

OBJECT-VERB ORDER IN BRAZILIAN PORTUGUESE: A MECHANISM FOR THE EXPRESSION OF SUBJECTIVITY

Jussara ABRAÇADO*

- **ABSTRACT:** In this paper, based on the theoretical interface between Functional Linguistics and Cognitive Linguistics, we intend to demonstrate that the relationship between word order and subjectivity, which can be observed in several languages, also occurs in the use of the object-verb order (OV) in Brazilian Portuguese (BP). By analyzing the occurrences of OV order in the speech of 12 participants from the city of Rio de Janeiro, we noticed that: (i) the principal function of OV order in Brazilian Portuguese is that of resuming a topic, or an aspect of a topic, in order to predicate about it; (ii) this function is composed, in fact, of three subfunctions: to establish contrast, to mitigate a previous statement, and to reinforce a topic that is being discussed; (iii) the principal function, mentioned above, and its subfunctions are mechanisms for expressing subjectivity in BP.
- **KEYWORDS:** Subjectivity. Word order. OV order. Brazilian Portuguese.

Introduction

This paper represents an additional phase in our research concerning subjectivity and word order in Brazilian Portuguese¹ (BP). In light of the theoretical interconnection that exists between Functional Linguistics and Cognitive Linguistics, herein we focus on object-verb order (OV), which is one of the types of variation that is observed in relation to the canonical/neutral order of BP, the Verb-Object order (VO). In light of the evidence we encountered in our research regarding the application of word order in BP (ABRAÇADO, 2013, 2003, 2001; PEZATTI, 1993; VOTRE, 1992; BRAGA, 1984; PONTES, 1987, among others), we propose to demonstrate that: (i) the principal, or most prevalent, function of OV order in BP is that of resuming a topic, or an aspect of a topic, in order to predicate about it; (ii) this function is composed, in fact, of three subfunctions: to establish contrast, to mitigate a previous statement, and to reinforce a topic that is being discussed; (iii) the principal function, mentioned above, and its subfunctions are mechanisms for expressing subjectivity in BP.

* UFF – Universidade Federal Fluminense. Instituto de Letras. Departamento de Ciências da Linguagem. Niterói – Rio de Janeiro – Brasil. 24210-200 – almeidamja@globocom.

¹ The following undergraduate research scholars contributed to the completion of this study: Marthina Scardua Ferreira (Paper) and Amanda Dib (PIBIC/UFF).

This paper is organized according to the following structure: firstly, we present the OV order discursive functions that were identified by previous studies; we then address issues related to the notion of subjectivity and the relationship between subjectivity and word order. Analysis results of the data are then discussed, and, lastly, we present our conclusions and observations based on the results that were found.

Discursive functions regarding OV order identified in previous studies

One of the main functions of the OV order in BP, according to Votre (1992), Braga (1984) and Pontes (1987), is that of establishing contrasts. The recurrent use of OV order in BP has been previously identified, and it is generally characterized as a process of topicalization with the aim of establishing contrasts, in accordance with the following example:

- (1) [...] *era um é uma menina, não é? Uma moça- é muito bonita a história. Eu, quando comecei assistir, não estava fazendo muita fé, mas meu marido disse: “essa novela vai ficar boa.” É uma menina que o pai era muito rico. Mas era um homem rico em terras, entendeu? Tinha muita terra, tinha muito dinheiro nas propriedades, **mas dinheiro mesmo ele não tinha entendeu?*** (FAL 30).

[...] it was a it is a girl, isn't it? A young lady- the story is quite lovely. When I began watching it, I didn't think it would be very good, but my husband said: "this soap opera is going to get better." It's about a girl whose father was very wealthy. But he was a man that was rich in terms of land, understand? He had a lot of land, he had a lot of money in real estate, *but he didn't really have any money, understand?* [literal translation: *but money really he did not have, understand?*] (FAL 30).

In contrast, Braga (1984, p.216) argues that establishing contrasts constitutes merely one of the roles that are played by OV order. According to this author, OV order is also employed in BP, “[...] to return to a topic, or an aspect of the topic, that was referred to directly before, to reinforce the topic that is being considered”. In cases such as these, states Braga, the use of a demonstrative is commonplace:

The combination of these aspects – the use of the demonstrative and a deviation from the neutral order – suggests that these topicalizations were employed to reinforce the topic that was being discussed. Consider the following example:

So, I feel that the... the... cook should exist over there as he exists, isn't that right? You're going to the army, you're going there, you're the cook, right? In the hotels everyone... Women are more for helping

out than anything else! Cut potatoes and wash the dishes, right? More easy-going work. I think that *this kind of heavy duty work*, you know, shouldn't be done by women, no sir [literal translation: this work heavy, you know, the woman should not do, no]. (BRAGA, 1984, p.216, emphasis added).

