'Exclamative' and 'quotative' illocutionary complementisers in Catalan, European Portuguese and Spanish

Corr, Alice

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal

'Exclamative' and 'quotative' illocutionary complementisers in Catalan, European Portuguese and Spanish

A study in Ibero-Romance syntactic 'near-synonymy'

Alice Corr

University of Cambridge

The use of the Ibero-Romance complementiser *que* in non-embedded contexts with various illocutionary functions is argued to be non-trivially distinct from its canonical function as a marker of subordination. Interpretative and grammatical differences, as well as variation in the availability and clause-typing of non-embedded 'exclamative' and 'quotative' illocutionary QUE across Catalan, European Portuguese and Spanish provide evidence that the subordinating complementiser has been repurposed for the representation of pragmatic information in the complementiser systems of Ibero-Romance, a hypothesis supported by analogies drawn between illocutionary QUE and illocutionary functions of the interrogative complementiser *si/se* in Catalan and European Portuguese.

1. Introduction

The present paper offers a formal account of the grammatical properties of Ibero-Romance complementisers (Rosenbaum, 1967; Bresnan, 1970) when, in addition to their canonical function as markers of subordination (1a), these items come to encode illocutionary meaning, such as the 'exclamative' (1b) and 'quotative' (1c) functions of (Ibero-)Romance *que* 'thət' (< Latin QUID), in non-subordinate contexts:

(1) a. Disseram *que* iam ganhar.
       say.PST.3PL thət go.IMPF.3PL win.INF
       "They said thət they would win." (E.Pg.)

b.　(Ai)　　*que*　t'atrapo!
　　ohhh　EXCL　you=catch.1SG
　　"Ohhh, I'm coming to get you!" (Cat.)
c.　Era　　　　el　　　becario...　*Que*　le　　ha
　　be.IMPF.3SG　the　　intern　　QUOT　to.him=have.3SG
　　tocado　　　　la　　lotería.
　　touch.PST.PTCP　the　　lottery
　　"It was the intern... [He said] he's won the lottery" (E.Sp.;
　　cartoon)

In (1b-c), the core function of the semantically-bleached complementiser *que* as a subordinator has been lost, and its morpholexical material has instead been reharnessed for the purpose of representing illocutionary information. Such illocutionary uses of the complementiser *que* have been identified within recent functional approaches (Gras, 2011, 2016; Gras and Sansiñena, 2015, 2017, forthcoming) as instances of 'insubordination', defined as "the phenomenon whereby a formally subordinate clause is conventionally used as a main or independent clause" (Gras and Sansiñena, 2017: 21; see also Evans, 2007, 2009 for the origin of the terminology). Though the presence of the complementiser in these constructions leads to the prima facie appearance of a subordinate clause, on a formal approach such as the one taken here, a structure cannot be simultaneously "formally" subordinate yet "conventionally used" as a main clause. That is, if a structure has the formal properties of a subordinate clause, it must necessarily also *be* (used as) one, and the same applies, mutatis mutandis, for main clauses; consequently, whilst recognising the descriptive contribution of such work, we do not appeal to the notion of 'insubordination' here.[1]

　　　Thus, whilst the functional and descriptive literature on what we dub *illocutionary complementisers* offers a rich taxonomy of the various interpretative values and functions of such structures, the contribution of the present article is to show that morphological (or phonological) similarity in the complementiser system does not guarantee semantic or, crucially, *syntactic* equivalence. Building on previous work focused predominantly on Spanish (Spitzer, 1942; Porroche Ballesteros, 2000; Escandell Vidal, 1999; Pons Bordería, 2003; Etxepare, 2007, 2008, 2010, 2013; Biezma, 2008; Rodríguez Ramalle, 2008a, 2008b; Gras, 2011, 2016; Demonte and Fernández-Soriano, 2009, 2013, 2014; Gras and Sansiñena, 2015, 2017, forthcoming), and, to a lesser extent, Catalan (Wheeler *et al.*, 1999), we examine the formal properties of just two types of non-embedded, illocutionary complementisers, viz. exclamative (1b) and quotative (1c) QUE, in Catalan, European Portuguese and Spanish. We will show that, despite near-synonymy in terms of their lexical entry, the contrasting interpretations of exclamative and quotative illocutionary QUE correspond to non-trivially distinct syntactic behaviours, differing both from each other as well as from the subordinating item *que* 'thət' in Ibero-Romance. That is, the various illocutionary nuances of non-embedded structures involving an Ibero-Romance complementiser are a consequence not of any lexical specialisation of the complementiser itself, but are encoded by the syntactic conditions of the complementiser and its place in the wider discourse and/or structural context.

---

[1] The treatment of 'insubordination' within a formal framework is addressed in Corr (forthcoming).

