

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/313040176>

On Defining Longer-Units in Narrative and Expository Spanish Texts.

Chapter · January 2000

CITATION

1

READS

40

3 authors:



Melina Aparici

Autonomous University of Barcelona

32 PUBLICATIONS 405 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE



Elisa Rosado

University of Barcelona

23 PUBLICATIONS 206 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE



Liliana Tolchinsky

University of Barcelona

87 PUBLICATIONS 1,228 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



Writing development [View project](#)



Processament i organització discursiva de textos expositius orals i escrits [View project](#)

On Defining Longer-Units in Narrative and Expository Spanish Texts¹

Melina Aparici, Liliana Tolchinsky and Elisa Rosado

ICE, University of Barcelona

This study is supported by a Spencer Foundation Major Grant for the study of
Developing Literacy to Ruth Berman

1. Goals

Coherence and cohesion embrace the text as a whole providing it with its "texture". It might be possible (and may be useful) to identify a kind of unit that gathers sets of connected clauses, some sort of packages/ chunks of connectivity (Berman, 1997). We assume that speakers do not produce their discourse "in one breath" but rather connect chunks of ideas about events, impressions, feelings, other people, or words. These "chunks" we are looking for will probably cover more than one clause, and should be characterized by syntactic criteria. Each chunk or package will not necessarily contain new information, it may rather be a reformulation, clarification, specification, and sometimes it might even be difficult to decide whether it forms a new package or unit.

It is also possible that our assumption is wrong, that speakers do not proceed by chunking ideas. If this is the case, we should not find any correlation between the kind of units we are trying to identify and any processing mark. For example, we should not find any relationship between the pauses detected by ScriptLog in the case of written texts and the purported L-Unit boundaries, neither between any other mark of processing in spoken language and L-Unit boundaries. If so, we might conclude that L-Units are not units of processing.

Another possibility is that our assumption holds true only for certain genres, modalities or age groups. In any case, it seems necessary to define or to be able to explicitly identify criteria of possible candidates to be evaluated developmentally and across genres and modalities.

2. Some previous attempts to define Longer Units

Different authors have attempted to define such units. For example, in the framework of Functional Grammar, Halliday (1994) talks about a 'Clause Complex' or 'Information Unit' as the combination of two or more clauses into a larger unit, with their interdependence normally shown by explicit signals such as conjunctions. This

¹ In this paper we attempt to share some of the thought, doubts and conclusions we arrived at when searching for the famous L-Units with the help of previous documents by Cahana-Amitay & Berman, Ravid, Assayag, Katzenberger, Nir and Sandbank (1999) and Cahana-Amitay, Berman, Aisenman, Assayag, Katzenberger, Nir, Ravid, Sandbank and Schleifer (1999). A previous version of this paper was presented at the *Spencer Foundation Workshop on Developing Literacy*, Barcelona, July 5-9, 1999. Thanks are due to Ruth Berman for her detailed review of this paper.

analysis has the advantage that it is neutral with regard to any potential differences in the way meanings are organized in speech and writing. It may be equated with a sentence in conventionalized written language (published texts) but keeping the two concepts ('Clause Complex' and 'sentence') separate allows us, for example, to handle clauses that are split by punctuation and intonation and ask rather for the possible relation between these units and punctuation or intonation. In this view, grammar (or linguistic form) constitutes a separate variable, to be contrasted with the other variables. In order to rely mainly on the signals of interdependence, it is essential to understand the organization of discourse. The main problem with these units is where to split them. For example, Halliday notes the difficulty with Co-ordinate clauses that are equal in status. There is a fuzzy line² between two equal clauses combined in a 'Clause complex' and two equal clauses treated as separate. The frequent use of co-ordinating conjunctions like 'but' and 'and' at the start of written and spoken utterances also reflects this indeterminacy.

Another attempt in the same direction is Chafe's (1987) 'Idea units'. These were originally developed as units for spoken languages that must fulfil a number of criteria: (1) spoken with a single coherent intonation contour, ending in what is perceived as a clause-final intonation, (2) preceded and followed by some kind of hesitation. But they overlap with a more general characterization: (3) it is a clause that "contains one verb phrase along with whatever noun phrases, prepositional phrases, adverbs and so on", it is about seven words long and takes about two seconds to produce and it contains the information a speaker can handle in a single focus of consciousness. As a result, it could be used for analyzing written texts as well. It seems that comparisons were made only between extremes of spoken and written language (conversation vs. academic prose) (Chafe 1987, p.108) and generalizations to different genres are difficult to obtain.

The intention when looking for complex (longer) units is to avoid using sentences as units of analysis. Sentences are considered "The lowest order units in the composition of texts" and are relatively easy to define in graphic terms since they are characterized by some initial marks (e.g., a capital letter) and by some final graphic marks (e.g., a period) (Scinto, 1986 p. 110). However, they are very problematic for analyzing texts of novice writers or those in the process of acquiring literacy, since in these texts it is possible to find units that look like sentences because of their marking but which are not sentences according to other criteria, and viceversa: they are sentences by any criteria, but are not punctuated as such.

The packages of clauses we are suggesting correspond roughly to what Hunt and Kellogg (1970) called 'T-Units', defined as "One main clause plus any subordinate clause or non-clausal structure that is attached to or embedded into it. Cutting a passage into T-Units will be cutting it into the shortest units, which it is grammatically allowable to punctuate as sentences. In this sense, the T-unit is minimal and terminable. Any complex or simple sentences would be one T-unit, but any compound or compound-complex sentence would consist of two or more T-units". This unit was particularly useful for evaluating syntactic development in the written texts of school children.

The unit we are looking for is roughly equivalent to what in well organized written texts will correspond to a sentence, which in conventional punctuation will be delimited by a period. In these cases syntactic, semantic and discursive criteria usually

² The T-unit is taken to solve this type of fuzziness (Thompson, 1996, p. 195).

overlap. However, in analyzing material produced by developing writers or speakers it seems essential to explicit which of them should be taken as predominant. Our starting criteria was a syntactic one, and the application of this criteria was relatively easy when the connectives functioned conventionally; but when they function as discourse glue or with non-conventional functions it becomes more problematic. Here are some of the criteria and examples we have followed in our decisions.

3. Method

We started with a framing definition: A finite predicate that acts as constructor defining dependency relationships plus its subordinates, co-ordinates and in some conditions its juxtaposed clauses (Example 1). The above was a very tentative and orientative definition. Then we have proceeded by successive approximations turning from (a) identifying units in the text, each judge independently, (b) discussing cases in group, and back to (c) revising criteria.

