

CONTEXTUALIZING CLAUSES

NÓRA KUGLER

ELTE Eötvös Loránd University

kugler.nora@btk.elte.hu

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8223-2926>

Abstract

The paper uses Hungarian data to explore the phenomenon of interclausal contextualizing relations, analysing clauses which provide access to a prominent referential scene via the speaker's mental operations. Seriality (closely related to the directing of attention) is treated as a point of departure, and it is argued that grammatical schemas for construing clause complexes offer patterns for serial construal as well. At the same time, linear realization is fundamentally affected by what opportunities are available for directing attention in the current discourse space, in the ongoing organization of discourse. These two factors collectively shape clause order within clause complexes. Clauses are regarded as intonation units integrated into clause complexes whose structure is defined by the build-up of attentional frames mutually elaborating each other as successive strata. The system thus outlined serves as a basis for exploring contextualizing clauses in Hungarian. Special attention is devoted to clauses (participating in subordinating interclausal relations) which foreground the speaker's mental operations and effect a grounding predication.

Keywords: clause complexes, grounding predication, baseline-elaboration, attentional frames, seriality, metapragmatic awareness

1. Introduction

The paper studies contextualization (cf. Verschueren 1999: 111, Imrényi 2017a: 27, 2017b: 743) in interclausal relations: it analyses clauses which provide access to a prominent referential scene. Within the category of contextualizing clauses, the focus is on those that signal the speaker's metapragmatic awareness (cf. Verschueren 1999, Tátrai 2017, 2020) by profiling the contextualizing activity which leads up to the construal of a prominent scene, and which is offered by the speaker so as to guide the listener's interpretation. Clauses providing access to the epistemic status and discursive role of a prominent scene are typically but not exclusively combined with subordinate clauses introduced by the *hogy* 'that' conjunction. This is motivated by the fact that the construction just mentioned has been grammaticized for the elaboration of mental functioning, for the specification of some mental content. Patterns which do not involve *hogy* and are not subordinating in character are beyond the scope of the present paper. Neither does the paper address contextualizing clauses with a quotative function.

The process of contextualization has an effect on the structure of clause complexes as the "main clause" only receives temporary activation (cf. Pelyvás 2006); in such constructions, departing from prototypical subordination, the referential scene of the "subordinate clause" is the more prominent one (cf. Langacker 2014). In its treatment of contextualizing clauses, the

paper discusses both objectivized and subjectivized construals of a mental subject (cf. Langacker 2006). The relevance of the distinction primarily results from the fact that according to the specialized literature, objectivization indicates a higher degree of metapragmatic awareness (cf. Verschueren 1999: 189; Tátrai 2017: 1046, 2019).

The paper's point of departure is the notion of seriality, closely related to the directing of attention (3). It is argued that grammatical schemas for construing clause complexes (2) offer patterns for serial construal as well. At the same time, linear realization is fundamentally affected by what opportunities are available for directing attention in the current discourse space, in the ongoing organization of discourse. These two factors collectively shape clause order within clause complexes (see 4, especially 4.3). The system thus outlined serves as a basis for exploring contextualizing clauses in Hungarian (5). Special attention is devoted to clauses (participating in subordinating interclausal relations) which are anchored to the ground (the speaker's mental operations) and effect a grounding predication (5.2). All sample sentences whose source is not specified come from the Hungarian National Corpus (v.2.0.5, see Oravecz–Váradi–Sass 2014).

2. Grammaticized patterns for the construal of clause complexes

2.1. Hierarchical interclausal relations

Clause complexes profile multiple referential scenes and their relations, integrated into a single, complex structure. They have grammaticized structural patterns (Haader 2001). Clause complexes are not structures produced by creating and concatenating clauses, they are not derivable from their parts; rather, they can be interpreted in terms of construction types (schemas) and their instantiations. Interclausal relations generally emerge in either of two ways (Hopper–Traugott 2003: 177):

- i. by the integration of two (or more) referential scenes on the basis of a perceived relationship between them; we call this a non-hierarchical relationship, and the interclausal relation is one of coordination (see (1));
- ii. by elaborating and further specifying some part of a referential scene and giving it the status of a separate scene, designated by a separate clause; we call this a hierarchical relationship, and the interclausal link is one of subordination (see (2a–b)).

- (1) [...] egy ideig még kiabált,_[1] aztán egyszerűen eldőlt a földön,_[2] és horkolásban tört ki_[3].
'[he] yelled for a while,_[1] then simply fell to the ground,_[2] and snorted_[3].'
- (2) a. A bosszút áhító nép veszélybe sodorja azt is,_[1] akit védeni akar_[2] [...] [...]
'The vengeful crowd also puts at risk the one_[1] it wants to protect_[2].'
- b. Meg volt győződve róla,_[1] hogy a mozdony keserű füstje jót tesz a torokfájásomnak_[2].
'She was convinced_[1] that the bitter smoke of the locomotive was good for my sore throat_[2].'

The hierarchical or non-hierarchical relationship between clauses is typically a function of whether the speaker (the conceptualizer) attributes different or identical cognitive statuses to the integrated scenes. In the case of an asymmetrical relation, one scene is in the foreground of attention, with the other serving as background for its processing; in symmetric relations,

the two scenes are foregrounded to approximately the same degree (Langacker 1991; Radden–Dirven 2007: 55; Herlin–Kalliokoski–Visapää 2014: 2).

