Research Article

Carmen Portero Muñoz*

Tense Switching in English Narratives: an FDG Perspective

https://doi.org/10.1515/opli-2018-0032
Received May 10, 2018; accepted October 23, 2018

Abstract: The functions of the simple past and the present perfect appear to be well delimited in English according to prescriptive grammars. However, in actual use their distribution is still a challenging area of English linguistics since there are fuzzy cases in which this distinction is blurred. For example, in some varieties of English the present perfect seems to be taking over the role of the simple past to express definite past in narratives, where the simple past is the default tense. In these cases, the use of the present perfect has been regarded to be functionally motivated by the speaker's intention to highlight the current relevance of the event expressed by this form (Ritz, 2010, Walker, 2011). The main objective of this research will be to use the results of corpus analysis and of the relevant studies on this topic and to propose an FDG analysis of these data. It will be concluded that the use of the present perfect in narratives has various functions captured at two different levels of the architecture of FDG, namely the Representational Level (RL) and the Interpersonal Level (IL). At the RL, the present perfect functions either as a marker of resultative aspect, or as a signal that a new narrative Episode is introduced. At IL, this form functions as a device for Emphasis, highlighting a salient passage in the narrative.

Keywords: Present perfect, narratives, episodes, emphasis, Functional Discourse Grammar

1 Introduction

Tense switching has been the subject of a significant number of studies. The focus of much of this research, however, has been on the discourse functions of the alternation between the simple past and the historical present in different types of narratives (Wolfson 1979, 1982, Schiffrin 1981, on contemporary spoken American English; Silva-Corvalán 1983, on oral Spanish narrative; Leith 1995, on Scottish folktale). This paper makes a contribution to a different set of studies which have paid attention to the not so widely extended pattern of alternation between the present perfect and the simple past.

The study of tense switch from the simple past to the present perfect will focus on one specific discourse type, narratives. Although I draw on Labov and Waletzky (1967) and Labov (1972)'s definition of narratives, the notion of narrative will be used to refer to any form of spontaneous recounting of experience. The fact that the use of verb tenses under study seems to be triggered by one specific discourse type motivates the use of Functional Discourse Grammar (hereafter, FDG).

This paper builds on previous research on tense variation in narrative discourse (Engel and Ritz 2000; Levey 2006; Ritz and Engel 2008; Ritz 2007, 2010; Walker 2011; Richard 2015; Richard and Rodríguez Louro 2016), which means that I will rely on evidence provided by different scholars from different varieties

Article note: The paper belongs to the special issue on Systems of tense, aspect, modality, evidentiality and polarity in Functional Discourse Grammar, ed. by Kees Hengeveld and Hella Olbertz.

***Corresponding author: Carmen Portero Muñoz,** University of Córdoba, Córdoba, Spain, E-mail: ff1pomuc@uco.es

of English (Southern British English, Australian English, New Zealand English) and different cohorts of speakers (primary school preadolescents, footballers, policemen). In addition, in order to provide further support for some of the points made, relevant data have been retrieved from the *UWA Narrative Corpus* (Richard 2013-2016).[1] The fact that the use of the present perfect is a micro-phenomenon concerning specific groups of speakers or varieties of English and that it cannot be extrapolated to the English language in general should not undermine the relevance of this study, as it might well be indicative of the emergence of some kind of change in the use of verb tenses, at least in some varieties of English. Nevertheless, the main objective of this research will not be to do a sociolinguistic analysis. Instead, I will use the results of the corpus analysis[2] and of the relevant studies on this topic and offer a proposal for the analysis of these data from the perspective of FDG theory.

This paper is structured as follows. Section 2 introduces narratives and basic aspects of the use of the present perfect. Section 3 presents an overview of the formal properties and the functions which have been assigned to the alternating use of the present perfect in narratives. Section 4 addresses the use of the present perfect in narratives in light of FDG theory. A brief conclusion is provided in Section 5.

2 Preliminaries

In this section I will first provide an introduction to narratives as a discourse type (Section 2.1), and then I will outline basic aspects of the use of the present perfect in English (Section 2.2).

2.1 Narratives as a discourse type. Definition and parts (Labov 1972, Labov and Waletzky 1967)

A narrative has been defined as "one method of recapitulating past experience by matching a verbal sequence of clauses to the sequence of events which (it is inferred) actually occurred" (Labov 1972: 359-360). The semantic interpretation of a narrative therefore depends on the expectation that the events described occurred in the same order that they are reported. A narrative, as defined by Labov (1972) and Labov and Waletzky (1967), includes different component parts, as shown in (1).[3]

(1)	Abstract	Summary of what the story is about
	Orientation	Place, time, persons, initial behaviour
	Complicating action	Then, what happened?
	Evaluation	So what?
	Result or resolution	What finally happened?
	Coda	Bringing back the perspective to the present

The abstract of a narrative summarizes the experience and presents general propositions that will be expanded in the narrative. The orientation provides background information, like the time and place of the events as well as their participants and their initial behaviour. The complicating action is the section where a series of events are adjacently reported. Evaluation clauses comment on and interpret events of the

1 Richard, Sophie (2013-2016). *UWA Narrative Corpus*. Discipline of Linguistics, The University of Western Australia. This is a corpus comprising 210 narratives produced by 58 native Australian English speakers.

2 The results of the analysis of the *UWA Narrative Corpus* will be used to provide further evidence on some of the points that have already been made by various relevant studies on this topic or on new relevant issues. However, it should be borne in mind that this article is not intended as a quantitative corpus study nor as a study on narrative structure. This means that the focus will be on the switch to the present perfect in the narratives analysed.

3 For some authors, narratives are a simpler notion than the one posited by Labov. Dahl (1985: 12) provides Julius Caesar's famous statement as an example of a maximally short narrative discourse: *Veni, vidi, vici* 'I came, I saw, I conquered'. He nevertheless acknowledges that such pure narrative discourses are relatively seldom found, as usually the main story-line is continuously interrupted by flashbacks and background information.

narrative action. The resolution is the portion of the narrative sequence that follows the evaluation. Finally, the coda is an optional means to close the story and return the reader to the present.

As can be expected from their distinct functions, the clauses in a narrative differ in their relation to the temporal frame of the story and in their contribution to it. Clauses that are temporally ordered are called narrative clauses. They are part of the complicating action and constitute the crucial part of a narrative. The clauses b-d in (2) provide an example of narrative clauses (Labov 2010: 547).

(2) a. Well, this man had a little too much to drink
b. and he attacked me
c. and a friend came in
d. and she stopped it.

Therefore, narrative clauses can be said to give an answer to the question "what happened then?". Temporal juncture is an essential defining property of narratives and it implies that narrative clauses are temporally ordered with respect to each other and cannot be interchanged without changing the interpretation of what actually happened (Labov and Waletzky 1967: 28). [4]

In contrast to clauses in the complicating action, clauses in the orientation part of a narrative report of existing states or extended processes and are not usually understood as being temporally ordered, so that their rearrangement would not have consequences for the interpretation of the order of events (Labov 1972: 359, Labov and Waletzky 1967: 28, Labov 2010: 547, Schiffrin 1981: 48-49). The first clause of the previous example in (2) would be an example of an orientation clause.

The evaluation part of narratives frequently contains irrealis clauses, expressed by negation, conditionals and future. These clauses refer to events that did not happen, might have happened, or events that have yet not taken place (Labov 2010: 547).

As a result of the different functions they perform, clauses in a narrative also differ in their 'reference time' and their 'event time', the former being established in relation to the time of speaking, the latter in relation to the time of other events (Schiffrin 1981: 49). While the reference time of clauses in the complicating action is prior to the time of speaking, that of orientation and evaluation clauses is not necessarily so. As regards event time, each event within the complicating action follows the previous event and precedes the following one. By contrast, the event time in the orientation and evaluation clauses is much more variable, as they describe general truths that usually hold before and after the narrated story.

Not surprisingly then, different sections of the narrative correlate with different verb tenses and aspects. In Schiffrin's (1981: 1) words, "the narrative is a naturally bound unit of discourse in which both formal and functional aspects of grammatical variation can be studied in a controlled and systematic way". This implies that this discourse type is a good testing ground to explore the use of tenses.

In this paper the focus will be on the complicating action, that is, the section that relays a sequence of temporally ordered events, since this is the specific part of narratives where the present perfect has been found to be predominantly used. The general meanings of the present perfect are introduced in Section 2.2, while Section 3 will address the alternating use of the present perfect in narratives.

2.2 The meanings of the present perfect

Four major meanings have been attributed to the present perfect in the literature, which generally apply to all main varieties of English (Comrie 1976, McCawley 1971, 1981): (i) The universal perfect or perfect of persistent situation (as in *I have lived here for two years*); (ii) the existential or experiential perfect (as in *I have never been to Japan*); (iii) the perfect of result or stative perfect (as in *I have broken my leg*); (iv) the perfect of recent past or "hot news" perfect (as in *They've just had an accident*).

4 Some clauses, known as restricted clauses, are embedded within the complicating action and can be moved within a restricted area.

Quirk *et al.* (1985: 193-194) also make reference to these different meanings. Specifically, they point out that, when used to refer to a single event in the past, there are three different – though interrelated – implications.[5] First, the use of the present perfect might imply that there is a relevant time zone leading up to the present. The choice between the present perfect and the past is thus often determined by the speaker's perception, that is, whether s/he has an implicit time zone in mind. Secondly, the use of the present perfect may convey the idea that the event is recent, which is just a short step from the previous implication. Thus, in (3) the connotation of recency of the present perfect is closely related to an implicit time zone the speaker has in mind (no longer than a day), which renders the answer in B as inappropriate.

(3) A: Has the postman left any letters?
B: ?Yes, he did six months ago.

Finally, the present perfect can imply that the result of the action still obtains when the verb denotes a change of state, so that in (4) the resultative implication would be that at the moment of speaking there are no apples left.

(4) The apples have all been eaten.

Huddleston (2002: 143) points out that these major uses of the present perfect can be seen as different ways in which a past situation can have current relevance (Comrie 1976: 52). The notion of current relevance might therefore be seen as an overarching property encompassing all the different uses of the present perfect. One aspect in which a past event can be currently relevant is that it involves a change of state, which may be derived straightforwardly from the meaning as in *She's broken her leg* (her leg is broken), or may be inferred, as in *I've been to the bank* (I have some money now). Another way in which a past event can be connected to the present is that it has happened recently or that it continues up to now.

The idea of current relevance traditionally associated with the present perfect allows for a distinction between this form and the past tense form in cases where they would appear to be interchangeable (Quirk *et al.* 1985: 192). Thus, while in (5a) the speaker appears to ask the addressee to remember a past action, in (5b) the focus is on the present location of the laptop.

(5) a. Where did you put my laptop?
b. Where have you put my laptop?

The choice between the past and the present perfect is associated with time orientation, and so is the selection and interpretation of time adverbials. While the past tense combines with adverbials which indicate a specific point or period in the past (e.g. *yesterday, last Monday, a week ago*), the present perfect combines with adverbials which denote a period leading up to the present (e.g. *since Monday, so far, up to now*). Finally, both the simple past and the present perfect combine with a mixed set of adverbials, some of which designate a period including the present (e.g. *today, this month, this year*), while others may lead to different interpretations, depending on the intended past or present time orientation. For example, Quirk *et al.* (1985: 195) remark that the adverbial in *I have seen him once* has a frequency sense, while in *I saw him once,* it has a time position sense.

Similarly, the choice of the past or present perfect form with phrases like *this week, this month or this year* reflects a difference of focus or orientation. The use of the present perfect implies that the time period referred to is not perceived as finished by speakers. By contrast, the use of adverbs or adverbials unexpected with a present perfect form, as shown in (6), is explained as a performance error, triggered by the use of the present perfect by speaker A (Quirk *et al.* 1985: 195, n.[a]).