In the first phase a group of four judges, two linguists and two non-linguists but with experience in text analyses, analyzed 8 spoken and written narrative and expository texts from different age groups, except from adults (24 texts). Each judge identified units according to her/his criteria and then we had group discussion, elaborated on doubts and verbalized criteria. In a second phase we elaborated a document with explicit criteria, commented on it in brief, and used it for identifying units in a group of 9 Catalan texts that were analyzed in L-Units by 7 judges. Only one text got total agreement, but doubts were on similar points and the difference among judges was never higher than two units per text.

After the discussion, we re-wrote the criteria, and two judges analyzed another group of texts (12 texts) in Spanish writing down the number of L-units (third phase). Five texts showed total agreement, four showed doubts on the same points and another three showed disagreements in 12% of the total amount of units.

In every case we first looked at the whole text, then we marked the units using syntactic, semantic and pragmatic criteria in just that order. We did not take into account original punctuation or the lines into which the subjects separate their written texts. We all agree that the correspondence between punctuation and the defined units should be studied.

For the first and second phase, we used the mirror version, and for the last (third) phase we used the standardized CHAT version.

4. Criteria

The following is an example fulfilling all the conditions of an L-Unit (Example 1)³: a main clause (1), a subordinated (2), a juxtaposed clause preserving the predicate perspective, tense and aspect of the previous clause and adding an argument or clarification by answering the *porque* 'why' from the clause to which it is juxtaposed (3), and a co-referential co-ordinated clause (4), the subject appears in the first clause

³ Examples are presented in numbered clauses in order to make reading easier. They are always part of larger texts unless otherwise indicated.

and then it is elided as is the norm in Spanish for co-referentiality. Gems indicate starting and ending of L-Units.

Example (1)

@bg: LU

1. *y ella no hizo el examen*
and she not did:PFV the exam
2. *porque: [/] no tenía ganas de hacer el examen*
because not (she) had:IFV desire of to do:INF the exam
3. *no sabía nada*
not (she) knew:IFV anything
4. *y se fue*
and (she) left:PFV

@eg: LU

[Jud, girl, IX, ES]

In this case there is a coincidence among criteria (syntactic, semantic, thematic and discursive) and it looks rather simple to determine boundaries of connectivity. But this was not always the case. Sometimes we agreed on the presence of a unit although the criteria were not fulfilled. There were tough discussions, for example as to whether the main criterion for co-ordination should be co-reference (with subject elision) or rather the co-ordinating value of the conjunction independently of co-reference. Sometimes there was agreement on separating juxtaposed clauses and at other times on leaving them within the same unit despite the fact that they met the same conditions. That's why we decided to list the cases of agreements and those problematic cases that were subject to differing interpretations.

4.1. Co-ordination, co-referentiality and effective co-ordination

4.1.1. *Co-ordinate co-referential clauses* are easily seen as a unit, as shown in example (1). However, in the next example, we included in the same unit not only clauses 5 and 6, which are co-referential, but also 7 and 8 in which there is a change in the subject, because there is an effective co-ordination between them (see section 4.1.4 and 4.1.6). The two criteria of co-referentiality and effective co-ordination are at play at the same time.

Example (2)

@bg: LU

1. *Pues yo creo*
Well I think:PRES
- 2-3-4 *que <lo que pasa en los colegios o sea las peleas > <copiar etc> está mal.*
that <what happens:PRES at the schools, that is, the fights> <to copy:INF etc.>
is bad.

@eg: LU

@bg: LU

5. *Porque si por ejemplo estas en el patio*

- Because if for example (you) are:PRES at the school
6. *y estas caminando*
and (you) are walking:PRE.PROG
 7. *y de golpe se choca alguien contigo*
and suddenly REFL bumps:PRES somebody into you
 - 8-9 *pues emvez, que la persona que se ha chocado diga perdon,*
well instead of that the person who REFL has bumped:PRES.PERF says:PRES
pardon
 10. *pues pasa de todo*
well (he) passes:PRES of everything
 11. *y se va*
and REFL leaves:PRES
- @eg: LU

[Mar, girl, XII, EW]

In example (3) there is (a) a clear co-ordination supported by the parallelism *una/otra* 'one/ the other' at the level of subjects and also at the level of predicates *darse cuenta/había enterado* 'to realize/had noticed' but there is no (b) co-reference. If the criterion is strictly co-ordination it should be considered one unit (clauses 1 to 4), if co-referentiality, two units (clauses 1-2, and clauses 3-4).

Example (3)

- @bg: LU
- 1 *una se dio cuenta de que tenía el papel al lado .*
one REFL realized:PFV that (she) had:IFV the paper beside her
 - 2 *y empezó a: [/] a copiar no [% question]*
and started to [/] to copy:INF no [% question]
 - 3 *y la otra chica ni se había enterado de .*
and the other girl not (even) REFL had noticed:PAST.PERF of
 - 4 *que tenía el papel en el suelo # .*
that (she) had:IFV the paper on the floor
- @eg: LU

4.1.2. *Cases with verb-gapping* were solved in total agreement, as in the following example (4) with co-reference, effective co-ordination and verb gapping (clause 2), in which *hay que* 'there has to' was elided.

Example (4)

- @bg: LU
- 1 *y: respecto_a los amigos pues@ hay que: dar~le la espalda: a unos cuantos #.*
and (with) respect to the friends well (there) IMP⁴ has:MOD to turn:INF the

⁴ We decided to include the coding of verbal morphology in the examples. Certain language-specific features from Spanish grammar made it necessary to introduce the marking of some phenomena. These are the following:

back to some
 2 y a los otros ser muy amigos #
 and to the others to be:INF good friends
 @eg: LU

4.1.3. But there was *disagreement* as to where we should cut. In this case, since there are two similar constructions, we were not clear whether they both depended on the discourse marker (y: *respecto_a los amigos pues@* 'and respect to the friends well') forming one unit, or whether they should be separated:

Example (5)

@bg: LU
 1 y: *respecto_a los amigos pues@ hay que: dar~le la espalda: a unos cuantos #*.
 and (with) respect to the friends well(there)IMP has to turn:INF the back to
 some
 2 y a los otros ser muy amigos #
 and to the others to be:INF good friends
 @eg: LU
 @bg: LU
 3 *hay que [% bosteza] xxx xxx y: respetar #* .
 (there)IMP has [% yawns] and to respect:INF
 4 *hay que respetar~los* .
 (there)IMP has to respect:INF them
 5 *porque: si ellos no te hacen nada* .
 because if they not you do:PRES nothing
 (because if they don't do anything to you)
 6 *no [/] no tienes porque tu meter~te con ellos y: xxx xxx* .
 no [/] no (you) have:PRES why you to mess:INF you with them and
 (you don't have why to mess with them)
 @eg: LU

[Fco, boy, XII, ES]

In this case we resort to the criterion of 'parallel constructions', which was useful throughout the texts (see 'parallel constructions' in section 4.8), and so decided to separate the two constructions.

