

Discursive functions and constructionalization of independent “subordinate” sentences in Spanish

Catalina Fuentes Rodríguez¹

Recibido: 20 de febrero de 2021 / Aceptado: 27 de mayo de 2021

Abstract. The topic under discussion in this paper is the syntax of sentences introduced by a subordinate conjunction (que, si, como) that have an independent function in the discourse. Some authors have considered them insubordinate clauses. The author discusses the functions they perform in Spanish discourse, especially in reactive turns, and proposes a macrosyntactic approach that includes a range of structural possibilities: independent utterances, conventional constructions, or discursive operators. These possibilities depend on the different degrees of grammaticalization they show: as semi-fixed constructions or pragmatic markers.

Keywords: macrosyntax; discourse markers; constructionalization; insubordination.

Sumario. 1. Introduction. 2. Structures and methodology. 2.1. Structures 2.2. Methodological concepts 3. Insubordination 4. Discussion. 4.1. Grammaticalization, reanalysis and discourse operators (applicable to *si quieres, si tú lo dices, si no te importa, como quieras, como te lo digo, lo que yo te diga*) 4.2. Independent utterances 5. Concluding remarks. References

Cómo citar: Fuentes Rodríguez, C. (2021). Discursive functions and constructionalization of independent “subordinate” sentences in Spanish. *Círculo de Lingüística Aplicada a la Comunicación*, 32(3), 173-184, <https://dx.doi.org/10.5209/clac.74388>

1. Introduction

The topic under discussion in this paper is the syntax of sentences introduced by a subordinate conjunction (que, si, como) that have an independent function in the discourse, i.e., appear as main clauses. Some authors have, therefore, considered them insubordinate clauses (Evans 2007, Gras 2016, Sansiñena-Smet-Cornillie 2015). Their discursive functions and their grammaticalization from subordinate clauses to main clauses are discussed in this study.

The structures analyzed show a diversity of functions. Some of them seem to have undergone a complete grammaticalization process (Traugott 1995, 2010) that brings them closer to the pragmatic markers and disjuncts (Greenbaum 1969, Quirk et al. 1972). Others constitute constructions, i.e., “stored pairings of form and function” (Goldberg 2003: 219). Their formal structure shows a part fixed and a free slot (hybrid constructions in Gras 2016). Their meaning is procedural.

This work aims at describing the two sides of the process: the syntactic characteristics of these constructions (their discursive functions) and the procedural content they acquire. Since the reality of these sentences is complex, we will review the analyses provided by the studies on insubordination (Evans 2007), constructional grammar (Goldberg 1995) together with a macrosyntactic approach (Blanche Benveniste 2003, Berrendonner 1990, 2002, 2003, Deulofeu 2011, 2016)

The goal is a linguistic-pragmatic description of these constructions (Fuentes Rodríguez 2017[2000]) whose starting point are utterances in context. The description of the forms must always consider the communicative and social context. The expression of the speaker’s intention and his persuasive goal (argumentation) is included, as well as the organization of what has been said to be relevant to the addressee. In that sense, the present study could contribute to the description of the discourse syntax, as well as to the process of grammaticalization or reanalysis that leads to the genesis of new discursive markers (“constructional change” in Traugott-Trousdale 2010 and 2013).

Studies on discursive markers (Schiffrin 1987, Fraser 1990, 1996, for example) and their evolution (Brinton 1996, 2008, Traugott 1995, Girón 2008) are also relevant, as well as approaches from thetical grammar (Kalten-

¹ Universidad de Sevilla. Correo electrónico: cfuentes@us.es

böck-Heine-Kuteva 2011) that help to typify the expressions that modulate the discourse and express the subjectivity of the speaker.

The discussion focuses on certain “insubordinates” of Spanish in order to propose a possible analysis which, by the very nature of colloquial discourse, is necessarily complex. The different methodological approaches presented do not fully explain the reality. The notion of construction, however, is revealed as very explanatory for a macro-syntax.

The structure of this paper includes a presentation of the constructions, followed by a review of methodological concepts (section 2). Section 3 describes the insubordination proposal. In 4, the different discursive contexts of these constructions are analyzed and discussed their categorization. Section 5 summarizes the conclusions.

2. Structures and methodology.

2.1. Structures

The structures considered in this work are originally dependent sentences (conditionals, modals, or that-sentences) that appear as complete utterances in monological and dialogal discourse, generally in interactive contexts of response. They also appear as peripheral complements, which requires a macrosyntactic approach, i.e., complements in the left-periphery or right-periphery of the utterance, without function in the sentence.

The research question is: Are they independent utterances, subordinate sentences that act as main sentences, as insubordination theory asserts? Should its evolutionary process be described more broadly, applying the theory of grammaticalization, the reanalysis considered in the studies of insubordination, or constructionalization (Goldberg 1995, Traugott-Trousdale 2010)? Are the new structures becoming new elements, i.e., theticals (Kaltenböck-Heine-Kuteva 2011), comment clauses or new discursive operators? (i.e. pragmatic markers, see Fraser 1996). Perhaps are they in an intermediate stage, functioning as peripheral complements or parentheticals (Dehé-Kavalová 2007, Fuentes Rodríguez 2018)? The degree of fixation of these clauses and their categorization as new pragmatic markers or new constructions will, therefore, be discussed. The theories involved in this analysis are insubordination, constructional grammar, both applied to the syntax of discourse.

As can be seen in the work, the list of possible functions of these structures is broader than what these theories have shown. The structures considered in this paper are the following:

- (1) “Si yo te contara...” (If I told you..., You don’t want to know)
Aquí están sucediendo continuamente cosas extrañas. ¡Si yo te contara...! (Strange things are happening here all the time. If I told you...!). (Corpes, F. Nieva, 2005).
- (2) “Si quieres” (If you wish)
– Quizás sería mejor que fuera yo a verte (Maybe it would be better if I came to see you.).
– Si quieres (if you wish) (Crea, E. Santiago, 1996).
- (3) “Si tú lo dices” (If you say so)
-Eres la pendeja más pendeja que he conocido. (You’re the fooliest of the fooliest I’ve ever met)
-Si tú lo dices. (If you say so). (Corpes, L.E. Gutiérrez Ortiz, 2012).
- (4) “Si no te importa...”, (If you don’t mind ...)
VICTORIA: Gracias. Y ahora, Clara, si no te importa... Espero una llamada importante. (Thank you. And now, Clara, if you don’t mind... I’m expecting an important call) (Corpes, J. López Mozo, 2005).
- (5) “Que + verb (IND)” (that +verb)
FIDEL– Qué? (What’s that?)
PACHI– (alto.) Que no quiero tener una muerte desordenada. (I’m saying I don’t want to have a messy death.) (Corpes, D. Armas, 2013).
- (6) “Como quieras” (As you wish)
LAURA: Lo hago cuando yo quiero, ¿ya? (I do it when I want to, okay?) CONSUELO: Como quieras (As you wish) (Corpes, E. Chías, 2001).
- (7) “Como te lo digo” (Just as I’m telling you)
LISARDA. (...) el jodío ha cerrado la autoescuela y ha montao una pescadería. ((...) the bastard has closed the driving school and opened a fishmonger).
LEONCIA. No fastidie... (No kidding!...)
LISARDA. Como te lo digo (Just as I’m telling you) (Corpes, J. Cedena, 2012).

- (8) “Como si tú no lo supieras...” (As if you didn’t know)
 -¿Qué decís, Gallego? ¿Otra vez hablando boludeces? (What are you saying, Gallego? Talking nonsense again?)
 -Como si no lo supieras, Flaca. Como si no lo supieras vos mejor que yo. (As if you didn’t know, Flaca. As if you didn’t know better than I do) (Corpes: M. Caparrós, 2008).
- (9) ¿Y si nos vamos al mar? (What if we go to the beach?) (Corpes, M. Dreyfus Bendaña, 2004).

All of them present an original subordinate structure [conjunction + clause]. They act as complete statements, but to call them main clauses would imply the possibility of carrying more complements (other subordinate clauses), which is not possible. They could not contain other complements. They seem to have undergone a process of fixation, but the question is: what is the output structure? Is it a phraseological unit with a unique function? Or is it a construction (Godberg 1995) that still allows a particular variation (Fuentes Rodríguez, in press)? In these processes not only the syntactic status changes but also meaning and textual function. Some of these elements appear as suspended utterances (1), others initiate a complete utterance (and if in 9 or que in 5) or may appear as answers constituting a turn, as the disjuncts (2, 3, 6, 7, 8). Some of these can be integrated as peripherals in another utterance (4, for example). This study wants to find patterns in their behavior.

2.2. Methodological concepts

This paper applies a macrosyntactic approach. Thus, it considers that the major unit in the analysis is the discourse (text), the superior unit of communication in context (a communicative event in De Beaugrande-Dressler 1981), oral or written, composed by paragraphs, sequences, and utterances. The syntax is understood in two dimensions: macro- and microstructure. Microstructure considers the organization of the sentence, and macrostructure is concerned with the organization of the text into parts and with the inclusion of aspects related with the speaker’s intention, the listener’s expectations and prior knowledge, and to the adjustment to the context surrounding them. Macrosyntax allows the utterance and superior units to be described in terms of syntactic relations between components (Blanche Benveniste 1990, 114) (See also Berrendonner 1990, 2003, Blanche Benveniste 2002, Deulofeu 2016 and Avanzi 2017).

The utterance, as the minimal unit of complete communication (a single illocution, i.e., marked by an intonational juncture and a melodic pattern), has a structure with a head and extrapositional elements, following Dik (1997):

Utterance= (Extrapositional elements+ sentence(s))

- (10) Afortunadamente no todo está perdido (Fortunately, not everything is lost) (Corpes, L.M. Ferrer Agüero, 2001)

Utterance=(fortunately + not everything is lost)

The division into core and marginal elements can be found in models such as Functional Discourse Grammar (Hengeveld-Mackenzie 2008), macrosyntax (Blanche Benveniste, for example, distinguishes between the noyau of préfixe and postfixe). The “periphery” (left or right) is also present in the work of Samek-Lodovici(2006), Rodríguez Ramalle (2011), who follows Rizzi (1997), Pons (2018), among others.

Extrapositional complements include macrostructural elements, relating to speaker intention (modal, enunciative complements) or the hearer’s interpretation (informative or argument structure: complements of thematization (Berruto 1985,1986, Hidalgo 2003, Fernández Lorences 2010), reinterpretation, focus (Padilla 2001) and argumentation (Fuentes Rodríguez 2012).

The interaction has specific intermediate units: turn and exchange (Briz and Valesco 2003, Fuentes Rodríguez 2013). The first includes one or some utterances emitted by a single speaker in a conversational act. The second is a set of turns that arise from an initial intervention (adjacency pair, see Fuentes Rodríguez 2017a [2000], 2013, 2017b). For example, in (2), there are two exchange turns:

- (2) Speaker A:– Quizás sería mejor que fuera yo a verte (Maybe it would be better if I came to see you).
 Speaker B:– Si quieres (if you wish/as you like) (Crea, E. Santiago, 1996).

Si quieres constitutes the whole reactive turn. This position is frequent for modal operators (disjuncts), i.e., pragmatic markers (Fraser 1996), which procedural meaning points to the speaker’s subjectivity. For example: of course, probably, maybe, sure, fortunately etc. (10) They can also appear in the periphery of the utterance (11).

- (11) Por supuesto, nuestro encuentro no había sido casual (Of course, our meeting had not been casual) (Corpes, R. Bolaño, 2001).

The structures considered above, although introduced by subordinate conjunctions, may appear with a falling or maintained boundary tone, as complete speech acts in two syntactic contexts. For example, sentences 1, 2, 3, 6 constitute independent, reactive turns, but *si quieres*, *si no te importa*, and less frequently *como quieras*, *como te lo digo*, may be integrated into another sentence as a peripheral construction.

The hypothesis of this paper will be explained below: the original structure [subordinating conjunction + clause] acts as a construction with several discourse functions. It can be fixed as a construction that has a procedural content, acts as an independent statement, or can advance in the process of fixation until it functions as a discursive operator (pragmatic marker), either in responses or as a peripheral within the sentence (ECC).

Thus, there are, two processes: a syntactic change further explained here, and another semantic process: “from semantic content to → procedural meaning”. Besides, there is a pattern fixation [subordinating conjunction + clause]. It is a construction, then. This term has been traditionally used as a vague term to refer to certain linguistic phenomena which have not been so well included within a grammatical framework or are hard to classify as such, i.e. adverbial sentences in Spanish grammar. (Goldberg 1995).