5 In addition to the use of the present perfect to refer to indefinite events in a period leading up to the present (e.g. Have you even (ever) been to Florence?), Quirk *et al.* (1985: 193-194) mention two other meanings: State leading up to the present (e.g. That house has been empty for ages) and Habit (i.e. recurrent event) in a period leading up to the present (e.g. Mr Terry has sung in this choir ever since he was a boy).

(6) A: Have you ever seen Macbeth on the stage?
B: Yes, I've seen it *ages ago*, when I was a child.

3 The alternating use of the present perfect in narratives

In this section I will first offer a brief introduction (Section 3.1) and then I will present an overview of the formal properties which have been found to frequently accompany the alternating use of the present perfect in narratives (Section 3.2). The main functions of the narrative perfect that have been reported in the literature on this topic will be provided in Section 3.3.

3.1 Introduction

The functions of the simple past and the present perfect appear to be well-delimited in English: the past tense is used to express the fact that the temporal location of the verbal event is prior to the time of speaking. Therefore, it can be used for narrating a sequence of temporarily ordered discrete events. By contrast, the present perfect tense is said to be relational, its prototypical function being to relate past events to present ones, not to locate an event at some definite point in time (Comrie 1976: 52). As a result, the present perfect cannot be used to move the narrative sequence forward (Dahl 1985:139).

However, the distribution of the past and the present perfect is still a challenging area of English linguistics since there are fuzzy cases in which this distinction is blurred. For example, in some varieties of English (American English and also Irish English) there is a tendency to use the simple past for the expression of recent past, that is, in contexts where the use of the present perfect is preferred in many other varieties of English (as in *Did you ever go to Florence, Did the children come back yet, I just came back, You told me already, I'm tired- I had a long day*) (Quirk *et al*. 1985: 193-194).

Conversely, in other varieties of English the present perfect seems to be taking over the role of the simple past to express definite past in narratives, where the simple past is the default tense, though this is a feature which is dependent on a number of sociolinguistic aspects such as the social class of speakers, age and gender. Specifically, narrative use of the present perfect has been reported in the literature for Australian English in radio chat show programs, police reports and oral narratives of personal experience (Engel and Ritz 2000; Ritz and Engel 2008; Ritz 2007, 2010; Richard 2015; Richard and Rodríguez Louro 2016). In addition, this especial use of the perfect has been reported for British English in narratives by working-class preadolescents from the South-East of England (Levey 2006), as well as in the language of footballers (Walker 2011). Finally, narrative use of the present perfect has been documented for New Zealand English in police reality television shows (Cox 2005). The use of the present perfect in narratives is illustrated in (7).

(7) So I **was standing** on the corner next to where she **hit** him. He**'s gone up** on two wheels, **gone** one-eighty sort of heading back the direction he**'s come**, still on two wheels. The cars behind him **have slammed** on their brakes, just as he**'s start**—**completed** the full three-sixty on two wheels. And he just **landed**. (Richard 2014: 30)

This use of the present perfect has been dismissed as an alternative option over the past, the quintessential tense for narration, and it has been regarded to be functionally-motivated by the speaker's intention to highlight the current relevance of the situation/event expressed by this form. Following this line of thought, Levey (2006), Ritz (2010) and Walker (2011) argue that the use of the present perfect in narratives might have a pragmatic function as it might be triggered by an intention to highlight unexpected events by the speaker. In their view, these uses of the present perfect in narrative have a mirative, foregrounding or emphatic function.

3.2 Formal properties

In the literature on the use of the present perfect in narratives, various scholars draw attention to a number of formal properties that have been observed to co-occur with the present perfect. Drawing on the results of these studies, an overview of these properties is offered below.

(i) Position in the narrative sequence
Levey (2006: 141) notes that the present perfect rarely initiates narrative progression in narrative clauses, as made evident by the low frequency of this form in initial position.[6] Instead, the present perfect relies on other temporal markers in initial sequences, mainly the past, to set up a temporal frame to be used to advance the temporal sequence of events of the story. It is therefore preferred in certain positions within the sequence of complicating action clauses, which might suggest that tense switch might perform a discourse structuring function, marking the sections within a narrative.

(ii) Clusters of verbs in the present perfect
A number of scholars have observed that the choice of a tense form in a clause has an effect on the choice of the verb form in the subsequent clause in the narration of events, so that different verbs tenses are not normally used in isolation (Scherre and Naro 1991). Among them, Schiffrin (1981) noticed that, when the past and the historical present alternate in narratives, verbs of the same tense cluster together. A similar observation was made by Levey (2006) in his study of tense variation in preadolescent narratives as regards the combined use of the past and the present perfect.

The use of a present perfect form can thus be said to be primed by the tense used in the previous complicating action clause, as observed by Richard and Rodríguez Louro (2016: 136) (see example (7)).

(iii) Combination with temporal modifiers
In Section 2.2. was shown that one of the properties of the present perfect is its constraint to co-occur with temporal adverbials signalling a definite past (Comrie 1976: 54; Quirk *et al*. 1985: 195; Elsness 1997: 25). Consequently, the presence of one of these adverbials is an inhibiting factor for the use of the present perfect since some types of adverbial temporal modifiers do not usually occur with this verb form.

Surprisingly, though, when looking at vernacular varieties of English the present perfect has often been found to occur with different types of modifiers that are not expected in combination with it.[7] Similar cases have been noted in the study of the use of verb tenses in different types of narration (Levey 2006: 135-136, Engel and Ritz 2000: 130, Ritz and Engel 2008, Ritz 2010).

One case of the use of temporal modification with the present perfect concerns the expression of temporal progression in a sequence of events in the narration. Levey (2006: 143), for instance, mentions the adverb *then* as the most frequent marker of temporal specification in his data (see also Ritz and Engel 2008). An example is offered in (8).

(8) a. . . . we stopped
b. and I went, "Paul come back! Shall we make a run?"
c. and **then** he'*s gone* . . . then he'*s gone*, "But what out . . .
with what though?"
d. and I'*ve gone*, "Wood, you div!"
e. and **then** . . . we'*ve made* it
f. and the snow'*s come* on it

6 This is in contrast with some findings within police reports, where the present perfect has been found to occur either at the introduction or in the development of the story describing the temporal sequence of events (Ritz 2010).

7 Harris (1984: 315), for instance, mentions the use of the present perfect in non-conventional contexts like *I've done a course two years ago* and *They've been here when we came*, which can be found in Hiberno English. Bauer (1994: 401) notes the increasing use of such combinations with temporal modifiers in New Zealand English. Trudgill (1984: 42) also makes reference to the increase of these uses in Southern British English. A similar observation is made by Denison (1999: 192-193) as regards colloquial varieties of British English.

g. and I'*ve gone* <SOUND EFFECT INDICATING SPEED>
h. and I couldn't land... (Levey 2006: 132)

In Levey's view, the fact that the present perfect co-occurs with a temporal marker of successive event time lends support to the idea that the present perfect is used to narrate a sequence of punctual and completed past events in preadolescent narratives.

Additionally, in her study on the use of present perfect in Australian police reports, Ritz (2010: 3406) (see also Ritz and Engel 2008: 149) finds a large number of temporal modifiers, especially those locating the action in a definite time in the past, as shown in (9) and (10).

(9) Police confirm that **at 16.30 hours yesterday** the body of Ivan Jepp *has been located*. (92.9 FM radio Perth: news, 17 March 2000) (Engel and Ritz 2000: 130)

(10) A woman driver *has been killed* **when her vehicle hit a 4WD towing a caravan** on the Great Northern Highway south of Northampton around 10.30 am Sunday 4 September 2005. (Ian Hasleby, 5.9.2005, WA Police Media) (Ritz 2010: 3405)

In (9) there is a clear past time reference indicated by the location of the event *at 16.30 hours yesterday*. In (10) the two events described are immediately subsequent, the killing of the woman being a consequence of her vehicle's hitting the 4WD. The use of the past simple tense in the time clause would thus lead to the use of the past simple in the main clause. However, the present perfect is used instead.

Ritz (2010: 3406) notes that 53% of adverbials of this type in her study of police reports appear in clause-initial position, which means that the date and the time are foregrounded, as shown in (11).

(11) **At about 3.20 pm yesterday** a man *has entered* the Eat-N-Run takeaway store on golden Four Drive, Bilinga, armed with a rifle. (John Kaarsberg, Q'land Police Media, 21.12.2001)

(iv) Combination with evidential expressions

In addition to temporal modifiers, Ritz (2010) reports on the non-conventional use of the present perfect in Australian English in combination with expressions like *It appears that*, as well as adverbs expressing evidentiality, like *allegedly,* where the adverb indicates that the information narrated has been obtained from an indirect source. An example is given in (12).

(12) Both offenders *have* then **allegedly** *continued* to kick the 35 year-old in the head. (Amanda Lampe, Q'land Police Media, 17. 10. 2005) (Ritz 2010: 3407)

This property is, however, contingent on the specific narrative type. Thus, it is likely to be found in police reports, where it is required to provide the source of the information provided.

(v) Co-occurrence with some verba dicendi or quotatives

Levey (2006: 143) identifies quotative contexts as a major locus for tense switching in preadolescent narratives. In his view, tense switch in combination with variation in the form of the lexical quotative helps demarcate participant roles across extended stretches of discourse. As a result of his study, he finds that the use of *go* attracts the present perfect (Levey 2006: 140).[8]

In their study of the use of the present perfect in Australian English narratives, Richard and Rodríguez Louro (2016: 136) also find a statistically significant use of this form with quotative *go*, such as (13).

8 Engel and Ritz (2000: 136) and Schiffrin (1981) also mention the use of *go* with the historical present.

(13) a. So she's come in,
b. and she'**s gone**, "Oh I need to fill out this form. Can you like get me a pen and like sort me out a spot on the table?
c. I was like, "Yeah yeah, no problem". (Male, 33, glazier)
(adapted from Richard and Rodríguez Louro, 2016: 129)

(vi) Type of verb[9]

Ritz and Engel (2008: 132, 152-156) observe that the majority of the verbs in the present perfect in their narratives contrast with the narrative present in being durative and dynamic and in having "a process part (that is, they denote activities and accomplishments)", which explains the effect of vividness achieved.

In line with Ritz and Engel's (2008) findings, Richard and Rodríguez Louro's (2016: 136) data reveal that the present perfect "collocates" with a set of activity verbs, such as *go* (non-quotative), *come*, *walk*, and *look*. In their view, this shows that the present perfect is well suited to express dynamic events, in accordance with the climactic nature of the specific section of the complicating action where this verb form tends to be used. The use with activity verbs makes it possible for the present perfect to contribute to the expression of temporal progression.

To sum up, there seems to be some agreement on the formal properties co-occurring with the narrative use of the present perfect. First, there is a tendency for these uses to occur in a specific position within the narrative, which suggests this use might have a discourse structuring function. In addition, they have been found to occur in clusters with a high frequency, they may co-occur with temporal modifiers that mark progression (e.g. *then*) or definite time in the past (e.g. *yesterday*), as well as with evidential adverbs like *allegedly* or other expressions denoting evidentiality (e.g. *It appears that*). Moreover, narrative verbs in the present perfect often appear in quotative contexts and they are frequently activity verbs like *go*, *come*, *walk* and *look*.

3.3 The functions of narrative present perfect

In this section, the different functions that have been assigned to the alternating use of the narrative present perfect in the literature on this topic will be outlined briefly.

(i) Marker of "hot news"

Ritz (2010: 3409) alludes to the use of the present perfect in police reports to mark especially recent events. She gives the example in (14) to show that the present perfect can be used to indicate that this information corresponds to the events the police found out about most recently (i.e. after they got to the place of the accident).