4.1.4. *Co-ordination with subject changes* in which one or more clauses functioned as context for the other were considered as one unit. In example (6), clause 1 contextualizes the following.

Example (6)

GERN: Gerund
 IMP: Impersonal
 IVE: Imperative
 SBJV: Subjunctive

@bg: LU

1. *un dia estaba yo en clase*
one day was:IFV I in class
2. *y un poquito antes de comenzar la clase siempre hay algun alumno*
and a bit earlier of to begin:INF the class always (there) IMP is:PRES some student
3. *que llega*
who arrives:PRES
4. *y empieza a comentarte cosas*
and begins:PRES to comment:INF you things
5. *o a hablar sobre [//]*
or to talk:INF about
6. *a hacerte preguntas sobre España*
to make:INF you questions about Spain
7. *y cómo viste la gente*
and how dress:PRES the people
8. *y qué come*
and what (they) eat:PRES
9. *y tal*
and so on

@eg: LU

[Enc, woman, NS]

In (7) there is a change of subject from clause 4 to 5 but they were considered within the same unit:

Example (7)

@bg: LU

1. *no se, hace: un año y medio más o menos*
(I) not know, ago a year and half more or less
2. *trabajaba en Alemania*
(I) worked:IFV in Germany
3. *en una escuela parecida a la escuela oficial de idiomas*
at a school similar to the school official of languages

@eg: LU

@bg: LU

4. *y bueno:pues había todo tipo de: [/] estudiante*
and well (there)IMP was:IFV every kind of student
5. *y entre ellos tenía un profesor eh@fp de química de la universidad*
and among them (I) had:IFV a professor of chemistry from the university

@eg: LU

[Enc, woman, NS]

But in the following example (8) there was agreement in considering them as different units although they have the same subject (clauses 3 and 4), maybe because of the adverbial *y entonces* 'and then' that led us to consider them as consecutive in time.

Example (8)

@bg: LU

1. *me preparé una chuleta para el examen de naturales .*
REFL (I) prepared:PFV a crib for the exam of natural (sciences)
2. *# y: [/] y entonces@i # cuando: [/] cuando la saqué .*
and [/] and then when [/] when it (I) took:PFV (out)
3. *el profe me pilló no [% interrogativo]@i .*
the teacher me caught:PFV no [% question]

@eg: LU

@bg: LU

4. *y entonces@i vino hasta mi mesa .*
and then (he) came:PFV to my desk
5. *y: [/] y me dijo .*
and me (he) told:PFV
6. *que qué tenía .*
that what (I) had:IFV

@eg: LU

@bg: LU

7. *y yo le dije que era: [/] # era una hoja de borrador # .*
and I him told:PFV that (it) was:IFV a sheet for draft

@eg: LU

@bg: LU

8. *y: entonces@i eh@fp él me la miró .*
and then he me it looked:PFV
(he looked at it)
9. *y vio que era una chuleta .*
and saw:PFV that (it) was:IFV a crib

@eg: LU

@bg: LU

10. *entonces@i me [/] me: puso una chuleta pa [: para] casa .*
then me [/] me (he) put:PFV a crib for home
11. *y: # para que la firmaran mis padres*
and for that it signed:PFV.SBJV my parents
(and for my parents to sign it) [% the recording stops]

@eg: LU

[Ser, boy, XII, NS]

4.1.5. Cases of coordinate correlation also yielded agreement (si.. .entonces, o... o...; 'if... then; or...or') when the connectives fulfill their function, as in the next example (9).

Example (9)

@bg LU

1. *Si se te ha colado la targeta en el telefono del colegio*
If REFL you (it) has (got) lost:PRES.PERF the card in the telephone of the

- school
 2. diselo al director /...
 tell:IVE him it to the director
 @eg LU

[Edu, boy, IX, EW]

4.1.6. Disagreement arose in all cases in which linguistic co-ordinators do not function as such but rather as ‘discourse glue’. In the following example ‘and’ y (in clause 3) functions as a ‘discourse glue’ or discourse marker and we did not consider clause 3 in the same unit, whereas in the next clause (4) there is effective co-ordination and we considered it in the same unit.

Example (10)

- @bg: LU
 1. - 2. *una vez estando con una amiga pues nos sentamos las dos a hablar*
no [%interrogativo]
 once being:GERN with a friend well REFL we sat:PFV the two to talk:INF
 no [%question]
 @eg: LU
 @bg: LU
 3. *y: [/] y entonces vino otra*
 and [/] then came:PFV another
 4. *y la que estaba conmigo*
 and the (one) who was:IFV with me
 5. *se puso a: [/] a hablar con la otra*
 REFL (she) started:PFV to talk:INF with the other
 @eg: LU

[Tin, girl, XII, NS]

The following example (11) shows contrasting interpretations leading to different segmentation. According to one interpretation clause (3) appears co-ordinated to (2), which functions as a conclusion, (4) is headed by a discourse marker y and the predicate *procuraré*, and (6) is an explanation of the clitic *lo*. In short, they appear as a list of juxtaposed clauses each functioning to specify or correct the previous one and therefore they should be included in the same unit.

Example (11)

- @bg: LU
 1 *Lo que he visto*
 What (I) have seen:PRES.PREF
 2 *esta [: está] muy mal*
 is very bad
 @eg: LU
 @bg: LU
 3 *y yo no lo hago*

- and I not it do:PRES
 4 *y procuraré* [: *procuraré*]
 and (I) try:FUT
 (I will try)
 5 *no hacer~lo* [*]
 not to do:INF it
 6 *lo que acabo de ver* #
 what (I) finish:PRES of to see:INF
 (what I have just seen)
 7 *Ni correr*
 Nor to run:INF
 8 *y tirar~le las cosas a los demás. etc* [% *puntos suspensivos*]
 and throw:INF them the things to the rest etc
 @eg: LU

[Ver, girl, IX, EW]

A different interpretation of example 11 is that clause (3) is a consecutive conclusion which closes a unit, and in (4) there is the opening of a new one followed by a series of specifications:

- @bg: LU
 1 *Lo que he visto*
 What (I) have seen:PRES.PERF
 2 *esta* [: *está*] *muy mal*
 is very bad
 3 *y yo no lo hago*
 and I not it do:PRES
 @eg: LU
 @bg: LU
 4 *y procuraré* [: *procuraré*]
 and (I) try:FUT
 (I will try)
 5 *no hacer~lo* [*]
 not to do:INF it
 6 *lo que acabo de ver* #
 what (I) finish:PRES of to see:INF
 (what I have just seen)
 7 *Ni correr*
 Nor to run:INF
 8 *y tirar~le las cosas a los demás. etc* [% *puntos suspensivos*]
 and to throw:INF them the things to the rest
 @eg: LU

[Ver, girl, IX, EW]

Similarly for other linguistic markers of connectivity like *entonces* 'then', the first time it appears we interpreted it as a consequence marker but other occurrences in the text

led us to consider them as a conversational particle whose function is opening units, as shown in example 12:

Example (12)

@bg: LU

- 1 *entonces@i a veces insultan .*
then sometimes (they) insult
- 2 *o en las fotos por ejemplo hacen: [/] # hacen los cuernos o algo de eso.*
or in the pictures for example (they) make [/] make:PRES the horns or something like that
- 3 *y eso a los alumnos les puede deprimir .*
and that to the students them may depress
(and that may depress the students)

@eg: LU

@bg: LU

- 1 *entonces@i tendríamos que: hacer <una: eh@fp> [///] .*
then (we) have:MOD.COND to do:INF a
- 2 *alguien que: vigilase: bien <a todos> [//] a los niños .*
somebody who watched:IFV.SBJV well <to all> to the children

@eg: LU

4.2. Subordination

In general there is no problem to consider subordinates in the same unit when the connectives are clearly subordinating ones. However, in cases where they do not fulfill this function, it is more problematic. Example (13) shows the typical causal marker *porque* 'because' (clause 4) when it is not used in its cause function and, so, we considered them as a separate units.

Example (13)

@bg: LU

1. *Pues yo creo*
Well I think:PRES
2. *que lo que pasa en los colegios o sea las peleas copiar etc*
that what happens:PRES in the schools, that is, the fights to copy:INF etc
3. *está mal.*
is bad

@eg: LU

@bg: LU

4. *Porque si por ejemplo estas en el patio*
because if for example (you) are:PRES at the patio
5. *y estas caminando*
and (you) are walking:PRES.PROG
6. *y de golpe se choca alguien contigo*
and suddenly REFL bumps:PRES someone into you

@ eg: LU

4.3. 'Discourse Items'

Discourse items (textual and personal) serve to define what belongs to an L-Unit.

4.3.1. When any of the *textual markers* (*o sea* 'that is', *por ejemplo* 'for instance', *es decir* 'that is to say', *con respecto a* 'in relation with', etc.) appears, everything that follows is included within the same unit if it introduces lists, no matter how the lists are constructed. The following example (14) shows a discourse item framing two co-ordinated clauses that were included in the same unit.

Example (14)

@bg: LU

1 *y: respecto_a los amigos pues@ hay que: dar~le la espalda: a unos cuantos.*
and (with) respect to the friends (there)IMP has:MOD to turn:INF the back to some

2 *y a los otros ser muy amigos #*
and to the others to be:INF good friends

@eg: LU

However, clauses will not be included in the same unit following a 'discourse item' if there is no clear syntactic dependency between the clause introduced by the discourse item and the main verb. For example, in (15) clause (3) was separated to form another unit.

Example (15)

@bg: LU

1. *bueno que en el colegio hay mucha gente*
well that in the school (there)IMP are:PRES many people

2. *que se mete con otra gente*
who REFL mess:PRES with other people

@eg: LU

@bg: LU

3. *por ejemplo los grupos de niñas se creen*
for example the groups of girls (they) themselves think:PRES

4. *que son muy chulitas*
that (they) are very cool

5. *y entonces se meten con niñas y todo*
and then (they) mess:PRES with girls and all (that)

@eg: LU

[Sil, girl, XII, ES]

In example (16), the clause headed by *por ejemplo* 'for example' (1) opens a new L-Unit.

Example (16)

@bg: LU

1. *por ejemplo eh@fp si uno le dice a otro .*
for example if one him tells:PRES to other
2. *que: mm@f qué tal ha: insultado: a su amigo .*
that someone has insulted:PRES.PERF to his friend
3. *pues@i ese: [//] el amigo del niño que le ha dicho: # eso #.*
well that [//] the friend of the child who him has told:PRES.PERF that
4. *pues@i puede que ya: [//] ya no sea amigo del: [//] de ese niño #.*
well (it) may:MOD be that now [//] now (he) is:PRES not friend of the [//] of that boy

@eg: LU

The next is an example of *o sea* 'that is' opening a new unit. The first is a complete clause and the second explains it through exemplification (2), but with syntactic independence and with its own subordinate clause (4).

Example (17)

@bg: LU

1. *mm@fp que: # hay que vigilar el comportamiento en clase*
(there)IMP has:PRES to watch:INF the behavior in class

@eg: LU

@bg: LU

2. *o_sea # si: # hay [//] hay un control .*
that is if (there)IMP is:PRES [//] a control
3. *no copiar~se .*
no REFL to copy:INF #
4. *porque eso lo hace mucha gente # .*
because that it do:PRES many people
(because many people do that)

@eg: LU

4.3.2. In the case of *personal markers* (e.g. *yo creo que...* 'I think that...', *y que...*, '... and that', *que...* 'that...'), although the marker can function as the main verb for all the following clauses (introduced by *y que* 'and that') we are not going to consider all the following in the same unit. In (18) we have an example in which we ignore the *yo creo que* as main clause of all the following ones.

Example (18)

@bg: LU

1. *pues yo creo*
well I think
2. *que este tipo de problemas no tendrían que suceder*
that this type of problems not have:COND to happen:INF
3. *porque en el colegio <no te> no te enseñan*
because in the school <no you> not you (they) teach:PRES
4. *ni a pelearse*
nor REFL to fight:PRES

5. *ni [/] ni a portarte mal con la gente sino todo lo contrario*
 nor [/] nor REFL to behave:INF badly with the people but all the opposite
 @eg: LU
 @bg: LU
6. *# y que:, no se no, si tienes los libros en el colegio*
 and that, not (I) know no, if (you) have:PRES the books in the school
7. *es para aprender*
 is for to learn:INF
8. *no para copiarte*
 not for REFL to copy:INF
9. *cuando hagas los exámenes*
 when (you) do:PRES.SBJV the exams
 @eg: LU
 @bg: LU
10. *# y [/] # y no se #*
 and [/] and not (I) know
 @eg: LU

[Sof, girl, IX, ES]

Example (19) shows in which cases *Pues yo pienso que* 'well I think that' opens a new unit. In this case we considered the whole text as one unit, not because of its dependency on *Pues yo pienso que*, but rather because of its dependency on *tenemos* 'we must'.