In addition, Braga (1984) points out another discursive function of the OV order in BP: that of mitigating a previous statement. The use of OV order, in this respect, tends to occur after an umbrella statement and serves to mitigate it, to shatter the reader's expectations. As such, if the preceding statement was affirmative in nature, the OV order will tend to present a negative statement, and vice-versa. The author proffers the following example to illustrate this function:

I am his second wife. There are these two children, that, here, no one knows about my life. That I live here... If you ask me the name of that neighbor next door, I don't know it. I know who he is, but, *his name*, I don't know. (BRAGA, 1984, p.217, emphasis added).

However, in our opinion, these examples do not provide sufficient evidence for the notion that OV order performs three distinct discursive functions. We know that there is only one principal function that is composed, in fact, of three subfunctions. Our understanding is based on the fact that, in each of the examples that were presented, independently of the "function" that they illustrate, one can observe the resumption of a topic, or of an aspect of the topic, that was mentioned directly before in order to justify it, whether by establishing a contrast, by mitigating a preceding statement, or even by reinforcing a topic that is being discussed.

Having established this, we can conclude that the most prevalent function of the OV order is to resume a topic, or an aspect of a topic, in order to predicate about it. As such, to establish a contrast, to mitigate a preceding statement and to reinforce the topic under consideration, all operate, in fact, as subfunctions of the first function.

Another aspect that is directly related to the previous finding also called our attention: the OV order occurs in portions of the discussion where the opinions and perspective of the speaker manifest themselves. This indicates that a relationship exists between the use of OV order and the expression of subjectivity. This relationship is examined below.

Subjectivity and word order

Although the concepts that involve subjectivity have garnered much attention in current linguistic research, mainly regarding studies that are based,

theoretically, on Functional Linguistics and Cognitive Linguistics, those concepts are still unclear and contain significant gaps. This makes comprehending the concepts themselves, and their significance to language, all the more difficult, and, furthermore, favors the emergence of a range of issues of varying nature. One of the questions that we ask is: does subjectivity involve human language, is it an inherent characteristic of the process of conceptualization, is it a type of motivation, a mechanism or a process of linguistic change? In other words – what is subjectivity really? In the following sections, we will make arguments for possible answers to this question in order to restrict and support the discussion of the object of this study.

(Inter)subjectivity: conceptualization and delimitation

Subjectivity in language, a subject that has been widely examined recently in linguistics, has previously been presented and discussed by other scholars, as mentioned by Silva (2011, p.95):

Going beyond what was proposed by Bréal, Bühler or Jakobson, one of the most notable concepts was proposed by Benveniste, who introduced the notion of the “subject of enunciation”, and the recognition that language [...]

[...] it's so profoundly affected by the expression of subjectivity that one wonders, if it were constructed differently, if it could still function AND be known as language. (BENVENISTE, 1966, p.261).

Lyons, a more recent contributor to the issue, has defined subjectivity as:

[...] the way in which natural languages, in their structure and their normal manner of operation, provide for the locutionary agent's expression of himself and of his own attitudes and beliefs. (LYONS, 1982, p.102).

One can observe that, while Benveniste (1966) views subjectivity as an intrinsic characteristic of language, Lyons (1982) describes it as a recourse, which exists in natural languages, that affords the locutionary agent a means by which to express himself, his attitudes and his beliefs.

In more recent studies, which have taken into account the functionalist and cognitivist perspectives, which are discussed below, discrepancies in the characterization and investigation of subjectivity have also been identified.

Subjectivity according to functional linguistics

Traugott (2010), based on Lyons's (1982) definition of subjectivity, according to which subjectivity refers to the means by which natural languages, in their structures and normal manner of functioning, provide the locutionary agent with a means for expressing himself and his attitudes and beliefs, associates intersubjectivity with the way in which natural languages, in their structures and normal manner of functioning, provide the locutionary agent with a means of expressing his opinion with regard to the attitudes, beliefs, and, most significantly, the "face" or "self-image" of the listener.