(14) Fatal Ranford Road Forrest dale: Police have released the name of the man involved in a fatal traffic crash which occurred on Ranford Road [. . .] The Holden Commodore sedan, which had been stolen earlier in the night, had been involved in a pursuit with Police which had been aborted. *It appears that* as the vehicle was being driven south east on Ranford Road the driver **has** then **been ejected** from the vehicle and **has come** to rest by the side of the roadway. [...] (Graham Clifford, WA Police Media 31.10.2007)

9 Some scholars have also mentioned the use of specific person pronouns as subject among the formal properties co-occurring with the use of the present perfect in narratives. For example, Elsness (1997: 342) notes that there is a tendency for the present perfect to be used with first and second person pronouns, whereas the past often occurs with third-person subjects. Levey (2006: 142) corroborates the tendency for present perfect forms to co-occur with first person pronouns when compared with other tense variants. The relevance of this property in the use of the present perfect is nevertheless not very convincing, as Richard and Rodríguez Louro (2016) obtain different findings. In contrast to Levey, in their study it is third person subjects that are found to occur predominantly with the present perfect, which the authors explain by drawing on basic discourse organization principles: as third person subjects are used to introduce new information, it makes sense that they are used felicitously with the present perfect, since this form has been found to also introduce new or unexpected information.

In (14) the present perfect is used to denote events that are informationally more recent, as the speaker is just aware of an event, though it happened in the past.

Ritz also observes that the use of the present perfect corresponds to events that were not witnessed directly by the police, that is, where the source of the information given is not direct, as evinced by the beginning of the clause with *It appears that*. According to De Lancey (2001: 279), the fact that the speaker has only recently been aware of a past event implies that he has only indirect evidence of it. However, Ritz acknowledges that the use of the present perfect cannot be regarded as a marker of secondary evidence, as it alternates with past simple in these segments. Ritz concludes that the use of the present perfect in this case might be an example of "hot news" perfect usage.

(ii) Mirativity

Closely related to the role of the present perfect as a marker of recent news, Ritz (2010: 3410) points out that its use might be regarded as expressing mirativity, which, drawing on De Lancey (2001: 269-270), she defines as "...the linguistic marking of an utterance as conveying information which is new or unexpected to the speaker".[10] An example from Ritz (2010: 3410) is given in (15).

(15) I'd done enough, and she said 'Can you sign this?' and I said 'Oh, okay, one final signing, I promise, and will you go away?' and she said 'Yeah, yeah'. So I'**ve got** a texta, I'**ve held** her head straight and I'**ve written** on her forehead 'Hi Mum, I've tried drugs for the first time.' (Triple J radio Sydney, 29.02.2000)

In (15) the speaker, a radio presenter who has been pursued by a fan, expresses retrospective surprise at his own actions.

This meaning might have arisen from the resultative meaning of the present perfect, and is also connected to evidentiality, since the result of an event which has not been witnessed (i.e. for which the source of evidence is not direct), or that has been forgotten, can be surprising or unexpected (hence, mirativity arises), as argued by Hengeveld and Olbertz (2012) and Olbertz (2012: 93).

(iii) Narrative rupture

A different pattern of alternation between the present perfect and the past simple where the use of present perfect can be related to the expression of unexpected events is seen when it is used to introduce new information into the discourse (narrative rupture) (Elsness 1997: 45-46, Ritz 2010), as shown in (16).

(16) Police are calling for witnesses to an attempted armed robbery in Crawley on Saturday 25 June 2005. At about 1.40 am, **a male driver** *was stationary* in his vehicle at the traffic lights on the corner of Mounts Bay Road and Hackett Drive, Crawley. **A vehicle** *has pulled up* behind him and **a male person** *has walked over* to the driver's side window whilst **another male** *has opened* the passenger side door of his vehicle and threatened him with a knife. **The male driver** *has panicked and drove away*. (Craig Bailey, WA Police Media, 26.06.2005) (Ritz 2010: 3411)

In Ritz's view, the switch to the present perfect in (16) can be related to the change of participants from *a male driver* to *a vehicle*, *a male person*, *another male* and back to the initial participant in the sequence of events. It should be noted, however, that in this paragraph (iii) and the following paragraph (iv), tense switching is considered throughout entire narratives (not only the complicating action section), as shown by the verbs in italics.

10 It is not completely clear whether the use of the perfect to express very recent news should be separated from its mirative use. Olbertz (2012: 84) points out that in Quechua studies the mirative is known as "sudden discovery tense". However, hot news is not necessarily surprising or unexpected, as it might just be the confirmation of a strong prediction.

(iv) Event demarcation

In her study of the use of the historical present in narratives, Wolfson points out that tense switch between the past and the historical present separates different "events". Later on, the author (1979: 181) concludes that switching between the past and the historical present serves to separate "episodes" in the story. It is not very clear what she means by episodes as she also refers to them as events or scenes. In her view, a verb expresses a different event if the scene and the participants are different and if it appears after *all of a sudden*, among other conditions (see also Fludernik 1991: 374-5, for the notion "'turn of event", and for the analysis of tense switch to the present as a marker of episodic beginning).

This function can be related to one formal property mentioned earlier, namely, the use in clusters. Reporting on Wolfson's (1979) conclusions, Schiffrin (1981: 52) points out that these alternating clusters have a function in discourse:

> The tendency for verbs in one tense to cluster together is given a functional, discourse-level explanation: maintenance of one tense groups events into one scene or episode, while switching separates events from one another.

This function of tense switch has also been noted in the case of the use of the present perfect. Ritz (2010: 3411) refers to some cases in which the present perfect is used to present events whose actors are different protagonists, as in (16) above or in (17).

(17) Remember last year **we** *were giving out* [...] the 'I hate Redman' and 'I love Redman' stickers? [...] Well**,** *there was* **a man**, **he'***s used* his initiative. [...] **He'***s* obviously *got* a handful of these stickers and **he'***s cut* them all *up* [...] and **he'***s made* a new sticker and it says 'I tolerate Redman'. (96 FM radio Perth: breakfast show, 10 March 2000) (Engel and Ritz 2000: 130)

The switch to the present perfect in (17) coincides with a change of participant, which supports an analysis of this sequence of verbs as a change of event/scene.

(v) Emphasis

Some of the previous functions concern different cases of information saliency. In addition, Levey (2006: 133, drawing on Fleischman 1990) makes reference to the emphatic function of the narrative use of the present perfect, pointing out that "strategic shifts between one tense form and another at narrative peaks of emotional intensity can function evaluatively to *emphasize* the significance of dramatic high points" (emphasis added).

As a matter of fact, this emphatic function of the present perfect in narratives was acknowledged by some scholars a few decades ago. Among them, Mustanoja (1960: 506-507) claims that this use of the present perfect is already recorded in Middle English, where the present perfect is used in narrative style "*to give emphasis* and additional vividness to certain events or situations" or "to *emphasize* the importance, dreadfulness, pathetic quality, etc of an event or situation", in contexts where the preterite or the pluperfect would be expected (emphasis added). By expressing some events in the present perfect and the circumstances surrounding them in the past, the writer/narrator manages to "call attention to the main line of action" when he wishes "to awaken in the reader a feeling of concern or strong emotion". Mustanoja points out that this use of the present perfect probably belongs to literary rather than popular style and is ascribable, at least partly, to French influence.

Emphasis is closely related to foreground, a function that has also been regarded to play a role in the narrative use of the present perfect (see Engel and Ritz, 2000: 119). However, there are different views on this notion in the context of narratives. Thus, drawing on Labov and Waletzky, different scholars make a sequential interpretation of foregrounding and equate the foreground with the sequence of temporally ordered clauses in which events forming the main plot line of the story are expressed and that are reported by perfective action verbs (that is, accomplishments and achievements). This interpretation is problematic, however, as not all the temporally ordered events in a narrative are equally important. In a second interpretation foreground is seen as "what is humanly important", that is, those situations that are

"intrinsically more important than others" and that the speaker wishes to highlight (Fleischman 1990: 172) and, therefore, it would be closer to the emphatic function mentioned earlier.

Summing up, the literature has identified a number of functions of the use of the present perfect in narratives. It has been analysed as a maker of "hot news" (one of the functions of the present perfect in non-narrative uses), as a device to highlight surprising events (that is, to express mirativity), as a way of introducing new information (narrative rupture) or signalling a change of scene/participants (event demarcation), or a means to emphasize specific events in the narration.

4 The functions of the narrative present perfect and the architecture of FDG

This section addresses the use of the present perfect in narratives in the light of FDG theory. Some relevant basic notions of the theory are sketched in Section 4.1, while Section 4.2 is concerned with the analysis of the topic under discussion from the perspective of FDG. After a brief introduction (Section 4.2.1), a tentative proposal is made for the analysis of the alternating use of the present perfect in narratives using FDG's architecture (Sections 4.2.2 and 4.2.3).

4.1 Some basic notions of Functional Discourse Grammar

4.1.1 Functional Discourse Grammar and levels of representation

Functional Discourse Grammar (hereafter: FDG) is a top-down grammatical model which has four levels of analysis organized hierarchically into different layers, each of which corresponding to different linguistic units and represented by different variables. This top-down orientation implies that units at higher levels and layers have scope over units at lower ones. Variables are then specified by one or more operators, which represent grammatically expressed information. Additionally, optional lexical information is given in a slot for modifiers at some levels.

The highest level for the analysis of linguistic expressions within FDG is the Interpersonal Level. This level accounts for all linguistically coded aspects of an utterance that are connected with the interaction between a Speaker and an Addressee, such as rhetorical and pragmatic aspects.

The Interpersonal Level is formed by eight different layers, each of which represents a specific linguistic unit, as mentioned earlier (Hengeveld and Mackenzie 2008: 48, Keizer 2015: 45). The layer at the top is the Move (M), which is defined as "the largest unit of interaction relevant to grammatical analysis" (Hengeveld and Mackenzie 2008: 50) and is formed by one or more units, referred to as Discourse Acts (A). These units are considered the basic unit of analysis within the FDG model and consist of different component elements, such as the Illocution (F), the Speech Participants (P) and the Communicated Content (C). The latter contains one or more Subacts of Ascription (T) or Reference (R). A schematic representation for the different layers that are included in the Interpersonal Level is given in (18) (Keizer 2015: 47):[11]

(18) $(M_1: A_1: [(F_1: ILL)\ (P_1)_S\ (P_2)_A\ (C_1: [\ldots(T_1)\ (R_1)\ldots]^{C})]^{A})^{M})$[12]

A Move may consist of only one Discourse Act, as can be seen in (19a), or different Discourse Acts, as shown in (19b) (Keizer 2015: 53).

11 This is a simplified representation of the internal structure of the Interpersonal Level, as provided by Keizer (2015: 47), where slots for functions, operators and modifiers have been omitted for the sake of clarity. More complex representations including operators and modifiers are offered in Hengeveld and Mackenzie (2008).

12 The standard theory (Hengeveld and Mackenzie 2008) does not make use of superscripts for closing, using closing variables instead. This is the option used in Keizer (2015) to facilitate the readability of the representations. These superscripts have been used here whenever drawing on Keizer (2015) for a representation.

(19) a. What have John and Mary done today? (M_1: (A_1))
b. John has gone out. Mary has stayed home. (M_1: [(A_1) (A_2)]^M)

The example in (19b) shows two Discourse Acts with the same communicative status, which are called equipollent Discourse Acts. However, one Discourse Act may also depend on the other. When this situation is found the main Discourse Act is called the Nuclear Discourse Act, and the other will be a Subsidiary Act, which is assigned a rhetorical function expressing the relation to the main Discourse Act. The contrast between these two types of Discourse Act is illustrated in (20) and (21) (see Keizer 2015: 53-54).

(20) Equipollent Discourse Acts:
John has gone out. Mary has stayed home.
(M_1: [(A_1: – John has gone out – ^{A}) (A_2: – Mary has stayed home – ^{A})]^M)[13]

(21) Subsidiary Discourse Act:
Are you alright? Because I've heard the news.
(M_1: [(A_1: – are you alright –^{A}) (A_2: – because I've heard the news – ^{A})$_{Motiv}$]^M)

The second Discourse Act in (21) expresses the Speaker's motivation for the first Discourse Act. Therefore, it is a Subsidiary Act, whose communicative function is to signal the relation between two linguistic actions. This relation to the Nuclear Discourse Act is marked by assigning the rhetorical function of Motivation to the second Discourse Act. Other possible functions are Orientation, Correction, Concession, and Aside.