In Constructional Grammar the term construction can be applied to lexical, phonic or syntactic elements. Therefore, this includes “morphemes, words, idioms, partially lexically filled and fully general linguistic patterns” (Goldberg 2003: 219). The meaning of the group is not deduced from the sum of its components. In addition, there are hybrid constructions, formed by a fixed part and a free part. This is the first step according to Traugott-Trousdale (2013) for the fixation. Some authors advocate a usage-based model (see Goldberg 1995; see Gras 2010; see Traugott & Trousdale 2013, etc.). Constructs are defined as the actual realisation of a construction in a real context. Some researchers from the Conversational Analysis have applied the concept of construction to the analysis of oral expressions (see Fried & Östman 2005; Couper-Kuhlen & Thompson 2008; Gras 2010, 2016; Gras & Sansiñena 2015) and their processes of change (constructionalization: Traugott & Trousdale 2013).

The structures discussed in this paper acquire a procedural meaning as a group, a previous step to the grammaticalization of these units. It is a parallel process of that experienced by other discourse markers, although in these cases there are differences in the degree of fixation. Some of these independent statements led by conjunctions may occupy the entire reactive turn or constitute a semi-fixed pattern, a semi-free construction, in which lexical choice is still permitted. However, it is the construction [fixed slot+ free slot] that acts as a group and develops the procedural content. In this regard, it can be understood as the “constructional change” described by Traugott-Trousdale (2010, 2013) and the process of constructionalization or reanalysis of Evans (2007, see §3).

This paper hypothesizes that in the constructionalization process of these “in subordinate clauses” there are some possible output functions, at least in what refers to the Spanish forms considered. To test it, I make use of a digital discourse corpus compiled by the APL Research Group (the Corpus MEsA), as well as current data from the Real Academia Española (RAE): CREA and CORPES XXI.

3. Insubordination

In subordinate clauses have been the object of recent discussion and constitute a proposal already applied to similar structures as 1-9. According to Evans (2007:367), insubordination is “the conventionalised main-clause use of what, on prima facie grounds, appear to be formally subordinate clauses”, i.e., this concept implies an evolutionary process.

The process undergone by these structures, as Evans (2007: 370) explains, is as follows:

“A: Subordination: subordinate construction

B: Ellipsis: ellipsis of the main clause

C: Conventionalised ellipsis: restriction of interpretation of ellipsed material

D: Reanalysis as main clause structure: Conventionalised main clause use of formally subordinate clause (Constructionalization)”.

This process is understood to be the inverse of the traditional grammaticalization process: from subordination (more grammar) to fixation as the main clause (which would be considered less grammar). Grammaticalization generally consists of the loss of constructional freedom to the point of functioning like a morpheme: more grammar, less syntactic freedom, and less denotative content. The general position is that grammaticalization is a process that “turns lexemes into grammatical formatives and renders grammatical formatives still more grammatical” (Lehmann 1982:v, in Evans 2007:375). According to Heine and Reh (1984: 15), “linguistic units lose in semantic complexity, pragmatic significance, syntactic freedom, and phonetic substance, respectively.” Within general theories of morphosyntactic change there are approaches that incorporate discourse markers. For Company (2004), that fixation occurs in the direction of a discourse element. For this reason, she writes of extra-sentential grammaticalization or grammaticalization of a discourse structure. In this way, pragmatics is not divorced from grammar, as is the case with the concept of pragmatization (Dostie 2004, Diewald 2011) or discoursization (Diewald 2011) (see Fuentes Rodríguez 2014). From a macrosyntactic point of view, in the process of –grammar to +grammar, the operators or connectors are grammatical units of contextualization (operators) or textualization (connectors).

The premises on which Evans bases his model are: a subordinate clause is dependent upon another and therefore may be eliminated; when it acts as an utterance or main clause, according to Evans, it acquires further content, a process which runs counter to grammaticalization. For this reason, Evans prefers to speak in terms of reanalysis: “A possible counter-move: insubordination isn’t grammaticalization, but reanalysis” (Evans 2009: 3).

Evans’ approach has received several objections. Mithun (2008) argues that his analysis “might explain constructions originated as complements, but not the ones that originated as adverbial (adjunct) constructions” (Sansiñena, De Smet, Cornillie 2015: 4). Van Linden & Van de Velde (2014) propose an explanation for autonomous and semi-autonomous subordination patterns in Dutch in terms of hypoanalysis (Croft 2000) to explain what they believe Evans fails to: “the semantic and pragmatic motivations for the language user to do away with the main clause” (Van Linden & Van de Velde 2014: 241). They add: “Evans’ hypothesis would be corroborated if we can find a credible link between the pragmatics of ellipsis and the semantics of insubordination” (p. 6).

Other researchers (Dostie 2004, Diewald 2011) prefer the term pragmaticalization when referring to discourse markers. Heine (2013) proposes the concept of cooptation that can be applied to structures that are not yet grammaticalized and that function as thetical elements: «units such as clauses, phrases, or words are taken from the domain of sentence grammar and deployed for purposes of discourse organization» (Heine 2013: 1205-6).

Theticals are elements which the speaker (or writer) presents as separate from sentence grammar in order to signal what Dik (1997: 396) called a «higher level orientation function». They allow the speaker to «step out» of the confines of the linearity of communication to some extent by creating a kind of second plane of communication, not unlike «asides» on stage. This plane can be inserted spontaneously virtually anywhere and therefore lends itself particularly well to situation specific, metacommunicative information. But the plane needs to be signaled to the listener as such prosodically by separate tone units, pauses, etc., and by the suspension or loosening of constructional constraints and ensuing mobility (Kaltenböck-Heine-Kuteva 2011: 883).

The application of the concept of insubordinate clauses to these constructions raises two important issues:

- a) The emergence of new categories /new discursive operators: The structures considered show that the process in these cases is not from subordinate clause to main clause, but from subordinate clause (1) to elided sentence (2), to conventional construction (3), and to pragmatic marker (4). From a macrosyntactic perspective, these elements are also procedural categories, closer to the grammatical than to the lexical.
- b) The conventional construction (3) may precede to grammaticalization: constructionalization of a syntactic structure with different functions in discourse which this paper wants to analyze.

