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Overview

This edited volume brings together the latest research on the subject of fictive interaction, that is the use of the ordinary conversation as a frame to structure cognition, discourse, and language (Pascual 2002, 2006a, 2014). The chapters in the volume deal with fictive interaction as a cognitive phenomenon, as a discourse-structuring pattern, as a communicative strategy in language for specific purposes, and as a linguistic construction at different stages of grammaticalization. The data discussed in the chapters involve a variety of unrelated languages and modes of communication, across cultural contexts and historical time.

The volume stems from the premise that there is a conversational basis to language, which serves to partly structure cognition, discourse, and grammar. The idea that the structure of language reflects its communicative function and interactional dimension is certainly not a new one (cf. Voloshinov [1929] 1986; Bakhtin [1975] 1981; Vygotsky [1934] 1962). However, it has taken the field of linguistics a long time to integrate this basic idea into the study of grammatical structure. This volume fits within the growing tendency in Cognitive Linguistics to combine cognitive and interactional approaches to language and language use (cf. Du Bois 2001 [2014]; Verhagen 2005; Hougaard & Oakley 2008; Langacker 2013; Brône & Zima forth.; Cienki forth.). More specifically, the volume is in line with the recent work in Interactional Linguistics (Ochs et al. 1996) and on intersubjectivity (cf. Bråten 1998; Davidse et al. 2010; Tomasello
2003; Zlatev et al. 2008), which challenges long-standing assumptions among linguists, by viewing grammar as arising from interaction. In the volume the conversational turn—rather than the sentence—is taken as the most basic unit of analysis. The book further moves away from the common focus on written language by examining spoken language as an equally valid window to linguistic, discursive, and cognitive structure.

The volume is particularly innovative in that it is devoted to what the first editor has coined *fictive interaction* (Pascual 2002, 2006, 2014), namely the use of the conversation frame in order to structure thought, discourse, and grammar. From a theoretical perspective, “fictive interaction” can serve as an umbrella term that covers a number of under-studied and un-studied phenomena, as well as other phenomena that are well-known, but which were formerly viewed as unrelated. These include: speech metaphors (Barnden 1997), apostrophe, dialogic monologues, Langacker’s (1999) “virtual speech acts”, such as rhetorical questions, and embedded “demonstrations” (Clark & Gerrig 1990)—as in “an attitude that says ‘what’s in it for me? ’”, “an attitude of ‘what’s in it for me?’”, or “a ‘what’s in it for me?’ attitude”. Little as it has been studied, intra-sentential fictive interaction constitutes a productive and sometimes obligatory, fully grammaticalized, construction in a vast number of unrelated languages (Pascual 2006b, 2014: ch. 4). The same seems to be the case for inter-sentential fictive interaction (e.g. “Why do I say that? Because,...”) and sentential fictive interaction (e.g. “Who needs that car?”).

As a linguistic phenomenon, manifested in the form of a grammatical intra-sentential construction, fictive interaction has been analyzed as such in a great number of unrelated languages: English (Pascual 2002, 2006b, Pascual 2014, Pascual et al. 2013; Brandt 2008, Królak 2008; Stec 2009; Sandler 2012a, 2012b); Dutch (Pascual & Janssen 2004, Janssen & Pascual 2005); Polish (Królak 2008); German (Santos Mendes 2005); Spanish and Catalan (Pascual 2002, 2010, 2014); Portuguese (Rocha 2012); Biblical Hebrew (Sandler & Pascual in prep.); Papuan languages (de Vries 2010); and signed languages (Jarque & Pascual in prep.). Various studies have further shown that fictive interaction may constitute a successful communicative strategy in various types of discourses. These include: legal argumentation (Chaemsaithong 2012; Coulson & Pascual 2006, Pascual 2002, 2006a, 2014); literature and comedy news programs (Stec 2007); political argumentation (Cienki & Giansante 2014; Oakley
& Coulson 2008; Turner 2010); theater (Abrantes 2009); classroom and philosophical discourse (Brandt 2008, 2013; Oakley & Brandt 2009; Xiang & Pascual 2013); religious texts (Sandler & Pascual in prep.); journalistic texts (Demeter 2011; Chaemsaithong 2013); written route directions (Santos Mendes 2005); cartoons (Stec 2007); art descriptions (Sullivan 2007, 2009a, 2009b); and even aphasic conversation (Pascual & Versluis 2006; Versluis & Kleppa 2008). This volume brings together the work of some of these scholars—both well-established and emerging—working on fictive interaction in an attempt to explore the phenomenon in its different dimensions and manifestations and from different angles.