Moving down in the architecture of FDG, there is a Representational Level (RL), which deals with the semantic aspects of a linguistic unit. This level is also constituted by various layers, each of them corresponding to basic semantic categories that are regarded as relevant for the analysis of language by FDG. The top layer is the Propositional Content (p), which is a "mental construct" that "[...] can be evaluated in terms of its truth" (Hengeveld and Mackenzie 2008: 131) and may contain one or more episodes (ep). Episodes form the subsequently lower layer, and they may contain one or more descriptions of thematically coherent State-of-Affairs (hereafter SoA) (e), which are defined as entities that "[...] can be located in space and time and can be evaluated in terms of their reality" (Hengeveld and Mackenzie 2008: 131). Finally, State-of-Affairs are characterized by a Configurational Property (f^c) that is, a complex property that combines different semantic units of equal rank. These units include Lexical Properties (f), which are headed by a lexical head (♦) (typically a verb), one or more arguments (typically Individuals (x)), and/or expressions designating a Location (l) or a Time (t). The different combinations of these semantic units are specified in terms of predication frames, whose nature depends in their qualitative and quantitative valency (Hengeveld and Mackenzie 2008: 139, 181-182).

A simplified schematic representation for the Propositional Content is shown in (22), as proposed in Keizer (2015: 35, n.2).[14]

(22) (πp_1: (π ep$_1$: (π e$_1$: $f^c{}_1$: [(f_2: ♦) (x_1)$_A$ (x_2)$_U$]: σ^f): σ^e): σ^{ep}): σ^p)

The representation in (22) shows the hierarchical organization of the Representational Level, where the Propositional Content (p) has scope over the Episode (ep), the Episode has scope over the State-of Affairs (e) and the State-of-Affairs has scope over the Configurational Property ($f^c{}_1$). Each of these units can be specified by different tense and aspectual operators (π) and modifiers (σ). Thus, Episodes can be specified for absolute tense (present, past and future), while State-of-Affairs can be specified for relative tense (anteriority, simultaneity or posteriority) and quantitative aspect (frequency and distributive). Configurational Properties, for their part, can be specified for phasal aspect (such as Prospective, Progressive and Resultative Aspect) and the Perfective-Imperfective distinction (see Sections 4.1.3 and 4.1.4.).

The two remaining levels are the Morphosyntactic Level (ML), and the Phonological Level (PL), which take care of the analysis of a linguistic unit in terms of its syntactic constituents or the phonological units it

13 The symbols '–' are used to indicate that the fragment in between is not analysed in detail (Hengeveld and Mackenzie 2008: 43).
14 A and U stand for Actor and Undergoer, respectively.

contains, respectively.[15] All these levels (that is, IL, RL, ML and PL) are purely linguistic, which means that they describe the functions and meaning of language only if these are encoded in its grammar.

4.1.2 FDG's notion of Episode

In FDG theory, Episodes are defined as "thematically coherent combinations of SoAs characterized by unity or continuity of Time (t), Location (l), and Individuals (x)" (Hengeveld and Mackenzie 2008: 133; Keizer 2015: 117).

A narrative would consist of different Episodes, corresponding to different parts of the narrative, such as the complicating action. As stated in the previous definition, the SoAs within an Episode may not take place at the same time, that is, they may not show *unity* of time, as long as they show *continuity* of time, "forming one unit in the course of events described" (Keizer 2015: 117). Thus, in (23) the different SoAs do not take place simultaneously, but they occur in a temporal sequence, so that changing their order would result in a change in the interpretation of the events that took place. Therefore, they can be seen as forming part of the same Episode.

(23) 'Did you say what I thought you said?' Mr Trotter **fumed**. 'How dare you,' he **continued**, 'Get yourself into the headmasters office, now.' (Keizer 2015: 117)

Further on, Keizer (2015: 121) provides example (24a), represented as (24b) to show that an Episode can have a configurational head when it consists of one or more SoAs.

(24) a. I **heard** a car coming, and I **dropped** the book and I **craned** out the front window to see if it was the Mighty UnButt Crack's truck (COCA, written, fiction)
b. (ep_1: [(e_1: – I heard the car coming –) (e_2: I dropped my book –) (e_3: – I craned out the front window …–)]^{ep})

From this, it appears that, at least some parts of a narrative, like the complicating action (see Section 2.1), might be seen as constituting Episodes of their own, as long as the events in the sequence show some sort of continuity and there is unity of Individuals and Location. The Orientation part of a narrative may be used to determine whether the subsequent clauses constitute an Episode as it provides information on the place, the time and the participants.[16] Thus, consider the narrative in (25).

(25) Abstract
Did you hear about *that nurse*
Who **got run off** her bike?
Orientation[17]
Yeah, *on Monday night*
Complicating action
um, twenty-six year old, **got thrown**, or like, you know, **whatevered off** her bike, **landed** on the floor
Result or resolution
and she**'s got** like a fractured pelvis and all that stuff.
(Rodríguez Louro and Ritz 2014: 2)

15 A more detailed description of the layers within the ML and the PL has not been included here as they are not relevant to the present paper. For a comprehensive account, the reader is referred to Hengeveld and Mackenzie (2008) and Keizer (2015).
16 Orientation is being discussed here as one of the parts of narrative structure and should not be confused with the interpersonal function of the same name within FDG, a rhetorical function that is assigned to a dependent Discourse Act to "orient the Addressee to the Speaker's communicative intentions" (Hengeveld and Mackenzie 2008: 55).
17 Note that orientation clauses can be embedded in the complicating action to provide information that the hearer might require to understand the significance of the events which are being narrated.

Example (25) shows that, though the actions of getting thrown and landing on the floor in the complicating action of this narrative are not simultaneous, they show continuity. In addition, the setting of these SoAs on a definite time in the past (Monday night) and the presence of one subject (a nurse) give it the required unity for episodic status.

The relevance for the recognition of this semantic unit within the RL is based on the fact that this category is "very manifestly present in the grammatical system" (Hengeveld and Mackenzie 2008: 157), not only by its internal structure but also by the way in which different Episodes are connected to each other.

By way of illustration, the internal structure of Episodes in English is shown in cases like (26) from Hengeveld and Mackenzie (2008: 158), where an Episode in the past (as shown by the use of the past form in the last verb) consists of a number of partly overlapping, or immediately subsequent, SoAs (*come, stop, take, pause, walk*), as indicated by the use of the progressive form.

(26) *Coming out*, *stopping* to check the mailbox, *taking* a look at the driveway and *pausing* to adjust his hat, he *walked* to his car

The connection between different Episodes is marked in different ways in other languages. For example, the different major steps of cooking recipes in many languages are clearly demarcated and might be regarded as the Episodes of the recipe, as can be seen in the Spanish example in (27) (adapted from Hengeveld and Mackenzie 2008: 158).[18]

(27) *En una olla coloca el agua, el ajo, la cebolla… **Una vez** blandos los vegetales puedes retirar los trozos de ajo, pimentón… **Una vez** que tenga consistencia de crema, añade la margarina…*
'Put the water, garlic and onion in a saucepan. Once the vegetables are soft, remove the garlic pieces, pepper…Once it is creamy, add the butter…'

In (27) each new step of the recipe corresponds with a new Episode introduced by *Una vez*. Similarly, the boundaries between the different steps of recipes can be marked in English by the use of *Once*.

The introduction of new Episodes can also be explicitly marked in English by certain verbs, as shown in (28) (Hengeveld and Mackenzie 2008: 133, Keizer 2015: 118, 143).

(28) The people were convinced that the sounding of the bells would ward off any kind of calamity. Several times it *happened* that [mighty black clouds had threatened Mar[r]akesh, thunder had rumbled, it had started hailing, but as soon as someone passing by began ringing the bells, the dark clouds broke as if by a miracle, skirting the entire Mar[r]akesh Valley.] (Keizer 2015: 118)

In (28) the verb *happen* introduces a single Episode consisting of a series of SoAs which show unity of Time, Location and Individuals.

As briefly mentioned in Section 4.1.1, Episodes may contain modifiers and operators, such as those used for absolute temporal location. Tense operators with scope on different layers are introduced in Section 4.1.3.

4.1.3 The distinction between absolute and relative tense operators

In FDG the past tense and the present perfect are analysed as absolute vs relative tense operators, respectively.

Absolute tense operators are the most relevant operators at the layer of the Episode. They are a "grammatical means to specify the time of occurrence of an Episode in relation to the time of speaking, independently from any other Episodes" (Keizer 2015: 298, see also Hengeveld and Mackenzie 2008: 163-

18 Similar phenomena from typologically different languages are discussed in Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2008: 157-160).

165). They have scope over the whole Episode, which implies that all the SoAs included in the same Episode must have the same feature for absolute tense. By way of illustration, all the verbs in the Episode in (29) are in the past tense because the whole Episode has the operator 'past' (Keizer 2015: 123).

(29) I **heard** a car coming, and I **dropped** the book and I **craned** out the front window to see if it was the Mighty UnButt Crack's truck (COCA, written, fiction)

On the other hand, relative tense operators are "a grammatical means to specify the time of occurrence of a SoA in relation to the tense of the Episode of which it forms part" (Keizer 2015: 312, see also Hengeveld and Mackenzie 2008: 173-174). The anterior operator (ant) and the simultaneous operator (sim), which indicate that the SoA takes place before the Episode or at the reference time, respectively, are included among the set of relative tense operators with scope over the SoA. As an example of the use of relative tense operators, consider the simplified version of an example from Keizer (2015: 143):

(30) The people **were convinced** that the sounding of the bells would ward off any kind of calamity. Several times it **happened** that mighty black clouds **had threatened** Mar[r]akesh [...], but as soon as someone passing by **began** ringing the bells, the black clouds **broke** as if by a miracle [...]

The verb *happen* in (30) is in the past tense form, which indicates that the whole Episode has taken place at a definite time in the past. All the subsequent SoAs form part of this Episode and are marked for their time of occurrence relative to that of the Episode. The first SoA has taken place before the Episode and is thus marked by an anterior operator (ant), which is combined with the episodical past time operator, triggering a past perfect form; the following SoAs take place at the reference time, that is, an absolute time in the past and are marked by the simultaneous operator (sim), which results in the simple past tense form when combined with the operator for past tense of the Episode. This would be represented as shown in (31) (see Keizer 2015: 144).

(31) $(\text{past ep}_1\text{: [(ant e}_1\text{) (sim e}_2\text{) (sim e}_3\text{)]}^{\text{ep}})$

It is possible that the time of reference and the time of speech overlap, as in football commentaries, which are usually located in the present. Any SoAs within that Episode occurring before the time of reference should be marked with the anterior operator, which would yield a present perfect form, as shown in (32).

(32) Well good spell of play by Belgium, they really **do knock** the ball around well. They'**ve got** Strupar who **comes off** well, very strong. Orin on the left hand side. They'**ve had** two good efforts on goal, well blocked by England defenders because they were net bound. (England v Belgium, 10/10/99, BBC Radio 5)

From the previous definitions of absolute and relative tense operators it would appear that the scope of the simple past and the present perfect, which constitute morphological exponents of absolute and relative tense operators, respectively, is well delimited in English, the past simple having scope over the Episode as a whole and the present perfect operating on the SoA relative to the tense of the Episode.

From a discourse perspective, the fact that the present perfect is predominantly an anterior form which establishes a link between a past event and the present moment (see Comrie 1976: 52) implies that this form cannot be used to advance the narrative sequence of events or to foreground key events in the story, a role that appears to be restricted to the past simple (or the historical present) (Dahl 1985). However, this division of labour would appear to be contradicted in at least a number of cases reported in the literature (Engel and Ritz 2000; Levey 2006; Ritz and Engel 2008; Ritz 2007, 2010; Richard and Rodríguez Louro 2016), as mentioned earlier. This will be discussed in more detail in Section 4.2.