Insubordination can be applied to these constructions, but also macrosyntax and cooptation are able to describe their functions. Some of these structures constitute reactive turns or form part of utterances (1,2,3,4,6,7,8,9). These elements are close to pragmatic markers (‘disjunct’ in Greenbaum 1969 and Quirk et al. 1972). Others, such as (5) or (8), generate constructions not entirely fixed, and present a syntactic behavior that points to another categorization. I discuss this in the following section to show that there are different options in this process.

4. Discussion.

The constructions considered above may appear in three situations with three different discursive functions, according to corpus analyzed:

- a) The utterance functions as a discursive operator (pragmatic marker) (4.1.)
- b) Conjunctions function as (il)locutionary marks (4.2.)
- c) The construction appears as an elliptical utterance (often suspended) (4.3.)

At the same time, they can also act simultaneously as free structures, whose meaning emerges from the sum of its parts.

4.1. Grammaticalization, reanalysis and discourse operators (applicable to *si quieres, si tú lo dices, si no te importa, como quieras, como te lo digo, lo que yo te diga*)

In order to assess that an expression is in the process of becoming a discursive marker, the following aspects must be confirmed:

- Its occurrence as an independent (intonational and syntactic) group: it is a phraseological unit,
- The construction cannot be extended, nor does it admit any insertion,
- The construction undergoes a semantic change: from the denotative meaning to the macrostructural or procedural meaning . (See Brinton 2010).

In parallel, Evans (2009, 11) explains that these insubordinate constructions are used by the speaker “in situations where a high degree of intersubjective alignment between speaker and hearer can be presupposed” (Evans 2009, 11). The listener applies a new analysis to the elements that compose the construction to interpret them in that new context. As there is no main verb to depend on, the receiver seeks to adjust to the context, and this allows for deducing new pragmatic contents. The new operators (pragmatic markers) may appear in two functional contexts:

a) As a reactive turn (as in 12): Also, in (2,3,6,7)

(12) M1:-Puedo llamarte un momento? Es para ver lo del día 14 (Can I call you back for a second? It's to double check what happened on the 14th).

H1: Si quieres (If you wish/as you like) (WA 2015-16 abril-dic, 7-7-2016) (see Chodorowska-Pilch 1999).

b) As part of another utterance, establishing a modal, enunciative, or argumentative meaning as in:

(13a)“Si quieres, puedes llamarme” (If you wish, you can call me) or (13b)“Puedes llamarme. Si quieres, claro” (You can call me. If you wish, of course).

This can extend to others: *si no te importa* in (4) appears in an elliptical clause, or *lo que yo te diga* (14). They can also act in an utterance, as peripherals, such as *como quieras* (modal clause, 15).

(14) Bueno, ¡fatal! ¡Menuda noche! ¡Lo que yo te diga!... (Well, that's terrible! What a night! I'm telling you!...) ((Corpes, Resino, Carmen: La boda (Monólogo). Alicante: Biblioteca Virtual Miguel de Cervantes, 2004.)

(15) Está bien, como quieras (All right, as you wish) (Corpes, Vidal, Javier: Ambas tres. www.celcit.org.ar: celcit.org.ar, 2001)

When these constructions occur in the context of a response (context A), they have the following properties:

- a) They have a modal meaning: disagreement (*si tú lo dices*), reaffirmation (*lo que yo te diga*, Brenes 2017), attenuation or politeness (*si no te importa, si quieres*)
- b) They do not admit insertion of elements but rather are fixed as phraseological units (Zuloaga 1980, Corpas 1996, Castillo 1997-8)
- c) They do not require replacement of any presupposed elliptical structure.

In context B, they may also be used with this modal function within an utterance, in monological discourse, which testifies to their integration within the paradigm of modal operators:

(16) Suéltalo, pero si no te importa, tráeme la sopa (Spit it out, but if you don't mind, bring me the soup) (CREA, Pujol, Carlos: Dos historias romanas. Barcelona: Ediciones Destino, 2008)

(17) Si quieres salimos a las calles para mostrar nuestro apoyo (If you want we go out on the streets to show our support (Corpus Digital, TW 2016 jul 16 DIO 04 [Dios]✓)

(18) La situación puede resumirse en que tenemos más libertad, pero menos libertinaje. Y lo que hace libre a un pueblo, dejémonos de éticas, es el libertinaje. El personal reciente votó socialismo como opción libertaria (*lo que yo te diga*, Felipe), y no como Supraestado del Estado. Deja suelta a la gente. (The situation can be summed up by saying we have more liberty, but less debauchery. And what makes a people free, let's not be ethical, is debauchery. Recent personnel voted for socialism as a libertarian option (just as I said, Felipe), and not as a State's Superstate. Let people be. (CREA, El País, 02/02/1986)

When these constructions appear with a peripheral function – an intermediate stage in their evolution – no longer depending on the main clause verb, they have undergone a semantic change and acquired procedural content: *si quieres* generates a proposal in (19):

(19) Si quieres vamos a hablar con él (If you wish, we can speak to him) (WA 2016 feb-mar).

Both functions, in dialogal and monological contexts, show that these constructions are (or will be in the future) new pragmatic markers. I would prefer to call them operators in progress: OPr (Fuentes Rodríguez 2020). In this process of grammaticalization, some stages have been completed by some of these expressions:

- a) A subordinate structure as an independent sentence
- b) A (modal, enunciative or argumentative) operator in responses
- c) An operator in peripheral structure, embedded in the sentence
- d) The subordinate conjunction + verb recategorized as “pre-pragmatic” marker.

Reflection on these elements leads us to certain conclusions:

Firstly, the discourse units also form part of the grammar and, therefore, whatever constructions fixed to constitute discourse markers (connectors and operators) bear grammaticalization (not only pragmaticalization or discursivization, Claridge-Arnovick 2010). Grammar should include macro-structural elements. For example, *si tú lo dices* as a reactive response (13) may be considered an insubordinate clause (within the theory of insubordination) or an independent utterance (within macrosyntax). The construction unfolds a new procedural meaning, doubt or incredulity, or at least the speaker’s polite reluctance to share the hearer’s position. Additionally, it syntactically acts as a unique element. In (20) fills the entire reactive turn.

(20) Paco: Pues eso es el amor: no le des más vueltas. (Paco: So that’s love: don’t give it a moment’s thought)

Tere: ¡Si tú lo dices! (Tere: If you say so!) (CREA, C. Resino: Pop y patatas fritas, 1992)

The process for *si tú lo dices* is shown below:

Table 1. *si tú lo dices*

Input Category	Output Category
Conditional subordinate clause	Utterance as reactive turn, with modal content = discursive operator or disjunct

Grammar, I would argue, should extend to discourse and include operators and connectors because they function in the text structure, in a specific context, without denotative meaning.