The volume is divided into five parts, covering different perspectives from which fictive interaction can be approached. Part I, which serves as the introduction to the rest of the volume, presents an overview of the phenomenon as cognitive, discursive, communicative and linguistic reality (Pascual & Sandler) and contextualizes its study within the broader century-long debate on the nature of linguistic meaning (Sandler). Part II, “Fictive Interaction as Cognitive Reality” explores conceptual configurations representing fictive communication (Pagán Cánovas & Turner); extends the study of the phenomenon to non-verbal modalities—comics (Xiang) and the conceptualization of pictorial art (Sullivan). Part III, “Fictive Interaction as Discourse Structure”, shows how historical written texts may be structured as simultaneous conversations (Chaemsaithong) and how in professional discourse a fictive speech act, such as a prayer (FitzGerald & Oakley) or an apology (Demeter) may be introduced purely for discourse purposes. Part IV, “Fictive Interaction as Linguistic Construction”, discusses evidence for the grammaticalization of fictive interaction constructions in different languages, such as the semi-grammaticalized use of non-genuine question-answer pairs for non-information-seeking functions in signed languages (Jarque), semi-grammaticalized fictive questions in conditionals in German and English from a synchronic and diachronic perspective (Leuschner); prosodic differences between fictive and factive direct speech in Portuguese (Rocha & Arantes), the fictive interaction alternative to the descriptive nominal construction in Polish (Królak), and finally fully grammaticalized fictive interaction constructions in Amazonian languages (van der Voort) and in Russian and an Australian aboriginal language (Spronck). Finally, Part V, “Fictive Interaction as Communicative Strategy”, explores the power of using the conversation frame in
language for specific purposes, such as in print advertisement (Brandt & Pascual), as well as in ordinary conversations by speakers suffering from aphasia (Versluis & Kleppa) or autism (Dornelas & Pascual). These chapters cover different modalities: written (Chaemsaiithong; Sullivan; Demeter; Leuschner; Królak), spoken (in monologues: FitzGerald & Oakley, in dialogues: Rocha & Arantes; Versluis & Kleppa; Dornelas & Pascual, grammaticalized spoken: van der Voort; Spronck), gesture/sign (Dornelas & Pascual; Jarque), visual (Xiang; Brandt & Pascual); and multimodal (Pagán Cánovas & Turner).

In sum, the proposed volume explores the universality of the conversation frame, and thus of fictive interaction, as a unit of conceptual, communicative, discursive, and linguistic structure, the forms it can take and the functions it can have in unrelated languages, and its effectiveness as a communicative strategy in different settings.

The research presented in this book combines linguistics and cognitive science, while bridging the gap between core linguistic studies and modern conversation and discourse analysis. The volume further reaches across what may be the most fundamental divide in linguistics: that between descriptive, theoretical and applied linguistics.

**Intended readership**

The intended readership includes scholars and graduate students working in the fields of Cognitive Linguistics, Discourse Studies, Interactional Studies, Conversation Analysis, Argumentation, and Philosophy of Language.
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Part I. INTRODUCTION

Chapter 1. Fictive interaction and the conversation frame: An overview
Esther Pascual, Zhejiang University, China
Sergeiy Sandler, independent scholar

This chapter surveys the literature on fictive interaction (Pascual, 2002, 2006a, forthcoming), emphasizing the role of conversation as a cognitive frame. We introduce fictive interaction at different levels: (i) the discourse (conversational monologues, e.g. non-information-seeking questions in written instructions); (ii) discourse content (speech metaphors, e.g. “Paracetamol is the answer to headache”); (iii) the inter-sentence level (e.g. “Any questions? Call our customer service”); (iv) the sentence (e.g. “Why bother?”); (v) the clause (e.g. “They felt, Oh no!”); (vi) the phrase (e.g. “the attitude of yes, I can do it”); and (vii) the word (e.g. “forget-me-nots”). The
main questions dealt with are:

1. What forms do conversational constructions take in language structure and use?
2. What are their communicative functions?
3. Are they communicatively effective?

We hope to show that conversational structures: (i) are productive constructions, highly widespread across different language families and modalities; (ii) are frequently used for a great variety of meanings or functions in a wide range of genres and by speakers of different sociolinguistic backgrounds; and (iii) may be used as a communicative strategy by professional as well as by non-professional speakers, including the speech-impaired. We maintain that the very existence of fictive interaction within the sentence, as in direct speech for non-reports, disproves the assumption that direct speech can refer only to communicative acts (e.g. Banfield 1973). Furthermore, the occurrence of the phenomenon in ancient texts and in communities without electricity shows that conversational structures are not restricted to contemporary informal communication in our multimedia era, as commonly assumed (e.g. Fairclough 1994; Streeck 2002). We conclude that there is a conversational basis for cognition, language, and discourse.

We close the chapter with an outline of the entire volume and a summary of the other chapters in it and their contribution to the field.

