



# Juxtaposed concessive constructions: a usage-based functional analysis

Ivo da Costa do Rosário

Universidade Federal Fluminense, Rua Miguel de Frias, 9, 24220-900, Niterói, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. E-mail: [rosario.ivo@gmail.com](mailto:rosario.ivo@gmail.com)

**ABSTRACT.** This paper presents a theoretical and empirical discussion about juxtaposed concessive clauses. It proposes an interpretation of distinct constructional patterns outside the prototypical scheme of finite and nonfinite concessive clauses. Based on a written language *corpus*, by means of the theoretical assumptions of the Usage-Based Functional Linguistics, it is assumed that concessive juxtaposed clauses have special characteristics that distinguish them from the prototypical concessive ones.

**Keywords:** concessivity, juxtaposition, functionalism.

## Construções concessivas justapostas - uma análise funcional centrada no uso

**RESUMO.** Este artigo apresenta uma discussão, de ordem teórica e empírica, acerca das concessivas justapostas. Propõe-se uma interpretação de padrões construcionais distintos, fora do esquema prototípico das concessivas finitas e não finitas. Com base em um *corpus* de língua escrita, por meio dos pressupostos teóricos da Linguística Funcional Centrada no Uso, verifica-se que as justapostas concessivas apresentam especificidades que as distinguem das concessivas prototípicas.

**Palavras-chave:** concessividade, justaposição, funcionalismo.

### Introduction

Commonly, the notions of cause, consequence, comparison, concession etc., are presented by the normative grammar (cf. LUFT, 2000; CUNHA; CINTRA, 2001; BECHARA, 2003; KURY, 2003) as a subject that is closely linked to the so-called adverbial adjuncts, in the scope of the simple sentence, and/or to its corresponding subordinating adverbial clauses, in the scope of the compound sentence.

On the other hand, several recent researches have proven that these semantic notions are not always strictly tied to adverbial structures. Rather, they also arise in other morphosyntactic arrangements, with various semantic-pragmatic peculiarities.

This article analyzes this matter by presenting how the notion of concessivity can be conveyed out of the prototypical scheme of subordinating-connective and reduced adverbial clauses. Beyond the forms attested by the traditional syntax, the notion of concessivity can also be conveyed by other means, including juxtaposition.

To achieve this goal, we will first make some considerations on how researchers have been approaching the connection forms of concessive clauses. It will become clear that the proposals are

quite divergent, at times sheltering juxtaposed concessive clauses, at times ignoring them. Then, we present the theoretical and methodological principles that guide the interpretation of the results of this research. Soon after this stage, we show the data analysis itself; this section is organized into subsections, each dedicated to a specific concessive pattern, followed by further considerations and references.

### Connections forms of concessive clauses

Among the traditional works researched, with regard to the forms of connection, there is convergence only when it comes to the possibility of concessive clauses being conveyed by gerund and infinitive clauses, and, of course, by fully developed ones. Kury (1960), Rocha Lima (1999) and Bechara (2003) did not address participle clauses. In turn, Bechara (2003) and Kury (2003) are the only ones that explicitly point out the existence of juxtaposed concessive clauses.

The following Figure 1 elucidates the position of some grammarians on this aspect:

Outside the traditional literature, there are different proposals for syntactic categorization that could be applied to concessive clauses. These proposals differ greatly but can reveal important

specificities about the notion of concessivity. Let us see how Quirk et al. (1985), Mateus et al. (2003) and Azeredo (1990), for example, from different theoretical perspectives, address this matter.

	Kury (1960)	Rocha Lima (1999)	Luft (2000)	Cunha and Cintra (2001)	Bechara (2003)	Henriques (2003)	Kury (2003)
Infinitive clauses	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Gerund clauses	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Participle clauses			X	X		X	X
Juxtaposed clauses					X		X

Figure 1. Forms of connection of concessive clauses.

Firstly, Quirk et al. (1985, p. 992) present three structural types of clauses, which are:

- 'Finite clauses' - characterized by the existence of a finite verb, that is, a verb inserted within a paradigm that specifies tense, mode, person and number. They are equivalent to the so-called fully developed clauses in the grammatical tradition.
- 'Nonfinite clauses' - characterized by the existence of a verb in its nominal form, without indication of tense. They usually appear more often in the written form, since the writer usually has time to review the speech in favor of a greater compression. Notions like mode, tense and aspect are abstracted from the sentential context. They are equivalent to the reduced clauses in the grammatical tradition.
- 'Verbless clauses' - characterized by not having a verbal element. They take syntactic compression to a higher stage, beyond that of nonfinite clauses. They commonly come with no explicit subject, which can, however, be recovered by the context. In functional terms, we could say that verbless clauses have gone through a 'miniaturization' or 'desentencialization' process, or have become a non-verbal constituent (cf. LEHMANN, 1988, p. 193).

For Quirk et al. (1985), nonfinite and verbless clauses should be recognized as clauses because it is possible to analyze their internal structure with the same functional elements found in finite clauses. Thus, we can understand that the English authors include the so-called concessive non-clausal phrase into a causal spectrum arranged in a *continuum* manner, allowing the analysis to cover the so-called non-clausal elements as well. It is a proposal different from those that normally restrict the study

of clauses to fully developed, reduced and, in a few cases, to juxtaposed ones.

Mateus et al. (2003, p. 720-721) also address in their generative grammar various forms of expressing the semantic notion of concessivity, besides the prototypical fully developed clauses. Let us see what these main forms are, followed by examples given by the authors themselves:

- Participle and gerund clauses, started with the connectors '*embora*' [although], '*conquanto*' [notwithstanding], '*ainda que*' [even though], '*se bem que*' [however]:

a) *Embora admitido à oral, o ponto está muito fraco.*

a) Although admitido à oral, the point is very weak.

b) *Embora tendo sido admitido à oral, o ponto está muito fraco.*

b) Although the student was accepted to the oral interview, the point is very weak.