In subordinating constructions, the hierarchical relation produced by this asymmetry receives grammatical marking on the formal side. This is exemplified in (2a) by the *azt* 'that-ACC' phoric demonstrative pronoun in the main clause and the relative pronoun *akit* 'whom-ACC', which is coreferential with it and contextualizes the subordinate clause; see also the use of *róla* 'about it' and the subordinating conjunction *hogy* 'that' in (2b). In cases of coordination, apart from the clauses being integrated into one complex structure, only a conjunction may make the relationship explicit (see e.g. *és* 'and' joining clauses [2] and [3] in (1)).

In what follows, we give an overview of the factors defining the two modes of construal (see Table 1, cf. Kugler 2018: 52), and describe the main types of construction along these lines. The characterization offered here is limited to (prototypical examples of) the two major construction types; in reality, it is impossible to divide interclausal relations into two completely separate classes as suggested by the structure of the table. There is no sharp boundary between subordinating and coordinating interclausal relations; instead, we find gradience, and the overlapping of categories also gives rise to blended constructions. The factors below are based on Langacker (2014), see also Herlin–Kalliokoski–Visapää (2014: 8):

- i. Prominence: is there a prominent scene among those profiled by the clauses, or put differently, do the scenes stand in a figure-ground relationship? Prominence hinges on the issue of profiling,¹ and it is assessed in relative rather than absolute terms (Langacker 2016: 21).
- ii. Completeness: “whether or not a clause has all of the elements required to stand alone as a full, independent sentence” (Langacker 2014: 17). The independence of clauses is constrained by the fact that the interclausal relation and the process of integration may produce deviations in both clauses with respect to their realizations as independent sentences. When an interclausal relation is marked, it is generally less natural (or even unnatural) to use a clause independently. Langacker suggests that in English, the criterion of completeness is only met by those subordinate clauses which contain a finite verb. In our own assessment, however, it is typical for the subordinate clause to also express a grounded process. For this reason, it seems more useful to evaluate completeness by looking at the grammatical and semantic relations of the entire complex sentence. From this perspective, a clause satisfies completeness when it can be used by itself to represent the structure as a whole at a lower degree of specificity/elaboration. At the same time, we continue to explore the extent to which clauses depart from their realizations as independent simple sentences. In this regard, though, there is no crucial difference between clauses and minimal “text-sentences”.
- iii. Containment: whether or not “one clause is taken as literally being »inside« another, functioning as an integral part within a larger whole” (Langacker 2014: 18).
- iv. Accessibility: is there a clause to which another clause provides mental access?

¹ “An expression’s profile is the conceived entity made prominent as the one it designates (refers to), the focus of attention for symbolic purposes” (Langacker 2014: 19).

Table 1. Characteristics of basic types of clause complexes

Factors	Types of clause complexes	
	Hierarchical relation (hypotaxis)	Non-hierarchical relation (parataxis)
prominence	the scenes are observed in a figure-ground relationship, the scene of the main clause is foregrounded against the background of the subordinate clause	the scenes are equally prominent, their relation is construed as symmetric, with progressive activation at work in accordance with the directing of attention
completeness	the main clause may schematically represent (stand for) the entire structure	the clauses may occur independently but neither of them represents the structure as a whole
containment	the scene of the subordinate clause is conceptually contained in the scene profiled by the main clause (e.g. a participant is schematically elaborated by means of an anaphoric demonstrative pronoun; a conceptual frame is opened for further elaboration by the subordinate clause)	there is no part-whole conceptual relation between the clauses, neither of the two is contained within the other
accessibility	the subordinate clause becomes accessible via the scene profiled by the main clause	there is no accessibility link between the scenes, only progressive activation is at work in accordance with the directing of attention

Subordination and coordination are fundamental operations. These notions allow for the characterization of central types of clause complexes in Hungarian (the prototypical examples of these types).² However, the two categories are not sufficient for describing the huge variability of clause complexes.

2.2. The main types of subordinating clause complexes

The central members of the category are clause complexes involving (nominal or adjectival) relative pronouns; these display most clearly the hierarchical nature of the interclausal relation. The central type is characterized by the following properties (Kugler 2017: 838):

- the subordinate clause elaborates a participant of the prominent scene profiled by the main clause by making it observable as a participant of another scene;
- in the main clause, a phoric (back-voweled) demonstrative pronoun is integrated into the dependency network, and schematically profiles this participant, also signalling the fact that the same participant can be observed in another scene profiled by the subordinate clause (in terms of accessibility, the subordinate clause is accessed via the main clause and it is conceptually contained in it);
- in the subordinate clause, a relative pronoun refers to the participant in question;
- the main-clause demonstrative pronoun and the relative pronoun are thus co-referential;
- the main clause determines the illocutionary force associated with the construction (it is not contained; it is functionally equivalent with the construction as a whole);
- it is the main clause's polarity which determines whether the sentence is interpreted as positive or negative (it is not contained; it is functionally equivalent with the construction as a whole).

² For prototype effects in the organization of linguistic categories, see Tolcsvai Nagy 2013: 125–129 (with references), see also Kövecses–Benczes 2010: 28–32 (and references therein).