In addition, in reference to a branch of her work, completed during the last 25 years, regarding the study of the semanticization of subjectivity as a function of time, Traugott (2010) regards as (inter)subjectification the diachronic process of the semanticization of (inter)subjectivity. Traugott indicates that a distinction must be made between the synchronic ((inter)subjectivity) state and the diachronic process ((inter)subjectification). Based on evidence that has been found in historic texts, Traugott assumes that the linguistic change represents a change in usage.

Traugott also assumes that a distinction exists between semantics and pragmatics and, based on this distinction, defends the hypothesis that subjectification and intersubjectification both involve a reanalysis and the conventionalization of pragmatic meanings that arise as contexts within which speaker and listener negotiate meanings. As such, subjectification is the development of meanings that express the attitude, or opinion, of the speaker, while intersubjectification is the development of meanings regarding the speaker's awareness of the listener's self-image.

According to Traugott (2010), subjectification and intersubjectification are the mechanisms by which:

- a. meanings are adopted to codify and regulate the attitudes and beliefs of the speaker (subjectification);
- b. once subjectified, such meanings can be adopted to codify meanings that are centered on the listener (intersubjectification).

Traugott and Dasher (2005), in turn, demonstrate to what extent subjectivity, which explicitly expresses the opinion of the speaker, is capable of, according to its linguistic usage, codifying new meanings. According to these authors, the most subjective expressions are involved in contexts within which the following are prevalent: clear temporal and spatial deixis; explicit attitude markers of the speaker regarding what is said, including epistemic attitude for the proposition; explicit attitude markers of the speaker regarding the relationship between the parts of the text; the principle of relevance.

Traugott and Dasher (2005) add that subjectivity depends on cognitive principles; however, in the context of communication and rhetorical strategies, it is related to competitive impulses that exist between speakers (to be informative) and listeners (to construct the inferences that are suggested) – in other words, subjectivity inevitably involves, to some extent, intersubjectivity. It is a metonymically-based process through which the speaker adopts meanings to transmit the information that will be reworked during communication.

This emphasis on the context of communication, that is, on each of the linguistic clues that appear in the surroundings, made Traugott (2010) view subjectification as a subtype of semantic reanalysis (related to metonymic processes).

Alternatively, as we will examine below, from the cognitivist perspective, the context is not emphasized so much so as the subject of the conceptualization.

Subjectivity according to cognitive linguistics

According to Cognitive Linguistics, subjectivity can be characterized in accordance with a fundamental principle of this line of thought, as explained by Verhagen (2007, p.48):

A fundamental principle in Cognitive Linguistics is that semantics is, indeed, primarily cognitive and not a matter of relationships between language and the world (or truth conditions with respect to a model). This principle becomes especially manifest in the research into facets of meaning and grammatical organization which crucially makes use of notions such as ‘perspective’, ‘subjectivity’, or ‘point of view’. What these notions have in common is that they capture aspects of conceptualization that cannot be sufficiently analyzed in terms of properties of the *object* of conceptualization, but, in one way or another, necessarily involve a *subject* of conceptualization.

Langacker (1999, 2003, 2006), basing his argument on the process of conceptualization, explains subjectivity and subjectification in terms of perspectives, or points of view, that can be observed in the asymmetrical relationship between the subject that observes/conceptualizes and the object that is observed/conceptualized:

One entity or situation is *objectively* constructed as it is placed “in scene” and observed from outside, as a specific point of focus, as an object of perception; it is *subjectively* constructed the longer it

remains “off scene”, as a subject that is not conscious of itself and implicit in terms of per/conception (Langacker, 2006: 18; 2008: 77). *Subjectivity* is, therefore, a property of concepts that are off scene, or implicit, insofar as *objectivity* is a property of concepts that are in scene, or explicit. *Subjectification* is, by extension, a process through which an entity transitions from the ‘object’ to the ‘subject’ of per/conception, and, consequently, the conceptualizer/speaker (one or the other element of the act of locution) ceases to be an observer/external element and begins to form part of the content of conceptualization. (SILVA, 2011, p.98, emphasis added).

