

Fictive self-quotation: QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE ASPECTS OF FICTIVITY IN EUROPEAN AND BRAZILIAN PORTUGUESE

Studies on fictivity (TALMY, 1996, 2000; LANGACKER 1991, 1999, 2008; PASCUAL, 2006; BRANDT, 2010) point out that certain linguistic expressions are only indirectly related to their meant referents and that unreal scene is often presented by language users as a means of mentally accessing the real scene. In the example “The fence stretches from the plateau to the valley”, part of our cognition perceives the image of an object moving, following the path from the plateau to the valley. Nevertheless, another part of our cognition assesses this image as unreal, relying on the conception that nothing in the scene is actually moving. Regarding this kind of cognitive conflict, the image assessed as unreal is fictive.

By overlapping cognitive and interactional frames, the fictive self-quotation phenomenon is a discursive type of fictivity, by which its conceptualisers pose a subjectifying and assessing perspective to the direct speech in the first person, differently from its factive counterpart. This is mainly due to the mismatching use between the traditional way of reporting self-speech and thought and the meaning of *dicendi* verbs like “dizer” and “falar”, which take an exclusively epistemic status (e.g. “I said (thought) “Oh, God!”). Therefore, by means of an unreal scene of discourse reporting, the illocutionary agent reports himself to a previous and assumed speech scene, aiming at allowing mental access to the real scene of thought.

The historically methodological track followed by the studies on fictivity is analogous to the one made by Cognitive Linguistics as a whole. It begins with works which are solely based on the linguists’ intuition, who developed epistemological constructs prompted by both image and linguistic illustrations, either made up or faked, though plausible, for postulating both psychological and cognitive state of affairs. Within this context, the main objective of this work is to describe and analyse fictive self-quotation and its factive co-extension in oral corpora of European and Brazilian Portuguese, focusing on the open construction “(I) said X-clause”, devoid of any directive phrases (GOLDBERG, 1995) or active zones (LANGACKER, 1991), which would unquestionably point to its factive interpretation.

As for the data, the Portuguese corpus C-ORAL-ROM (NASCIMENTO, GONÇALVES, VELOSO, ANTUNES, BARRETO E AMARO, 2005) and the Brazilian corpus C-ORAL (RASO e MELLO, 2010) are used, as they have similar basic architectures. The corpora CINTIL, NURC and the database of the reality show Big Brother Brasil (2002) are also used, all of which subjected to the TextSTAT or Contextes electronic tools. On the whole, the results point out meaningful conceptual, diatopic and diaphasic contrasts between the uses of “disse” and “falei” in the national varieties, since the verb “falar” is not often used to build a reported speech mental space in the European Portuguese and that, from a constructional standpoint, certain interactional frames seem to favour fictive self-quotation more promptly, as in the case of the reality show.

However, from a discursive point of view, fictivity affects self-quotation in both varieties of the Portuguese language, mapped by clues which include monological self-report, subjectification, epistemic co-text, mental scanning, the metaphor “THINKING IS SPEAKING”, speech acts such as promises, planning and appreciation, friendship face-taking and deictic mismatch. Such signs form a set of semantic and pragmatic trends extracted from the single-out case analysis of real interactions, making

interactional and cognitive frames to converge, thus supporting the multidimensional feature of the phenomenon, basically split into epistemic and pragmatic dimensions. This contributes to an innovative view on fictivity which, according to Talmy (2011), only refers to cognitive conflicts between discrepant (fictive and factive) ways of perceiving or conceiving the same object. On the other hand, if we take into consideration the collocation hypothesis of Gries e Stefanowitsch (2003, 2004, 2008), which chiefly implies identifying the associative force between a given construction and a given lexical item, and if we treat it from a discursive standpoint, we conclude that a fictive cognitive frame is evoked whenever a fictive interactional frame is.

Bibliographical References

- CRESTI, E.; MONEGLIA, M. (eds.) C-ORAL-ROM: integrated reference corpora for spoken romance languages. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2005.
- FRANCIS, E. J.; MICHAELIS, L. A. (eds.) Mismatch: form-function incongruity and the architecture of grammar. Stanford: CSLI Publications, 2003.
- LANGACKER, R. W. Cognitive Grammar: a basic introduction. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- LIM, T. S.; BOWERS, J. W. Facework: solidarity, approbation, and tact. *Human Communication Research*, 17,3: 415-450, 1991.
- PASCUAL, E. Fictive interaction within the sentence: a communicative type of fictivity in grammar. *Cognitive Linguistics* 17-2, 245-267, 2006.
- RASO, T.; MELLO, H. R. The C-ORAL-BRASIL corpus. In: Moneglia, Massimo; Panunzi, Alessandro. (Org.) Bootstrapping information from corpora in a crosslinguistic perspective. 1ed. Florença: Firenze University Press, 2010, v. 1, p. 193-213.
- ROCHA, L. F. M. A fala silenciosa reportada: metáfora, metonímia e mesclagem. *Linguística*, Rio de Janeiro, v. 2, n. 1, p. 23-38, junho de 2006.
- SILVA, A. S. da. Perspectivação conceptual e Gramática. *Revista Portuguesa de Humanidades: estudos linguísticos*. Faculdade de Filosofia da UCP, Braga, 2008, vol. 12-1, p. 17-44.
- TALMY, L. Fictive motion in Language and “Ception”. In: BLOOM, P; PETERSON, M. A.; GARRETT, M. F. *Language and Space*. MIT Press: Cambridge, 1996, p. 211-276.
- WAUGH, L. R.; FONSECA-GREBER, B.; VICKERS, C.; ERÖZ, B. Multiple empirical approaches to a complex analysis of discourse. IN: GONZALEZ-MARQUEZ, M.; MITTELBERG, I.; COULSON, S.; SPIVEY (eds.) *M. J. Methods in cognitive linguistics*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2006, p. 120-1

ORAL PRESENTATION