Pragmatic markers in Brazilian Portuguese: The case of "bora (lá)"

| **Introduction and relevant data** | The main goal of this paper is to examine the properties of Brazilian Portuguese (BP, henceforth) constructions with the expression *bora (lá)* 'let's go', as can be seen in the examples below:

(1) Bora (lá) pro bar!
    bora (there) to+the bar
    'Let's go to the bar!'

(2) Bora (lá) comemorar!
    bora (there) celebrate$_{INF}$
    'Let's celebrate!'

(3) Bora (lá)!
    bora (there)
    'Let's go'

This expression has a hortative force and conveys the speaker's exhortation for the addressee to act together for some purpose. In all the examples, *bora* can stand alone or be followed by *lá* (originally, a locative adverb), without any difference in meaning. In (1), *bora* is followed by a locative PP [*pro bar*] 'to the bar', and the sentence means that the speaker is urging the addressee to go to the bar for some contextual implicit purpose. In (2) *bora* combines with an infinitival verb and the meaning is that the speaker encourages the addressee to celebrate something together. In this case, the infinitive expresses the urged action itself. In (3), *bora* appears without a locative PP or an infinitive. In this example, the action urged by the speaker is expressed by *bora* itself (which can be understood as 'let's go') and the purpose for the action is done/given/supplied by the context.

| **Analysis** | We argue that the expression *bora* is derived from the verbal expression in (4):

(4) vamos   embora > vam'bora > bora
    go-$_{1\text{-}PL\text{-}IMP}$ away
    'Let's go away'

The adverb *embora* contributes with the phonological material to the form of *bora* and the verb *vamos* contributes with the phi-features to the interpretation of *bora*: 1st plural, which is a combination of 1st (speaker) and 2nd person (hearer). Hence, although *bora* is not a verbal form, it bears some verbal semantic features.

Since *bora* relates the two participants of a conversation, our proposal is that this form underwent a grammaticalization process and became a pragmatic marker occupying a higher position in the clause. Adopting the proposal in terms of the projection of pragmatic roles in syntax (Speas & Tenny 2003; Hill 2007, 2014), we analyse *bora (lá)* as an item associated with an speech act head speaker (SAPs) and an speech act head hearer (SAPH):

(5) [$_{SAPS}$ bora (lá) [$_{SAPH}$ bora (lá) […

This explains the interpretation of *bora* as a marker of exhortation for both the speaker and the addressee to perform some action. This analysis also captures the property of sentences with *bora* being restricted to main clauses:

(6) *Eu disse que bora lá pro bar / bora (lá) comemorar
    I said that bora (there) to-the bar / bora (there) celebrate$_{INF}$

As for the nature of the locative PP and the infinitival, we assume that these constituents are part of a ForceP with a verb (overt or not); when a locative PP is present, it occupies the argument position of a verb of movement (marked as V$_{GO}$ in 7a):

(7) a. Bora (lá) pro bar!   [$_{SAPS}$ bora (lá) [$_{SAPH}$ bora (lá) [$_{ForceP}$ V$_{GO}$ [$_{PP}$ pro bar]]]]
   b. Bora lá comemorar!   [$_{SAPS}$ bora (lá) [$_{SAPH}$ bora (lá) [$_{ForceP}$ comemorar]]]
   c. Bora lá!   [$_{SAPS}$ bora (lá) [$_{SAPH}$ bora (lá) [$_{ForceP}$ contextual V]]]

| **Refining the analysis** | A potential problem to our proposal is raised by sentences in (8):

(8) a. Bora (lá) levantar!   b. Bora me ajudar!
          bora (there) wake$_{INF}$ up!   bora me help$_{INF}$
          'Let's wake up!'   'Help me!'

According to our description of sentences with *bora*, in (8a), the speaker encourages the addressee to wake up, and the purpose is also given by the context; however this sentence is compatible with two contexts: (i) a boy that just woke up is waking his brother up (for them to go to the school or because they are both late for school) and (ii) a mother waking her son up (for him to go to the school or because he is late for school). In context (i), *bora* encodes speaker and hearer as in (5) but in (ii) only the hearer. This is also the case in (8b): the speaker urges the hearer to help him, hence *bora* encodes only the hearer. Our analysis is that *bora* in all of its uses encodes a speaker's urging directed to the adresse, but the action he is urging for can be performed by both speaker and hearer or only by the hearer. So (5) must be complemented:

(9) a. [$_{SAPS}$ bora (lá) [$_{SAPH}$ bora (lá) […   speaker + hearer perform the action
     b. [$_{SAPS}$ [$_{SAPH}$ bora (lá) […   hearer only performs the action

Another question has to do with sentence (2). This sentence is ambiguous. It can be a speaker's urging for the addressee to celebrate something (the salient reading) or it can be a speaker's urging for the addressee to go somewhere in order to celebrate something. The infinitive can express the urged action itself or the purpose of the urged action. We are facing two structures for *bora* constructions like (2) :

(10) a. [$_{SAPS}$ bora (lá) [$_{SAPH}$ bora (lá) [$_{ForceP}$ infinitive]]]
      b. [$_{SAPS}$ bora (lá) [$_{SAPH}$ bora (lá) [$_{ForceP}$ V$_{GO}$ XP$_{LOCATIVE}$ [$_{PURPOSE}$ infinitive]]]]]

We argue that in structures with an overt locative constituent, as in (11a) and (11c), the infinitival is always an adjunct purpose clause. Sentences in (11b) and (11d) show that the order between the locative and the infinitive verb cannot be reversed, which indicates that the XP locative is an argument of the silent verb of movement.

(11) a. Bora (lá) pro bar comemorar!   b. *Bora (lá) comemorar pro bar!
          bora (there) to+the bar celebrate$_{INF}$ bora (there) celebrate$_{INF}$ to+the bar

      c. Bora (lá) pro bar pra comemorar!   d. *Bora (lá) pra comemorar pro bar!
          bora (there) to+the bar to celebrate$_{INF}$ bora (there) to celebrate$_{INF}$ to+the bar
          'Let's go to the bar to celebrate!'

Therefore we believe the data examined in this work constitute empirical evidence for the proposal of the Speech Act category, and, in this sense, can contribute to the discussion about the syntacticization of discourse (Haegeman and Hill 2013).

| **References** |
HAEGEMAN, L.; HILL, V. (2013). The syntacticization of discourse. In: Folli, R.; Truswell, R; Sevdali, C. (Eds.). *Syntax and its Limits*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. p. 370-390.
HILL, V. (2007) Vocatives and the pragmatics-syntax interface. Lingua 117(2): 2077-2105.
HILL, V. (2014) *Vocatives: How syntax meets with pragmatics*. Leiden: Brill Publishers.
SPEAS, M. & TENNY, C. (2003) Configurational properties of point of view roles. In: Di SCIULLO, A. M. (ed.). *Asymmetry in Grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, p. 315-344.