By offering Catalan and European Portuguese data in addition to Spanish, and showing that the formal properties of exclamative and quotative QUE are systematic across these languages, this article expands both empirically and theoretically on existing work. Specifically, after reviewing the key features of the Ibero-Romance finite complementiser system (Section 2), it will be shown that exclamative and quotative QUE differ from the subordinating complementiser *que* not only in terms of their (illocutionary) interpretative contribution (Section 3), but in terms of their clause-typing (Section 4.1), compatibility with embedding (Section 4.2), conjunction and disjunction (Section 4.3), and their availability across Ibero-Romance, revealing micro-variation in the comparative grammar of complementisers of Catalan, European Portuguese and Spanish (Section 5). The empirical focus of the present article are the varieties spoken in and around the Iberian Peninsula, with attested data obtained from a variety of spoken and/or textual sources, all of which are publicly available online (and typically indexed by Google). Data elicited from and/or provided by Ibero-Romance native speaker informants appear here without citation (see Corr, 2016, 2017 for further methodological clarifications). Their introspective judgments, obtained via questionnaire and corroborated through in-person qualitative consultations, form the basis for any claims in the present article for '(in)felicitousness' or '(un)grammaticality' of the empirical data (cf. Ludlow, 2011; Schütze, 2016; Corr, 2017).

2. The Ibero-Romance (finite) complementiser system

The formal analysis offered here adopts the view that there is a correspondence between interpretation and structural representation (an assumption taken to its extreme in the so-called 'cartographic enterprise', although we will not mapping the structural position of Ibero-Romance complementisers here).[2] Multifunctional units of language such as the Ibero-Romance particle *que* are a case in point: this item can introduce adverbial, relative and complement clauses; it licenses polar interrogatives in Eastern Ibero-Romance; and, in Spanish, it is (superficially)[3] homophonous with the wh-pronoun *qué* 'what'. Given its morphological and phonological invariability, and in the absence of any kind of substantive content, the interpretation of *que* is determined by its syntactic distribution: it has one interpretation – i.e. grammatical function – in a given syntactic context (e.g. when selected by a particular class of verb in a higher clause), but another interpretation/function in a different syntactic environment (e.g. when the clause it introduces modifies a noun phrase).

We thus observe that the (Ibero-)Romance finite complementiser system is a (relatively) simple one: roughly speaking, the complementiser *que* introduces declarative subordinate clauses (2a), whereas the interrogative complementiser *se/si* (<Lat. SI) introduces polar interrogative subordinate clauses (2b):

(2) a. Sei *que* vais comprar aquele livro amanhã.
know.1SG thət go.2SG buy.INF that book tomorrow
"I know thət you're going to buy that book tomorrow" (E.Pg.)

---

[2] See, however, Corr (2016) for a cartographic account of the phenomena discussed here.
[3] The wh-item can carry focal stress, whilst the complementiser cannot.

b. En Pau li va preguntar *si* li agradava
the Pau to.her=go.3SG ask.INF if to.her=please.IMPF.3SG
cantar.
sing.INF
"Pau asked her if she liked singing" (Cat.; À. Burgas, *Una cançó per a Susanna*, 2008)

The absence of the declarative (or indeed any) complementiser in simple sentences, as in

(3), is understood to mark a declarative matrix clause, an observation which holds cross-linguistically with few exceptions (one of which, notably, is the neighbouring dialect of Gascony Occitan; cf. Campos, 1992):

(3)　(*_Que_)　vais　comprar　aquele　livro　amanhã.
　　　thət　go.2SG　buy.INF　that　book　tomorrow
　　"(*Thət) you're going to buy that book tomorrow" (E.Pg.)

In addition to its dedicated function as a marker of subordinate declarative clauses, the complementiser *que* is well-known for its multifunctionality and syncretism, as noted at the start of this section. In the case of subordinate clauses, the Ibero-Romance complementiser *que* does not show sensitivity to mood, introducing indicative and subjunctive clauses:

(4)　Le　dije　*que*　{volvió/volviera}
　　to.him=say.PST.1SG　thət　return.PST.3SG/return.IMPF.SUBJ.3SG
　　a　casa.
　　to　home
　　"I told him {(s)he had returned/to return} home" (Sp.)

In Portuguese, the subordinating complementiser is also sensitive to clause type and finiteness, licensing declarative finite structures only as illustrated in (1a, 2a).[4] These restrictions do not, however, apply in Catalan and Spanish, varieties in which the subordinator *que* can introduce a range of clause types beyond declaratives – as exemplified here by an embedded infinitival command (5) and wh-exclamative clause (6) – when selected by a *verbum dicendi* (cf. Section 4.2.2):[5]

---

[4] An exception are deontic modal constructions, which are also attested in Catalan and Spanish:
(i)　Temos　*que*　humilhar　o　inimigo.
　　have.1SG　thət　humiliate.INF　the　enemy
　　"We have to humiliate the enemy" (E.Pg., *O Jornal Económico,* 11 May 2017)

[5] Note, however, that, historically, Portuguese had a specialised evidential complementiser *ca* (<Lat. QU(I)A), which is attested exclusively with indicative clauses (Corr, 2016), and that the generalised complementiser *que* could introduce clause types other than declaratives (Suñer, 1999; Matos and Brito, 2013), as illustrated in (i) and (ii) respectively:
(i)　*cuido*　*ca*　me　quer　matar.
　　consider.1SG　thət　me=want.3SG　kill.INF
　　"I think thət he wants to kill me" (GPMP; Osoir'Anes, *Que me non podesse forçar*)
(ii)　Perguntaram-lhes　as　vezinhas　*que*　adomde　leixara
　　ask.PST.3PL=to.them　the　neighbours　thət　where　leave.PLUP.3SG
　　ela　o　filho.
　　she　the　son
　　"The neighbours asked where she left her son." (Dias, 1917: 265, apud Matos and Britos, 2013: 91)