The other main type within the category comprises clause complexes with the subordinating conjunction *hogy* 'that'. This type departs from the basic type represented by constructions with relative pronouns; however, it is also linked to it on the basis of family resemblance. The similarity between these two types concerns the fact that in both hierarchical constructions, the subordinate clause serves to elaborate, and make observable in a separate scene, an argument (schematic figure) associated with a main-clause expression. The main features of clause complexes with *hogy* 'that' are the following (Kugler 2017: 838–839):

- in the main clause, a phoric (back-voweled) demonstrative pronoun is integrated into the dependency network, and schematically elaborates a substructure of a head word's meaning, also signalling the fact that the conceptual frame which has been activated receives further elaboration in the subordinate clause; with regard to accessibility, the subordinate clause is accessed via the main clause and it is conceptually contained in it;
- the subordinate clause is introduced by the conjunction *hogy* 'that', which signals the clause's subordinate status; moreover, in contrast with relative clauses elaborating arguments, it marks the fact that the subordinate clause expresses the content of a frame activated by the main clause;
- the main clause highlights the mental functioning of a subject having thoughts, beliefs, emotions, etc. as processed from the speaker's perspective, with the subordinate clause elaborating the object of this mental activity (some THOUGHT, BELIEF, EMOTION, etc.);
- the main clause determines the illocutionary force of the construction, with the main-clause frame-evoking expression possibly affecting the mood of the verb appearing in the subordinate clause (completeness is satisfied for the main clause, containment for the subordinate clause);
- the main clause determines the polarity of the construction, i.e. its evaluation as positive or negative (completeness is satisfied for the main clause, containment for the subordinate clause).

The central, prototypical members best instantiate elaboration in the sense of Halliday (1994: 225–229).

3. Patterns of seriality

A basic prerequisite of communicative behaviour is that the interlocutors must be able to pay attention to each other. At the age of 9 to 12 months, children are already capable of triadic attention (Tomasello 2003: 21). The structure and form of linguistic expressions are also affected by other cognitive capacities, however. For example, it is crucial what is the size of the domain that the interlocutors are able to actively attend to, how much information they can efficiently process in such domains. Moreover, it is vital to know that the speech partner's mental functioning is similar to one's own, hence the speaker is able to make inferences about the speech partner's mental operations on the basis of her own experiences (Tomasello 1999; Tátrai 2017: 909).³

³ Of course other cognitive prerequisites also exist, such as abstraction and the efficient functioning of long-term memory.

While the main patterns of clause complexes described in Section 2 resist syntactic definitions of fully general, universal import,⁴ serial order motivated by the directing of attention, and the modes of information “packaging” (Chafe 1988), constrained by the functioning of memory, are general. Not only do they offer an explanatory principle for the conventionalization of syntactic constructions but they also give clues for the interpretation of phenomena in the area of language acquisition.

In data on language acquisition, the most basic clause complexes (holophrase or island-construction complexes in the sense of Tomasello 2003) are not to be interpreted in terms of the categories hierarchical (subordinating) and non-hierarchical (coordinating). Rather, they can be described as attentional frame constructions (see the notion of ‘frame constructions’ in Lieko 1992). These attentional frames (or ‘window(s) of attention’ in the sense of Talmy 2007: 267) emerge via relationships between basic strata and more elaborate strata, according to the schema of ‘baseline-elaboration’ relationships described by Langacker (2016).

- (3) A nyomtatóból kijövő lapokra mutatva mondja [Jancsi]:
Leesett egy._[1] Jön egy másik._[2] onnan ki,_[3] a papír_[4]. (Jancsi 2;5)⁵ (Wéber 2011: 165)
 down-fall-PST.3SG_[1] come-3SG an-other_[2] from-there out_[3] the paper
 ‘Jancsi⁶ says pointing at the sheets of paper coming out of the printer:
One dropped. Another is coming, out of there, the paper.’

Katalin Wéber analysed the utterance in (3) by dividing it into four intonation units (on the basis of an audio recording). She assigned varied strengths to their boundaries, with the units corresponding either to clauses or units below the clause level. With the first two intonation units of his utterance, Jancsi directed attention at two different referential scenes ([1]–[2]), the ongoing processes were at the forefront of his attention. Then in [3], he elaborated the direction of the process designated by *jön* ‘come-3SG’ in [2] before elaborating its most important participant in [4]. In this way, he progressively elaborated his observation in ever higher detail, integrating all relevant aspects of the referential scene into a single sentence.

The intonation units typically correspond to referential scenes, and the order of scenes reflects the structure of the speaker’s experience, also directing the speech partner’s attention to the jointly observed event described in (3).

This operation is analogous to how attention is directed within clauses. In (4), the clausal core *adsz* ‘give-2SG’ stands in the focus of attention. The object of giving is then made accessible by Jancsi via its size and colour as he successively elaborates these as properties of the object in question. Presumably he expects that on the basis of these properties, the speech partner will be able to identify the relevant object; finally though, he also puts this beyond the shadow of doubt by representing the object with a noun denoting its category.⁷

⁴ Several studies corroborate this finding, see e.g. Matthiessen–Thompson 1988: 275, Haspelmath 2004: 37, Cristofaro 2014: 73–76. Prototype-based description suggests itself as an alternative (cf. Herlin–Kalliokoski–Visapää 2014: 1; see also the clusters in Lehmann 1988; for a prototype-based approach applied to Hungarian, see Kugler 2017).

⁵ The number specifies the speaker’s age, with the first number designating the number of years and the second one the number of months.

⁶ The equivalent of Hansel or Johnny.

⁷ Example (4) lends further support to the assumption that it is worth subsuming appositive constructions under the phenomenon of contextualization (see Imrényi 2017b: 756–758).

- (4) Adsz nagyot pirosat ollót? (Jancsi 2;3) (Wéber 2011: 165)
 give-2SG big-ACC red-ACC scissors-ACC?
 'Will you give me a big, a red, scissors?' (Jancsi 2;3)

In (3), the processes designated by *leesett* and *jön* constitute the core of the referential scenes. There is little point in asking whether the relationships in [2]–[4] are subordinating or coordinating in nature, since neither construction type is instantiated with its specific markers in the linguistic expressions under study. Further, it seems futile to ask (expecting a definitive answer) how many clauses the utterances consist of, as both bi-clausal and three-clause analyses could be justified. Construal is organized by the opening of attentional frames and their elaborative relations.