In other words, for Langacker, subjectivity does not refer to linguistic expressions *per se*, but the way in which an element of a conceptualization is constructed within a perspective, in other words, whether objectively or subjectively:

For example, the difference between *Vanessa is sitting across the table from me* and *Vanessa is sitting across the table* according to Langacker is that the same content (here: the speaker as the landmark of the *across*-relation) is ‘objectively construed’ in the former because it is put on stage by the expression *me* (similarly to another nominal expression [...]), whereas it ‘subjectively construed’ in the latter because it remains offstage as the implicit locus of conception. (VERHAGEN, 2007, p.74).

Within this line of thought, Langacker uses the term *subjectification* to refer to an increase in subjectivity, that is, an increase in the conceptual perspectivization of some idea, which corresponds to a “realignment of a given relationship from the objective axis to the subjective axis” (LANGACKER, 1990, p.17). In these terms, the subjectification occurs in conjunction with a process of semantic bleaching of the objective concept, which occurs because the subjective component (the perspective of the conceptualizer) is immanent to the objective concept, because it is part of the conceptualization process itself.

Furthermore, Langacker (2006) also discusses the relationship between subjectification and grammaticalization, demonstrating it through reports of various cases, such as, for example, the evolution, in English, of the future meaning of the verb *to go*. Subjectification, according to Langacker (1999), is a gradual and multifaceted phenomenon that is related to the following parameters of change: (a) a change of state (current > potential; specific > generic); (b) a change in the focus of attention (profiled > unprofiled); (c) a change of domain (physical interaction > social interaction); (d) a change in the source of activity (entity is “in scene” > entity is “off scene”).

Although implicitly, Langacker, in his model, also foresees the intersubjective dimension:

[...] the intersubjective dimension is inherent to Langacker's model. The very notion of *perspectivation*, as a process of joint attention between the speaker and the listener vis-a-vis the object of conceptualization, evokes both dimensions: not only the dimension within which the conceptualization 'object' is structured, but also the dimension of intersubjective coordination between the conceptualization 'subjects', i.e., the speaker and the listener. (SILVA, 2011, p.99, emphasis added).

Subjectivity: the point of view adopted in this paper

Despite the discernible distinctions that exist among the perspectives regarding subjectivity that have been discussed, we are not in disagreement with any of them, for we understand that these divergences are due to inherent differences in the perspectives that are adopted. Benveniste (1966) analyzes subjectivity as an intrinsic characteristic of human language, since his principal focus is, in fact, language. While for Lyons (1982), as well as for Traugott and Dasher (2005), subjectivity, viewed from a phenomenological perspective, corresponds to mechanisms that exist in the natural languages, through which the speaker expresses his beliefs and attitudes. In parallel, Traugott and Dasher also consider intersubjectivity to be a mechanism that serves, however, to express the opinion of the speaker regarding attitudes, beliefs and, more specifically, the "face" or "self-image" of the listener. Furthermore, Traugott (2010), who calls attention to the distinction between (inter)subjectivity (synchronic state) and (inter)subjectification (diachronic process), associates subjectification and intersubjectification to processes of change. Alternatively, Langacker (2006), who emphasizes the process of conceptualization and, by extension, the conceptualizing subject, explains subjectivity in terms of conceptual perspectivation: the manner in which the element of a conceptualization is constructed within a perspective, in other words, whether it is constructed objectively or subjectively.

In light of the above, we consider it necessary to determine, firstly, in accordance with which perspective is subjectivity dealt with in this paper. To do so, we must explain that the focus of our study is a type of mechanism for manifesting subjectivity, observed within a particular language, or, more specifically, within BP. As such, in light of the specific characteristics of this study, we will base ourselves on Lyons's definition (1982). We postulate, therefore, that subjectivity refers to mechanisms that exist in the natural languages that allow their users to express themselves, their attitudes and their beliefs.

The following is also necessary in order to restrict the scope even further. Although it is understood that subjectivity and intersubjectivity are inherently linked, and that, therefore, only on a phenomenological level, in an evaluation that is based on linguistic clues, can one address them separately, due to the reduction in scope that we chose to perform in this study, we will only deal with subjectivity in the remainder of this paper.

Having defined the approach to subjectivity that has been adopted, we shall transition to an examination of the relationship between subjectivity and OV order in BP.