- Prepositional phrase of contrastive sense ('*apesar disso*' [in spite of that], '*apesar de tudo*' [in spite of everything]):

a) *Apesar de tudo, o ponto está muito fraco.*

In spite of everything, the point is too weak.

- Concessive intensive clauses, they contrast the intensity of a quality or of a quantity of a substance and the propositional content expressed by the main clause; in the concessive clause, the conjunctive tense is always selected (subjunctive).

d) *Por muito trabalhador que ele seja, não conseguirá o emprego.*

However hard worker he is, he will not get the job.

e) *Por mais que ele seja trabalhador, não conseguirá o emprego.*

Even though he is a hard worker, he will not get the job.

- Clauses that articulate relative and concessives nexuses.

f) *Mil felicitações que eles me mandassem, eu não esqueceria o que me fizeram.*

Even if they complimented me a thousand times, I would not forget what they did to me.

g) *Os problemas, muitos que fossem, não impediram a continuação do rali.*

The problems, as many as they were, did not prevent the rally from going on.

- Adversative coordinating clauses (which also express equally a contrastive value):

h) *O ponto está muito fraco, mas / porém / contudo a aluna foi admitida à oral.*

The point is very weak, but / however / nevertheless the student was accepted to the oral interview.

- Correlative coordinating structures:

i) *Quer estudes quer não estudes, terás sempre dificuldade em arranjar emprego.*

Whether you study or not, you will always have trouble finding a job.

As we observe, Mateus et al. (2003) widen the range of possibilities of conveying the notion of concessivity. They specify in detail other morphosyntactic arrangements that convey this semantic concept, including the support of bordering structures between concession and other nuances, as is the case of (iii), (iv), (v) and (vi), which amalgamate, for instance, concession with intensity and alternation.

In addition to Mateus et al. (2003), other authors also dedicated themselves to studying various constructions that convey the notion of concessivity. Azeredo (1990, p. 105) is one of them. For the author, there are three emphatic variations of concessive structure. He presents them as follows:

(i) Intensive concessive clauses - These constructions highlight the contrast between the intensity expressed in the adverbial clause and the content of the base clause.

a) *Por mais esperto que ele seja, não nos enganará de novo.*  
However smart he is, he will not deceive us again.

b) *Por pouco que se esforçasse, ele ganharia a prova.*  
Even if he barely tried, he would win the competition.

(ii) Concessive correlation - Contrast is additionally highlighted and reiterated in the base clause through the adverb 'entretanto' [however] (and synonyms), 'ainda assim' [yet], 'assim mesmo' [even so] etc.

c) *Por pouco que se esforçasse, ainda assim ele ganharia a prova.*

Even if he barely tried, yet he would win the race.

d) *Embora tivessem direito às diárias, não fizeram, todavia, questão de reivindicá-las.*

Although they had right to the daily rates, they did not, however, bother to claim them.

(iii) Concessive reduplication - It highlights the categorical tone of the content of the base clause.

e) *Doa a quem doer, esta denúncia tem que ser feita.*  
No matter who gets hurt, this complaint has to be made.

f) *Aceitemos ou não (aceitemos), a opinião dele prevalecerá.*

Whether we accept it or not, his opinion will prevail.

The proposal by Azeredo (1990) provides a typology that encompasses other morphosyntactic realizations of the expression of concessivity. It has the merit of describing linguistic structures that deviate from the prototypical clausal concessive ones.

Moreover, the author's analysis, as well as the contributions of Quirk et al. (1985) and Mateus et al. (2003), as it is clear, diverge from the normative orientation that, in general, it is restricted to presenting only three forms of connection for all adverbial clauses.

Empirical works, such as Gouvêa (2002), Margarido (2010) and Rosário (2012), prove the existence of participle concessive and juxtaposed concessive clauses, opposing to the orientations of some grammarians. These structures, as they are poorly studied, deserve a more detailed treatment. For reasons of space limitation, this article will focus on only three representative patterns of juxtaposed concessive clauses, which will be presented in the following sections.

Before we close this section, it is worth defining what we are considering as 'juxtaposition'. Based on Hopper and Traugott (1997), we consider 'juxtaposition' as a process of articulation of clauses or segments in which there is an inferential relationship between distinct cores.

The examples of intensive concessive clauses and concessive reduplication presented by Azeredo (1990, p. 105) fall within the definition we adopted to the concept of juxtaposition. Here are some of them:

b) *'Doa a quem doer', esta denúncia tem de ser feita.*

b) 'No matter who gets hurt', this complaint has to be made.

It is possible to notice the expression of concessivity from the segments highlighted, by means of an inferential relationship, since there are no prototypical concessive conjunctions present. In other words, in this type of syntactic articulation, there is no *stricto sensu* connective responsible for connecting the main clause (or segment) to the concessive one. Rather, the articulation is made possible by special arrangements.

### Theoretical-methodological assumptions

We aim, in this article, to present results of an investigation on concessive juxtaposed clauses in real situations of use in formal contexts. For such a purpose, we have chosen a set of speeches uttered by congressmen at the ALERJ - Legislative Assembly of the State of Rio de Janeiro - as analytical *corpus*. Such speeches are constructed from the appreciation of the various bills as well as tributes to personalities that stand out for something deemed relevant.

Our research source is found in the website <http://www.alerj.rj.gov.br>, more specifically in the 'Discursos e Votações' [Speeches and Voting] icon, which shows political speeches by Rio de Janeiro's states representatives, from 2007 to the present day. The years, in turn, are subdivided into months (from January to December). Each month presents a quite variable number of speeches, depending on the day's agenda and on the internal rules of the Legislative House.

For this article, we selected 1,275 speeches of different lengths, dated from February 2, 2009 to October 29 of the same year. The scope for our analysis is a set of synchronous texts that mirror contemporary uses of the Portuguese language in its Brazilian variety within the selected text genre.