**CHAPTER 2. The semantics of fictive interaction constructions and the nature of linguistic meaning**

Sergeiy Sandler, University of Groningen, The Netherlands

In this chapter, I look at fictive interaction constructions (Pascual 2002, 2006) and ask the fundamental question: How to account for their meaning? Examining the semantics of fictive
interaction adds to our understanding of this linguistic phenomenon, and importantly, it also has far-reaching repercussions for how meaning in general should be conceived of.

One may distinguish (following Voloshinov, 1986) between three broad conceptions of linguistic meaning. One conception, which I will call “logical”, views meaning as given in reference (for words) and truth (for sentences). This approach attributes meaning to linguistic expressions in themselves and their relation to the world, essentially bypassing human consciousness. Another conception, the “monological” one, seeks meaning in the cognitive capacities of the individual, identifying it with the speaker’s expressive intentions or with the speakers and/or listener’s conceptualization of an utterance’s content. A third, “dialogical”, conception of meaning, anchored in intersubjectivity-based approaches, attributes meaning to interaction between individuals and personal perspectives (e.g. Linell 1998; Pascual 2002, forthcoming; Verhagen 2005; Zlatev et al. 2008). This view finds the meaning of an utterance in how it is responded to (Bakhtin [1979] 1986; Sacks 1992), and examines the content of utterances through the dialogue embedded within them (Bakhtin [1963] 1984, [1979] 1986).

In this chapter I directly contrast how well these three approaches to meaning would fit fictive interaction constructions. I consider possible logical, monological, and dialogical accounts of the semantics of these constructions, and argue that only in a dialogical framework can a properly motivated and workable account for the use of the conversation frame in discourse (Pascual 2002, 2008, forthcoming) be provided.
PART II. FICTIVE INTERACTION AS COGNITIVE REALITY

CHAPTER 3. Generic Integration Templates for fictive communication

Cristóbal Pagán Cánovas, University of Navarra, Spain
Mark Turner, Case Western Reserve University, USA

Human beings are extremely good at mixing the present situation with an exchange from the past, reporting past communicative events, or interacting in fictional scenarios. Fictive communication (Coulson & Pascual 2006; Pascual 2002, 2006a) is one of the clearest examples of our advanced capacities for conceptual integration, or blending (Fauconnier & Turner 2002), the higher-order cognitive capacity that allows us to integrate disparate elements into novel, meaningful conceptual wholes. Although every instance of blending might look extremely creative and unique, there are generic, recurrent patterns of integration (Fauconnier 2009; Turner 2014; Pagán Cánovas 2010). These patterns can be transmitted by culture, and mastering them allows us to be fast and efficient in performing individual conceptual blends. Two decades of research into conceptual integration have exposed an impressive number of “Generic Integration Templates” (GITs), that is, generic integration networks that are not in themselves full and specific integration networks or expressed as such, but that operate as established patterns used to inform specific integration networks.

This article analyzes how fictive communication is made possible by GITs. First we examine the basic templates for fictive interaction, and then we move to the more specific patterns for building fictive communication through the integration of one or more mental spaces with the frame of the Conversation (Pascual 2008). We distinguish a variety of GITs that intervene in the process, with different possible outcomes: no interaction in the inputs but only in the blend, interaction in the inputs with an emergent, meaningful interaction in the blend, splitting the self to create fictive conversations, etc. By situating fictive communication within a
theory of GITs, we can more easily point at the particularities of conceptual integration in discourse, as opposed to non-discursive cognitive activity.

CHAPTER 4. Real, imaginary, or fictive? Philosophical dialogues in an early Daoist text and its pictorial version

Mingjian Xiang, Zhejiang University, China

This chapter deals with fictive interaction imagery in a foundational text of Daoism, Zhuangzi (4th century B.C.), and its two-volume comic book rendition, Zhuangzi Speaks (Tsai 2005). The comic book faithfully reproduces the original text, adding to it a multimodal representation in the interrelated panels of the comic books (cf. Narayan 2001).

The Zhuangzi text is replete with small dialogues between real historical or contemporary figures as well as entirely fictitious characters, deities or personified animals and plants (Ning 2008; Xiang & Pascual under review). Even when involving actual individuals, these dialogues are all imaginary, since they never happened (Lu 1981). The philosopher splits himself into two selves, assuming the role of fictive addressee (e.g. a River God) and fictive addressee (e.g. a Sea God). The philosopher thus fictively talks to himself through other characters in a kind of ventriloquism (Tannen 2004; Cooren 2010, 2012), the reader becoming a bystander (Goffman 1963) of this fictive conversation on the philosopher’s insights into human nature and the universe. This is pictorially reflected in the first and last panel of each strip in the comic book version, which always depict Zhuangzi. Hence, readers understand the moral of the narrative through both fiction and fictivity. Even though the exchange is fictional, it is still structured by the conversation frame (the philosopher speaking through the conversing characters and we readers as bystanders fictively interacting with them), and so it exhibits fictivity. The overall
configuration is licensed by the conventional integration of writing and reading as a simultaneous conversation (Herman 1999; Fauconnier & Turner 2002).