Example (19)

- @bg: LU
1. *Pues yo pienso*
Well I think:PRES
2. *que para arreglar los problemas de la escuela*
 that for to solve:INF the problems of the school
3. *tenemos de poner castigos, copias,*
 (we) have:MOD.PRES of (to) put:INF punishments, copies
4. *ponerle notas,*
 to put:INF him notes
5. *decirselo a su madre*
 to tell:INF her it to her mother
6. *y ponerle más deberes que a los demás*
 and to put:INF him more homework than to the rest
 @eg: LU

[Jua, boy, IX, EW]

In those texts in which there is no explicitation of *yo creo que* 'I believe that' or *yo pienso que* 'I think that' but rather a direct starting with *que...* 'that...' as a sort of answer to the interviewer, we followed the same criteria as before (see examples 20 and 21).

Example (20)

@bg: LU

1. *bueno que en el colegio hay mucha gente*
well that in the school (there)IMP are:PRES many people
2. *que se mete con otra gente*
that REFL mess:PRES with other people

@eg: LU

[Sil, girl, XII, ES]

Example (21)

@bg: LU

1. *Pues que los niños no copien*
Well that the children not copy:PRES.SBJV
2. *que estudien.*
that (they) study:PRES.SBJV

@eg: LU

@bg: LU

3. *Que todos tenemos que ser amigos de todos*
That (we) all have:MOD.PRES to be:INF friends of all
4. *y dejar leer comics etc.*
and to allow:INF to read:INF comics etc

@eg: LU

@bg: LU

5. *Que nadie le haga los cuernos a otro*
That nobody him makes:PRES.SBJV the horns to another
6. *si a el o ella no lo gusta*
if to him or to her no it likes:PRES
7. *pues que no se lo haga a otro.*
well that not him it does:PRES.SBJV to another

@eg: LU

@bg: LU

8. *Si se te ha colado la targeta en el telefono del colegio*
If REFL you (it) has (got) lost:PRES.PERF the card in the telephone of the school
9. *diselo al director*
tell:IVE him it to the director

@eg: LU

[Edu, boy, IX, EW]

4.3.3. *For nominalizations*, we followed the same criteria as with personal discursive markers: they do not define the inclusion in the same L-Unit. In example (22) the verb after *que* 'that' and not the one in the clause with the nominalization is considered the main verb; although everything depends on the first nominalization followed by *es que* 'is that', we are not considering the successive clauses as one unit.

Example (22)

- @bg: LU
- 1-2. *La reflexión que he tomado es*
The reflection that I have taken:PRES.PERF is
3. *que hay cosas que en verdad no suceden*
that (there)IMP are:PRES things that in reality not happen:PRES
- @eg: LU
- @bg: LU
4. *Por ejemplo que dos chicos se pegan así porque si*
For example that two boys RECIP beat:PRES just like that
5. *y lo de que la señora se le caen 10.000 pts.*
and the (one) of that the lady REFL her fall:PRES 10.000 pts
(the one in which the lady drops 10.000 pts)
- @eg: LU
- @bg: LU
6. *Pero lo de copiar si que sucede*
But the (one) of to copy:INF yes that happens:PRES
7. *porque la gente de mi clase lo hacen...'*
because the people of my class it do:PRES
- @eg: LU

[Mig, boy, IX, EW]

4. 4. Questions and their answers

Answers, and in general complements of declarative verbs, are considered within the same unit than their questions. These are clauses that are connected semantically but without an overt connector.

Example (23)

- @bg: LU
- 1-2. *la pregunta de la cual podríamos partir sería*
the question from which (we) could:COND start be:COND
3. *existen actualmente conflictos en el ámbito escolar?*
(there)IMP are:PRES nowadays conflicts in the school environment
- @eg: LU

4. 5 Juxtaposed clauses

Decisions as to when juxtaposed clauses should be included in the same unit were the subject of strong debates. Below are some examples in which we got total agreement. They have similar features: predicates in the juxtaposed clauses preserve tense and aspect of the main predicate (example 24) or of the predicate of the clause to which it is juxtaposed, or they function to explain a term that appears in the previous clause (example 25), or as a specification of the previous clause (example 26), or add a reason or a claim (example 1).

Example (24)

@bg: LU

1. *no serviría para nada*
not (it) serve:COND for nothing
(it would be useless)
2. *porque vuelven a ir a su rollo*
because they go back to their business
3. *y pasan de todo,*
and (they) pass:PRES of everything
(they don't care about anything)
4. *no harían caso*
(they) pay:COND attention
5. *de lo que les has dicho*
of (to) what them you have told:PRES.PERF

@eg: LU

In (25) the juxtaposed clause functions to explain a term that appears in the previous clause: the term *espía* 'spy' (clause 2) is explained in the next clause (clause 3).

Example (25)

@bg: LU

1. *entonces@i también tendríamos que hacer alguien .*
then (we) also have:MOD.COND to do:INF somebody
2. *como si fuese un espía .*
like if (he) was:IFV.SBJV a spy
3. *un niño que fuese: sincero .*
a boy who was:IFV.SBJV sincere
4. *y: [/] # y que comunicase .*
and [/] and who communicated::IFV.SBJV
5. *lo que se hiciera .*
what REFL (was) done:IFV.SBJV

@eg: LU

[Jud, girl, IX, ES]

Example (26)

@bg: LU

1. *cogió a las dos chicas*
(he) took:PFV the two girls
2. *les cogió el examen.*
them (he) took:PFV the exam
3. *y: las suspendió*
and them (he) failed:PFV

@eg: LU

[Cha, girl, XVI, NS]

However, the following example (27) show clauses that were considered as different units in spite of their thematic coherence. One possible interpretation is that, since they refer to consecutive events, we tend to view them as separate.

Example (27)

@bg: LU

1. *Al partido [: partido] siguiendo [: siguiente] al que me hizo la falta es_decir al Carasco*

In the next match to the (one) that me (he) made:PFV the fault that is to the Carasco

2. *le rompi [: rompí] el tobillo # .*

him (I) broke:PFV the ankle

@eg: LU

@bg: LU

4. *Le tueron [: tuvieron] que llevar al medico [: médico] de urgencia .*

Him (they) had:MOD.PFV to take:INF to the doctor's of emergency

@eg: LU

[Mig, boy, IX, NW]

4.6. Summing up ('Colophon')

This is the case of clauses that function as the end of a paragraph and it is difficult to decide whether they belong to the series of previous clauses they appear to subsume or whether they stand independently. In some cases it is difficult to decide whether they refer to the previous clause, the previous group of clauses or the whole text. We decided to look at the predicate: if there is a change in perspective, mood or grammatical person, we decided to open a new unit. The same applies if there is a change towards a generic subject.