We chose the Usage-Based Functional Linguistics (UBFL) because we are proposing a research based on data, not on abstract theoretical formulations without context. The theoretical arsenal offered by this chain helps us analyze the language in use under a qualitative and quantitative perspective, with rigor and refinement, gathering contributions of the Functional Linguistics of North-American orientation, and of the Construction Grammar.

Traugott and Trousdale (2013, p. 2-7) present five different research orientations, with reference to the broad field of the Construction Grammar:

- a) 'Berkeley Construction Grammar'. It has Fillmore as one of its greatest researchers. Along this line, the semantics of frame semantics and grammar of cases are of great relevance. The objective of Berkeley Construction Grammar is to investigate the hypothesis that some aspects of the constructions are universal.
- b) 'Sign-based construction grammar'. It deals mainly with typological studies and, in a way, it is a development of Berkeley Construction Grammar. It aims to identify the universal properties of language, and advocates the Saussurean idea that language is a system based on signs.
- c) 'Cognitive construction grammar'. This subdivision encompasses works developed mainly by Lakoff and Goldberg. The focus of this investigation perspective is the construction of argumentative structure. According to the authors of this chain, constructions are models not derivable from their component parts.
- d) 'Cognitive grammar'. This line is especially developed by Langacker, for whom the sign is the link between semantic and phonological structure. There is an outstanding rejection of the notion of the syntactic component of grammar (cf. TRAUGOTT; TROUSDALE, 2013, p. 7).
- e) 'Radical construction grammar'. Croft is the greatest exponent of this line, whose research is centered on the idea of constructions as specific realities of a language. In this subdivision, linguistic uses occupy a prominent place in researches.

The Usage-Based Functional Linguistics normally elects the perspective defended by Croft as the most central one, because, as it should be reiterated, language use is the focus of attention, which is quite different from Berkeley's line. Thus, when speaking of UBFL, in general, we are referring to ideas advocated by Croft without,

however, rejecting in absolute other theoretical subdivisions.

In Croft's line, aspects of form (syntactic and morphological properties) and aspects of meaning (semantic, pragmatic and functional-discursive properties) are just as relevant. In this sense, the author breaks with perspectives of more formalistic character and approaches the interests of functionalists, who consider the language in use as the most fundamental point of linguistic studies.

According to Cezário and Cunha (2013, p. 9), the UBFL "[...] assumes that there is a symbiosis between speech and grammar: speech and grammar interact and influence each other". In this theoretical perspective, grammar is understood as a structure that is constantly changing/adapting, driven by discursive idiosyncrasies. Within this theoretical apparatus, questions about (inter)subjectivation (need to give expression to speech) and regularization of constructional patterns are given a great highlight.

Another equally important concept is that of 'iconicity'. According to Cezário and Cunha (2013, p. 22-25), "[...] iconicity can be defined as the motivated correlation between form and function, that is, between the language code and its *designatum*". In other words, this principle defends the idea that the language is organized according to the frames of the human conceptualization of the world.

The authors explain that this principle is divided into three subprinciples, namely:

- a) 'Amount' - the greater the amount of information, the greater the amount of forms for its codification.
- b) 'Proximity' - the most integrated concepts within the cognitive plan also present themselves with a higher degree of morphosyntactic adherence.
- c) 'Linear ordering' - the most topical information tends to come first, and the order of expressions in speech often follows the temporal sequence in which events are conceptualized.

In the study of juxtaposed concessive clauses, the 'amount subprinciple', in particular, proved quite useful. As it will become clear in the next section, juxtaposed concessive clauses present a larger amount in terms of codification. This invariably implicates a larger amount of information as well.

Concessivity relations are presented, especially in formal speech, as an important rhetorical strategy aimed at argumentativeness, since in more informal speeches, adversative relations appear with greater strength (cf. ROSÁRIO, 2012). It is for this reason that the indicated *corpus* was chosen for the research. After all, political speeches are usually formal and strongly argumentative.

As of now, faithful to the theoretical assumptions regarded in this study, we understand formal and informal speech as poles of a *continuum* rather than as two dichotomous points, with clear and unambiguous characteristics.

### Data analysis

In the analyzed *corpus*, 65 occurrences of concessive juxtapositions were found, as can be seen in the Table 1 below:

**Table 1.** Concessive juxtapositions.

	Patterns	Number of occurrences
Pattern 1	Por mais [N] que [N/pron] V <sub>subj.</sub> <i>Por mais que ele tente</i> [However hard he tries]	19 – 29.23%
Pattern 2	Por [mais] adj que V <sub>subj.</sub> <i>Por mais esperto que seja</i> [However smart he is]	16 – 24.61%
Pattern 3	-Q + quer que + V <sub>subj.</sub> <i>Qualquer que seja</i> [Whatever it is]	13 – 20%
Pattern 4	V <sup>I</sup> [N/pron] -Q V <sup>I</sup> <i>Tenha a origem que tiver</i> [No matter the origin]	13 – 20%
Pattern 5	V ou não <i>Queira ou não</i> [Like it or not]	4 – 6.15%
	Total	65 – 100%

The established notation to characterize each pattern of the previous table adopts the following conventions for this study:

- N – name (normally a noun)
- Pron – pronoun (usually personal)
- Adj – adjective
- V<sup>I</sup> – correferential verb in relation to another one in the same construction
- V<sub>subj.</sub> – subjunctive verb
- Q – any interrogative particle (which, where, who, what)
- [ ] – indicates that the term is optional
- [/] – indicates that the term is optional and may present variation

Each pattern constitutes a ‘family of constructions’ (cf. GOLDBERG; JACKENDOFF, 2004), in which semantic and syntactic variations are observed, which carries different effects, including productivity rate. This family of constructions is called *interconnected web*, to express more clearly that the relations between constructions always take place in an interrelated manner.