This functioning of the directing of attention is also evident when the patterns of subordinating and coordinating construal can be identified. In (5a), Jancsi specifies the reason in ever higher detail, thereby progressively elaborating the profiled event (of feeling sadness) that he anticipates.

- (5) a. Most már szomorkodni lehet,_[1] mert leveszek mindent,_[2] lekapcsolok mindent,_[3]
 és már soha többet nem lesz cirkusz_[4]. (Jancsi 4;8) (Wéber 2011: 166–167).
 'Now it's time for being sad_[1] because I take everything off,_[2] turn everything off_[3]
 and there will never be a circus again_[4].' (Jancsi 4;8)

In [1]–[4], there is a progressive build-up of strata; however, the relations are also marked by the conjunctions *mert* 'because' and *és* 'and'. Thus it can be evaluated what is the relationship between clauses in terms of the classification in Table 1. The examples in (5a) and (5b) further show that construal operations would not be fundamentally different even if the scenes were integrated to a lesser degree, being more separate, as seen in the modified example (5b). The integration/separation of referential scenes is a matter of degree (Lehmann 1988).

- (5) b. Most már szomorkodni lehet,_[1] mert leveszek mindent,_[2] lekapcsolok mindent_[3].
 És már soha többet nem lesz cirkusz_[4].
 'Now it's time for being sad_[1] because I take everything off,_[2] turn everything off_[3].
 And there will never be a circus again_[4].'

4. The linear order of clauses

Grammaticalized constructions of clause complexes also offer patterns for serial arrangement by virtue of being associated with typical figure-ground and accessibility relations (see the factors of prominence and accessibility in Table 1). It is plausible to assume that serial construal deviating from the most entrenched pattern indicates a higher degree of pragmatic awareness on the part of the speaker (cf. Tátrai 2017: 1040).

4.1. Clause order in subordinating (hierarchical) constructions

Subordinating, hierarchical relations allow for double marking (demonstrative pronoun in the main clause, subordinating conjunction in the subordinate clause). Accordingly, the order of the two clauses can be typically reversed without any fundamental change in how the relation between the two scenes is conceptualized. However, ease of interpretation and faster processing favour main clause + subordinate clause order. Still, the order of clauses is organized

dynamically as discourse unfolds. Thus, the order of referential scenes is not determined by the dependency relation (subject, object, etc.) involving the demonstrative pronoun and the elaboration of its schematic meaning by the subordinate clause. Rather, it is shaped by how the utterance contributes to the ongoing discourse and how the speaker intends to provide access to the observed referential scenes (cf. Farkas 1962; Tátrai 2011: 30; Tolcsvai Nagy 2013: 136).

In the case of relative clauses, main clause + subordinate clause order is typical but the reverse is not uncommon either (Kugler 2017: 815). In part, this can be put down to the evolution of this construction. Such clause complexes first emerged with the subordinate clause standing in front, and the integration of clauses was marked only by the relative pronoun (functioning as conjunction) up to the middle of the 14th century; thereafter, main-clause demonstrative pronouns also began to proliferate (cf. Haader 2008: 81). Additionally, though, the frequency data are also motivated by the nature of elaboration supplied by the subordinate clause.

Up until the end of the 18th century, subordinate clauses serving to characterize or specify a participant elaborated by a noun in the main clause invariably followed their main clauses (cf. Dömötör 2008: 54–56), thus this relation departs from typical interclausal links marked by a relative pronoun with regard to the sequence of clauses too. The subordinate clause + main clause order is less common and therefore more salient in the case of subordinate clauses introduced by *hogy* 'that' (Kugler 2017: 814–815). In subordinating clause complexes, a higher degree of markedness (demonstrative pronoun and conjunction) facilitates the use of clause order for suitably embedding the associated referential scenes into discourse.

The insertion of a clause within another clause only occurs with subordination, it is not attested in coordinating clause complexes. This arrangement is more complex than the main clause + subordinate clause arrangement, hence its processing generally requires more effort. However, the difficulty of processing does not result from the inserting pattern alone. In fact, in constructions involving a relative clause such as (6), this pattern is easier to process than possible alternative construals which eliminate it. (In the example, inserted clauses are marked by italics.)

- (6) Ez a fajta fejlesztési politika,^[1] *ami elkezdődött*^[2] *és ami folytatódik ezzel a szöveggel*,^[3] ugyanis nem működhet másként,^[1] mint [...]
'This kind of development policy,^[1] *which has begun*^[2] *and will continue with this text*^[3], could not function in any other way^[1] than ...'

4.2. Clause order in coordinating (non-hierarchical) constructions

In coordinating (non-hierarchical) clause complexes, the relationship between the scenes is typically construed to be symmetrical. Thus, the order of the scenes can be reversed when their temporal relation makes this possible. The association between the scenes is motivated by the structure of experience. The remarks made below about clause order concern clause complexes not marked by a conjunction. For this configuration, two main motivating factors can be highlighted: i. the observed scenes are construed as simultaneous, ii. the observed scenes represent events which are temporally contiguous, with one following the other.

The latter situation is reflected by clause complexes with the order of clauses matching the temporal sequence of portrayed events. The joint perception and processing of simultaneous events is subject to figure-ground alignment. Simultaneity between two scenes can only be conceptualized when the scenes are to some extent separated. In linguistic construal, salience and the spreading of attention during the observation of events may also affect the ordering of

scenes. In general, the event which is more salient or easier to process serves to provide access to what is less salient or is more difficult to process. Besides this peculiarity of the directing of attention, the construal of scenes is also symmetrical, with the processing of more or less equally prominent scenes connected by some relationship. The scenes stand in a part-part relation, neither of them is contained in the other.