4.1.4 Aspect

A number of aspectual distinctions are treated as operators with a function at the layer of the Configurational Property in FDG, since they specify the internal constituency of a State-of-Affairs characterized by this Property (Hengeveld and Mackenzie 2008: 210-211). A different set of aspectual distinctions are used for "event quantification", such as habitual and distributive, and are relevant at the layer of the SoA (Hengeveld and Mackenzie 2008: 179, Hengeveld 2011). In contrast to relative tense, Aspect does not have a situating function, which implies that there is flexibility for the temporal location of a State-of-Affairs characterized by aspectual distinctions (Hengeveld and Mackenzie 2008: 210).

Within the layer of the Configurational Property two distinctions are made between Phasal aspects and the Perfective-Imperfective opposition (Hengeveld and Mackenzie 2008: 210). Phasal aspect distinctions specify the relation between a phase of the development of a State-of-Affairs and a temporal reference point. Thus, Prospective Aspect characterizes a State-of-Affairs as being about to happen, Progressive Aspect as taking place at the reference point, while Resultative Aspect characterizes the State-of-Affairs as having occurred before the reference point. By contrast, the Perfective-Imperfective distinction indicates the way in which the State-of-Affairs is presented, as a single whole (Perfective) or viewed from within (Imperfective).

The present perfect can be used to express resultative aspect, "indicating the result or relevance of a SoA that started in the past" and is represented as the operator 'perf' (Keizer 2015: 144, 310). This meaning of the present perfect explains why it is commonly found with dynamic SoAs (that is, SoAs that "necessarily involve some kind of change") (Dik 1997a: 107),[19] as mentioned in Section 3.2, since the Configurational Property containing the perfect must contain a dynamic predicate with one or two arguments, one of which must be affected (or effected) by the meaning expressed by that predicate. The perfect of result can thus be used to express Accomplishments and Changes (in the FG sense), that is, dynamic and telic SoAs, which reach a natural end-point when fully achieved (Dik 1989: 92), assigning a property to the affected (or effected) referent, very often a second participant affected by or resulting from the action (represented as $(x_2)_U$). An example and its representation is given in (33).

(33) Someone has killed this woman (= this woman is dead)
(perf f^c_1: [(f_2) (x_1)$_A$ (x_2)$_U$] (f^c_1))

4.2 Analytical proposal

4.2.1 Introduction

The use of the present perfect to mark temporal progression, that is, in a temporally ordered sequence of SoAs narrating past events, appears to contradict a basic property of Episodes, as "all the SoAs within the Episode must share the feature for absolute tense" (Keizer 2015: 123). If the past form of verbs in a temporally ordered sequence specifies "the time of occurrence of an Episode in relation to the time of speaking, independently from any other Episodes" (Keizer 2015: 298), the unexpected switch to the present perfect within that sequence must bring with it a specific function and would be a reflection of a semantic (or pragmatic) property that must be captured at the RL (or IL). Otherwise, the choice of the present perfect cannot be reasonably explained.

As seen in Section 3.3, the use of the present perfect in narratives is a phenomenon which has been characterized by a multiplicity of functions in the literature. Having shown these functions, the aim of this section will be to make a proposal for where to account for the alternating use of the present perfect in narratives using the architecture of FDG.

19 Dik (1989: 90-98; 1997a: 106-115) uses the term 'Event' to refer to dynamic SoAs, which are further classified into [+controlled] (that is, Actions) and [-controlled] (that is, Processes). Actions and Processes are also subclassified on account of their telicity into Accomplishments (telic SoAs) vs Activities (non-telic SoAs) and Changes (telic SoAs) vs Dynamisms (non-telic SoAs), respectively. This typology is, however, not followed in Hengeveld and Mackenzie (2008).

The best option is one that is supported by some formal properties as only those cognitive, discourse or interactional aspects with a formal reflection in the language should be captured by this theory. In Section 3.2 I presented an overview of different formal features that have been reported in the literature on this topic. In order to provide further support for the analysis of the narrative use of the present perfect within FDG, I analysed the switch to the present perfect in the *UWA Narrative Corpus*. The main results are offered below.

Firstly, the analysis of the narratives in the *UWA Narrative Corpus* provides further evidence of the relevance of the clustering effect mentioned in Section 3.2: 35,1% of the total number of narratives that were analysed (that is, 76 out of 216 narratives) contain examples of tense switch to the present perfect, of which 43,4% (that is, 33 out of 76 narratives where switch to the present perfect was found) illustrate the use of the present perfect in clusters (that is, there is a sequence of, at least, two verbs in the present perfect). Some examples are given in (34).[20]

(34a) *The cheap flight and its bad surprises (not arriving on the same day at all)*

I suppose how I got to London is a good story. [...] Yeah. [...] So like a cheap flight. You know when you go online, [...] and you've never travelled before – or not much at all – and you're just looking for the cheap- cheapest stuff. [mm] And so I'**ve gotten** a- a Royal Brunei flight to Frankfurt ... from Perth. And um [...] I think I booked it thinking that it was the same day that I was arriving in Frankfurt, [...] like a sixteen-hour flight or something. Anyway [...]. So I'**ve started** [...] um yeah packing and everything. And then I'**ve looked** at my um tickets. And I'**ve** just **realised** it's actually the next day. (*UWA Narrative corpus*)

(34b) *Going ballistic*

Well I just got back from holidays [...] er "Going ballistic" [...] I had a moment [...] of about a minute, where my dad ... We had three bags when we got off the plane. [...] And when we got off the bus we had two. And I'**ve turned around**. And I looked at him. And he'**s looked** at me. And I'**ve looked** forward again. I'**ve looked back** again with this look and he'**s gone**, "Where's the other bag?" And I'**ve gone**, "You're kidding! Are you kidding?! [...] (*UWA Narrative corpus*)

Secondly, as regards the use of adverbial modification, it has not been found to be very prominent in the *UWA Narrative Corpus*, which can be explained on the grounds that adverbials are optional elements. Thus, only 10,5% of the examples (that is, 8 out of 76 narratives) contain adverbials of time indicating temporal progression in combination with the present perfect (e.g. *then, immediately, the next minute, the next day*). An example is given in (35).

(35) *Nuns cutting the queue*

Queue cutting ah! Do I have a story about queue cutting?! When I was in Rome... We had to wait- I think we got there at- We went to the Vatican. [...] And we had to queue. [...] So we managed to hit right at the front. Right. [...] We're all excited, you know. We reach the front. We're- we're at the front. And we got there earl-- We had our little breakfast packs and everything else. And **the next minute** we'*ve turned around* and there's five nuns that've jumped the queue in front of us. (*UWA Narrative Corpus*)

Likewise, the use of the present perfect with temporal modifiers that anchor an event or a sequence of events at a definite temporal point in the past is not very significant in the *UWA Narrative Corpus*. Being optional elements, this type of modifiers are more likely to occur in specific types of narration, like police reports, where the temporal location of events is crucial. However, some examples are found, as shown in (36).

20 The narratives retrieved from the *UWA Narrative Corpus* have been adapted in this article, for the sake of clarity and simplification: all the sections uttered by the interviewee's companion, some passages that are not relevant for the discussion (for example, digressions) or indications of body gestures (like laughter, lip smack, chuckle, etc.) have been omitted.

(36) *Surf trip, scary moment in waves*
When I was sixteen. 'Cause we used to surf a bit. And er went on a- did a surf trip with six other mates. Went down to Binningup and the biggest wave I've ever surfed before that was about six foot so, bit over y-- my head, you know, when you're standing up and you face the wave. That was pretty hairy and that was the day before. **This day** *I've wok-- We've woken up* and you wake up and, we're in tents and the ground would sort of vibrate. (*UWA Narrative Corpus*)

Interestingly, however, time clauses introduced by *when* are found in the proximity of clauses containing verbs in the present perfect, so that the narrated events are initially located in the past. This is illustrated in (36).

As far as the type of verb is concerned, action verbs make up the largest set of all verbs in the complicating action of the narratives of *UWA Narrative Corpus*. Specifically, 50,2% of all the tokens in the present perfect (that is, 113 out of 225 verbs) are verbs that denote some kind of movement (e.g. *walk*, *come*, *go*, *jump, push forward, race, roll around, run*), followed by quotative verbs (e.g. *go, say*), which represent 12% of the total number of verbs (that is, 27 out of 225 verbs), verbs of perception or cognition (8,8%, that is, 20 out of 225 verbs) (e.g. *look at, realize*) and verbs denoting some kind of change (6,2%, that is, 14 verbs) (e.g. *knock into, freak out*). Many of these verbs denote telic events, that is, SoAs with a natural terminal point. In short, although examples of the use of quotative *go* (and more marginally *say, ask* and *yell*) were found, the use of reportative verbs is nevertheless not higher than the use of other semantic types, like verbs denoting different kinds of movement.

A final noteworthy property that has been found to co-occur with the present perfect in the *UWA Narrative Corpus* is the use of the discourse marker/conjunction *so*. An example is offered in (37).

(37) *A car crash*
I had a car crash, on Dampier Highway, when I was about nineteen. er th-- there was heaps of water on the road and I couldn't see it. And I got to the water, and it just ripped the steering wheel out of my hands. And I went flying through the bush. And I came into the opposite side of the road. And there was two cars coming at me. And I said, "I'm not killing anyone." **So** I*'ve darted* back into the bush. And the car done like a five-forty spin and I ended up facing the right way, in the emergency stopping lane on the opposite side of the road. [...] (*UWA Narrative Corpus*)

This property, which is only mentioned in passing by Fludernik (1991: 382) as regards the alternating use of the historical present, appears to be relevant in the corpus analysed: 46%, that is, 35 narratives, almost half of the total number of 76 narratives where the present perfect is used, contain examples where the switch to the present perfect is introduced by *so*.

Summing up, a relatively systematic property that co-occurs with the switch to the present perfect in narratives is its use in clusters, very often preceded by discourse marker *so* and the use with action verbs denoting Accomplishments and Changes (that is, telic SoAs) (see Section 3.2). In addition, the possibility of combining adverbs expressing temporal sequence like *then* or those anchoring the SoA at a specific time in the past, such as *this day,* with a verb tense which is not used for that purpose might be an indication that the choice of the present perfect has a non-conventional function. These properties cannot be considered to be fully systematic, and this is especially so in the case of temporal modification, but this is to be expected from the optional nature of adverbial modification. The choice of which sequences to highlight by the switch to the present perfect is also made by the speaker either strategically or unconsciously, hence it is not completely predictable either. And yet, the mere fact that certain properties co-occur and that this happens more than once seems to suggest that this is not coincidental and that it should be paid attention to in a functional theory of grammar. Drawing on these properties, in Sections 4.2.2 and 4.2.3 a proposal will be made to analyse narrative uses of the present perfect at two different levels of FDG's architecture, the Representational Level and the Interpersonal Level.

4.2.2 The narrative present perfect at the Representational Level

(i) Resultative aspect

As mentioned in Section 3.2, the present perfect has been found in combination with temporal adverbs locating the action on a definite point in the past, as seen in (10), repeated in (38) for convenience.

(38) A woman driver *has been killed* when her vehicle hit a 4WD towing a caravan on the Great Northern Highway south of Northampton around 10.30 am Sunday 4 September 2005. (Ian Hasleby, 5.9.2005, WA Police Media) (Ritz 2010: 3405)

In (38) the two events described can be regarded as forming part of the same Episode since they show episodic unity, in spite of being immediately subsequent, as the killing of the woman is a consequence of her vehicle's hitting the 4WD. The use of the past simple tense in the time clause creates some expectations for the use of the past simple in the main clause. However, it is not the past but the present perfect that is used, in order to shift the focus on the result of the action.