Through the table, we see that the five patterns are partly specified, that is, they are neither wide open, as the subject-predicate relationship, nor fully specified, such as proverbs and clichés that, as a rule,

do not accept changes. For instance, pattern 1 (*Por mais [N] que [N/pron] V<sub>subj.</sub>*) admits different morphosyntactic realizations for N, pron and V.

The principle of iconicity, as we have seen, postulates a non-isomorphic relationship, but motivated between form and function. According to the amount subprinciple, the greater the amount of information, the greater the amount of form. In concessive patterns, this principle acts vigorously, as the difference between a simple concessive connective and a concessive juxtaposition is exactly the greater load of information of the latter, which tends to amalgamate the notion of concessivity with other semantic notions. This, in turn, is mirrored in the morphosyntactic configuration of the construction.

The relevance and the amount of information conveyed by these constructions make them ‘heavier’ or larger from a formal point of view. After all, we are dealing with constructions with a large amount of informational load.

Except for pattern 5, we can say that the other patterns have approximately the same level of productivity. As already reported, for a matter of space limitation, this article will disregard patterns 1 and 2. It is enough to say that pattern 1 [*Por mais [N] que [N/pron] V<sub>subj.</sub>*] presents the idea of extreme scalar position. The constructions that belong to this pattern are also called ‘universal conditional concessive clauses’. Pattern 2 [*Por [mais] adj que V<sub>subj.</sub>*], in turn, presents the idea of intensification of the adjectival value.

Let us, therefore, move on to the analysis of patterns 3, 4 and 5.

Pattern 3: -Q + quer que + V<sub>subj.</sub>

Pattern 3 basically comprises three different interrogative particles, represented by Q- in the previous abstract scheme. They are: *qualquer* [whatever] (5 cases); *quem quer* [whoever] (5 cases) and *onde quer* [wherever] (3 occurrences). Because of its morphosyntactic configuration and discursive use, Martelotta (1998, p. 39-40) called this construction “[...] total undefined pattern”. Indeed, when we use the expressions ‘whatever’, ‘wherever’, ‘whoever’, we are naturally creating a range of options of indefinite number, which is referred to by Azeredo (2008, p. 335) as an expression of “[...] the absolute absence of restrictions to the content of the main clause”.

Let us see some examples started with ‘whatever’:

(01) *Projeto de lei nosso a Casa aprovou, está para o Governador sancionar. Ele sancionará ou vetará.*

[‘Qualquer que seja a decisão’], nós vamos querer que isso aconteça de imediato e vamos até as últimas consequências nesse sentido. – 19/03/2009

[Our Bill, which the House approved, will be sanctioned by the Governor. He will sanction or veto it. [‘Whatever the decision might be’], we will want that to happen immediately and we will fight until our last breath for that.]

(02) *Uma das maiores crises que enfrenta o nosso Estado, bem como o Brasil inteiro, é na área de Saúde, Sr. Presidente. E como administrador, [‘qualquer que seja ele’ – prefeito, governador, o próprio presidente –], tenho certeza de que uma das suas maiores missões é resolver o problema da saúde.* – 24/03/2009

[One of the biggest crises our state and Brazil as a whole are facing refers to the health area, Mr. President. And as an administrator, [‘whoever it might be’ – mayor, governor, the president himself –], I’m sure that one of his/her major missions is to solve the health issue.]

(03) *Não acredito que ninguém, em sã consciência, possa acreditar que a direção da empresa não tivesse conhecimento daquele procedimento. Eu admito até que houvesse cobrança para alcançar resultados, [‘qualquer que fosse o procedimento’].* – 16/04/2009

[I do not believe anyone in their right mind can believe that the company’s management had no knowledge of that procedure. I even admit that there was pressure for achieving results, [‘whatever the procedure was’]].

Examples (01), (02) and (03) profile –Q as the particle *qualquer* [whatever]. With such particle, the use of the copulative verb *ser* [to be] is categorical, that is, it occurs in 100% of the cases. The use of non-notional verbs causes the informative load to fall over other parts of the speech. In this case, this load is imposed on the particle *qualquer*, which can be used for various references of cataphoric or anaphoric character.

Example (01) is quite prototypical, as it fills all elements of the pattern in focus (–Q + *quer que* + *V<sub>subj</sub>*). It is worth noting that the expression *a decisão* [the decision] is shifted to the right, as this would not be its most common ‘place’. Thus, the strong crystallization of the expression *qualquer* becomes clear, since the tendency is to prevent the inclusion of other elements in its morphosyntactic arrangement.

In (01), we observe a case of anteposition, since the period is started by this very concessive pattern. The anteposition is configured as the most recurrent strategy in the field of concessivity (cf. ROSÁRIO, 2012). This happens because anteposition is a way for the speaker to ‘take precautions’ against the

strong objections of the interlocutor. In other words, anteposition has the primary function of sparing the other’s face (see MARGARIDO, 2010, p. 109). It is a kind of defensive protection, which is precisely at the heart of concessivity.

In the selected excerpt, the speaker talks to the attendees about the need for the effectuation of his proposal. To do so, he says he will fight ‘until his last breath’ if necessary. The use of the expression *Qualquer que seja a decisão* [Whatever the decision might be] brings to the speech another point of view that is not necessarily that of the audience, “[...] in order to pre-empt a possible counter-argument” (GOUVÊA, 2002, p. 37). Thus, often, there is an attempt to destabilize the interlocutor, before he argues otherwise. In short, “[...] the interlocutor would put the other party’s argument in a discredit position to the exact purpose of disqualifying him or her” (GOUVÊA, 2002, p. 92).

In general, these concessive clauses prepare the listener/reader to the following information. They work, therefore, as a kind of guide or thread through which the argumentation will be employed. According to Cunha et al., (2003), they serve as a basis for the more central information that is coming next.

Example (02) is similar to (01), except for the item on the right of the segment *qualquer que seja* [whatever it might be]. In (01), it is an abstract name (decision); in (02), a personal pronoun is used (he/she), which, in the occurrence, synthetizes the various elements that specify it – ‘mayor’, ‘governor’, ‘president’. In both cases, we find the displacement of the subject to the right, with the objective of ‘preserving’ the concessive pattern, given its crystallization.