This study confirms Brandt’s (2008, 2013) view that fictive interaction configurations are a standard argumentative strategy in philosophical texts, as also instantiated in Plato’s Dialogues (Kahn 1996; Wang 2013). I also hope to show that fictivity and fiction form a continuum, rather than a clear-cut distinction with prototypical and peripheral members.

CHAPTER 5. Screaming abstractions and “Look at me” drawings: Direct and indirect fictive speech from artworks on Deviant Art

Karen Sullivan, University of Queensland, Australia

An interesting artwork can be said to “speak” to its viewers. This metaphoric “speech” is a form of fictive interaction (Pascual 2002). The current study indicates that the way art “speaks” depends on its subject matter. It has been observed that purely abstract artworks usually “speak” to their creators, whereas figurative works (depicting people, objects or landscapes) mostly “speak” to their viewers (Sullivan 2006, 2009). The present study finds that abstract artworks not only “speak” to fewer people, but are less capable of direct speech than figurative artworks. On the other hand, drawings and paintings of named characters are found to participate in fictive conversations not shared by other works.

In a corpus of 1,105 examples of fictive interaction from the “DeviantART” website, 79 figurative works “speak” directly, such as when a drawing “says ‘hey, I’m alive’” or “screams ‘WTF’”. However, only one abstract work “speaks” directly. Three reasons are suggested for this disparity. First, subject matter in figurative works often “speaks” directly, such as when a fairy “says”, “I will have my revenge”. Purely abstract works lack subjects that can “speak”. Second, artworks frequently “speak” as mediums of communication, as in a “thank you” drawing”
(Pascual forthcoming). However, no abstract artworks in the corpus were created for other people. Third, figurative works reference popular culture, such as when a painting “screams ‘<300>’” (a movie title) or “screams ‘elf’” (a fictional species). No abstract art referenced existing creative works in this manner.

However, portraits of named characters participated in a wider range of interactions than other works. Only named characters were “introduced” to their viewers, and artists issued “commands” or “questions” only to these works.

In sum, artworks’ subject matter affects not only its “conversational partners” (Sullivan 2009), but also influences the type of “speech” that artworks may produce.

PART III. FICTIVE INTERACTION AS DISCOURSE STRUCTURE

CHAPTER 6. Persuading and arguing with the reader: Fictive interaction as discourse organizing device in witchcraft pamphlet prefaces (1566–1621)

Krisda Chaemsaitong, Hanyang University at Seoul, South Korea

In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in Europe, pamphlets became an important vehicle for disseminating information and reporting contemporary issues, especially in times of crisis and instability. One of the frequent issues reported in these pamphlets includes tales of witchcraft and demonic possessions.

This study sets out to examine the monologic genre of the preface accompanying a witchcraft pamphlet. At first glance, its relevance to the content section, where narratives of events and moral aspects are presented and highlighted, seems minimal and inconsequential, and it does not seem to invite in-depth linguistic exploration. However, if we adopt the view that monologues can be construed as a type of fictive interaction (Pascual 2002, 2006), the prefatory
section can be argued to serve as a critical interactive space for the pamphleteer to manage a public voice and offer a credible representation of themselves and the main content section.

Drawing on a corpus of English witchcraft pamphlets (1566–1621), and adopting the concept of voice/engagement (Hyland 2005, 2008), this study—qualitatively and quantitatively—reveals how fictive interaction constitutes an integral part of this genre of discourse, and explicates the way in which fictive blends are constructed. It appears that this monologic genre relies on both textual and interpersonal discursive devices as a means not only to guide the addressee through the material to be presented in the pamphlet, but also to discuss and deal with controversial issues, thereby serving both instructional and argumentative functions. That is, pamphleteers express their personal attitudes toward the subject matter, and they make their argumentative intention explicit when commenting on their writing. At the same time, they also use explicit instructional strategies to guide the readers in supporting their arguments.

CHAPTER 7. Invocation or apostrophe? Prayer and the conversation frame in public discourse

William FitzGerald, Rutgers University Camden, United Kingdom

Todd Oakley, Case Western Reserve University, USA

Prayer is a special kind of rhetorical performance, whose sanctioned listener is a divine agent. But prayer is also a pervasive performance of appeal and invocation operating in secular public discourse. Sustained inquiry into prayer as at once special and pervasive has received scant attention outside theology, with two notable exceptions: Kenneth Burke’s (1961) Rhetoric of Religion and William FitzGerald’s (2012) Spiritual Modalities. Burke and FitzGerald approach prayer as a rhetorical phenomenon, one that manifests motives of scene, act, and attitude—three
dimensions of Burke’s “dramatistic” pentad, a mode of analysis for understanding “why people do what they do”.