Subjectivity and OV order in bp

The relationship between subjectivity and OV order in BP (which can also be observed in the previous examples) is exemplified in the following passage:

- (2) *Quer dizer que ele (riso i) sofreu o diabo, entende? Sofreu! Mas agora <aga-> felizmente já está- se <recuperou> se recuperou quase, não é? E ele é muito assim, ele é <muito> ele é assim muito bom <amigo>.É até parecido comigo, sabe? [Ele é muito]- ele é muito de mim. Eu acho que **isso eu transmiti para ele** (FAL 30)*

You mean that he (laughter) suffered like the devil, know what I mean? Yes, he suffered! But now fortunately, he has already <recovered> almost recovered, right? It's typical of him, he is <very> he is like, very good <friend>. He's even like me, ya know? [He is very]- he's very much like me. I think that *I passed this onto him* (literal translation: I think that *this I passed onto him.*) (FAL 30).

As one can see, in this and in previous examples, the occurrences of the OV order happen during moments in which the speaker speaks of himself, of his own feelings or, perhaps, when he proffers comments about someone or about something that happened.

Thompson and Hopper (2001, p.53) had already shown that the low transitivity that was detected while analyzing data from conversations is due to the fact that our conversations mainly concern themselves with "how things are according to our point of view", that is, devoid of feedback from the subjectivity in our daily use of the language. To emphasize what these authors postulate, the majority of the OV order cases that we registered occurred in dialogues. Furthermore, it should also be emphasized that the relationship between word order and subjectivity that we observe in BP can also be found in other languages. According to Traugott (2010, p.21, emphasis added):

A growing number of studies have suggested that as they are subjectified linguistic elements are used in increasingly peripheral positions. Typically the shift is leftward in VO languages, and rightward in OV languages. In English many discourse markers are associated with left (sometime right) periphery, and their use in this position can be correlated with subjectification of their meaning (see e.g. Traugott and Dasher 2002 on *indeed, in fact, actually*, Brinton Forthcoming on *I mean*). It has further been suggested that subjectified meanings of adjectives are to be found in the left periphery of the NP, see e.g. Adamson (2000) on the development from descriptive to affective meanings of *lovely* as in *a lovely little example*, and Breban (2006) on the word order correlations of subjectification and grammaticalization in the development of adjectives like *different, distinct*. Likewise, in Japanese many items that are subjectified or intersubjectified come to be used on the periphery of the clause.

Furthermore, we emphasize that, with respect to BP (whose neutral order is (S)V(O)), the OV order can be perfectly classified within the standard that is described by Traugott above. In our view, the occurrence of subjectified linguistic elements in peripheral positions (changing from the left in VO Languages and to the right in OV Languages) is related to that which was stated by Givón (1985), who said that the canonic/neutral clause must convey the basic idea regarding the events/actions/states, and, furthermore, express who did what for whom, when, where, how or why, and for what purpose. As a result, the performance of other important communicative functions would be left to the types of variation that are commonly recorded with respect to the canonic/neutral clause.

Within this line of thought, we conclude that the OV order serves the discursive strategy of expressing subjective enunciations, separating them from the other basic ideas that are normally expressed by the canonic/neutral clause.

Furthermore, in light of the fact that the use of the OV order refers to a principal mechanism that makes three different manners of expressing subjectivity possible, we postulate that: (i) the principal function of OV order is that of resuming a topic, or an aspect of a topic, in order to predicate about it; (ii) this function is composed, in fact, of three subfunctions: to establish contrast, to mitigate a previous statement, and to reinforce a topic that is being discussed; (iii) the principal function, mentioned above, and its subfunctions are mechanisms for expressing subjectivity in BP.

Each one of the subfunctions constitutes, therefore, a distinct way of expressing subjectivity. The resumption of a topic, or an aspect of a topic (principal

function), should, therefore, occur in discursive situations in which the speaker: looks to promote certain entities via the establishment of contrasts with others; reconsider, or mitigate, a previous statement; or, still, emphasize his point of view, or opinion, with respect to some topic that was being examined.

Analysis of the phenomenon

The examples that were presented up to this point illustrate the occurrences of OV order that we found in the data that was analyzed. In each case, one can observe the use of OV order to express subjective enunciations, such as in the following examples:

- (3) *O presidente- está aí, eu gosto desse presidente nosso. Eu gosto muito dele, eu gosto. Porque eu acho que [ele]- [ele]- ele tem [muita]- muita vontade de fazer muita coisa, mas a- o pessoal todo tem que ajudar, não é? Que se não ajudar, ele sozinho não pode fazer grande coisa. **Vontade ele tem.** (FAL 30).*

The president – he's there, I like this, our president. I like him a lot, I like him. Because I believe that [he] – [he] – he has [a lot] – a lot of desire to do many things, but peo- everyone has to help, right? Because if not, he himself can't do much. *He wants to help, though.* (literal translation: *Desire he has.*) (FAL 30).