We should add that, in (02), we have a case of intercalation, since the concessive pattern neither starts nor finishes the sentence. In this case, the speaker ‘splits’ the speech to introduce a concessive clause that has the function to better precise or focus the selected referent (in this case, the term ‘administrator’). Typically, intercalation occurs when there is a need for suspending the speech flow to introduce information that is relevant to the audience’s understanding. The function of this concessive clause is, therefore, focusing, without a doubt.

Finally, example (03) also has a structure similar to the other ones, with only one exception: the use of the verb in the subjunctive imperfect tense (*fosse* [was]). This is the only occurrence of the use of the past in pattern 3, in the research corpus. We add that this is a case of postposition, since the concessive pattern occupies the right margin of the period, ending it.

According to Neves (2000), the order of concessive constructions obeys different communicative purposes. In the cases of postposition, the nuclear assertion, that is, the asseveration, is expressed first; then objection is expressed, which is used, in a way, in the defense of the viewpoint expressed.

We cannot invoke the discursive topic function for these constructions. Instead,

[...] they have much of an addendum, portion of the statement in which the speaker goes back to what he/she has just said, weighing *a posteriori* objections to his or her proposal (NEVES, 2000, p. 879).

In (03), the speaker deemed necessary to add the information that the company was pressuring for results, and this happened in 'whatever the procedure'. The postposed concessive, therefore, despite the non-topical character, highlights a peculiarity of the information conveyed, reinforcing it as an additional element.

Let us now see some examples with 'whoever' and 'wherever':

(04) *O carnaval do Rio de Janeiro, da nossa cidade-estado, é o melhor do mundo. O povo ordeiro, a participação espetacular de todas as comunidades e nós que acompanhamos de perto o carnaval na Zona Norte, na Zona Oeste, precisamente na Zona Sul, acompanhamos um carnaval belíssimo, sem constrangimento para* ['quem quer que seja']. – 04/03/2009

[The Carnival of Rio de Janeiro, of our city-state, is the best in the world. The orderly people, the spectacular participation of all communities and we who closely follow the carnival in the North Zone, in the West Zone, precisely in the South Zone, we follow a beautiful carnival, without embarrassment to ['whoever it might be']].

(05) *É lógico que isso é inconstitucional. Não dá para imaginar que um subtenente ou um sargento assumam o papel de um delegado de polícia* ['onde quer que seja']. *Isso é uma usurpação de função pública, é lógico.* – 11/03/2009

[Of course, this is unconstitutional. You cannot imagine that a second lieutenant or a sergeant takes on the role of a police commissioner ['wherever it might be']. This is an encroachment of civil service, of course.]

(06) *O que não se pode, Sr. Presidente, é onerar ainda mais essas professoras. E é por isso que eu vou apresentar nesta Casa um Requerimento de Informação. Vou buscar essa informação* ['onde quer que se encontre'], *por ser essa uma atribuição e uma responsabilidade nossa, dos parlamentares.* – 18/06/2009

[What should not happen, Mr President, is those teachers being even more encumbered. And that's

why I will present at this House a Request for Information. I'll get this information ['wherever it might be found'], as this is an assignment and a responsibility of ours, of parliamentarians.]

(07) *A questão não é se mora na Baixada,* ['onde quer que more'], *todo mundo já soltou pipa.* – 31/03/2009

[The point is not whether you live in the 'Baixada', ['wherever you may live'], everyone has once played with a kite.

The five occurrences of *quem quer que* [whoever] present great regularity of use, since all are used with the verb *ser* [to be] in the subjunctive present tense, in very similar conditions. The very semantic load of *quem* [who] already tells us of the contexts of use of this construction. It is an exclusive use to refer to people.

In example (04), the particle 'who' refers to the large mass of individuals, one way or another, linked to Carnival. According to the speaker, all were spared the embarrassment over this party. The most emphatic and economical linguistic resource to handle this use was the expression *quem quer que seja* [whoever it might be], of generalizing, universal character.

The three occurrences of *onde quer que* [wherever] present a greater variability of use. Example (05) is filled by the verb *seja* [might be], which is the most prototypical one in all juxtaposed clauses (cf. ROSÁRIO, 2012). Example (06), in turn, is profiled by the verb *encontre* [might be found], and example (07), by the verb *mora* [may live]. These last two occurrences are not so idiosyncratic, since the verbs *encontrar* [find] and *morar* [live] have a close semantic relationship with the interrogative *onde* [where].

In these three examples, there is reference to an undefined entirety of spatial character. In other words, the expression *onde quer que seja* [whatever it might be] means 'anywhere', just as *quem quer que seja* [whoever it might be] means 'anybody', and so on. The lexical selection of the items that make up or accompany these concessive patterns, therefore, often derives from the very same semantic field, which gives coherence to the speech. Another particularity of this pattern is the strong right margin tendency.

Barreto (1999) focuses, in his studies, the *como quer que* form, that belongs to this juxtaposition pattern. Despite not having been found in our corpus nor in the synchronous corpus of the researcher, it is certainly worth being addressed, as it will help us understand the construction we are analyzing. After all, the *como quer que* form follows the morphosyntactic pattern of formation of pattern 3. About the frequency of occurrence, we read:

As a concessive conjunction, *como quer que* seems to have occurred until the end of the XV century, because it has not been documented in later texts. Today, *como quer que* works as modal conjunction, equivalent to the conjunction *como* followed by the indetermination formula *quer que*, which, as already explained, can also follow other pronouns or adverbs of the Portuguese language. It is not, however, cited by the consulted contemporary grammarians. It is possible to assume, therefore, that it has not fallen into disuse, being just a conjunctive item not much used (BARRETO, 1999, p. 206-207).