Close examination of speech events reveals a dynamic interaction between these motives, analyzable as relations between dimensions. In canonical prayer, for example, the situation or “scene” is predisposed for an “act” of prayer. It exhibits a “scene–act” relation. But in many instances, the “scene” is not so predisposed; instead, the “act” of prayer is part of a secular discourse. It exhibits an “act–scene” relation.

Prayer, then, is a natural addition to work on fictive interaction, the notion that the scene of conversation is a pervasive representational resource for framing all manner of situations in terms of one person talking to another (cf. Pascual 2002, 2006). Our empirical aim is to examine several instances of prayerful language from a corpus of news broadcasts. We will focus on three phrases (with minor variations) indicative of either a full invocation of the divine as a sanctioned addressee or as a more “fossilized” apostrophic act of reference to the divine as eavesdropper, or as Bakhtin’s “superaddressee”. We will study instances of let us pray; lord have mercy; and god be praised, each of which turned up with multiple hits in the Little Red Hen database as both instances of invocation or apostrophe. We contend that invocation and apostrophe access the same conversational frame but with different dimensions of address. These findings, we argue, provide an opportune moment for putting current work on fictive interaction into productive dialogue with classical and modern rhetorical theories.
participate in fictive interaction (Pascual 2002, 2006). In line with such approaches, speech acts can also occur in fictive interaction as fictive speech acts (Demeter 2011; Pascual 2002, forth). The aim of this chapter is to investigate the forms and functions of fictive apologies as manifestations of fictive interaction in different languages.

The speech act that will be examined in this chapter is the apology. The forms and functions of fictive apologies will be analyzed using extensive examples from both spoken and written corpora in several languages, including, but not limited to, English, Romanian, and Hungarian. To illustrate the phenomenon of a fictive apology, consider this example from an editorial on environmental issues published before a world climate conference in 2009: “Hansen and his team have shown that we could actually burn most of the oil in our wells (but sorry Canada, not the tar sands)” (Davies 2008). In this example, the apology is addressed to Canada, which is not an actual participant in the conversation between the writer and the reader, but rather a fictive one. In turn, the reader becomes what Goffman (1963) termed a bystander. Both the pragmatic offense and the apology are therefore fictive, as well. Such fictive apologies usually have additional metadiscursive functions, such as irony in the example above.

This is the first extended study of fictive apologies, which typically involve a role shift between addressee and bystander. This chapter contributes to a more integrated account of how the conversation frame is construed.

Part IV. FICTIVE INTERACTION AS LINGUISTIC CONSTRUCTION
Chapter 9. What about? Fictive question-answer pairs for non-information-seeking functions across signed languages

Maria Josep Jarque, University of Barcelona, Spain

The central question addressed in this chapter is: how is the basic interactional pattern of turn-taking reflected in grammatical structure? Specifically, I deal with the grammaticalized question-answer pattern, which constitutes a prototypical conversational structure. Many languages accept the occurrence of the question(-answer) pattern as a rhetorical device or marker of information structure (Haiman 1978; Li & Thomson 1976, see overview in: Pascual forth). In signed languages, the question-answer pattern often serves to set up a fictive kind of interaction to express grammatical or discursive meaning.

Here I examine the grammaticalized occurrence of polar and content questions and their subsequent answers for the expression of non-information-seeking functions in signed languages. The focus is on conditionals, topics, and connectives (consecutives, finals, and causals), which all show formal similarities with interrogatives, especially eyebrow raise (Coerts 1992; Janzen 1999; Johnston & Schembri 2007, inter alia). For instance, in Jordanian Sign Language the sentence ‘If it rains tomorrow, there will be no trip’ is literally produced as “Tomorrow rain? There will be no trip” (Hendricks 2008). Similarly, in Finnish Sign Language, the sentence ‘The capital of Iceland is Reykjavik’ is construed as a topic construction with an interactional structure: “Iceland? Its capital is Reykjavik” (Jantunen 2007). The question-answer structure is also used for the connective function as in the following Catalan Sign Language example (literally): “But there is a negative side. Which negative side? The one concerning mass media”.

I compare these structures in long-established signed languages, such as those mentioned above, and in recently emerged signed languages, such as Al-Sayyid Bedouin Sign Language (ABSL) and Nicaraguan Sign Language (ISN). This study is based on cross-linguistic data involving 35 signed languages from different families, enriched with a qualitative analysis of data from Catalan Sign Language (from television newscasts to everyday conversations).
Chapter 10. **Fictive questions in conditionals? Synchronic and diachronic evidence from German and English**