(28) is an example in which the 'summing up' was separated to form a new unit. The *esta* 'this' in clause 9 refers to the whole text.

Example (28)

@bg: LU

1. *pues [/] pues bueno se trata <de de> [/] de una anécdota*
that (I) had:PFV

2. *que tuve....*

well [/] well REFL (it) is:PRES <about about> [/] about an anecdote

[...the texts continues]

3. *para mi no es una anécdota agradable*

for me not (it) is:PRES an anecdote nice

4. *sino que me parece bastante desagradable*

but that me (it) seems:PRES quite unpleasant

5. *mas que nada <por por el pensamiento o o si> [///] por el esfuerzo que uno como profesor quizás pone en sus clases*

more than anything <for for the thought or or if> [///] because of the effort that one as teacher perhaps puts:PRES in his classes

6. *y [/] y la respuesta sin embargo que [/] que los alumnos tienen de: [//]*
and [/] and the answer however that [/] that the students have:PRES of [//]
7. *o lo que esperan de ti*
or what (they) expect:PRES from you
8. *y que a lo mejor tu [/] tu no das, no*
and that perhaps you [/] you not give:PRES, no
- @eg: LU
- @bg: LU
9. *# o sea, que esta es la [/] la anécdota*
that is, that this is:PRES the [/] the anecdote
- @eg: LU

[Enc, woman, NS]

However, if there are anaphoric expressions such as *así es* 'that way is', *no tendría que ser así* 'it didn't have to be that way' or there is a reformulation or summary of the immediate preceding chunk, we decided to keep it in the same unit, as in the (29) where *eso* 'that' subsumes what has been said immediately before.

Example (29)

- @bg: LU
1. *entonces@i a veces insultan .*
then sometimes (they) insult:PRES
2. *o en las fotos por ejemplo hacen: [/] # hacen los cuernos o algo de eso .*
or in the pictures for example (they) make [/] make:PRES the horns or something like that
3. *y eso a los alumnos les puede deprimir .*
and that to the students them may:PRES depress
(and that may depress the students)
- @eg: LU

[Jud, girl, IX, ES]

4.7. Parenthetical Comments

'Appositions' and in general different kinds of 'parenthetical comments' or insertions are included in the same unit, as in examples 30 (clause 7) and 31 (clause 2). We suggest to code L-units containing insertions as a special kind of L-Unit.

Example (30)

- @bg: LU
1. *y: [/] y es un tema pues@ # .*
and [/] and (it) is:PRES a topic well
2. *que: hasta el momento pues@ por muchas cosas que se haga# pues@ no:.*
that so far well for many things that IMP (one) does:PRES.SBJV well no
3. *aunque sea un tema de colegio .*
although (it) is:PRES.SBJV a topic from school

4. *no: [/] no tiene arreglo por_el_momento .*
no [/] not (it) has:PRES solution at the moment
 5. *si no es por los mismos familiares .*
if not (it) is:PRES by the same relatives
 6. *que intenten hacer # quitar el odio a sus hijos .*
who try:PRES.SBJV to do:INF the hatred to their children
 7. *para que no: [/] no incordien digamos~lo así <a los> [//]*
a sus compañeros. [+ CE]
so that no [/] no (they) disturb:PRES.SBJV let:IVE us say it that way <to the>
[/] to their classmates
 8. *no les hagan la vida imposible xxx xxx xxx .*
not them (they) make:PRES.SBJV the life impossible
- @eg: LU

[Ait, boy, XII, ES]

Example (31)

- @bg: LU
1. *esto puede llevar a problemas*
this may:MOD.PRES lead to trouble
 2. *porque siempre que como salía en el video*
because always that as (it) was:IFV on the video
 3. *que son amigos*
that (they) are:PRES friends
 4. *no te deja copiar*
not you (he) lets:PRES to copy:INF
(he doesn't let you copy)
 5. *y tal pues también # se pillan rencores*
and so on well also REFL (they) get:PRES rancorous
- @eg: LU

[Yag, boy, XVI, ES]

4. 8 Parallel constructions

The presence of parallel constructions across a the text was a very strong criterion for including or not a given sentence within a unit. When encountering a construction that appeared earlier in the text, we tried to use it as a criterion for decision, not only to be consistent but also as a guide for the demarcation of boundaries (see example 5). Underlying this reliance on parallel constructions there is a personal rhetoric that speakers follow in the text and that it is made explicit at this level of structuring.

Sometimes, however, the presence of a parallel construction was a disturbing factor. In Appendix 1 we present a complete text with the decisions we have taken and the different interpretations that were at play.

5. Coding of special L-Units. Some analyses.

So far, we have decided on the need to code as 'special' 3 categories of L-Units:

- 1) formulaic (opening and closure): titles, formulaic endings.
- 2) with parenthetical coments
- 3) the rest.

All types of L-Units, however, will be analyzed as for their internal structure: types of linkage between the clauses forming an L-Unit, both 'syntactic' types (coordination and subordination) and other types -detailed in the previous sections.

The relationship between processing markers (both in written and spoken texts), as pauses, hesitations, re-formulations, and punctuation, and the purported L-Unit boundaries, defined by syntactic, thematic and discourse criteria, should also be assessed, as pointed out in section 1.

So far, some analyses on counting L-Units per text and clauses per L-Unit have been done, as shown in Table 1 and 2, and in table 3 and 4, respectively.

As for the number of L-Units per text (tables 1 and 2), there is an increase in the number of L-Units per text by age, particularly in Expository texts, where the average increase is higher than 2 Lus per text. This trend seems clearer, as for the first three age groups, in the Catalonia corpus than in the Andalucia corpus, but it is in the group of adults where the increase is higher. However, there are no important differences between types of texts (by genre and modality variables). The only constant trend is that the highest number of Lus is found in spoken texts and the lower one in written texts in all age groups, being usually (in most age groups) the Narrative Spoken text the one showing more Lus and the Expository written the one with the lowest number of Lus per text.

As for the number of clauses per L-Unit (tables 3 and 4) we do not observe differences by any of the variables at play. In the Catalonia corpus there is no regular increase by age, and in the Andalucia corpus the increase in the number of clauses per LU by age is not higher than one clause per LU in most of the cases. There are no clear differences by type of text neither. Of course, these preliminary results need further analysis.

