# Utterances: one speaker but two ressources, micro and macro syntax

Jeanne-Marie Debaisieux
*Université de Paris 3, Lattice CNRS ENS Paris 3 USPC*

Jeanne-marie.debaisieux@univ-paris3.fr

My contribution will present a framework the « Extended » Approche pronominale (Blanche-Benveniste et al., 1984, 1990, Debaisieux (ed.) 2013, Deulofeu (2017) in which we claim the need of new units in order to overcome the shortcomings of a sentence-based approach of syntax. The text units we define correspond indeed to what is generally meant by 'utterance', that is, roughly stretches of discourse that are syntactically independent and prosodically and semantically autonomous. The aim is to capture the combinatorial regularities of discourse units in a separate component of the linguistic description (macro-syntax) and to articulate these regularities with the rules of syntax in the narrow sense (micro-syntax) in order to describe properly the way in which messages are processed. At the microsyntactic level syntactic frames (phrases and clauses) combine into larger frames according to grammatical dependency rules. The cognitive counterpart of the outcomes is the capacity of human brain to built "signs" according to saussurean tradition, that is arbitrary associations of form and meaning. At the macrosyntactic level, discourse units, that is utterances (frames + prosodic contours) and communicative behaviors combine according to the regularities of pragmatic dependency. The cognitive counterpart of combining utterances is the human capacity of using indexes, instead of symbols, as units in an ostensive inferential way to encode and decode meaningful messages.

At the level of linguistic description, we will define two types of clause based on utterances according to their internal structure as well as their combinatorial possibilities: free units ('Nucleus') and discourse dependent units ('Satellites'). The Nucleus can stand by itself as an autonomous free-standing message. This Unit may be accompanied by one or several Satellites, which can be considered as discursively or pragmatically dependent on the Nucleus as they cannot form by themselves a free standing message but need to be grouped with a Nucleus to be properly interpreted. We argue that combinatorial regularities of discourse units and intonation play a crucial part in the distinction of the main types of discourse patterns. In order to do that, we will present the analysis of three French samples: a conversation between three friends and two monologues. The macrosyntactic analysis of both text and intonation is processed into macrosegments, whose boundaries are marked by the absence of dependency relations "on the left", i.e. at the beginning of the macrosegment towards a macrosegment that would precede (or be absent), and "on the right", i.e. at the end towards a macrosegment that would follow (or be absent). The purpose of this analysis is 1) to highlight and investigate the cases of alignment and misalignment of both text and prosodic macrosegment boundaries and 2) illustrate how the three formal tools to build statements : Microsyntax, Macrosyntax and prosody are freely combining but with preferred associations depending on the type of discourse.

### References

Blanche-Benveniste, Claire. 1990. *Le français parlé, études grammaticales*. Paris: Editions du CNRS. Coll. Sciences du langage.

Debaisieux, Jeanne-Marie. 2007. La distinction entre dépendance grammaticale et dépendance macrosyntaxique comme moyen de résoudre les paradoxes de la subordination. *Faits de Langue* 28, 119-132. Paris: Ophrys.

Debaisieux, Jeanne-Marie (dir.). 2013. *Analyses linguistiques sur corpus*. Paris: Hermès Lavoisier.

Debaisieux, Jeanne-Marie. 2016. Toward a global approach to discourse uses of conjunctions in spoken French. In: Oliver Ehmer & Dagmar Barth-Weingarten (eds). *Adverbial Patterns in Interaction*. special issue of *Language Sciences* 58, 79–94.

Deulofeu José. 2017. La macrosyntaxe comme moyen de tracer la limite entre organisation grammaticale et organisation du discours. *Modèles Linguistiques* 2016, 135–166.