Torsten Leuschner, University of Ghent, Belgium

It is well known that interrogatives, together with markers of modality, markers of givenness, temporal markers and copula constructions, are among the main sources of conditional markers crosslinguistically (Traugott 1985). Concessive conditionals, too, are marked in ways reminiscent of interrogatives in many languages (Haspelmath and König 1998; Leuschner 2006). As an explanation of how interrogatives develop into conditionals, the hypothesis that protases may grammaticalize directly from interrogatives in fictive interaction is therefore highly attractive. Combining the perspectives of contrastive and historical-comparative linguistics, the present chapter draws on corpora of English and German (both present-day and historical) to discusses the alleged emergence of verb-first conditionals from dialogal sequences with polar interrogatives (Jespersen 1909): A: p? (B: Yes.) A: Then q. This scenario is initially quite convincing for German, whose verb-first conditionals not only increasingly diverge from interrogatives and converge with wenn(‘if’)-conditionals throughout their history from Old High German times onwards, but continue to display the full range of variation from grammaticalized sentence constructions to loose combinations of clauses in fictive interaction even in present-day usage. In English, by contrast, a corresponding hypothesis is impossible to defend, as verb-first protases in present-day English only allow should, had and were and, despite a certain overlap at earlier historical stages of the language, were never similar enough to interrogatives even in Old English to lend credibility to a fictive interaction scenario (Van den Nest 2010). Based on findings by Hopper (1975) and others, an alternative modal is there-fore proposed in which verb-first order in conditionals in Germanic is treated, not as stemming directly from polar interrogatives, but as a residue of a stage in ancient Germanic when word-order options were still determined pragmatically rather than syntactically. This approach avoids an implicit assumption of the fictive interaction hypothesis, viz. that verb-first order is
already available as a grammaticalized marker of interrogativity in conversational turns. Instead, the use of verb-first order in Germanic conditionals seems to have been mediated by the period as a culturally defined unit of narrative structure (Kuzmenko 1995). Starting from discourse sequences in which verb-first clauses functioned ‘thetically’ as initial scene-setters (Petrova and Solf 2008), verb-first order emerged, and was later reanalyzed, as a marker for conditionality. The apparent emergence of verb-first conditionals from fictive interaction in present-day German should therefore be regarded as a synchronic fact post-hoc, and not as the indicator of interrogative origins for which it has often been taken in the literature.

Chapter 11. The intonation of fictive interaction constituents vs. actual reported speech counterparts

Luiz Fernando Matos Rocha, Federal University of Juiz de Fora, Brazil
Pablo Arantes, Federal University of São Carlos, Brazil

This chapter deals with prosodic features structured by the conversation frame, especially those concerning grammatical fictive interaction (Pascual 2002, 2006a). It investigates how prosodic aspects contribute to the recognition of embedded fictive interaction as a virtual instance of direct speech in a Brazilian Portuguese oral corpus.

The construction in question is “(eu) falei + CLAUSE” (‘I said’ + CLAUSE), which can be interpreted either fictively or factively (Rocha 2006, 2013a, b). We used PRAAT, a software for the analysis of speech in phonetics, to analyze 10 recorded examples of the use of this construction (5 fictive and 5 factive), and, according to preliminary results, factive interactions have greater fundamental frequency (F0) mean, standard deviation and range than fictive ones. No differences in overall contour shape were observed.

These findings may contribute to the hypothesis that these distinct vocal construals, related to the same construction, point out different cognitive frames in the flow of discourse: the fictive interpretation is linked to the evaluation frame, i.e. given a set of evidence one comes to believe
something is going to be or is the case, while a factive interpretation is related to the speech communication frame. Discursive context clues appearing in conjunction with fictive interaction instances, such as epistemic verbs, can prompt a fictive reading of such a pattern at the semantic level. Also, prosodic analysis can unveil enunciative dimensions of fictive interaction as a linguistic construction organized by the conversation frame. Thus prosodic aspects are important for distinguishing how the conceptualizer interprets such construction as either fictive or factive.

Chapter 12. **Polish nominal constructions involving fictive interaction: Their scope and functions in discourse**

Emilia Królak, Independent scholar

This chapter aims to present a particular type of construction in the Polish language, consisting of a head noun usually followed by a quotative marker and a direct speech fragment. Examples are:

(1) a. mina pod tytułem: wiedziałem, że tak będzie
   face entitled: *I-knew-it*
   ‘*I-knew-it face’

b. osoba typu przepraszam, że żyję
   person of the type *I-am-sorry-I’m-alive*
   ‘*I-am-sorry-I’m-alive person’

c. nastrój w rodzaju: bez kija nie podchodź
   mood of the kind: *Don’t-approach-me-without-a-stick*
   ‘*Don’t-approach-me-without-a-stick mood’

The quotation-like fragment (in italics) illustrates non-prototypically used direct reported speech, referred to as “constructed dialogue” (Tannen 1986, 1989), “demonstration” (Clark & Gerrig 1990) or “fictive interaction” (Pascual 2002, 2006a).