In that sense, the approach adopted in this paper necessarily involves innovations in the analysis of the syntax and coincides with thetical and cooptation proposal of Heine.

However, not all the constructions listed at the outset are in the same situation since several cases remain unresolved. For example, *si yo te contara* (‘if I were to tell you’) is not at the same stage of fixation as *si tú lo dices* (‘if you say so’), leading us to the following point, where we discuss other possibilities.

4.2. Independent utterances

4.2.1. The conjunction as a locutionary or illocutionary marker

Each of these structures conveys modal comment, but not all have completed the fixation process to the extent of losing the denotative meaning of the construction and acquiring a modal function. In some of them, the conjunction may adopt locutionary or illocutionary functions, widening the range of constructive possibilities. Let us consider some contexts of realization.

4.2.1.1. Dyadic dependence or enunciative que.

In (21), as in (5), *que* introduces the reply:

(21) MADRE: ¿Qué pasa con la nena? (What’s the matter with the girl?)

ROSA: Que no quiere salir de la casita, señora. (she doesn’t want to leave the house, Madam) (CORPES, A. Ferrari: La casita feliz, 2008)

Proponents of “dyadic dependence” (Sansiñena, De Smet, Cornillie 2015) explain these utterances as follows: the utterance used in replies arises from a prior turn, which it completes, hence the expression “dyadic dependence”.

This concept refines Evans’ notion of ellipsis:

‘dyadic dependence’ merely assumes that speakers can build syntactic structures on material available in previous discourse. We use it here as a more neutral term to substitute for Evans’ ellipsis” (...) “dyadically dependent clauses offer a potential basis for the conventionalization of associated discourse functions, leading to the emergence of insubordinate constructions proper (...). But insubordinate clauses also display functions which our current data set does not allow us to trace back to dyadically dependent clauses (Sansiñena-De Smet-Cornillie 2015: 5-6).

This phenomenon is restricted then to the sphere of interaction.

Sansañena-De Smet-Cornillie describe sentences with initial *que* as two types of insubordinates: a) modal, with subjunctive, and b) discourse connective uses: with indicative.

The latter insubordinates function discursively:

- a) As a cooperative response
- b) To contradict the speaker
- c) To repeat or highlight what has just been said.

Their conclusion is that “dyadically dependent clauses adopt specific textual and interpersonal functions. In other words, there are specific functional motivations for using dyadically dependent clauses, rather than dependent clauses with explicit matrix or independent clauses without initial complementizer” (Sansañena-De Smet-Cornillie, 2015: 17).

Besides, they suggest this possibility as an intermediate stage in their evolution:

The retention of the complementizer in dyadically dependent constructions is functional, in marking the relations to previous discourse and the status of the clause within the turn as a whole. The use of dyadically dependent clauses is further found to correlate with directness and emphasis, to the point of signaling speaker irritation in relation to the previous turn. These findings add credibility to Evans’ (2007) ellipsis-based pathway from subordinate to insubordinate constructions, as they provide the missing intermediate stage – i.e. functional specialization in dyadically dependent utterances (p. 17).

Other researchers are aware that this theory fails to account for the full range of the subordinated sentences. Moreover, they disregard other approaches that are well-known in the scholarly literature: this *que* reveals the presence of the performative verb (Ross 1970) or the enunciative verb (Ducrot 1984: 150) (*I say that...*) in cases with the verb in indicative. With the subjunctive, *que* presupposes an illocutionary verb. The conjunction, then, acts as an enunciative marker (*digo +que+ indicative*) or an illocutionary verb (*quiero +que+ subjunctive*).

A macrosyntactic perspective would consider these ways of relating interventions and accepting the presence of this locutionary marker as a manifestation of the act of enunciation (Ducrot 1984).

4.2.1.2. Conjunctions as illocutionary markers: *y si*

In (9) “¿y si nos vamos a la playa?” (lit. and if we go to the beach? and what if we go to the beach?), *y si* introduces a suggestion, parallel to “*si on allait se promener?*” in French, “how about a walk?” “what if we go for a walk?” in English. This utterance may be interpreted as a subordinate clause depending on an elliptical main verb: “*y si vamos a la playa ¿te vendrías? ¿qué te parece?*” (and if we go to the beach, would you come? what do you think?). There is a range of possible continuations available, but all have the illocutionary meaning of proposal. *Y si* can be used alone with this value (*¿Y si...?*) as an independent utterance, without any further verbalization, and it continues to express possibility or suggestion. The coordinate conjunction + *si* behaves then as an indication of a claim (proposition, invitation) and does so as a group; the conjunction *y* cannot be eliminated. It can also occur in an initial remark so that we do not need to presuppose any prior discourse with which it connects. It brings into question whether *y si* acts as a complex conjunction, as a modal marker expressing the illocutionary force of the proposition or invitation, or instead as an indicator of a question concerning a future possibility.

The same occurs with *es que*, employed alone in oral discourse as introducing an objection or excuse in a suspended utterance: *esqueeee....*

(22) NO ES NO. Y punto. Todavía estoy leyendo comentarios « pero y si...» De idiotas no nos libraremos nunca (NO MEANS NO. That’s it. I’m still reading comments «but what if» We will never get rid of idiots (TW 2017 ago LET 03, usuario 23)

(23) Homero: No puedo. No. Es que... (Homer: I can’t. No. It’s just that ...) (Corpes, Rosenzvit, Walter: Nadar en tierra. Buenos Aires: celcit.org.ar, 2013-02-27).

In such cases, there are elliptical statements that function as reactive turns. But they do work as illocutionary markers, referred to the speaker subjectivity.

4.2.2 Elliptical utterances (often suspended) and constructionalization: *si yo te contara...*

The suspended utterance (Pérez Béjar 2018) is another syntactic structure whose status within the macrosyntax must be acknowledged. Microsyntax does not encompass its specific characteristics: its inferential function, (appeal to the interlocutor to collaborate in the decoding) and a specific intonation.