When the relationship is not marked by a conjunction, changing the order of clauses (to the extent that the result is meaningful) translates into a reversal in the relationship between the observed events, and the semantic link between the two clauses receives a different interpretation (e.g. cause-effect vs effect-cause).

5. Providing access to the prominent scene

5.1. The variability of syntactic patterns

It is possible in all grammaticized construction types that the clauses do not elaborate or expound on a prominent scene through an elaborative relation, but rather one or more clauses profile the accessibility path by which the speaker intends to observe the prominent scene. These clauses are used to contextualize a target structure (Kugler 2017: 867–870, 874–878).

- (7) *Telt-múlt az idő, és a moszkvaiak számára kezdett valóban úgy tűnni, hogy [...]*
 'Time passed, and for the Muscovites it really began to seem that way, that ...'
- (8) *Amit nagyon fontosnak érzek az az, hogy több mint 250 diák dolgozik most önkéntesként ezen a gátszakaszon.*
 'What I feel very important is that over 250 students are now volunteering at this stretch of the dam.'
- (9) *Amit sajnállok, hogy annak idején az eseményeket nem dokumentáltam.*
 'What I regret is that I did not document the events at that time.'

In (7), it is possible to observe contextualization in both coordinating and subordinating clause complexes (involving *és* 'and' and *hogy* 'that', respectively). (8) and (9), for their part, give evidence of a constructional change triggered by contextualization. In (8), the main clause is completely schematic (*az az* 'it is that', lit. 'that is that'), only featuring demonstrative pronouns with the function of schematically signalling the containment of, and (identifying) relation between the clauses. In (9), there is no main clause at all which would contain the subordinate clauses syntactically. In these patterns, the clauses introduced by relative pronouns foreground the speaker's attitude to the prominent scene (the voluntary work of the students and the absence of documentation, respectively).

5.2. The clause as a grounding predication

In the remainder of this paper, I focus exclusively on clause complexes involving *hogy* 'that'. The *hogy* conjunction is typically an optional element in these constructions. Within the scope of contextualization, those constructions are in the foreground of attention which are anchored to the speaker as a mental subject, objectivizing (putting on stage) her mental functioning.

- (10) a. *Azt hiszem*, 14 lányból és tizenkét ifjúból állt a jókedvű csapat.
that think-1SG
 'I think the cheerful team was made up of 14 girls and twelve boys.'

Such main clauses offer a point of departure for accessing the referential scene in the subordinate clause; they effect a grounding predication (Langacker 1987: 489, 549; 2008: 299; Pelyvás 2001, 2006). A grounding predication expresses the fact that the scene (in the example above, the content of the subordinate clause) can be accessed via the speaker's mental functioning. In (10a), *azt hiszem* 'I think' signals epistemic uncertainty with regard to the number of participants in a Swedish demographic programme, caused by the less than fully reliable functioning of memory.

Main clauses like this only receive temporary activation, with attention spreading on from them onto the target structure. They serve as bridges connecting a mental subject (identical with the speaker) who has some belief and the belief that is made observable ('it was made up of 14 girls and twelve boys') (cf. Pelyvás 2001, 2006). The utterance puts the "subordinate clause" into the centre of attention, its scene being the more prominent. This means that the pattern departs from the prototype of subordination. It follows from the prominence of the subordinate clause that the question tag (QTAG) *ugye*, historically derived from *úgy* 'so, that way' + the *-e* interrogative particle, can pertain only to this clause but not to the contextualizing main clause, as shown by answers A and B in (10b). The test was created by Péter Pelyvás.

- (10) b. *Azt hiszem*, 14 lányból és tizenkét ifjúból állt a jókedvű csapat, *ugye?*
that think-1SG, 14 girl-ABL and twelve boy-ABL stand-PST the cheerful team, QTAG?
 'I think the cheerful team was made up of 14 girls and 12 boys, isn't that the case?'
 A: – ???Igen, azt hiszed.
 'Yes, you do [think so].'
 B: – (Igen/egyérték,) pont/valószínűleg ennyiből állt.
 'Yes, I agree, it was made up exactly/probably of 14 and 12.'

The expression *azt hiszem* 'I think' typically opens up the conceptual domain of BELIEF, marking it on the cognitive verb (*hiszem* think-1SG) that the belief is anchored to the speaker, i.e. it specifies the mental path leading up to the belief. However, it is not the mental functioning of the speaker but rather the event represented in the subordinate clause which stands in the centre of attention. The temporality of the target event is also made accessible through the belief being anchored to the speaker.

Main clauses effecting a grounding predication (cf. Pelyvás 2001) can also follow their subordinate clauses (see (11)), or may be inserted (contained) in them (cf. (12)). The latter is not at all characteristic of clause complexes expressing a hierarchical relation.

- (11) Bár akkoriban, negyven éve, negyvenmilliárd évvel ezelőtt ez valahogy több volt, nagyobb frusztráció lehetett, *azt hiszem*.
 'Although at that time, forty years, forty billion years ago, it was somehow more, it could have been more frustrating, I think.'
- (12) Pénzem, *azt hiszem*, lesz.
money-PX.1SG, that think-1SG, be-FUT
 'I think, I will have money'

Insertion and postposing iconically reflect the fact that the “main clause” has lost its prominence (cf. H. Molnár 1968: 52). At the same time, both sentence-initial and sentence-final positions are typically associated with contextualizing expressions (cf. Dér–Markó 2010: 137).