Just as its English compound counterpart (Królak 2005, 2008, Pascual et al. 2013), this Polish construction may serve to categorize a wide variety of concepts, including individuals,
attitudes, verbal and non-verbal communication, time, or place. It may be used to refer to new social or cultural phenomena or to characterize existing concepts in a more emotionally-involving, ironic, humorous or subjective way (Królak 2008). The article will focus on the various functions that these linguistic structures fulfil in written and spoken discourse. I will show that they constitute an intriguing categorization pattern, offering an alternative to the traditional modes of categorization, for example by modifying adjectives or nouns (e.g., “arrogant face”, “poker face”). Many rhetorical effects produced by the instances of these constructions follow from the activation of the conversation frame, whose relevant elements are selected via the conceptual mechanism of metonymy.

The database for this study contains more than 200 instances of these expressions from a variety of texts, including: novels, press articles, websites, internet blogs, reviews, interviews, song lyrics, radio and TV programs, and casual conversations.

Chapter 13. Evidential fictive interaction in Ungarinyin and Russian
Stef Spronck, KU Leuven, Belgium

Cross-linguistically, direct speech constructions show a remarkable range of functions. In some languages these constructions conventionalise to express meanings that lie far beyond that of attributing speech to some discourse entity, marking, e.g. the beginning of some event, causation or future tense. In this paper I argue, however, that the range of meanings conventionalised direct speech constructions may exhibit in the languages of the world is not boundless and that they share one fundamental property: they necessarily index some type of discourse entity.

Extending Roman Jakobson’s schematic representation of verbal categories, I present a framework within which these discourse entities can be made explicit. Based on examples of sentential fictive interaction in Russian and the Australian Aboriginal language Ungarinyin, both of a subtype that I label ‘evidential fictive interaction’, I illustrate the similarities and differences between direct speech constructions in the two languages within the proposed framework. I also
suggest that the representation of direct speech constructions put forward in this paper provides a grammatical framework that may be used to further analyse and classify examples of sentential fictive interaction cross-linguistically.

CHAPTER 14. Grammaticalized fictive interaction in the southwestern Amazon

Hein van der Voort, Museu Paraense Emílio Goeldi, Brazil

In this article I discuss fully grammaticalized fictive interaction expressed through recursion of bound person markers in several unrelated languages of the Southwestern Amazon, the most linguistically diverse region of South America. In Kwaza, a language isolate spoken in the Brazilian state Rondônia, recursive application of inflexional person markers is used to express quoted speech. However, the same recursive construction has also become grammaticalized, giving rise to less transparent expressions, such as purposive and desiderative. As a consequence of this grammaticalization process, new derivational morphemes expressing modality have developed from inflexional mood markers (van der Voort 2002), a development that can actually be considered as an instance of degrammaticalization (cf. Norde 2009). The Kwaza “quotative” construction has no relationship with another unusual, if not unique, phenomenon: reduplication of inflexional person markers to express temporal and aspectual notions (van der Voort 2009). Constructions similar to the Kwaza quotative construction are found in the neighboring isolate language Aikanâ and in the Chapakuran language Wari’ spoken further to the west. The quotative construction involving recursive person inflexion has grammaticalized completely as the only way to express future tense in Aikanâ (van der Voort 2013). The construction is not recognized by the speakers as quotative and actual quotation of speech does not employ this construction. Wari’ has a very similar construction, involving recursive application of person clitics (Everett 2008). However, in Wari’ the construction can have both a future tense and a quotative interpretation. In view of the possibility that grammaticalized fictive interaction was
subject to areal diffusion in the Andean region (Adelaar 1990) and in New Guinea (de Vries 1990), the quotation construction may also represent an areal phenomenon in the Southwestern Amazon.

Part V. FICTIVE INTERACTION AS COMMUNICATIVE STRATEGY

Chapter 15. 'Say hello to this ad’: The persuasive rhetoric of fictive interaction in marketing
Line Brandt, Copenhagen Business School, Denmark
Esther Pascual, Zhejiang University, China

The conversation frame is argued here to be rightly recognized as a basic resource in human cognition (Brandt 2013). One phenomenon illustrating this is the employment of “fictive (verbal) interaction” (Pascual 2002) in natural discourse. Fictive interaction reveals the ubiquity of non-genuine quotes in planned as well as spontaneous discourse, providing evidence for its grammatical status. To further develop the theory, I introduced some technical distinctions (Brandt 2008, 2010, 2013), among these two overall types of what I call “imagined dialogue”. One type primarily involves conceptual integration (e.g. the Debate with Kant, Fauconnier & Turner 1996, 1998); the other concerns utterances functioning as grammatical constituents (e.g. “I do! ring”). Since the latter form is embedded in the matrix speech event and relies on metonymic reference (Pascual 2006a, Pascual et al. 2013), this type is characterized as ‘embedded metonymic enunciation’. This, in turn, is defined by the imagined presence of either a specific speech situation (“fictive interaction”) or a generically represented situation of address (“generic interaction”).