From a macrosyntactic perspective and pragmatic orientation (Fuentes Rodríguez 2017b) the suspended sentence is considered a construction in its own right, one with a range of pragmatic functions. It derives from a contextual use, but as this becomes fixed, it develops a construction employed for particular uses in specific contexts, including the creation of discourse markers.

For this reason, among the structures mentioned, there are also fixed constructions: the structure [conjunction+ clause] unfolds an additional procedural value, although lexical variation is still permitted. Constructionalization is, therefore, the final stage expected by Evans (see above). It is important to mention this because these constructions are finally given a specific interpretation, and a discourse and/or pragmatic function.

a) Construction [Si + subjunctive...!]

For example, in “Si yo tuviera tu casa...” (If I had your house), “Si me tocara la lotería...” (If I won the lottery...) the construction [si + imperfect subjunctive] appears as a suspended clause, with a rising boundary tone and vowel lengthening. It is the expression of a desire in which the subjunctive lends it the character of unattainability or remoteness. The options are: to describe it as a conditional with an elided main clause, or, as I propose, an utterance formed by a construction containing si with the value of unattainable wish. Si yo te contara (1) has its origin in this suspended construction (If I told you...) but ends up acquiring the status of an independent utterance, a phraseological unit as a discursive operator.

b) Construction [Si + indicative] in replies (counter argumentation)

Other constructions introduced by si constitute a paradigmatic case analyzed as subordinate clauses (Evans 2007). Following Schwenter (1996), he considers them as a case apart from those instances of Spanish si that have an argumentative function in replies.

- (24) A: – Cómete todo el arroz (Eat up all the rice)
 B: – ¡Si no se puede comer !(You can't even eat it)

Schwenter has analyzed Spanish si as a rejoinder or counterargument, identifying a possible conditional origin in which the main clause is omitted: “si no se puede comer, ¿cómo puedes pedirme eso?” (If it's almost inedible, how can you ask me to do that?). According to Montolio (1999a, 1999b), this structure presupposes verbs of more general scope or speech verbs. Porroche (1998) regards si as an argument in disagreement. Given that it is unnecessary to replace all the information (“¿cómo puedes pedirme eso?”), it is enough to call it argumentative si since it introduces a justification. It is a question then of a change of function in three aspects:

- a) Meaning: From conditional si to argumentative si.
- b) Category: From clause to utterance or intervention.
- c) Plane: In essence, from micro- to macro-syntax.

We believe that this difference of perspective leads us to a better understanding of the syntax of si (see also Schwenter 2017). Si+ clause in responses, then, would be a specific construction that occurs in this act of responding, thus there is a constructionalization: [si in reply with argumentative function].

c) Constructions: [Cuando + decir indicative], [como si + subjunctive]...

There are other constructions with procedural meaning. [Cuando + verb of speech in the indicative] (“Cuando tú lo dices, cuando ella lo dice... (será verdad)” if you say so, if she says so.. (it will be true) adopts this evidential character: “I accept it, it is true, because I stand by my belief on an authority: you, she”. This case is also a suspended clause. It does not occur without a falling boundary tone.

With Evans, a progression in discourse functions can then be detected (from designative meaning to attenuation device), which is consistent with the Kaltenböck-Heine-Kuteva's approach (2011), a new grammar of intersubjectivity.

It can also be said that (6) Como si... is still a free construction, with the verb in the subjunctive, used in a reply. The construction como si + subjunctive appears as an independent and complete statement: como si tú no lo supieras (as if you didn't know), como si estuviera lloviendo (as if it were raining) and develops a procedural meaning (Fuentes Rodríguez in press). It is a reply, which rejects what was said by the interlocutor presenting a hypothetical situation that does not occur and which would justify what was said:

- Speaker A. Affirmation
 Speaker B. As if X. Rejection of A's claim.

The fact asserted by speaker A would only be possible if the fact X, which is presented as unreal (in subjunctive), were given. For example, if you knew it, if it were raining, which does not happen...

For the purpose of this paper, we consider the concept of construction as the most important aspect of the insubordination hypothesis, which is necessary to incorporate into the analysis of utterances. Macrosyntax involves not

only taking into account discourse markers and illocutionary acts, but also admitting new syntactic structures and categories (see cooptation in Heine). Some of these are peripheral constructions, suspended sentences, free sentences derived from clauses with subordinate conjunctions, and new discourse operators that have emerged from the fixation of these same constructions, as stated above.

Evans' hypothesis opens new perspectives to macrosyntax. Constructionalization is a fundamental stage in evolution and allows for a more extensive syntax.

5. Concluding remarks

Some Spanish subordinate clauses used as independent utterances have been reexamined, following a macrosyntax approach. The result of the constructionalization process may be:

- a) Fixation as discursive operator
- b) Conjunction reinterpreted as an illocutionary mark
- c) Fixed construction with a procedural content that adopts a peripheral function in the statement or acts as an independent utterance

The following table summarizes the functions of the structures analyzed:

Table 2. Constructional changes

Input construction	Category/function	Output construction/category
Subordinate conjunction +clause	Discursive operator (pragmatic marker)	Discursive operator (pragmatic marker) in replies (reactive turn) or peripheral elements in monological discourse (si quieres, si no te importa, como te lo digo, si tú lo dices, como quieras).
	Parenthetical	
	Suspended utterance	
	Conjunction and clause as illocutionary construction	Utterance with illocutionary marks: Y si...
	Construction as fixed structure of response	Como si +subjunctive..., si (argumentative), si yo te contara/cuento (subjunctive or indicative)....

Acknowledgments

This work is carried out in the framework of the project FFI 2017-82898-P, supported by the Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness of the Spanish Government and FEDER funds, and the PAIDI Project P18-FR 2619.