According to the author, this construction is constituted of the association of the conjunction *como* with the indetermination formula *quer que*, formed by the third-person singular of the present indicative tense of the verb *querer* [want]. The expression *como quer que* occurs in the Portuguese language from the thirteenth century to end of the fifth century as a concessive conjunction, in an interphrastic or initial position in the sentence. Still according to Barreto (1999, p. 206-207),

The possibility of adding adverbs or relative pronouns to the syntactical resource *quer que* to indicate indetermination is evident in archaic Portuguese, because the corpus still have the forms *u quer que ~ hu quer que*, *onde quer que*, *que@ quer que ~ quenque@quer que ~ quenquer que*, *qualquer que ~ qual quer que/quaes quer que ~ qual... quer que e quando quer que*, which, just as *como quer que*, seem to be constituted of relative conjunctions or pronouns followed by the same syntactical resource that indicates indetermination.

With the exception of *u quer que ~ hu quer que*, in which *u ~ hu* was replaced by *onde* [where], all other forms are still potentially used in contemporary Portuguese. Barreto (1999) found that the same mechanism can also be observed in the history of the Portuguese language, with respect to the expression *qual quer que* [whatever], whose existence is found in the thirteenth century, in the non-crystallized form, allowing the insertion of lexical items among its terms.

Pattern 4: V<sup>1</sup> [N/pron] –Q V<sup>1</sup>

Pattern 4 differs greatly in structural terms from the other patterns. In this case, we have two correferential verbs, that is, that share the same lexical base. The inclusion of a name or pronoun is optional, but the incidence of the particle –Q is always attested, being realized like *que* (7 cases), *qual* (4 cases) and *quem* (2 occurrences). According to Azeredo (1990, p. 105), this is a case of “[...] concessive reduplication”. We judge the term to be

very appropriate, since, indeed, there is reduplication of the verb, which triggers a concessive value. Let us see:

(08) *Nós sabemos que não é fácil um processo de doação. Existe todo um trâmite burocrático. O Estado comprar uma coisa hoje e, amanhã, fazer uma doação para [‘seja quem for’].* – 17/02/2009

[We know it is not easy, a donation process. There is a whole bureaucratic proceeding. The state buy something today and, tomorrow, makes a donation to [‘whomever it might be’]].

(09) *Teve que se deslocar um reboque, com todo o congestionamento, que estava posicionado na Av. Brasil. Não havia treinamento de operadores e guardas de trânsito para atuar em situação de emergência, [‘seja ela qual for’].* – 17/02/2009

A tow truck had to move, with all the traffic jam, which was located at Av. Brasil. There was no training for operators, nor traffic wardens to act in an emergency, [‘whatever it might be’].

(10) *Quero dizer aqui que se alguém ficar com pena dos estupradores, [‘sejam eles da idade que for’], [‘tenham o grau intelectual que tiver’], [‘tenham a idade que tiver’], que o leve para casa.* – 11/03/2009

[I want to say here that if someone feel sorry for rapists, [‘whatever age they might be’] [‘whatever the level of intelligence they might have’], [‘whatever age they might be’], then take them home].

(11) *Ora, em nenhum momento cabe, nas relações institucionais, a presença de intermediários, [‘sejam eles quais forem’].* – 15/04/2009

(11) Now, at no time the presence of intermediaries in institutional relations is appropriate, [‘whoever they might be’].

(12) *Se é para fazer isso, que entreguem então o serviço às bancas de jornal. O que nós queremos é uma identificação civil responsável, [‘custe o tempo que custar’], para se verificar se aquele cidadão corresponde àquela carteira de identidade.* – 26/08/2009

(12) If this has to be done, then assing the service to newsstands. What we want is a responsible civil identification, [‘whatever the time it takes’] to check if that citizen corresponds to that ID.

Example (08) illustrates a prototypical realization of the focused pattern. Usually, correferential verbs are endowed with a lower informational load, which is typical of copulative verbs. Furthermore, the construction does not usually involve many components; on the contrary, it tends to compression. In that example (08), the speaker seeks an economical way to refer to any person, universally. For this reason, he/she uses this concessive reduplication: *quem quer que seja* [whoever it might be].



In example (09), pattern 4 is realized with the inclusion of the personal pronoun *ela* [it], which refers to *situação de emergência* [emergency situation], previously cited. In this case, –Q is already realized by the particle *qual* [what]. When it comes to an abstract term, the speaker uses *qual* [what] instead of *quem* [who], as observed in example (08).

Example (10) has a structure different from the other ones, since it coordinates three concessive juxtapositions: *sejam da idade que for* [whatever age they might be], *tenham o grau intelectual que tiver* [whatever intellectual level they might have], *tenham a idade que tiver* [whatever age they might be]. These three occurrences follow pattern 4, with variation only in the use of the verb. In the first occurrence, the prototypical verb *ser* [to be] is used; in the other ones, only the verb *ter* [to have] is used. Undoubtedly, this is a fairly emphatic structure, given the speech content: rape cases.

In other words, this occurrence serves to illustrate the principle of iconicity of form and function, as syntax of resources, selected among the more complex ones (in phonological and morphosyntactic terms) are used in favor of the construction of an equally complex argument and that requires intense argumentativeness. After all, the subject ('rape of women') is very controversial and generates innumerable debates.

Finally, still with reference to (10), we should note that in the last two concessive juxtapositions, the canonical verbal inflection of number is not observed in the second occurrence of the verb. If the standard language was adopted, we would have *tenham o grau intelectual que tiverem* and *tenham a idade que tiverem*. This phenomenon is explained by the little knowledge of the standard Portuguese the Congressman who was speaking has, which allowed the expression of a more economical structure of the discursive point of view, or by the very nature of the oral speech, which tends to use in larger amounts non-marked forms, like singular.

Example (11) is similar to example (10), with one exception: in this case, we observe the use of the standard agreement, which causes the concessive juxtaposition to be realized as *sejam eles quais forem*. It is worth remembering that, just as in all previous occurrences, we come to a generalization: the Congressman claims himself opposed to any presence of intermediaries in institutional relations.