Main clauses effecting a grounding predication (cf. Pelyvás 2001) are as varied as the linguistically expressible mental operations that provide access to a target structure. Besides inference-making and belief, these also include remembering (cf. (10a)), which may be expressed by a specific mental verb as well (13).

- (13) *Úgy emlékszem, tízezer lejt vittem magammal, [...]*
that.way remember-1SG, ten-thousand lei take-PST.1SG myself-with
 ‘I remember taking ten thousand lei with me’

Anchoring may hinge not only on the mental functioning of the speaker but also on the construal of shared knowledge and the organization of discourse. The main clauses of (14) and (15) have the function of construing shared knowledge through specifying the source of information (first-hand experience in (14) and information from others in (15)). The main clause of (16) highlights the process of assessing the availability of some information. Marking the source of information belongs to the semantic domain of evidentiality.

- (14) Azt kellett volna mondanom, hogy „magyar teniszbravúr Ausztráliában”, és ehelyett azt mondtam, hogy „magyar teniszbúvár Ausztráliában” úgy, hogy akkor észre sem vettem. *Csak azt láttam, hogy a kollégám alig tud megszólalni, és a fülesen keresztül hallottam, hogy a többiek ordítva nevetnek a vezérlőben.*
 ‘I should have said "Hungarian tennis bravura in Australia" and instead of that I said “Hungarian tennis brave urea in Australia”⁸ and I didn't even notice it. *All I could see was that my colleague could barely speak, and I heard through the headset that the others were yelling at the controller in the studio.*’
- (15) *Mástól hallottam, hogy az öregemnek a kisujjában volt a szakmája.*
 ‘I heard from others that my dad had his profession at his fingertips.’
- (16) [...] *mindannyian pontosan tudjuk, hogy a kultúra az egyik legsikeresebb ágazat [...]*
 ‘we all know that culture is one of the most successful sectors’

As the utterances in (17) and (18) demonstrate, the accessibility path may also involve a chain of reference point constructions so that one contextualizing clause is contextualized by another. Thus, the notion of elaboration (in the sense of Langacker 2016) may be applied to the strata of contextualizing clauses as well.

- (17) *Azt hiszem, azt viszont mindannyian tudjuk, hogy a budapesti polgárok számára a közbiztonság jelenlegi helyzete elfogadhatatlan: [...]*
 ‘I think we all know that the current state of public safety in Budapest is unacceptable for the citizens’

⁸ In the original Hungarian text *búvár* ‘diver’ was said instead of *bravúr* ‘bravura performance’.

- (18) *Azt gondolom, mindannyian tudjuk, hogy egy autópálya-körgyűrűnek, illetve egy körgyűrűnek egy város életében többféle funkciója lehetséges.*
'I think we all know that a motorway-ring or a ring road can have many functions in the life of a city.'

A contextualizing main clause may also put on stage the way in which the speaker wishes to embed the target structure into an ongoing discourse, for example as a surprising piece of information which is hard to integrate into existing knowledge/expectations in the case of (19). Furthermore, the main clause may also put on stage a conversational move by the speaker, such as topic shift in (20).

- (19) *Meglepő volt számomra, hogy az anyák egyike sem gondolja úgy, hogy családjuk a legszegényebbek közé tartozik. Valamennyien átlagosnak tartották életkörülményeiket.*
'It was surprising to me that none of the mothers think that their family is one of the poorest. They all considered their living conditions to be average.'
- (20) *Térjünk vissza az eredeti kérdésre: [...]*
'Let's go back to the original question: ...'

In Hungarian, the most basic way in which the conceptualizer may be objectivized is when anchoring to a person is symbolized by the finite verb; with the exception of (19), all of the data above belong to this type. A less direct device is when the mental subject is portrayed as an affected (more or less backgrounded) participant of the grounded process (see the expression *számomra* 'for me' in (19)).

In the above examples, the subordinate clause is not subordinated to the main clause in terms of prominence; on the contrary, the referential scene of the subordinate clause stands in the forefront of attention. In the case of contextualizing main clauses effecting a grounding predication (cf. Pelyvás 2001), the subordinate clause satisfies the criterion of completeness as it is not interpreted as part of a larger structure (cf. containment) but rather as a whole, and the entire construction can be reduced to it. Functionally speaking, a contextualizing main clause of this type is similar to clause-internal contextualizing expressions (vö. *úgy emlékszem* 'so I remember' ~ *emlékezetem szerint* 'according to my memory').

5.3. Subjectivized construal of the speaker's vantage point

In the examples of Section 5.2., it is made explicit by an objectivized mode of construal that the prominent scene becomes accessible through the mental functioning of the speaker (cf. 'individual access') or with the speaker accessing information together with others (see e.g. (16), cf. 'shared access'). However, the mental subject may also be left implicit, and in Table 2 below, a few examples are offered for illustrating this. Examples with a grey background represent objectivized construal, whereas those with a white background exemplify the subjectivized mode of processing (cf. subjectification, Langacker 2006: 18).