References

- Anscombre, J.C.-O. Ducrot 1983. *L'argumentation dans la langue*. Pierre Mardaga, Liège. Beaugrande, R. y W. Dressler 1997. *Introducción a la lingüística del texto*. Ariel, Barcelona.
- Avanzi, M. 2017. Regards croisés sur la notion de macro-syntaxe, *Travaux neuchâtelois de linguistique* 47, 39-58.
- Berrendonner, A. 1990. Pour une macro-syntaxe. *Travaux de linguistique*, 21, 25-36. Berrendonner, A. 2002. Les deux syntaxes. *Verbum*, 24/ 1-2, 23-36.
- Berrendonner, A. 2003. Eléments pour une macro-syntaxe: actions communicatives, types de clauses, structures périodiques. In A. Scarano (a cura di). *Macro-syntaxe et pragmatique. L'analyse linguistique de l'oral*. Bulzoni, Roma, 93-109.
- Berruto, G., 1986. La dislocazione a destra in italiano. In H. Stammerjohan, H. (ed), *Tema-remà in italiano*. Gunter Narr Verlag, Tubinga, 55-69.
- Berruto, G., 1985. Dislocazioni a sinistra' e 'grammatica' dell'italiano parlato. In: Franchi De Bellis, A. y Savoia, L. M. (eds.), *Sintassi e morfologia della lingua italiana d'uso. Teorie e applicazioni descrittive*. Bulzoni, Roma, 59-82.
- Blanche Benveniste, C. 1990. *Le français parlé. Études grammaticales*. Éditions de CNRS, Paris.
- Blanche-Benveniste, C. 2002. Macro-syntaxe et micro-syntaxe: les dispositifs de la rection verbale. In H. Leth Andersen – H. Nolle (eds.). *Colloque international, Macro-syntaxe et macrosemantique*. Berna: Peter Lang, pp. 95-118.
- Blanche-Benveniste, C. 2003. Le recouvrement de la syntaxe et de la macro-syntaxe. En A. Scarano (a cura di). *Macro-syntaxe et pragmatique. L'analyse linguistique de l'oral*. Roma, Bulzoni, pp. 53-75
- Brenes Peña, E., 2017. Lo que yo te diga: funciones discursivas y proceso de gramaticalización. *Círculo de Lingüística Aplicada a la Comunicación (CLAC)* 71, 63-82.
- Brinton, L. J. 1996. *Pragmatic Markers in English: Grammaticalization and Discourse Functions*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Brinton, L. J. 2008. *The Comment Clause in English: Syntactic Origins and Pragmatic Development*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

- Brinton, L. J. 2010. Discourse Markers. In: Andreas Jucker e Irma Taatvisainen, *Historical Pragmatics*. De Gruyter Mouton, Berlin, 285-314.
- Briz, A. – Grupo Val. Es.Co. 2003. Un sistema de unidades para el estudio del lenguaje coloquial. *Oralia* 6, 7-61.
- Castillo Carballo, M. A., 1997-1998. El concepto de unidad fraseológica. *Revista de Lexicografía* IV, 67-79.
- Chodorowska-Pilch, M. 1999. Si quieres as a grammaticalized politeness marker in Peninsular Spanish. In S. J. Hwang; A. R. Lommel (ed.), *Lacus forum* 25, Lacus: Fullerton, Ca, 151-160.
- Claridge, C.–L. Arnovick. 2010. Pragmaticalisation and Discursisation. In A. Jucker – I. Taavitsainen (eds.), *Historical Pragmatics*. De Gruyter Mouton: Berlin, 165–192.
- Company, C. 2004. ¿Gramaticalización o desgramaticalización? Reanálisis y subjetivización de verbos como marcadores discursivos en la historia del español. *Revista de Filología Española* 84 (1), 29–66.
- Couper-Kuhlen, E.– S. A. Thompson 2008. On assessing situations and events in conversation: ‘extraposition’ and its relatives. *Discourse Studies* 10 (4), 443-447.
- Corpas Pastor, G., 1996. *Manual de fraseología española*. Gredos, Madrid.
- Croft, W., 2000. *Explaining Language Change. An Evolutionary Approach*. Longman, Harlow.
- Dehé, N.-Kavalová, Y. (eds.) 2007. *Parenteticals*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Deulofeu, J. 2016. La macrosyntaxe comme moyen de tracer la limite entre organisation grammaticale et organisation du discours. *Modèles linguistiques*, pp. 135-166: <http://ml.revues.org/2040>; DOI: 10.4000/ml.2040 (05-05-2015).
- Deulofeu, H.-J. 2011. L’approche macrosyntaxique en syntaxe: un outil pour traiter le problème des constructions improprement appelées subordonnées. In J.J. Bustos et al (eds): *Sintaxis y análisis del discurso hablado en español. Homenaje a Antonio Narbona*. Vol. II, Universidad de Sevilla, 731-746.
- Diewald, G., 2011. Pragmaticalization (Defined) as Grammaticalization of Discourse Functions. *Linguistics* 49(2), 365–390.
- Dik, S. C., 1997[1957]. *The theory of functional grammar*. 2nd ed. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.
- Dostie, G., 2004. Pragmaticalisation et marqueurs discursifs. *Analyse sémantique et traitement lexicographique*. De Boeck-Duculot, Bruxelles.
- Ducrot, O. 1984. *El decir y lo dicho*. Hachette, Buenos Aires.
- Evans, N., 2007. Insubordination and its uses. In I. Nikolaeva (ed.), *Finiteness: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations*. Oxford University Press, New York, 366-431.
- Evans, N., 2009. Insubordination and the grammaticalisation of interactive presuppositions. *Conference: Methodologies in determining morphosyntactic change, organized*. Museum of Ethnography, Osaka.
- Fernández Lorences, T., 2010. *Gramática de la tematización en español*. Universidad de Oviedo, Oviedo.
- Fraser, B. 1990. An approach to discourse markers. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14, 383-395. Fraser, B. 1996. Discourse markers. *Pragmatics* 6, (2), 167-190.
- Fried, M. –J.O. Östman 2005. Construction Grammar and spoken language. The case of pragmatic particles. *Journal of Pragmatics* 37: 1752-1778.
- Fuentes Rodríguez, C. 2003. Operador/conector, un criterio para la sintaxis discursiva. *RILCE* 19/1, 61-85.
- Fuentes Rodríguez, C. 2012. El margen derecho del enunciado. *RSEL* 42/2, 63-93.
- Fuentes Rodríguez, C. 2013. La gramática discursiva: niveles, unidades y planos de análisis. *Cuadernos de AISPI* 2, 9-30.
- Fuentes Rodríguez, C. 2014. Comment Clauses and the Emergence of New Discourse Markers: Spanish lo que es más. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 61 (1), 103-119.
- Fuentes Rodríguez, C. 2017a[2000]. *Lingüística pragmática y análisis del discurso*. Arco/Libros, Madrid, 3.ª ed.
- Fuentes Rodríguez, C. 2017b. *Macrosintaxis y lingüística pragmática*. *CLAC* 71, 5-34.
- Fuentes Rodríguez, C. 2018. *Parentéticos*. Arco Libros, Madrid.
- Fuentes Rodríguez, C. 2020. Operadores discursivos. In C. Fuentes Rodríguez, coord. *Operadores en proceso*. Lincom, München, 4-30.
- Fuentes Rodríguez, C. in press. Enunciados independientes (de rechazo) y construcciones en intervención reactiva. In C. Fuentes Rodríguez– E. Brenes Peña– V. Pérez Béjar (eds). *Sintaxis discursiva: construcciones y operadores*. Peter Lang, Berne.
- Girón Alconchel, J.L. 2008. Lexicalización y gramaticalización en la creación de marcadores del discurso... y de otras palabras. In E. Stark, R. Schmidt-Riese, E. Stoll (hrsg.) *Romanische Syntax im Walden*. Gunter Narr Verlag. Tübingen, 363-385.
- Goldberg, A. E. 1995. *Constructions. A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago / London.
- Goldberg, A. E. 2003. *Constructions: a new theoretical approach to language*. *TRENDS in Cognitive Sciences* 7 (5): 219-224.
- Gras, P. 2010. *Gramática de construcciones en interacción*. Doctoral thesis.
- Gras, P. 2016. Revisiting the functional typology of insubordination. Insubordinate que-constructions in Spanish. In N. Evans and H. Watanabe (eds.), *Insubordination*, Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 113-143.
- Gras, P.– M. S. Sansiñena 2015. An interactional account of discourse-connective que-constructions in Spanish. *Text&Talk* 35 (4): 505-529.
- Greenbaum, S., 1969. *Studies in English Adverbial Usage*. Longman, London.
- Heine, B. 2013. On discourse markers: Grammaticalization, pragmaticalization, or something else?. *Linguistics* 51 (6): 1205–1247.
- Heine, B., Reh, M., 1984. *Grammaticalization and reanalysis in African languages*. Helmut Buske Verlag, Hamburg.
- Hengeveld, K., Mackenzie, J. L., 2008. *Functional discourse grammar. A typologically-based theory of language structure*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Hidalgo, R., 2003. *La tematización en español*. Gredos, Madrid.
- Kaltenböck, G., Heine, B., Kuteva, T., 2011. On Thetical Grammar. *Studies in Language* 35(4), 852–897.
- Lehmann, C., 1982. Thoughts on grammaticalisation: a programmatic sketch. Vol. 1. (Arbeiten des Kölner Universalien-Projekts 48). Universität zu Köln, Institut für Sprachwissenschaft, Köln.
- Mithun, M., 2008. The extension of dependency beyond the sentence. *Language* 84 (1), 264--280.