This chapter elaborates on these theoretical advances by examining imagined dialogue in discourse designed for the specific purpose of promoting a particular agenda or commercial product. In so doing, it furthermore explores the grammatical aspect of the examined embedded metonymies. So far excluded from the prescriptive grammars of languages, embedded imagined
utterances may in fact participate in grammatical structures as “parts of speech”, in English typically as nouns, verbs or adjectives, functioning as heads or modifiers in syntactic phrases (Pascual 2002, Pascual et al 2013). The overall aims of this chapter are: (i) to provide empirical support from strategically motivated discourse for Pascual’s fundamental discovery that fictive conversational turns can function as parts of speech; and (ii) to stipulate a hypothesis concerning the strategic motivation for the use of imagined dialogue in marketing.

Chapter 16. The use of interactive structures as a communicative strategy in Dutch and Portuguese aphasic speakers

Christine Versluis, VU University Amsterdam, The Netherlands
Lou-Ann Kleppa, Federal University of Santa Maria, Brazil

This study addresses strategic speech styles in brain-damaged speakers with good comprehension skills but limited resources for speech production. Strategic behavior in these speakers is seen to comprise highly frequent use of elliptical repertoire in response to a reduced attention window for syntactic information (Kolk 1995; Kolk and Van Grunsven 1985). We focus on varieties of elliptical form that indicate a conceptual strategy underlying agrammatic outcomes in aphasia. Our data-driven, qualitative analysis of conversations with two Brazilian and two Dutch aphasic participants shows a great deal of ellipsis organized by fictive interaction (Pascual 2002, 2006a), including direct speech, onomatopoeia and mimicry. We identified three communicative functions of the fictive interaction structure.

1) Re-enactment of past events

MS  (Looks up submissively, frowns forehead) Bicicléta!
Bicycle!
(Straightens body, shakes head, assumes grave tone) NÃO! Rólógio!
No, watch!
[When I was a child I begged for a bicycle but my parents gave me a watch]
2) Rhetoric
R En “Tadaa!” Hallo!
And “Tadaa!” Hello!
[after stroke, being isolated, possibly dying and unable to call for help, I was found: Stereotype making an appearance, evaluates point of story: ‘I thought I was lost but then I still got back on stage’]

3) Modelling grammatical relations
MS Muito calor? À noite.
Very hot? At night.
[conditionality: If it is hot, (I walk) at night]

All subjects used fictive interaction on its own as well as in conjunction with Topic Comment organization both in sentence-level and text-level combinations. They demonstrated a controlled use of interactive structure in support of current referential and rhetorical values. These findings suggest that participants in this study use a speech style that strategically draws on and exploits a shared conceptual frame of reference and particularly a shared model of interactive knowledge and action.

Chapter 17. Literal reported speech as fictive interaction strategy in autistic conversation
Aline Bisotti Dornelas, Federal University of Juiz de Fora, Brazil
Esther Pascual, Zhejiang University, China

This study explores how echolalia (i.e. literal reported speech) is used by autistic children as a compensatory strategy in conversation. Studies have characterized echolalia as a functional adaptive strategy in autism (see Saad & Goldfeld 2009 for a review). However, little is known
about the communicative functions of echolalia in autistic conversation, as only few qualitative studies have been carried out to date. We understand functional echolalia as a communicative strategy involving fictive interaction (Pascual 2002, 2006). Autistic children mostly use literal quotations as fictive interaction constructions. They also use non-literal fictive reported speech, such as paraphrases and even creative speech, as a communicative strategy.

Four Brazilian autistic children between 4 and 12 were recorded during interactions with adults in weekly therapies. The autistic children studied do not just use literal quotation to present prior speech, as in ordinary reported speech. They also use literal quotation fictively (Pascual 2002, 2006, 2014) as a means of communication. They present past or socio-culturally related utterances in order to demand needs, describe situations, and refer to people, animals and events. In this study we show that fictive reported speech seems to be divided into three types, depending on the origin of the direct speech constituent:

(i) Social communicative event: e.g. ‘Desculpa’ [Pardon me] (to evoke a prior scenario when the speaking child was accidentally hurt by the therapist, rather than the child causing the hitting);
(ii) Cultural knowledge: e.g. ‘Representa a sua voz, é a sua vez!’ [It represents your voice, it’s your time!] (to refer to a political party);
(iii) Specific prior interaction: e.g. ‘Você quer fugir Branca de Neve?’ [Do you want to run away Snow White?] (paraphrasing the hunter character’s speech in the Snow White movie as a means to refer to him).

Autistic children mostly use literal quotations as fictive interaction constructions. They also use non-literal fictive reported speech, such as paraphrases and even creative speech. They mostly seem to use noncreative instances as a fundamental communicative strategy to handle their language difficulties in ordinary conversation.
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