Finally, (12) brings an expression already quite crystallized in our everyday use: *o tempo que custar* [no matter how long it takes]. This finding allows us to postulate the existence of different degrees of grammaticalization to one same pattern, within a family of constructions. In this case, a 'soft' word as

*ser* [to be] or *ter* [to have] is no longer used, but the verb *custar* to cost], which, in any way, acts as a support for the word *tempo* [time], which is the focus of the expression. The civil identification of the person responsible, from the perspective of the speaker, should take whatever time is necessary, in any circumstance. Thus, we reiterate the generalizing aspect of this construction.

It is worth adding, as shown by Jiménez (1990), that the presence of the verbal form naturally results more decisive in cases in which one cannot count on the support of any explicit conjunction or connective. This especially applies to this pattern, which requires the repetition of the verb in its constitution.

#### Pattern 5: *V ou não*

Finally, pattern 5 is profiled by a very simple structure from the morphosyntactic point of view. It is a verb followed by the alternative expression *ou não* [or not], and the whole constitutes a semi-lexicalized expression. For Quirk et al. (1985), these constructions are called alternative conditional concessive clauses. According to the authors, this pattern offers a 'choice' between two opposite conditions, liable of paraphrase by a prototypically concessive expression like *embora queiram ou não* [whether they like it or not] or *ainda que queiram ou não* [even if they like it or not]

Azeredo (1990, p. 105), in turn, prefers to include them in the list of the constructions already explored in pattern 4, that is, he calls them a case of "[...] concessive reduplication". Because there are only four examples across the corpus studied, let us see them all:

(13) *Quando chove, em qualquer parte deste Estado ou em Minas ou em São Paulo, nas cabeceiras do Rio Paraíba e seus afluentes, ['queiram ou não'], vai desaguar na Baixada Campista.* – 04/02/2009

[When it rains, in any part of this state or in Minas or in São Paulo, in the headwaters of Paraíba River and its tributaries, ['like it or not'], will flow into Baixada Campista.]

(14) *E vai acontecer, ['queiram ou não'], essa riqueza é tão gigante que vai acontecer.* – 13/08/2009

[And it will happen, ['like it or not'], this wealth is so huge that is going to happen.]

(15) *Será que o prefeito não está pedindo uma intervenção? Isso tudo fica sem resposta nesse modelo de gestão 'à la Stanislaw Ponte Preta'. Essa é uma salada de fruta, um imbróglia complicadíssimo que, ['querendo ou não'], vai cair nas mãos do Tribunal de Contas da União, porque tem o SUS, e do Estado, porque tem gestão municipal e, seguramente, recursos do Tesouro Municipal, também.* – 10/02/2009

[Isn't the mayor asking for an intervention? This all goes unanswered in this management model 'à la Stanislaw Ponte Preta'. This is a fruit salad, a very complicated mess that ['like it or not'], will fall into the hands of the Federal Court of Accounts, because there is SUS [Brazilian Unified Health System], and the state, because there is municipal management, certainly, resources of the Municipal Treasury too.]

(16) *Como dizia, ['tendo sido orquestrada ou não'], acho que a vaia foi merecida, porque se trata de um Governador que passa por crises sucessivas na área da segurança, saúde, educação, que despeja escola.* – 10/03/2009

As I was saying, ['having been orchestrated or not'], I think the booing was deserved, because he is a Governor that is going through successive crises in the area of security, health, education, that disregards schools.

In (13) and (14), we detected the expression *queiram ou não* [like it or not], which has the function of amalgamating two expressions of *embora queiram* [although (subject) want(s) it] and *embora não queiram* [although (subject) do(es) not want it] type, that is, a concessive clause of positive polarity and of negative polarity in one single expression. The economy of the expression, therefore, is quite evident.

In both one case as in the other, the speaker addresses to the audience, in a very emphatic manner, leading his speech in a way to make it even more forceful and relentless. Especially in example (14), even the expression *vai acontecer* [will happen], which occurs in duplicate in the speech, contributes to that, in order to endow the futurity expression with rigor and firmness.

Example (15) brings the same expression, but with the gerund verb. This use allows the verbal action not to be applied to a person specifically, since there is no requirement for indication of person and number. This gerund expression makes the speech, therefore, more impersonal. Thus, the speaker does not commit much to the agentivity matter, because he does not make clear to whom his speech is being addressed.

The same applies to (16). The speaker does not commit to the authorship of the booing at the plenary assembly, and not even to the origin of its motivation, hence the use of *tendo sido orquestrada ou não* [having been orchestrated or not]. It is inferred, therefore, that the expression serves to face-protection purposes, without a doubt, which is very costly to the political speech.

With a closer look, we will say that this pattern 5 is hybrid, as it amalgamates disjunction, concession and condition, in terms similar to what Quirk et al.

(1985) stated. In a way, the boundaries between hypotaxis and parataxis are more fluid, since this concessive juxtaposition (*queiram ou não* [like it or not], for example) profiles a typically coordinating alternative construction, in formal terms; on the other hand, it also takes on a circumstantial hypotactic value of concession, attributing greater emphasis or vitality to the speech. By the way, the emphasis or greater rigor present in this pattern is responsible for a more pronounced argumentativeness load at the time the speaker elaborates his speech.

### Final considerations

Based on this study, we can confirm that the Portuguese of Brazil has other structures that convey the notion of concessivity outside the *stricto sensu* prototypical scheme of the connective or reduced subordinating adverbial clauses.

The analyzed concessive juxtapositions have varying degrees of compositionality and, in general, are still not fully crystallized, as it happens with prototypical concessive connectives, which do not allow any type of variation. In the words of Goldberg and Jackendoff (2004), they are 'families of constructions' with different degrees of grammaticalization.