The adverbial clause introduced by *when* in (38) is analysed as a modifier at the layer of the SoA in FDG, more specifically one expressing relative time of occurrence, as the killing must be understood as taking place after her vehicle hits the caravan, or concurrently with the hit. This modifier falls within the scope of episodic absolute time modifiers, as shown in (38), where the temporal specification *Sunday 4 September 2005* has scope over the previous SoA modifier.

The function of the present perfect in (38) and similar cases is to focus on the result, or more generally, the current relevance of an action located in the past: the driver is dead now. A possible explanation for the unexpected combination of the perfect with temporal modifiers expressing definite time is that the speaker wishes to make clear that the result of a past SoA still holds at the time of speaking, so that the constraint to combine with a temporal modifier expressing a definite point in the past is cancelled (see Skala this issue). In these cases, the expression of resultativity precedes the expression of location in time, without the latter affecting the former (Olbertz, pc). This is indeed a property that makes Aspect different from relative tense, since a State-of-Affairs specified by aspectual distinctions can be located at any point in time (Hengeveld and Mackenzie 2008: 210).

The use of the present perfect might thus be regarded as a marker of resultative aspect, performing a function at the layer of the Configurational Property when combined with modifiers of temporal location (see Section 4.1.4).

Secondly, as mentioned in Section 3.2, the majority of verbs in the present perfect are action verbs, that is, they denote dynamic SoAs. Many of these verbs also designate Accomplishments or Changes, that is, SoAs reaching a terminal point, which lends further support to the function of the present perfect as a marker of resultative aspect. Thus, the present perfect forms of *kill* in (38), of *grab* and *give* in (39a) or of *take off* in (39b) focus on the resulting states, as someone is now dead (in (38)), has the cup (in (39a)), or is shirtless (in (39b)).

(39a) *The fight before they broke up*

And like the- the fight we had before we broke up was because we went to her friend's new housewarming party. And there was a girl there that was going to get a cup. And she couldn't reach 'em. **So** I'*ve grabbed* the cup and *given* it to her. (*UWA Narrative Corpus*)

(39b) *Bitten by a scorpion*

[...] Oh I had an incident when I was a very small- [....] Oh in Vietnam. [...] Yeah, I was too. [...] 'Cause you- [...] you get all sweaty up there. It's the tropics so you get all sweaty and that- [...] It was- it was- [...] it was out in a- out in a bush um doing an exercise. Sorry? [...] In the jungle. Yes. It's a jungle. [...] It's a jungle there. Bush, jungle, whatever. And and ah sweaty- you sweat all the time. **So** I'*ve taken* my shirt *off*. *Put* it on a bush just to dry it. (*UWA Narrative Corpus*)

Finally, the frequent use of *so* in combination with the present perfect can also be explained in connection with its function as an aspectual marker, as the prototypical function of this discourse marker is to introduce a clause of result or decision.[21] It is therefore not surprising that it is found in combination with the present perfect to mark the beginning of a SoA or a sequence of SoAs, characterized by a Configurational Property, which can be seen as the result of previous SoAs, as shown in (39). In the preceding narratives, the present perfect is used after *so* to express actions that the speaker performs as a result of the previous events or situations: the woman's inability to reach the cup in (39a) and the man being sweaty in (39b) lead to the actions expressed in present perfect that are introduced by *so*.

(ii) Episodic marker

The usual occurrence of the present perfect in clusters (see Section 3.2) provides support for an analysis of the use of the present perfect as an episodic marker, that is, a sequence of SoAs in the present perfect might be analysed as constituting an Episode of their own. As mentioned earlier, maintenance of one tense has been regarded to have the function of grouping events into one scene or episode, while switching separates events from one another (Wolfson 1979, Schiffrin 1981: 82). Although the use of labels is not consistent, Wolfson and Schiffrin's events appear to match FDG's notion of Episode (see Section 4.1.2, see also Silva-Corvalán 1983: 770 and Fludernik 1991). This is in accordance with Mustanoja's (1990: 506-7) suggestion that the present perfect "may be used to introduce and end up a series of events".

Thus, the potential problem posed by the expression in the present perfect of a SoA which denotes a subsequent action in a sequence of temporally-ordered events in the past might be solved by considering the change of verb tense as a marker of a new Episode. In other words, if it is true that absolute tense is an operator at the level of the Episode, and that all SoAs within the same Episode must share the same mark for absolute tense, this forces an analysis of the use of the present perfect as a mark of the beginning of a new Episode that the speaker wants to present as salient. This is illustrated in (40), where a witness is narrating a car accident.

(40) *The worst car accident witnessed*

And the worst was a guy. This woman instead of stopping at the stop signs – as someone might do – she saw the traffic coming er eastbound on Sue Road. So she tried to gun it with that traffic on the- you know, coming from her left. No way was she gonna make it. She slowed down to maybe forty at the stop sign. No way she was gonna stop if there was something coming from the right. Gunned it, hit like an old seventy-seven Corolla, which is a tiny little tin box. Hit it hard. T-boned. He goes and- 'cause I've- I've got a close-up footage 'cause I'd just been dropped off by my dad after the beach. So I was standing on the corner next to where she hit him. He*'s gone up* on two wheels, *gone* one-eighty sort of heading back the direction he*'s come*, still on two wheels. The cars behind him *have slammed* on their brakes, just as he*'s start-- completed* the full three-sixty on two wheels. And he just landed. And I saw him. [...] (*UWA Narrative Corpus*)

While the speaker starts narrating the preceding events leading to the accident in the past simple in (40), he/she switches to the present and then to the present perfect to narrate the crucial part of the accident. A very salient Episode is thus depicted by a sequence of verbs in the present perfect, as if zooming in on one specific part of the narration. A simplified representation in FDG is shown in (41).

(41) (past ep_1: [sim (e_1) ... (e_{1+N})]^{ep}) (narr-perf ep_2: [(e_1) ... (e_{1+N})]^{ep})

The representation in (41) shows that the SoAs in the first Episode are marked by a simultaneous operator (sim), which yields the past tense form when combined with the past tense of the Episode. Though a series of subsequent SoAs can still be part of one and the same Episode as long as they show unity or continuity, the use of the present perfect for the expression of a SoA in a sequence of temporally ordered events indicates

21 Fludernik (1991: 382, 386) mentions some examples where *so* marks resultatives and the beginning of episodes.

a change of Episode. The representation of the present perfect by means of 'narr-perf' indicates that the meaning of the present perfect as an anterior operator (relative tense) or as a resultative operator (phasal aspect) is cancelled out in these cases. Instead, temporal progression in a sequence of Episodes that were previously located in the past is expressed. Therefore, in these cases the present perfect competes with the simple past, as it makes reference to SoAs that happened before the time of speaking.

From an FDG perspective it could be stated that, by means of the use of clusters of verbs in the present perfect, coherence between different SoAs within one Episode is achieved. As a matter of fact, this is not exclusive to some varieties of English but appears to be a property shared by other languages.[22]

In addition, the switch to the present perfect can be related to the change of participants, as mentioned earlier as regard example (16). Similar cases were found in the *UWA Narrative Corpus,* as shown in (42) and (43).

(42) *At the casino: annoying people in the elevator*
[...] we went to the casino once. And we'd had a few drinks before we get in there. And we're going up the escalator and **he's** kind of- **he's** at that level of drunkenness that **he** *gets* to where **he** just *gets* to be flappy Dereck. [...] And **he** *gets* to the top like just obviously *doesn't care* about anyone else there [...] And **he**'*s wait* for like- *there was* like **four people** going on the escalator. [...] And **he**'*s* just *hit* the emergency stop. And they all just, "Oh good job dick." [...] **They** just *get pissed off*. [...] **They'**re like- **they** *stopped* for that. And then **he'***s*- instead of like, "Oh, let's run away." **He**'*s* just *gone* to the other side and *waited* for people to go down. And then **he'***s did* it again. [...] (*UWA Narrative Corpus*)

In (42) while the present is used to refer to Derek in the orientation, the present perfect is used to narrate the sequence of events of the complicating action in which Dereck is the subject. These uses of the present perfect are interrupted by examples of the present and the past when talking about the people on the escalator. The use of the present perfect is finally resumed when referring to Dereck again.

(43) *Woman hitting an emu with her car*
I haven't hit an animal but I know- I saw a car in front of me hit an emu down south. The stupid woman. **She** *was driving*. Do you know you get your- like the roads are a lot better now. The dual carriage way most of the way but this was a single lane. Going home f-- on the weekend. **She** *was speeding*. **She** *overtook* me and another guy on a bend in the road. Anyway so **we** *get* round the corner. And **she**'*s* just *got* ahead of us. Next thing **this emu** just *came out* of nowhere, ((INAUDIBLE)), *ran out* to the road. **She'** s *clipped* the back of it and **I** *saw* it just stayed and *went* <WOBBLING NOISE AND GESTURE> like that. And *ran off* into the bush. And I *was* thinking, "Oh poor thing, I hope it's ok", you know. I was thinking, "What a stupid, stupid girl!" (*UWA Narrative Corpus*)

In (43) a switch to the present perfect takes place to start the crucial part of the story referring to the woman driver (the initial part is narrated in the past), but then the tense is changed back to the past when the emu is introduced into the story. The narrator switches back to the present perfect when referring to the woman.

Bearing in mind the definition of Episodes as "a thematically coherent combination of SoAs characterized by unity of Time (t), Location (l), and Individuals (x)" (Hengeveld and Mackenzie 2008: 157; Keizer 2015: 117), this lends further support to the analysis of the use of the present perfect in narratives as episodic markers.

Generally speaking, however, the switch to the present perfect cannot be concluded to be definitely connected with a change of participant, as very often no change of participant occurs when the switch takes place or different participants may alternate in the use of the present perfect.

22 Hengeveld and Mackenzie (2008: 157) and Keizer (2015: 118-119) mention the use of markers for 'same subject' or 'different subject' as well as tense markers applying to a sequence of clauses for coherence within an Episode in Tauya (McDonald 1990: 218).

Tentatively, it could be suggested that in some cases where a sequence of temporally ordered SoAs shows continuity of time, location and individuals, the use of the present perfect in clusters/chains might be seen as a special narrative construction with some kind of function, like marking some part of the sequence of events as a salient Episode, because new, recent, unexpected information is given. The switch to the present perfect in these Episodes might thus be regarded to have a pragmatic function. I will return to this in Section 4.2.3.

Secondly, as mentioned in Sections 3.2 and 4.2.1, the present perfect has been found with unexpected temporal modification. Combination with temporal modifiers with scope on different layers at the RL (SoAs or Episodes) might also mark the specific function of the present perfect in narratives.

As mentioned earlier, the present perfect may appear with temporal modifiers that locate the action at a definite point in the past. In addition, it has been found in combination with modifiers expressing temporal progression, such as *then* (see Section 3.2). From an FDG perspective, the adverb *then* would be analyzed as a Modifier of the Episode (see Keizer 2015: 121-122). However, this analysis implies a clash between lexical and grammatical information at the Morphosyntactic Level, as *then* is a lexical means to introduce a subsequent SoA in a sequence of past events, which creates an expectation for an inflectional past form. This problem is avoided if the SoAs expressed in the present perfect are considered to be part of a different Episode.

In Spanish, the switch from the past to the historical present often co-occurs with *y de repente* (Silva-Corvalán 1983). Similar observations have been made in English, where *all of a sudden* has been found to co-occur with the use of the historical present. Wolfson (1979) points out that this phrase is used to introduce an unexpected or dramatic event. She argues that the use of *all of a sudden* as well as a change of the scene and participants is meant to express a different event, so that the switch to the present can be analyzed as "a structural marker of a segmentation of events" (174).

Levey (2006: 137) gives the example in (44) from the *Queen Mary Narrative Corpus* (Cheshire 2005), in which it is the present perfect that co-occurs with this adverbial. In his view, this suggests that the present perfect can be strategically used by speakers to mark a turn of events within narrative structure.