TABLE 1: Mean number of LUs per text (by age group, genre and modality).
Corpus Catalonia

| AGE GROUP | ES | | EW | | NS | | NW | |
|--------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|
| | Mean | Range | Mean | Range | Mean | Range | Mean | Range |
| Primary (n=15) | 5.93 | 1-10 | 4.93 | 1-8 | 7 | 2-20 | 4.4 | 2-8 |
| Secondary (n=14) | 7.8 | 1-12 | 6.7 | 2-16 | 9.1 | 2-23 | 7 | 2-21 |
| Further Secondary (n=16) | 15.87 | 5-43 | 11.53 | 5-22 | 9.8 | 2-45 | 9.5 | 5-19 |

Excluding LU-types which are formulaic endings or titles

TABLE 2: Mean number of LUs per text (by age group, genre and modality).
Corpus Andalucia

| AGE GROUP | ES | | EW | | NS | | NW | |
|--------------------------|------|--------|------|--------|-------|--------|------|--------|
| | Mean | Range | Mean | Range | Mean | Range | Mean | Range |
| Primary (n=20) | 6.3 | 1 - 46 | 4.35 | 1 - 11 | 8.2 | 2 - 64 | 5.1 | 2 - 12 |
| Secondary (n=20) | 6.45 | 3 - 15 | 6.4 | 2 - 14 | 8.65 | 3 - 29 | 8.35 | 4 - 22 |
| Further Secondary (n=20) | 9 | 4 - 25 | 8.25 | 4 - 19 | 11.85 | 2 - 34 | 11.1 | 1 - 29 |
| Adults (n=3) | 17.3 | 10-26 | 22.3 | 16-33 | 31 | 6-51 | 16.3 | 5-36 |

Excluding LU-types which are formulaic endings or titles

TABLE 3: Mean number of clauses per LU (by age group, genre and modality).
Corpus Catalonia

| AGE GROUP | ES | | EW | | NS | | NW | |
|--------------------------|------|---------|------|-----------|------|------------|------|------------|
| | Mean | Range | Mean | Range | Mean | Range | Mean | Range |
| Primary (n=15) | 3.75 | 1.4 - 8 | 3.03 | 1.5 - 6 | 3.5 | 2.4 - 5.25 | 3.02 | 1.6 - 4.6 |
| Secondary (n=14) | 3.5 | 2 - 9 | 3.1 | 1.8 - 4.4 | 2.9 | 2 - 3.7 | 2.9 | 1.8 - 3.6 |
| Further Secondary (n=16) | 3.8 | 3 - 5.8 | 4 | 3.2 - 6.7 | 3.6 | 2.7 - 5 | 3.7 | 2.5 - 6.25 |

Excluding LU-types which are formulaic endings or titles

TABLE 4: Mean number of clauses per LU (by age group, genre and modality).
Corpus Andalucia

| AGE GROUP | ES | | EW | | NS | | NW | |
|--------------------------|------|-----------|------|------------|------|-----------|------|-----------|
| | Mean | Range | Mean | Range | Mean | Range | Mean | Range |
| Primary (n=20) | 4.08 | 2.3 - 8 | 3.37 | 1.1 - 7 | 3.59 | 1.6 - 8 | 2.92 | 2 - 7.75 |
| Secondary (n=20) | 4.58 | 2 - 6.75 | 4.69 | 1.33 - 7 | 4.01 | 2.7 - 5.8 | 3.48 | 2.6 - 5 |
| Further Secondary (n=20) | 5.93 | 2.83-9.85 | 4.87 | 2.77-11.77 | 4.66 | 2.33-7.9 | 4.29 | 2.55-5.6 |
| Adults (n=3) | 4 | 3.3 - 4.5 | 3 | 2.3 - 3.8 | 3.4 | 3.1 - 3.8 | 3.7 | 2.6 - 3.6 |

Excluding LU-types which are formulaic endings or titles

References

- Berman, R.A. (1998). Typological perspectives on connectivity. In N. Dittner and Zvi Penner (Eds.), *Issues in the Theory of Language Acquisition* (pp. 203-224). Bern: Peter Lang.
- Cahana-Amitay, D. & Berman, R., with Ravid, D. Assayag, N., Katzenberger, I., Nir, B. and Sandbank, A. (1999). Initial ideas on L(onger)-Units. In R.A. Aisenman (Ed.), *Working Papers in Developing Literacy across Genres, Modalities and Languages, Vol. I* (pp. 114-127). Tel-Aviv: Tel-Aviv University Press.
- Cahana-Amitay, D., Berman, R., Aisenman, R., Assayag, N., Katzenberger, I., Nir, B., Ravid, D., Sandbank, A. & Schleifer, M. (1999, July). *More about L(onger)-Units*. Paper presented at the Spencer Foundation Workshop on Developing Literacy, Barcelona.
- Chafe, W. (1987). Punctuation and the Prosody of written language. *Technical Report n° 11*. Center for the Study of writing, University of California at Berkley, California, USA.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1994). The construction of knowledge and value in the grammar of scientific discourse, with reference to Charles Darwing's *The Origin of Species*. In M. Coulthard (Ed), *Advances in Written Text analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Hunt, K. W. (1970). Syntactic maturity in school children and adults. *Monograph of the Society for Research in Child Development*. 134, 35, (1).
- Scinto, L. (1986). *Written language and psychological development*. NY: Academic Press.
- Thompson, G. (1996). *Introducing Functional Grammar*.

APPENDIX 1

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| @bg: LU | | |
| 1. | queridos señores y señoras . <i>dear ladies and gentlemen</i> | Formulaic opening. It will be codified as a special kind of L-Unit |
| @eg: LU | | |
| @bg: LU | | |
| 2. | em@fp en el colegio hay: [/] # hay niños . <i>in the school (there)IMP are: PRES children</i> | |
| 3. | que: se creen muy: [/] muy grandes muy [/] muy chulitos. <i>who think: PRES (themselves) very [/] very big very [/] cool: DIM</i> | |
| @eg: LU | | |
| @bg: LU | | |
| 4. | entonces@i a veces insultan . <i>so sometimes (they) insult: PRES</i> | The first time <i>entonces</i> appears we doubted if it seemed possible to consider it as a consequence marker and part of the previous unit. But after observing its functioning in the rest of the text we decided to categorize it as a discourse marker that "opens" L-units |
| 5. | o en las fotos por ejemplo hacen: [/] # hacen los cuernos o algo de eso. <i>or in the pictures for example (they) make: PRES (they) make: PRES the horns or something like that</i> | Here <i>por ejemplo</i> is not viewed as the opening of a unit. |
| 6. | y eso a los alumnos les puede deprimir . <i>and that to the students them (they) can: MOD. PRES depress: INF (and that may depress the students)</i> | <i>eso</i> as a synthesis of the preceding section (colophon) and part of the previous unit. |
| @eg: LU | | |
| @bg: lu4 | | |
| 7. | porque: hay insultos . <i>because (there)IMP are: PRES insults</i> | (* The initial <i>porque</i> does not seem to be causal, in any case it is related to what it follows and not to the preceding text. This construction appears again in some other part of the text. (**) The <i>porque</i> is causal and heads repeated causal formulations. As if the speaker would not be satisfied and would re-structure a determined new information (not much information, just what the speaker said before in the LU3) |
| 8. | que: a los alumnos pues@i les puede molestar . <i>which to the students well, them (they) can: MOD annoy: INF</i> | |
| 9. | y: [/] y hasta les puede hacer:algo <i>and [/] even them (it) may: PRES make something</i> | |
| 10. | que no trabajen bien <i>that (they) not work: PRES.SBJV well</i> | |
| @eg: lu4 | | |
| @bg: lu5 | | |