Table 2. Objectivized and subjectivized construals of the speaker's vantage point

The nature of grounding predication	Examples for objectivized and subjectivized modes of construal
inference, opinion	<p>„[...] Amilyen érzéketlen és primitív lélek vagyok, számomra ez egyáltalán nem érződik neműnek” – mondtam, „de ha már tárgyról van szó, <i>valószínűnek tartom</i> [probable.DAT think.1SG], hogy semlegesnemű kell legyen.” 'Being an insensitive and primitive soul, I wouldn't conceptualize it having a gender – I said – but talking about an object, <i>I think</i> [lit. probable-DAT hold-1SG] it should be neutral'</p> <p><i>Valószínű</i>, hogy a ház tiltakozik ittlétem ellen. 'Probably [lit. (it's) <i>probable</i> (that)] the tenants are protesting against my presence.'</p>
memory	<p><i>Úgy emlékszem</i>, tízezer lejt vittem magammal, [...] 'I remember [lit. that.way remember-1SG] taking ten thousand lei with me'</p> <p><i>Úgy rémlik</i>, még ez is benne volt abban a levélben. 'It seems [lit. that.way seem-3SG] that even that was in that letter.'</p> <p><i>Úgy tűnik</i>, tegnap láttam már. 'It seems that I saw that yesterday.'</p>
perception	<p><i>hallottam</i>, hogy a többiek ordítva nevetnek a vezérlőben 'I heard that the others were yelling at the controller in the studio'</p> <p><i>Hallatszott</i>, hogy füttyörészve szorgoskodik. 'It could be heard that he was whistling while he was busy'</p> <p><i>Mégis jól hallható</i>, hogy a magyar szerző sajátos, egyéni hangra talált [...] 'Still it can be heard clearly that the Hungarian author has found his unique, individual voice'</p>
report	<p><i>Mástól hallottam</i>, hogy az öregemnek a kisujjában volt a szakmája. 'I heard it from others that my dad had his profession at his fingertips.'</p> <p><i>Belgrádban olyan találgatások hallhatók</i>, hogy a bujanovaci akciót Slobodan Milosevic emberei szervezték [...] 'In Belgrade such speculations can be heard that the action in Bujanovac had been organized by the men of Slobodan Milosevic'</p>
evaluation as 'unexpected; unusual, new' (mirativity)	<p><i>Meglepő volt számomra</i>, hogy az anyák egyike sem gondolja úgy, hogy... 'It was surprising to me that none of the mothers think that...'</p> <p><i>Meglepő</i>, hogy itt is minden harmadik-negyedik [gép] áll, nincs ember. 'It is surprising that here too, every third or fourth [machine] is standing still, there are no workers.'</p>
discourse functions	<p><i>Itt most áttérek arra, amit Sümeghy képviselő úr mondott.</i> Igen, képviselő úr, [...] Here I move over to what my fellow MP Sümeghy said. Yes, Mr Sümeghy, [...]</p> <p><i>Erről annyit</i>, hogy nehezen tudom elképzelni, ahogy [Politikus]t félrelökik, vagy kirángatják egy kocsiból. 'So much about this that I can hardly imagine [this politician] to be pushed aside or pulled from a car.'</p>

With subjectivized construal, some uncertainty of interpretation is caused by the fact that for each construction, and sometimes for each situation, it needs to be assessed separately whether access is individual or shared. Since in Hungarian, there are no grammaticalized markers of various types of source evidence, the evaluation of access may be a highly complex process (see Kugler 2015: 54). Even with inference-marking predications, contextual factors need to be taken into account when access type is (probabilistically) characterized. At the other end of the scale are expressions like *úgy rémlik* 'so it seems', which allow for anchoring to the speaker, e.g. with the *nekem* 'to me' satellite; however, even without this, the expression typically evokes the speaker's vantage point.

6. Summary

The paper explored the interaction between grammaticized schemas for construing clause complexes (especially subordination with the conjunction *hogy* 'that') and the operation whereby the speaker offers an access path for processing a prominent referential scene by progressively opening up attentional frames in the scene of joint attention. From this perspective, special attention was paid to clauses effecting a grounding predication which are anchored to the vantage point of the speaker as a mental subject. In terms of both access paths and modes of construal, a high degree of variability was found.

Acknowledgements

This paper was supported by the National Research, Development and Innovation Office of Hungary, project No. K-129040 (Verbal constructions in Hungarian. Research in usage-based construction grammar) and the Thematic Excellence Program of ELTE Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary.

References

- Chafe, Wallace 1988. Linking intonation units in spoken English. In: Haiman, John – Thompson, Sandra A. (eds.): *Clause combining in grammar and discourse*. Amsterdam–Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 1–28.
- Cristofaro, Sonia 2014. Is there really a syntactic category of subordination? In: Visapää, Laura – Kalliokoski, Jyrki – Sorva, Helena (eds.): *Contexts of subordination*. Amsterdam–Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 73–92.
- Dér, Csilla Ilona – Markó, Alexandra 2010. A pilot study of Hungarian discourse markers. *Language and Speech* 53(2): 135–180.
- Farkas, Vilmos 1962. A mondat rendje [The order of the sentence]. In: Tompa, József (ed.): *A mai magyar nyelv rendszere*. II. kötet. Mondattan [The system of present-day Hungarian. Vol. 2. Syntax]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. 451–455.
- Haader, Lea 2001. Mikrodiakronia és változásvizsgálat (az összetett mondatokban) [Microdiachrony and linguistic change in compound sentences]. *Magyar Nyelvőr* 125: 354–370.
- Haader, Lea 2008. Az alárendelő mondatok változási irányairól [The direction of the change of subordinate clauses]. In: Haader, Lea – Horváth, László (eds.): *Tanulmányok a középmagyar kor mondattana köréből* [Papers on the syntax of Middle Hungarian]. Budapest: Tinta Könyvkiadó. 77–87.
- Haspelmath, Martin 2004. Coordinating constructions: an overview. In: Haspelmath, Martin (ed.): *Coordinating constructions*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 3–39.
- Herlin, Ilona – Kalliokoski, Jyrki – Visapää, Laura 2014. Introduction. In: Visapää, Laura – Kalliokoski, Jyrki – Sorva, Helena (eds.): *Contexts of subordination*. Amsterdam–Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 1–16.
- H. Molnár, Ilona 1968. *Módosító szók és módosító mondatrészek a mai magyar nyelvben* [Modal adverbs and discourse markers in modern Hungarian]. Nyelvtudományi Értekezések 60. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Hopper, Paul J. – Traugott, Elizabeth Closs 2003. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Imrényi, András 2017a. Form-meaning correspondences in multiple dimensions: The structure of Hungarian finite clause. *Cognitive Linguistics* 28(2): 287–319.
- Imrényi, András 2017b. Az elemi mondat viszonyhálózata [The network structure of clauses]. In: Tolcsvai Nagy, Gábor (ed.): *Nyelvtan* [Grammar]. Budapest: Osiris Kiadó. 664–760.
- Kugler, Nóra 2015. *Megfigyelés és következtetés a nyelvi tevékenységben* [Observation and inference in language use]. Budapest: Tinta Könyvkiadó.