As one can notice in any of the given examples, in the periphery of the OV order occurrences, linguistic clues exist, such as the presence of the first person singular tense of verbs such as *gostar, querer, saber, achar (to like, to want, to know, to guess)*_ the latter word is employed as a cognitive verb_, which confirms that we are faced with portions of the discourse within which, in accordance with Lyons (1982), the speaker expresses himself, his attitudes and his beliefs. We believe, therefore, that the conclusion stating that the OV order serves the discursive purpose of expressing subjective enunciations has not been adequately explored.

Such examples, as well as the data that we analyzed, were extracted from speech samples provided by 12 participants from the city of Rio de Janeiro, whose interviews are contained in the *Amostra Censo*, a database that was produced by *Projeto Censo da Variação Linguística no Rio de Janeiro (PEUL/ Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro)*². The following table contains the code, gender and ages of each of our participants.

² Each of our participants had 11 years of schooling or less.

Table 1 – Participants

INF	AGE	GENDER
FAL 49	7	M
FAL 50	8	F
FAL 1	18	M
FAL 4	25	F
FAL 9	39	M
FAL 7	41	M
FAL 30	43	M
FAL 43	42	M
FAL 16	56	F
FAL 8	57	M
FAL 34	62	F
FAL 46	62	M

Source: Made by the author.

As shown in Table 1, for our study, we collected speech data from participants whose ages ranged from seven to 62 years. From the participants' speech, we extracted a total of 79 OV order occurrences within a total of 415 items of data³. These results showed that, in 100% of the cases, that is, in all of the OV order occurrences that were identified, each one was a subjective enunciation.

It is also notable that each participant, regardless of their age, made use of OV order in their speech. To illustrate this point, Table 2, now containing the percentage of occurrences of OV order by age interval, is provided below:

³ In addition, considering the neutral order occurrences, the data revealed the following: VO = 336 (80,9%); OV = 79 (19,1%). Having performed the Chi-Square Test, the distribution of the data that was analyzed was proven to be statistically significant. The X^2 result was equal to 159.14, a value that is much higher, therefore, than the critical value of 3.841 for a degree of freedom equal to 1 (the higher the X^2 result, the more statistically significant is the relationship between the dependent variable and the independent variable).

Table 2 – Occurrences of OV order by age interval

Age interval	Inf.	Age	OV	Total	
				N	%
1 ^a	FAL 49	7	2	18	22,8
	FAL 50	8	3		
	FAL 1	18	1		
	FAL 4	25	9		
2 ^a	FAL 9	39	12	42	53,2
	FAL 7	41	8		
	FAL 43	42	4		
	FAL 30	43	13		
3 ^a	FAL 16	56	3	19	24
	FAL 8	57	5		
	FAL 34	62	7		
	FAL 46	62	3		
Total				79	100

Source: Made by the author.

Returning to the object of this study, to calculate the percentage with respect to each of the subfunctions that are performed by the OV order, we have separated the occurrences into three categories: I – the establishment of contrasts; II – the mitigation of a previous statement; III – the reinforcement of a topic that is being discussed. Examples regarding these three categories are provided below:

- (4) I – the establishment of contrasts:

Eu não fiz todas as séries. Tem primeira, não é? (est) CA, jardim, não? (est) até CA não tem, não é? só assim primeira- e primeira- (hes) é. [Primeira], não é? primeira, CA, (est) eu não fiz, não. só fiz a segunda, porque eu estudei num outro colégio, Abeu Filgueiras, lá em Nilópolis. (FAL 50).

I did not complete all of the series. There is a first one, isn't there? CA, garden, isn't there? up to CA there isn't, right? only in that manner first- and first. [First], right? *first, CA, I didn't do it*, no. (literal translation: *first, CA, I didn't do, no.*) I only did the second one, because I studied at a different school, Abeu Filgueiras, over there in Nilópolis. (FAL 50).

- (5) II – the mitigation of a previous statement:

Ela é chatinha também. [ela]- Ela não gosta muito de- ela não come nada, é chata mesmo. Uma coisinha como nunca vi. Gosta mais um pouquinho de sopa. (voz da filha) Sopa ela gosta. (FAL 30).