(44) and it *was* quite a big document it *was* like thirty pages long
a. and **all of a sudden** it*'s gone* through
b. and the printer*'s* just *started* printing
c. it*'s got* to page thirty
d. and it*'s kept* going
e. and I *couldn't* stop the printer . . .

As Wolfson's events seem to correspond to FDG's Episodes, the analysis of the use of the present perfect in narratives as episodic markers is consistent with Wolfson's and Levey's earlier proposals.

Further evidence for the analysis of a sequence of different SoAs in the present perfect as constituting a new Episode is provided by the frequent use after *so* that has been found in the corpus analysed (see Section 4.2.1).

In spoken English, *so* is a highly versatile discourse marker performing several functions. In addition to its basic use as resultative/inferential discourse marker, it can be used to take the discourse back to the main topic after a digression, to mark a discourse boundary, and to mark a potential turn transition (see Schiffrin 1987, Müller 2005), which is consistent with the analysis of these strings of present perfect verbs introduced by *so* as Episodes of their own. Example (45) illustrates this.

(45) *Baby tiger snake, joke to scare a mate*
And the other time I've come across a snake was good fun. It was a baby tiger snake. And it would have been about the width of a pencil. [....] Maybe a foot long. And er it was when I was living in Chidlow down by er Bibra Lake. [...]. And I had some mates coming over that arvo for a beer. And I thought, "This could be fun." 'Cause one of my mates does not like creepy crawlies at all. So I went inside and put it in a lunchbox. And we had two beers and I went, "Oh Ron, that's it, I've got something for you." And he's- he's perked up thinking, "Yes!", you know. He's more than happy to receive presents. **So** I*'ve*

> *gone in*, *come back* out the door, and as I'*ve come back* out the door I'*ve done* this Oscar-winning fake, "Oh, I've tripped." as I'*ve opened* the thing. And this baby tiger snake *has landed* directly in his lap. He'*s jumped up* screaming, while me and my mate are screaming laughing. 'Cause my mate got there early and I told him what I was gonna do. Yeah, Ron did not think it was nearly as funny as we did. He wanted to punch me but, yeah we called him a sook. It was awesome fun. It really was. He still hasn't forgiven us to this day but. (*UWA Narrative Corpus*).

The speaker in (45) starts his narration setting the scene in the past, but he switches to the present perfect to initiate a new Episode that constitutes the relevant part of the story, when he proceeds to tell the joke he played to his mate.

Summing up, the present perfect is used in the context of two different types of temporal modification with scope on the Episode or the SoA. In addition, the present perfect is usually found in clusters and following *so*. Crucially, the use of temporal adverbials like those illustrated above cannot be regarded as examples of misuse, but rather reveals that the present perfect may have a non-conventional function (in addition to its canonical function as a mark of resultative aspect). In these non-standard cases the present perfect seems to be taking over the role of the past simple, anchoring a SoA or a series of SoAs on a definite time in the past, or contributing to the temporal progression of the events in a narrative when demarcating different Episodes. This non-conventional use of the present perfect would appear to imply a widening of scope in the function of the perfect/resultative operator, as in such cases the present perfect does not operate on the Configurational Property but on a higher layer, the Episode. Scope increase along hierarchically-organized semantic layers (that is, from lower to higher layers) is used to explain processes of grammaticalization within FDG theory (Hengeveld 2011, see also Olbertz, this Issue, for an FDG account of the grammaticalization of the perfect). No claims are made in this paper that grammaticalization is involved in the case under study, however. In any case, the use of the present perfect in all the different cases mentioned earlier would reasonably have to be located at the Representational Level.

4.2.3 The narrative present perfect at the Interpersonal Level

In the preceding sections it has been shown that the relational meaning of the present perfect as an anterior form used to set a link between a past event and the present time is cancelled out by its occurrence in specific parts of narratives, like specific Episodes of the complicating action. In other words, the time reference of the present perfect is changed by its use in the complicating action part of a narrative in alternation with other verb tenses, like the past (or the historical present). It could therefore be suggested that this use is rooted at a higher discourse level.

The suggestion that the function of tense switch might be rooted in discourse has been put forward by different scholars. Among them, Levey (2006: 148) points out that it is not the use of the present perfect, but its alternating use with other verb tenses and in specific parts of a narrative that is assigned a discourse structuring function as a device to separate episodes from one another (see also Fludernik 1991: 374-375).[23]

From an FDG perspective this raises the question of how or where to account for this function and whether it should be accounted for at all within the grammar, as the use of the present perfect appears to be triggered by the discourse type, that is, by contextual factors, and the contextual component lies outside the grammar proper in FDG. Yet, one of the principles of the theory is that any linguistic utterance should be considered in the larger discourse context in which it appears (Hengeveld and Mackenzie 2008: 9). This applies to the case under study, where a grammatical property is sanctioned by a discourse type, whose structure delimits the area in which tense switch occurs. The use of the present perfect can thus be partially

23 The same point has been made by other scholars as regards the historical present, like Wolfson (1979) and Silva-Corvalán (1983): "it is only when CHP [conversational historical present] is seen, not uniquely as a verb tense, but as part of an alternation set – which must be examined at the level of the discourse, rather than at that of the sentence alone – that we can understand its function: the organization of the narrative" (Wolfson 1979: 181).

predicted in specific sections of the narrative. Some of the uses of the present perfect illustrated in this paper would have been inappropriate in isolated utterances or outside the discourse type that motivates their use. This implies that tense switch to the present perfect cannot be accounted for on a sentence-by-sentence basis.

When dealing with the hierarchical structure of discourse, Dik (1997b: 422) points out that in developing a discourse the speaker takes a number of decisions that involve the discourse as a whole, such as entering the discourse event or choosing a genre. In his view, these decisions "open up a bracketing within which certain things can be done, while other things are excluded, both as regards form and as regards content."

The aim of FDG is not to provide an account of discourse relations, but grammatical properties triggered by discourse should be accommodated within the theory, as pointed out by Hengeveld and Mackenzie (2008: 42):

> FDG, despite its name, is not a functionally oriented Discourse Grammar (in the sense of an account of discourse relations). Rather, it is an account of the inner structure of Discourse Acts that is sensitive to the impact of their use in discourse upon their form.

In Sections 3.2 and 4.2.1 it has been shown that there is a tendency for a number of different formal properties to accompany the use of the present perfect in narratives that reveal a non-conventional use of this verb form. These cases of tense switch have been analysed as a strategy used by the speaker to mark specific parts of a narration as salient by some scholars (Levey 2006, Ritz 2010, Walker 2011). This might suggest that its use is not only relevant at the layers of the Configurational Property or the Episode (that is, at the Representational Level) but also at a higher level, the Interpersonal Level.

In order to accommodate these uses of the present perfect in narratives within the grammatical component, I draw on Anstey's (2009) proposal for the postulation of one type of Move specific to narratives.[24] By positing 'Narrative Moves', the unexpected use of the present perfect in narratives can be explained as a choice rooted at the Interpersonal Level.

Thus, the choice of the present perfect over the past to express a temporally ordered sequence might be a strategy of the speaker to mark specific parts of the narration as salient, as illustrated in (46) and (47), so that these uses could be regarded to have a function captured by some kind of operator of the Interpersonal Level.

(46) *Incident bodyboarding*
I have- I've never really liked the beach but I know, I know that looking back on my life that I did have an incident when I was down the beach with a mate. And um we were body- bodyboarding on some [...] short boards and um [...] I caught a wave in and my board dug in- It- it- it hit something anyway and the water which m-- as you're riding it like this, it'**s dug in** and **come back** and **smacked** me right in the um in the- in the guts and **winded** me. And then- Obviously you'**ve**- you **rolled around** underwater for a little while. [...] And you'**ve walked out** of the water and **gone**, "Eh". (*UWA Narrative Corpus*)

(47) *Embarrassing moment (first day at first job), ladies' toilet*
[...] I remember I got a job once with a company when I was very young um. [...] My very very first day er I had to be there like at seven o'clock in the morning. [...] So I was a bit nervous um. [...] Wanted to make a good impression. And um [...] I remember driving to work and I was busting to go to the toilet. Busting. And I knew- I couldn't stop before I went to work. [...] So I got there, parked the car, went in. Didn't know anyone. [...] I need to go to the toilet. Like I really really had to- [...] And um I remember walking into this very very large mess hall [...] a very very large room with jus-- just a series of tables and at the end of the room was the toilets, right? [...] And this room was packed because everyone was getting ready to go to work [...] I'**ve walked** in. [...] Everyone's sort of staring at you 'cause you're the new guy [...] And because I was busting I didn't actually look at the symbol above the door and I'**ve**

24 Anstey (2009) draws a distinction between Narration Move (MoveNrtn) (spoken narration) and transitional Narrative Move (a Move that starts or ends up a paragraph in written narrative discourse), which is, however, not relevant for the present purposes.

> **walked** into the ladies' toilet. And er I'**ve gone** in, **sat down** to do my business, and **looked** to my left and **seen** one of those sanitary bins and **thought**, "Mm [...] it's a bit weird for a boys' toilet." [...] (*UWA Narrative Corpus*)

In (46) the speaker starts narrating a past incident while he was bodyboarding using the simple past. He then switches to the present perfect to tell the details of the incident. A salient part of the story is also made more prominent in (47), when the speaker starts using the present perfect to narrate an embarrassing moment in his life once the scene is set in the past.

The question is raised whether this marking of a section of the narration as salient should be explained in terms of an interpersonal operator, such as Mirative or Emphasis, or by means of a pragmatic function, like Focus.

Drawing on previous proposals by Mustanoja (1960) and Fleischman (1990) (see Section 3.3), the narrative use of the present perfect in these and similar cases will be considered to have an emphatic function (see Section 3.3). In FDG Emphasis is seen as the result of the Speaker's intensification of different layers at the Interpersonal Level, that is, an Emphatic operator can be assigned at different layers within the Interpersonal Level: the Illocution, the Discourse Act, Ascriptive Subacts or Referential Subacts. An example of Emphasis at the layer of the the Discourse Act is shown in (48).

(48) a. ¡Que no me gusta nada esa película!
'I don't like that movie at all!'

b. ¿¡Que si vienes mañana!?
'Are you coming tomorrow?!'

c. ¡Que no te marches mañana!
'Don't you leave tomorrow!' (Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2008: 67)

The fact that this use of *que* applies regardless of the Illocution lends support to an analysis of this case as an Emphatic operator at the layer of the Discourse Act. This flexibility is not found, however, in the case of the narrative use of the present perfect, as the default Illocution of narratives clauses is Declarative (see Dik 1997b: 419).

In contrast to Emphasis, Focus is a pragmatic function of the Communicated Content that involves the speaker's strategic selection of *new information*. Although Emphasis partially resembles Focus, it is different from Focus, as it is not necessarily new information that is brought to the fore in the case of Emphasis, but specific sequences of events to which the Speaker wishes to draw especial attention (note that the passages in the present perfect are usually qualified as "dramatic", "vivid", "climatic" in the literature, which might well correspond to the function performed by Emphasis).

As regards the mirative operator, the reason why this analysis is discarded is that the switch to the present perfect does not necessarily imply that the narrated event is surprising to the Speaker. [25] Thus, in (46) the events narrated in the first part (including the board digging in, coming back, smacking and winding the speaker) are very surprising and appear to fit the definition of mirativity. However, the second part is not surprising, according to the Speaker himself/herself, who uses the adverb *obviously*. This seems to indicate that the event is not unexpected and makes the analysis with a mirative operator inappropriate.

By means of the choice of the present perfect some parts of a Linguistic Expression are marked as salient by the speaker so that he gets the Addressee's attention. In some cases, these might correspond to surprising events, but the use of the present perfect is not restricted to these cases and would appear to have a more general function (that is, sometimes the events marked in the present perfect would be new information, sometimes surprising information, sometimes neither of the previous).