| | | |
|------|---|---|
| 12. | entonces@i tendríamos que: hacer <una: eh@fp> [//] . so (we) have to: MOD.COND make:INF <a: eh@fp> [//] | (*) entonces functioning as an opening?? If we consider it as such we are then consistent with the previous decision and obtain LUs structured in a very similar way. (**) or is this a consecutive sentence and entonces works as a closing ?? |
| | alguien que: vigilase: bien <a todos> [//] a los niños . somebody who watched: IFV.PROG SUBJ properly <to every> to the children | |
| @eg: | lu5 | |
| @bg: | lu6 | |
| | y: vigilar and to watch:INF | Y: discourse glue. It is therefore considered separately. They are juxtaposed sentences but although there is thematic unit they are included in a new unit with what it follows and not in the previous LU. |
| 13. | que no se: peguen ni: [//] ni nada de eso . that (they) RECIP not beat:PRES.SUBJ nor nothing like that | |
| | ni que: n> [//] ni que nadie insulte a nadie . <nor that> [//] nor that nobody insults:PRES SUBJ anyone | |
| 14. | y: entonces@i eso es una cosa and then that is a thing | (*)Here she decides to use together an entonces, which so far was functioning as an opening item, and an eso which used to be employed as a closing. Then she used porque to begin the next one. (** No, it is separated y: entonces begins a new unit. It is not like the y eso from the LU3 which originated a consecutive sentence in the LU. This one provides new information. Here eso is referring not only to what precedes it but also to the previous LU2. |
| 15. | que: [//] que se tiene que hacer that [//] REFL (it) has:MOD to do:INF | |
| @eg: | lu6 | |
| @bg: | lu7 | |
| 16. | porque claro <ha> [//] hay niños. because, of course, (there)IMP are:PRES children | Another beginning headed by "porque" considered as an indicator consistent with one of the aboved mentioned interpretations(*). |
| 17. | que trabajan bien . who (they) work: PRES well | |
| 18. | y han empezao [: empezado] a trabajar mal # and (they) have begun: PRES.PERF to work:INF badly | |
| 19. | <lo que:> [//] lo que le ha insultado. <what> [//] what him (he) has insulted: PRES.PERF | |
| 20. | y: <por al:> [//] por algún medio de alguien # pues se han deprimido . and <for an> [//] for any means of anybody's well REFL (they) have: PRES PERF (become) depressed | |
| @eg: | lu7 | |
| @bg: | lu8 | |

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| 21. | entonces@i # tendríamos que mirar # a todos los niños . <i>then we would have: MOD to look: INF at all the children</i> | |
| | # eh@fp que tampoco dijese a nadie . <i>that neither (they) told: PRES.SBJV anybody</i> | |
| @eg: lu8 | | |
| @bg: lu9 | | |
| 22. | por_ejemplo eh@fp si uno le dice a otro. <i>for example if one him tells: PRES to another</i> | This "por ejemplo" opens a construction which is not subordinated to the previous part, that is why it begins a new unit. There was consensus about this interpretation and it is emphasized the idea that juxtaposed sentences should not go together although there is thematic unit, except under exceptional circumstances (see juxtaposition). |
| | que: mm@f qué tal ha: insultado: a su amigo . <i>that that somebody has insulted: PRES.PERF to his friend</i> | |
| | pues@i ese: [/] el amigo del niño que le ha dicho: # eso #. <i>then that (one) the friend of the child who him has said: PRES.PERF that</i> | |
| | pues@i puede que ya: [/] ya no sea amigo del: [/] de ese niño # so (it) maybe that anymore [/] (he) is: PRES.SBJV not friend of the [/] of that child | |
| @eg: lu9 | | |
| @bg: LU0 | | |
| | entonces@i también tendríamos que hacer alguien . <i>so also we have: MOD.COND to make: INF somebody</i> | |
| | como si fuese un espía . <i>as if (he) was: IPFV.SBJV. a spy</i> | |
| | un niño que fuese: sincero . <i>a child who was: COND.IFV sincere</i> | This is the explanation of the word "espia" and, as such, we consider it part of the same unit. This is viewed as a prototypical example of cases in which juxtaposed sentences are considered within the same unit. |
| | y: [/] # y que comunicase . <i>and [/] and that communicated: IFV.SBJV</i> | |
| | lo que se hiciera . <i>what (it) REFL did: IPFV.SBJV (what it was done)</i> | |
| @eg: LU0 | | |
| @bg: LU1 | | |
| | porque: ha [/] hay niños en los colegios . <i>because (there) IMP are: PRES children at the schools</i> | This is again an opening porque related to what it follows. There is agreement in the necessity of separating but no justification is found. I think that parallel constructions could be considered a justification depending on what precedes it in the text. |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | que dicen cosas . <i>who say::PRES things</i> | |
| | que dicen mentiras a: [/] # a sus amigos. <i>who tell:PRES lies to [/] to their friends</i> | |
| | para que les crean y: [/] # . <i>so that them (they) believe: PRES.SBJV</i> | |
| | y entonces@i eh@fp sus amigos ya: [/] ya no son amigos de otros <i>and then their friends anymore anymore (they) not are:PRES friends of others .</i> | I think this <i>entonces</i> , as opposed to the others implies consequence. There is agreement about this interpretation. |
| @eg: LU1 | | |
| @bg: LU2 | | |
| | y: [/] y se acabó # . <i>and [/] and (it) is finished: PFV</i> | The last LU begins here and it should be codified as FED. |
| | ya está . <i>that's it</i> | |
| | se ha acabado el discurso? <i>is the speech finished?</i> | |
| @End | | |

[Jud, girl, IX, ES]