She is also a bit annoying. [she]- She doesn't very much like- she doesn't eat anything, she's really annoying. Something I've never seen before. She likes soup a bit more. (daughter's voice) *She likes soup.* (literal translation: *Soup she likes.*) (FAL 30).

- (6) III – the reinforcement of a topic that is being discussed:

*Então, com treze anos, eu comecei a trabalhar na obra com meu pai. Meu pai era construtor- (latido longe) eu ia para a obra com meu pai, <papa...>, comecei ajudar meu pai, pintava uma parede, pintava isso, pintava aquilo. Eu sei até assentar tijolo, botar cerâmica, **essas coisa assim, dentro numa casa, eu sei fazer.** Trocar um cano d'água, (est) ver um fio, fazer uma instalação, colocar uma bucha numa parede, **isso tudo, eu sei fazer.*** (Fal 7).

So, when I was thirteen years old, I began to work on the construction site with my father. My father was a construction worker- (far off bark) I used to go to the construction site with my father, <papa...>, I started to help my dad, I would paint a wall, paint this, paint that. I even know how to lay bricks, install ceramic tiles, *I know how to do stuff like that, inside a house* (literal translation: *those things like that, inside a house, I know how to do*). Change a water pipe, install wires, build household installations, install a washer in a wall, *I know how to do all that stuff* (literal translation: *all that stuff, I know how to do*). (Fal 7).

Table 3, containing the results that were obtained, is shown below⁴.

⁴ The distribution of the data was shown to be statistically significant by means of a Chi-Square test; χ^2 was equal to 17.18, which was greater than the 5.991 value that corresponds to the critical value for a degree of freedom equal to 2.

Table 3 – Subfunctions of the OV order

Subfunctions	N	%
I	12	15,2
II	25	31,6
III	42	53,2

Source: Made by the author.

As can be seen in Table 3, the percentages concerning the three subfunctions show that the OV order is utilized more in the subfunction of reinforcing a topic that is being discussed. Next, in decreasing order, the OV order is used to mitigate a previous statement and, finally, it is adopted for the subfunction of establishing contrasts. Our data revealed that the subfunction of establishing contrasts, considered in some studies to be the principal function of OV order, appears as the one least frequently used.

Final considerations

By adopting the concept that subjectivity refers to mechanisms that exist in natural languages, which make it possible for their users to express themselves, their attitudes and their beliefs, this paper has examined the relationship between OV order and the manifestation of subjectivity within BP. We have presented evidence that the function of resuming a topic, or an aspect of a topic, in order to predicate about it, is the principal and most widespread function of OV order in BP. As such, this function is composed, in fact, of three subfunctions: that of establishing contrasts, that of mitigating a previous statement and that of reinforcing a topic that is being discussed.

In quantitative terms, we were able to identify the following trends: (i) that 100% of the OV order occurrences corresponded to subjective enunciations; (ii) that the subfunction of reinforcing a topic that is being discussed occurs most often; (iii) that the second most often used subfunction is that of mitigating a previous statement, which is followed, in terms of frequency of use, by the subfunction of establishing a contrast; (iv) that the principal function and the OV order subfunctions constitute mechanisms for expressing subjectivity in BP.

ABRAÇADO, Jussara. Ordem objeto-verbo no português do Brasil: mecanismo de expressão de subjetividade. *Alfa*, São Paulo, v.59, n.3, p.539-555, 2015.

- *RESUMO: Neste trabalho, pautado na interface teórica entre Linguística Funcional e Linguística Cognitiva, pretendemos demonstrar que a relação entre ordem de palavras e subjetividade, verificada em pesquisas realizadas em diversas línguas, verifica-se também no uso que se faz da ordem objeto-verbo (OV) no português do Brasil (PB). Analisando as ocorrências da ordem OV na fala de 12 participantes da cidade do Rio de Janeiro, constatamos: (i) que a principal função da ordem OV no PB é a de retomar um tópico ou aspecto de um tópico para se predicar sobre ele; (ii) que tal função se subdivide em outras três: a de estabelecer contraste, a de atenuar uma afirmação precedente, e a de reforçar um tópico sob consideração; (iii) que a função principal e suas subfunções constituem mecanismos de expressão de subjetividade no PB.*
- *PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Subjetividade. Ordem de palavras. Ordem OV. Português brasileiro.*

REFERENCES

ABRAÇADO, J. Funções e subfunções da ordem Objeto-Verbo no Português do Brasil. In: LEITE, C. T.; SILVA, J. B. da (Org.). **Línguas no Brasil**: coleta, análise e descrições de dados. Maceió: Edufal, 2013. p. 117-133.