- Moescher, J.–Reboul, A. 1994. *Dictionnaire encyclopédique de pragmatique*. Éditions du Seuil, Paris.
- Montolío, E. 1999a. ¡Si nunca he dicho que estuviera enamorada de él! Sobre construcciones independientes introducidas por si con valor replicativo. *Oralia*, 2: 37-69
- Montolío, E. 1999b. Las construcciones condicionales. En I. Bosque y V. Demonte, eds. *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*. Tomo 3. Madrid: Espasa Calpe, pp. 3643-3738.
- Padilla, X., 2001. *El orden de palabras en el español coloquial*. Publicaciones Universitat de València, Valencia.
- Pérez Béjar, V. 2018. *Pragmagramática de las estructuras suspendidas*. Tesis Doctoral. Universidad de Sevilla.
- Pons, S. 2018. Paths of grammaticalization: beyond the LP/RP debate. In S. Pons-O. Loureda (eds.) *Beyond grammaticalization and discourse markers. New issues in the study of language change*. Brill, Leiden/Boston, 334-383.
- Porroche, M., 1998. Sobre algunos usos de que, si y es que como marcadores del discurso. In Martín Zorraquino, M. A., Montolío Durán, E. (eds.), *Los marcadores del discurso. Teoría y análisis*. Arco Libros, Madrid, pp. 229-242.
- Quirk, R. et al., 1972. *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. Longman, London.
- Rizzi, L., 1997. The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery. In L. Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of Grammar*. Kluwer, Dordrecht, 281-337.
- Rodríguez Ramalle, T., 2011. Sobre si y la organización del margen preverbal en español. *LEA: Lingüística española actual* 33(2), 199-222.
- Ross, J. R., 1970. On declarative sentences. In R.A. Jacobs – P.S. Rosenbaum (eds.), *Readings in English transformational grammar*. Georgetown University Press, Washington, pp. 222–272.
- Sansiñena, M. S., De Smet, H., Cornillie, B., 2015. Between subordinate and in subordinate. Paths toward complementizer-initial main clauses. *Journal of Pragmatics* 77, 3-19.
- Samek-Lodovici, V., 2006. When Right Dislocation Meets the Left Periphery. A Unified Analysis of Italian non Final Focus. *Lingua* 116, 836-876. <http://www.homepages.ucl.ac.uk/~ucljvsl/Publications/Focus&RightDislocation.PDF>
- Schiffrin, D. 1987. *Discourse markers*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Schwenter, S. 1996. Pragmatics of the independent si-clauses in Spanish, *Hispanic Linguistics*, 8 (2), 316-351.
- Schwenter, S., 2017, Independent si-clauses in Spanish. In N. Evans –H. Watanabe (eds.), *Insubordination*. J. Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 89-112.
- Traugott, E. C. (1995) The Role of the Development of Discourse Markers in a Theory of Grammaticalization. Consulted: 05-05-2015. <<http://web.stanford.edu/~traugott/ect-papersonline.html>>.
- Traugott, E. C. 2010. Grammaticalization. In A. H. Jucker – I. Taavitsainen (eds.), *Historical Pragmatics*, 97-126. De Gruyter Mouton, Berlin.
- Traugott, E. C. – G. Trousdale. 2010. Gradience, gradualness and grammaticalization: How do they intersect?. In E. C. Traugott – G. Trousdale (Eds.), *Gradience, gradualness and grammaticalization*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 19–44.
- Traugott, E. C. – G. Trousdale. 2013. *Constructionalization*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Van Linden, A., Van de Velde, F., 2014. (Semi-)autonomous subordination in Dutch: Structures and semantic--pragmatic values. *Journal of Pragmatics* 60, 226-250.
- Zuluaga, A., 1980. *Introducción al estudio de las expresiones fijas*. Peter Lang, Frankfurt.