---

25 In FDG the category of mirativity is considered to be related to the informational status, more specifically, the newsworthiness, of the content of a speech act, and hence it is located at the layer of the Communicated Content (see Hengeveld, 2017: 29)

Since these uses of the present perfect are licensed by the specific discourse type in which they occur, we could explain them proceeding in a top-down fashion, by saying that the Interpersonal Level consists of a number of Narrative Moves (NarrM), containing various Discourse Acts, as well as all the subsequently lower interpersonal layers (see Section 4.1.1). Drawing on Keizer (2015: 47), a simplified representation for a Narrative Move is shown in (49).

(49) $(\text{NarrM}_1\text{: } (\text{A}_1\text{:}[(\text{F}_1\text{: ill}) (\text{P}_1)_\text{S} (\text{P}_2)_\text{A} (\text{C}_1\text{: } [\ldots (\text{T}_1) (\text{R}_1)\ldots]^\text{C})]^\text{A})^\text{NarrM}$

A discourse function of the present perfect within Narrative Moves is only possible in a narrative discourse situation. However, the function of the present perfect as an aspectual (resultative) marker with scope on the Configurational Property at the Representational Level is independent of its use in narratives. This explains why combination with unexpected modifiers is also found outside narratives (see Skala, this Issue). The different functions of the present perfect at the Representational and the Interpersonal Levels are, however, not mutually exclusive. Instead, some interactions can be found, so that it is possible to integrate an analysis at both levels. For example, the use of the present perfect as an Episodic marker at the Representational Level is not incompatible with an Emphatic function at the Interpersonal Level, when the Speaker chooses to give prominence to the Communicated Content of one (or a series of immediately subsequent) Discourse Act(s) in the past in his narration. Tentatively, this inter-level relation can be represented as shown in (50).[26]

(50) IL: $(\text{NarrM}_1\text{: } [(\text{A}_1)\text{: } [(\text{F}_1\text{: DECL}) (\text{P}_1)_\text{S} (\text{P}_2)_\text{A} \text{ emph } (\text{C}_1\text{: } [\ldots]^\text{C})]^\text{A} \quad]^\text{NarrM})$

$\updownarrow$

RL: $(\text{past ep}_1\text{: } [\text{sim } (\text{e}_1) \ldots (\text{e}_{1+N})]^\text{ep}) (\text{narr-perf ep}_2\text{: } [(\text{e}_1) \ldots (\text{e}_{1+N})]^\text{ep}$

The different functions of the present perfect in narratives and the scope at different levels of representation within the architecture of FDG are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Functions of the present perfect in narratives and FDG's levels of representation.

LEVEL	**INTERPERSONAL LEVEL**			**REPRESENTATIONAL LEVEL**			
Layer	**Move (M) NarrMove**	**Discourse Act (A)**	**Communicated Content (C)**	**Proposition (p)**	**Episode (ep)**	**SoA (e)**	**Configurational property (f^c)**
Function			Emphasis		New Episode		Resultative aspect

Table 1 shows that the use of the switch to the present perfect in narratives makes its contribution at both the Representational Level and the Interpersonal Level. Tense-aspect morphology is used in narratives not only to mark narrative boundaries (that is, as an episodic marker at the Representational Level) but also for discourse-pragmatic purposes to mark information saliency, highlighting crucial material of the story (that is, as an emphatic device at the Interpersonal Level) (see Fleischman 1990: 168). As argued by Anstey (2009: 840) in his analysis of the biblical Hebrew Quatal verb in narratives and narration, it should be avoided giving precedence to semantics by choosing an analysis within the Representational Level, or on the contrary, giving precedence to discourse factors by choosing an analysis at the Interpersonal Level.

5 Conclusion

The use of the present perfect in narratives has been analysed as serving various functions captured at two different levels of the architecture of FDG. Firstly, the use of this form can be seen to perform a function at

26 These representations are not intended to be fully-detailed and should only be understood as provisional ways of accounting for the questions raised.

the Representational Level, as a marker of resultative aspect or signalling the beginning of new Episodes in narratives. However, the function of tense switching to the present perfect cannot be appropriately understood without considering the specific discourse type where this use is mainly found, and it can also be seen as playing a fundamental role at a higher discourse level. From an FDG perspective, tense switching to the present perfect has been regarded to perform a role at the Interpersonal Level, where it is sanctioned by the narrative discourse type, serving as an emphatic device used by the Speaker to mark specific parts of the narration (in the complicating action) as salient.

Acknowledgements: This paper was presented at the FDG-Workshop on "Expressions of tense, aspect, mood, evidentiality and polarity" (Amsterdam, June 2017). I am grateful to the participants in this workshop, particularly to Evelien Keizer, for helpful suggestions. The comments by three anonymous reviewers are also gratefully acknowledged. Last but not least, I am indebted to Sophie Richard, who allowed me to use her corpus of narratives (UWA Narrative Corpus). The usual disclaimers apply.

References

Anstey, Matthew. 2009. The Biblical Hebrew Qatal verb: a functional discourse grammar analysis. *Linguistics* 47(4): 825-844.
Asher, Nicholas and Lascarides, Alex. 2003. *Logics of Conversation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Bauer, Laurie. 1994. *Watching English change: An introduction to the study of linguistic change in standard Englishes in the twentieth century*. London: Longman.
Cheshire, Jenny. 2005. *The Queen Mary narrative corpus*. London: Queen Mary, University of London.
Comrie, Bernard. 1976. *Aspect*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Cox, Rebecca. 2005. *Preterite uses of the present perfect in New Zealand English narratives: A case study*. Christchurch: University of Canterbury MA thesis.
Dahl, Östen. 1985. *Tense and aspect systems*. New York: Blackwell.
De Lancey, Scott. 2001. The mirative and evidentiality. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33.3: 369-382.
Denison, David. 1999. Syntax. In Romaine, Suzanne (ed.), *The Cambridge history of the English language*, vol. 4, 92-329. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Dik, Simon C. 1989. *The Theory of Functional Grammar. Part I: the Structure of the Clause*. Dordrecht: Foris.
Dik, Simon C. 1997a. *The Theory of Functional Grammar. Part I: Complex and Derived Constructions* (Functional Grammar Series 21). Edited by Kees Hengeveld. Berlin and New York, NY: Mouton de Gruyter.
Dik, Simon C. 1997b. *The Theory of Functional Grammar. Part II: Complex and Derived Constructions* (Functional Grammar Series 21). Edited by Kees Hengeveld. Berlin and New York, NY: Mouton de Gruyter.
Elsness, Johan. 1997. *The perfect and the preterite in contemporary and earlier English* (Topics in English Linguistics, 21). Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
Engel, Dulcie and Marie-Eve Ritz. 2000. The use of the present perfect in Australian English. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 20(2): 119-140.
Fleischman, Suzanne. 1990. *Tense and narrativity: From medieval performance to modern fiction*. London: Routledge.
Fludernik, Monika. 1991. The historical present tense yet again: Tense switching and narrative dynamics in oral and quasi-oral storytelling. *Text* 11.3: 365-397.
Harris, John. 1984. Syntactic variation and dialect divergence. *Journal of Linguistics* 20: 303-27.
Hengeveld, Kees. 2011. The grammaticalization of tense and aspect. In: Bernd Heine and Heiko Narrog (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Grammaticalization*. Ed. by. Oxford: OUP, 580-594.
Hengeveld, Kees. 2017. A hierarchical approach to grammaticalization. In Kees Hengeveld, Heiko Narrog and Hella Olbertz (eds.), *The grammaticalization of tense, aspect, modality, and evidentiality: A functional perspective* [Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs 311]. Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton, 13-38.
Hengeveld, Kees and Lachlan Mackenzie. 2008. *Functional discourse grammar: a typologically based theory of language structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Hengeveld, Kees and Hella Olbertz. 2012. Didn't you know? Mirativity does exist! *Linguistic Typology* 16: 487-503.
Huddleston, Rodney. 2002. The verb. In Huddleston, Rodney and Geoffrey K. Pullum (eds.), *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 71-212.
Keizer, Evelien. 2015. *A Functional Discourse Grammar for English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Labov, William. 1972. The transformation of experience in narrative syntax. *Language in the Inner City: studies in the black English vernacular*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. 354-396.
Labov, William. 2010. Narratives of personal experience. In Hogan, Patrick (ed.) *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the Language Sciences*. 546-548.

Labov, William and Joshua Waletzky. 1967. Narrative analysis. In Helm, J. (ed.), *Essays on the Verbal and Visual Arts*, 12-44. Seattle: University of Washington Press. Repr. *Journal of Narrative and Life History* 7 (1997): 3-38.
Leith, Dick. 1995. Tense variation as a performance feature in a Scottish folktale. *Language in Society* 24: 53-77.
Levey, Stephen. 2006. Tense variation in preadolescent narratives. *Journal of English Linguistics* 34(2): 126-152. doi:10.1177/0075424206290256.
McCawley, James. 1971. Tense and time reference in English. In Fillmore, Charles, Terrence Langendoen (eds.), *Studies in Linguistic Semantics*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston: New York, 96-113.
McCawley, James. 1981. Notes on the English present perfect. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 1: 81-90.
Müller, Simone. 2005. *Discourse Markers in Native and Non-native English Discourse*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Mustanoja, Tauno. 1960. *A Middle English syntax*. Helsinki, Finland: Société Néophilologique.
Olbertz, Hella. 2012. The place of exclamatives and miratives in grammar – A Functional Discourse Grammar view. *Linguística* (Rio de Janeiro) 8: 76-98.
Olbertz, Hella. This issue. The perfect in (Brazilian) Portuguese: a Functional Discourse Grammar view.
Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.
Richard, Sophie. 2014. The Present Perfect in Australian English narratives: Some preliminary sociolinguistic insights. In Harvey, Mark & Alexis Antonia (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2014 Conference of the Australian Linguistic Society.* Callaghan, NSW: University of Newcastle. 29-49.
Richard, Sophie. 2013-2016. *UWA Narrative Corpus*. Discipline of Linguistics. The University of Western Australia.
Richard, Sophie and Celeste Rodríguez Louro. 2016. Narrative-embedded variation and change: The sociolinguistics of the Australian English narrative present perfect. In Werner, Valentin, Elena Seoane, and Cristina Suárez-Gómez (eds.) *Reassessing the Present Perfect* (Topics in English Linguistics [TiEL] 91). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 119-146.
Ritz, Marie-Eve. 2007. Perfect change: Synchrony meets diachrony. In Salmons, Joseph C. and Shannon Dubenion-Smith (eds.), *Historical Linguistics 2005.* Selected Papers from the 17th International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Madison, Wisconsin, 31st July-August 2005, 133-147. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Ritz, Marie-Eve. 2010. The perfect crime? Illicit uses of the present perfect in Australian police media releases. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42: 3400-3417.
doi:10.1016/j.pragma.2010.05.003
Ritz Marie-Eve and Dulcie Engel. 2008. Vivid narrative use and the meaning of the present perfect in spoken Australian English. *Linguistics* 46(1): 129-158. doi:10.1515/LING.2008.005.
Scherre, Maria Marta Pereira and Anthony J. Naro. 1991. Marking in discourse: 'Birds of a feather'. *Language Variation and Change* 3: 23-32.
Schiffrin, Deborah. 1981. Tense variation in narrative. *Language* 57: 45-62. doi:10.1353/lan.1981.0011.
Schiffrin, Deborah. 1987. *Discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Silva-Corvalán, Carmen. 1983. Tense and aspect in oral Spanish narrative. *Language* 59(4): 760-780.
Skala, Julia. This issue. The present perfect puzzle in US-American English: an FDG analysis.
Trudgill, Peter. 1984. Standard English in England. In Trudgill, Peter (ed.) *Language in the British Isles*, 32-44. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Walker, Jim. 2011. The emergence of the narrative present perfect in British English: reality or illusion?. *Groninger Arbeiten zur germanistischen Linguistik* 53(2): 71-87.
Wolfson, Nessa. 1979. The conversational historical present alternation. *Language* 55.1: 168-181.