Aiming to draw a brief summary of the analyzed patterns, we can say that they have the following characteristics:

- Pattern 1 [*Por mais* [N] *que* [N/pron] *V<sub>subj</sub>*]

This pattern has the idea of extreme scalar position. The constructions that belong to this pattern are also called universal conditional concessive clauses. Example of said construction: *Por mais livros que eu tenha* [No matter how many books I have.]

- Pattern 2 [*Por* [mais] *adj que V<sub>subj</sub>*]

It presents the idea of intensification of the adjectival value. Example of construction: *Por mais interessante que seja* [However interesting it might be.]

- Pattern 3: -Q + *quer que* + *V<sub>subj</sub>*.

This pattern can be called total indefinite. Example of construction: *Qualquer que seja* [Whatever it might be]

- Pattern 4: *V<sup>I</sup>* [N/pron] -Q *V<sup>I</sup>*

Concessive reduplication pattern. Example: *Tenha a origem que tiver* [No matter the source it might have.]

- Pattern 5: *V ou não*

Alternative conditional concessive pattern. Example: *Queira ou não* [Like it or not.]

All these patterns convey the notion of concessivity. They reveal the innovative character of the language, which is in permanent variation and

change, being shaped according to new communication needs, depending on the vicissitudes of the speech. They develop alongside prototypical concessive connectives, because the speakers of the language have a growing need for greater expressiveness in the speech.

These patterns illustrate the elastic character of the Portuguese language, just as it happens in all the other natural languages. The emergence of new expressions to convey more or less established ideas is a continuous movement and, thus, is hardly detected by most classical normative works of reference.

In addition to these patterns analyzed, in the course of the research we also detected special cases in which adjective (or relative) clauses can also accumulate an adjacent circumstantial content of concession (cf. AZEREDO, 2000, p. 221). It is thus another strategy for the expression of concessivity, also outside the prototypical scheme of concessive adverbial clauses. This, however, must be the subject of a further study to be conducted with greater depth and detail.

## References

- AZEREDO, J. C. **Iniciação à sintaxe do português**. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar, 1990.
- AZEREDO, J. C. **Fundamentos de gramática do português**. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar, 2000.
- AZEREDO, J. C. **Gramática Houaiss da Língua Portuguesa**. São Paulo: Houaiss/Publifolha, 2008.
- BARRETO, T. M. M. **Gramaticalização das conjunções na história do português**. 1999. 508f. Tese (Doutorado em Letras)-Universidade Federal da Bahia, Salvador, 1999.
- BECHARA, E. **Gramática escolar da Língua Portuguesa**. Rio de Janeiro: Lucerna, 2003.
- CEZÁRIO, M. M.; CUNHA, M. A. F. (Org.). **Linguística centrada no uso**. Rio de Janeiro: Mauad/Faperj, 2013.
- CUNHA, C.; CINTRA, L. **Nova gramática do Português contemporâneo**. 3. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Nova Fronteira, 2001.
- CUNHA, M. A. F.; OLIVEIRA, M. R.; MARTELOTTA, M. E. **Linguística funcional: teoria e prática**. Rio de Janeiro: DP & A, 2003.
- GOLDBERG, A. E.; JACKENDOFF, R. The English resultative as a family of constructions. *Language*, v. 80, n. 3, p. 532-567, 2004.
- GOUVÊA, L. H. M. **Perspectivas argumentativas pela concessão em sentenças judiciais**. 2002. 277f. Tese (Doutorado em Língua Portuguesa)-Faculdade de Letras, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, 2002.
- HENRIQUES, C. C. **Sintaxe Portuguesa para a linguagem culta contemporânea**. Rio de Janeiro: Oficina do autor, 2003.
- HOPPER, P.; TRAUGOTT, E. **Grammaticalization**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- JIMÉNEZ, A. N. **Las subordinadas adverbiales improprias en español (II): causales y finales, comparativas y consecutivas, condicionales y concesivas**. Málaga: Librería Ágora S.A., 1990.
- KURY, A. G. **Pequena Gramática para a explicação da nova nomenclatura gramatical**. Rio de Janeiro: Agir, 1960.
- KURY, A. G. **Novas lições de análise sintática**. São Paulo: Ática, 2003.
- LEHMANN, C. Towards a typology of clause linkage. In: HAIMAN, J.; THOMPSON, S. A. (Ed.). **Clause combining in grammar and discourse**. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1988. p. 181-225.
- LUFT, C. P. **Moderna Gramática Brasileira**. São Paulo: Globo, 2000.
- MARGARIDO, R. **Construções (coordenadas) adversativas e construções (subordinadas) adverbiais concessivas em português: pontos de contato e de contraste na língua em função**. 2010. Dissertação (Mestrado em Letras)-Universidade Presbiteriana Mackenzie, São Paulo, 2010.
- MARTELOTTA, M. E. Gramaticalização e graus de vinculação sintática em cláusulas concessivas e adversativas. *Veredas*, v. 2, n. 3, p. 37-56, 1998.
- MATEUS, M. H. M.; BRITO, A. M.; DUARTE, I.; FARIA, I. H. **Gramática da Língua Portuguesa**. Lisboa: Caminho, 2003.
- NEVES, M. H. M. **Gramática de usos do Português**. São Paulo: Unesp, 2000.
- QUIRK, R.; GREENBAUM, S.; LEECH, G.; SVARTVIK, J. **A Comprehensive grammar of the English Language**. [S.l.]: Longman, 1985.
- ROCHA LIMA, C. H. **Gramática normativa da Língua Portuguesa**. Rio de Janeiro: José Olympio, 1999.
- ROSÁRIO, I. C. **Expressão da concessividade em construções do Português do Brasil**. 2012. 277f. Tese (Doutorado em Língua Portuguesa)-Faculdade de Letras, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, 2012.
- TRAUGOTT, E. C.; TROUSDALE, G. **Constructionalization and constructional changes**. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Received on August 4, 2014.

Accepted on April 6, 2015.

License information: This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.