- Kugler, Nóra 2017. Az összetett mondat [Clause complexes]. In: Tolcsvai Nagy, Gábor (ed.): *Nyelvtan* [Grammar]. Budapest: Osiris Kiadó. 806–895.
- Kugler, Nóra 2018. *Az összetett mondat* [Clause complexes]. Budapest: Eötvös Kiadó.
<http://www.eltereader.hu/kiadvanyok/kugler-nora-az-osszetett-mondat/>
- Langacker, Ronald W. 1987. *Foundations of cognitive grammar*. Volume I. Theoretical Prerequisites. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Langacker, Ronald W. 1991. *Foundations of cognitive grammar*. Volume II. Descriptive Application. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Langacker, Ronald W. 2006. Subjectification, grammaticization, and conceptual archetypes. In: Athanasiadou, Angeliki – Canakis, Costas – Cornillie, Bert (eds.): *Subjectification. Various paths to subjectivity*. Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 17–40.
- Langacker, Ronald W. 2008. *Cognitive grammar: A basic introduction*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Langacker, Ronald W. 2014. Subordination in a dynamic account of grammar. In: Visapää, Laura – Kalliokoski, Jyrki – Sorva, Helena (eds.): *Contexts of subordination*. Amsterdam–Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 17–72.
- Langacker, Ronald W. 2016. Baseline and elaboration. *Cognitive Linguistics* 27(3): 405–439.
- Lehmann, Christian 1988. Towards a typology of clause linkage. In: Haiman, John – Thompson, Sandra A. (eds.): *Clause combining in grammar and discourse*. Amsterdam–Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 181–225.
- Lieko, Anneli 1992. *The development of complex sentences: a case study of Finnish*. Helsinki: Finnish Academy of Science & Letters.
- Matthiessen, Christian – Thompson, Sandra A. 1988. The structure of discourse and 'subordination'. In: Haiman, John – Thompson, Sandra A. (eds.): *Clause combining in grammar and discourse*. Amsterdam–Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 275–329.
- Oravecz, Csaba – Váradi, Tamás – Sass, Bálint 2014. The Hungarian Gigaword Corpus. In: *Proceedings of LREC 2014*.
- Pelyvás, Péter 2001. On the development of the category modal: a cognitive view. How changes in image-schematic structure led to the emergence of the grounding predication. In: Kocsány, Piroska – Molnár, Anna (Hgg.): *Wort und (Kon)text*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang. 103–130.
- Pelyvás, Péter 2006. Subjectification in (expressions of) epistemic modality and the development of the grounding predication. In: Athanasiadou, Angeliki – Canakis, Costas – Cornillie, Bert (eds.): *Subjectification. Various paths to subjectivity*. Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 121–150.
- Radden, Günter – Dirven, René 2007. *Cognitive English grammar*. Amsterdam–Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Talmy, Leonard 2007. Attention phenomena. In: Geeraerts, Dirk – Cuyckens, Hubert (eds.): *The Oxford handbook of cognitive linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 264–293.
- Tátrai, Szilárd 2011. *Bevezetés a pragmatikába. Funkcionális kognitív megközelítés* [Introduction to pragmatics: A functional cognitive approach]. Budapest: Tinta Könyvkiadó.
- Tátrai, Szilárd 2017. Pragmatika [Pragmatics]. In: Tolcsvai Nagy, Gábor (ed.): *Nyelvtan* [Grammar]. Budapest: Osiris Kiadó. 899–1058.
- Tátrai, Szilárd 2020. On the perspectival nature and the metapragmatic reflectiveness of contextualization. *Studia Linguistica Hungarica* 32: 109–120.
- Tolcsvai Nagy, Gábor 2013. *Bevezetés a kognitív nyelvészetbe* [Introduction to cognitive linguistics]. Budapest: Osiris Kiadó.
- Tomasello, Michael 1999. *The cultural origins of human cognition*. Cambridge MA – London: Harvard University Press.
- Tomasello, Michael 2003. *Constructing a language: A usage-based theory of language acquisition*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wéber, Katalin 2011. „Rejtelmes kétféleség”. *A kétféle igeragozás elkülönülése a magyar nyelvben. (Megkülönböztetésük a magyar nyelvészeti hagyományban és gyermeknyelvi megnyilatkozások longitudinális korpuszvizsgálata alapján)* [“Puzzling duality”: The differentiation of the two verbal paradigms in Hungarian]. Bölcsészdoktori értekezés [PhD thesis]. Pécs: PTE.