounts for cases like *(She is) fond of chocolate*, in which *chocolate* is an argument of *fond*.

This paper supports these innovations empirically in the following way:

(i)   Types 2 and 4 above show that the Comment can be focalized, hence it must be a unit at the Interpersonal Level, which is where pragmatic functions are assigned.

(ii)   Types 7, 10, and 13 above show that embedded Communicated Contents can be focalized, hence must be units at the Interpersonal Level.

(iii)   Type 9 above shows that a Referential Subact embedded within an Ascriptive Subact may be focalized, hence must be a unit at the Interpersonal Level.

The innovations proposed thus allow for the representation of 6 informational articulations that could not be accounted for in the version of FDG presented in Hengeveld & Mackenzie (2008).

Acknowledgements

References

Albor, Hugo R. (1986), Uso e interpretación de "ser" en construcciones galicadas y en "el necesita es descansar". *Thesaurus* XLI.1-3, 173-186.

Arias Cortés, Diego (2014), El ser focalizador en el español hablado de Ciudad Bolívar. *Lingüística y Literatura* 65, 15-36.

Bosque Muñoz, Ignacio (1999), On focus vs. wh-movement: The case of Caribbean Spanish. *Sophia Linguistica* 44-45, 1-32.

Camacho, Jose (2006), In situ focus in Caribbean Spanish: Towards a unified account of focus. In Nuria Sagarra & Almeida Jacqueline Toribio (eds), *Selected proceedings of the 9th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project, 13-23.

Curnow, Jowan Timothy & Travis, Catherine E. (2004), The emphatic *es* construction of Colombian Spanish. In: Christo Moskovsky (ed.), *Selected Papers from the 2003 Conference of the Australian Linguistic Society*, 1-11.

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

Hengeveld, Kees & Keizer, Evelien & Giomi, Riccardo (in prep.), *Layering in Functional Discourse Grammar: The hierarchical structure of the language system*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kouwenberg, Silvia & Muysken, Pieter (1995), Papiamento. In Arends, Jacques & Muysken, Pieter & Smith, Norval (eds.), *Pidgins and Creoles. An Introduction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 205-218.

Mackenzie, J. Lachlan (2019), The Functional Discourse Grammar approach to syntax. In András Kertész, Edith Moravcsik and Csislla Rákosi (eds), *Current approaches to syntax - a comparative handbook*. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter Mouton, 291-316.

Méndez Vallejo, Catalina (2009), *Focalizing* ser *('to be') in Colombian Spanish*. PhD Diss. Indiana University.

Méndez Vallejo, Dunia Catalina (2015), *Ser* focalizador: variación dialectal y aceptabilidad de uso. *Revista Internacional de Lingüística Iberoamericana* 13.2, 61-79.

Mittendorfer (in prep.), *A prosodic approach to information packaging in FDG*. PhD Thesis University of Vienna.

Olbertz, Hella & Vázquez Rosas, María Victoria (2022), Asymmetrical pseudoclefts in Spanish – towards an FDG account. Lecture, *Seventh International Conference on Functional Discourse Grammar*, Schoorl, The Netherlands.

Smit, Niels (2010), *FYI: Theory and typology of information packaging*. PhD thesis, University of Amsterdam.

Teng Shou-hsin (1979), Remarks on cleft sentences in Chinese. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 7, 101-114.