_____. **Ordem de palavras**: da linguagem infantil ao português coloquial. Niterói: EdUFF, 2003.

_____. O princípio da adjacência e o grau de integração entre verbo e objeto. **DELTA**, São Paulo, v. 17, n. 2, p. 323-336, 2001.

ADAMSON, S. A Lovely Little Example: Word Order Options and Category Shift in the Premodifying String. In: FISCHER, O.; ROSENBAACH, A.; STEIN, D. (Ed.). **Pathways of Change**: Grammaticalization in English. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2000. p. 39-66. (Studies in Language Companion Series, 53).

BENVENISTE, E. **Problèmes de Linguistique Générale**. Paris: Gallimard, 1966.

BRAGA, M. L. **Tópico e ordem vocabular**. Trabalho apresentado na 36ª Reunião Anual da Sociedade Brasileira para o Progresso da Ciência, USP, São Paulo, 1984.

BREBAN, T. **The Grammaticalization and Subjectification of English Adjectives Expressing Difference into Plurality/Distributivity Markers and Quantifiers**. Preprints of the Department of Linguistics 251, Department of Linguistics, University of Leuven, Leuven, 2006.

GIVÓN, T. Function, Structure, and Language Acquisition. In: SLOBIN, D. I. (Ed.). **The Crosslinguistic Study of Language Acquisition**. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers, 1985. p. 1005-1027. (Theoretical issues, 2).

LANGACKER, R. W. **Cognitive Grammar**: a Basic Introduction. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

_____. Subjectification, Grammaticization, and Conceptual Archetypes. In: ATHANASIADOU, A.; CANAKIS, C.; CORNILLIE, B. (Ed.). **Subjectification**: Various Paths to Subjectivity. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2006. p. 17-40.

_____. Extreme Subjectification: English Tense and Modals. In: CUYCKENS, H. et al. (Ed.). **Motivation in Language: Studies in Honor of Günter Radden**. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2003. p. 3-26.

_____. Losing Control: Grammaticization, Subjectification, and Transparency. In: BLANK, A.; KOCH, P. (Ed.). **Historical Semantics and Cognition**. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1999. p. 147-175.

_____. Subjectification. **Cognitive Linguistics**, Berlin, v. 1, n. 1, p. 5-38, 1990.

LYONS J. Deixis and Subjectivity: Loquor, Ergo Sum? In: JARVELLA, R. J.; KLEIN, W. (Ed.). **Speech, Place, and Action: Studies in Deixis and Related Topics**. New York: Wiley, 1982. p. 101-124.

PEZATTI, E. G. A ordem de palavras e o caráter nominativo/ergativo do português falado. **Alfa**, São Paulo, v. 37, p. 159-78, 1993.

PONTES, E. **O tópico no português do Brasil**. São Paulo: Pontes, 1987.

SILVA, A. S. da. (Inter)subjetificação na linguagem e na mente. **Revista Portuguesa de Humanidades/Estudos Linguísticos**, Braga, v. 15, n. 1, p. 93-110, 2011.

THOMPSON, S. A.; HOPPER, P. Transitivity, Clause Structure, and Argument Structure: Evidence from Conversation. In: BYBEE, J. L.; HOPPER, P. (Ed.). **Frequency and the Emergence of Linguistic Structure**. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2001. p. 27-60. (Typological Studies in Language, 45).

TRAUGOTT, E. C. Revisiting Subjectification and Intersubjectification. In: CUYCKENS, H.; DAVIDSE, K.; VANDELANOTTE, L. (Ed.). **Subjectification, Intersubjectification and Grammaticalization**. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2010. p. 1-23. (Topics in English Linguistics).

TRAUGOTT, E. C.; DASHER, R. **Regularity in Semantic Change**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

_____. **Regularity in Semantic Change**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics, 96).

VERHAGEN, A. Construal and Perspectivization. In: GEERAERTS, D.; CUYCKENS, H. (Ed.). **The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics**. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007. p. 48-81.

VOTRE, S. **Linguística funcional: teoria e prática**. Rio de Janeiro: Ed. da UFRJ, 1992.

Recebido em junho de 2014.

Aprovado em outubro de 2014.