(5) Dijo   *que*   a   no   molestarle
     say.PST.3SG   thət   to   not   bother.INF=him
     "He said not to bother him" (Sp.; Rivero, 1994: 551)

(6) Vaig   dir   que   quina   pallissa   que   els   van   clavar.
     go.1SG say.INF   thət   what   battering   thət   they   go.3PL   get.INF
     "I said what a battering they got" (Cat.)

Multiple complementisers across Romance with distinct morphological forms, semantico-pragmatic specifications (e.g. modality) or conditions (e.g. discourse context), and/or distributional patterns (Ledgeway, 2005, 2012, 2016; D'Alessandro and Ledgeway, 2010; Mascarenhas, 2015; Villa-García, 2015) suggest that, despite the impression that Ibero-Romance *que* functions as a 'one-size-fits-(almost)-all' complementiser, the morphological uniformity of *que* in its various roles may in fact mask distinct grammatical behaviours.

Although it is uncontroversial to assume that the Spanish complementiser *que* 'thət' is a separate grammatical item from the wh-constituent *qué* 'what', there is a reluctance to assume that the same could apply to phonologically-identical complementisers. Yet, we already have evidence that this is the case. Namely, Catalan (and other Eastern Ibero-Romance varieties patterning alike) is unique in this branch of the Romance languages in allowing the complementiser *que* to introduce interrogatives *in root clauses*:

(7) Que   puc   fumar?
     INT   can.1SG   smoke.INF
     "Can I smoke?" (Prieto and Rigau, 2007: 35)

Catalan interrogative *que* (Hernanz and Rigau, 2006; Prieto and Rigau, 2007) provides uncontentious evidence that, in this variety, the complementiser *que* has moved beyond its canonical role as a marker of subordination into a signifier of exclusively illocutionary information. In other words, we already have confirmation of our thesis that phonologically-identical complementisers – in this case, Catalan matrix interrogative *que* versus Ibero-Romance subordinating *que* – can exhibit distinct grammatical compatibilities from one another.

In the remainder of this paper, we will argue that, despite the apparent ban on the complementiser *que* in matrix clauses, exclamative and quotative sentences directly introduced by *que* (rather than a higher selecting predicate), such as those illustrated in (1b-c) are genuine cases of root clauses headed by a complementiser. While we consider correct the received view that the absence of a complementiser in matrix clauses is an indicator that the sentence is to be interpreted as a declarative assertion, we should not automatically assume that the presence of the complementiser *que* denotes a subordinate clause (i.e. the absence of a higher selecting clause is a result of elision of that constituent). Rather, the presence of the complementiser *que* in a non-embedded clause signals that the sentence has a non-neutral illocutionary interpretation. In this regard, we understand the complementiser system "as the interface between a propositional content [...] and the superordinate structure (a higher clause, or possibly, *the articulation of discourse*, if we consider a root clause)" (Rizzi, 1997: 283, my emphasis). Illocutionary complementisers function as precisely that interface between a propositional content and the articulation of discourse in a root clause.

3. Interpretative contribution of illocutionary QUE

The complementiser *que* is devoid of any fixed lexical or semantic content, entailing that its interpretation is a function of its syntactic distribution. For example, we may label it a 'declarative' or 'finite' or 'subordinate' complementiser – i.e. descriptors reflecting a grammatical role – as these are the most common environments in which the item is found across (Ibero-)Romance. In the present section, we detail the interpretative specialisations of the complementiser in certain syntactic-pragmatic environments, namely, its 'exclamative' and 'quotative' usages, which can be said to constitute 'near-synonymy' in syntactic terms. That is, the reflexes of Latin QUID, whilst sharing a set of common syntactic behaviours, have undergone specialisation to innovate illocutionary functions in this language family.

3.1 Exclamative QUE

On our definition, Ibero-Romance exclamative QUE pairs a finite indicative root clause – which is typically (8a-b) though not necessarily (8c) a declarative clause type (see Section 4.1.1) – with an exclamative illocutionary force:

(8) a. Uau,   *que*   a   bebe   já   faz   18   anos!
         wow   EXCL   the   baby   already make.3SG   18   years
         Wow, the little one's already turning 18!' (E.Pg., Twitter)

     b. Ay,   *que*   estamos allí,   nos tienen   puestos
         ohh   EXCL   be.1PL   there   us=have.3PL   put
         en   el   bar.
         in   the   bar
         "We're here, they've set us up at a bar!" (E.Sp.; La 8 León *rtvcyl*)

     c. ufff, *que*   qué   putadón Coronil.
         ufff   EXCL   what   bugger   Coronil
         "Oof, what a bugger, Coronil" (E.Sp.; forum comment)

Such constructions can occur in discourse-initial environments (as in 9a), or constitute an exclamation within an existing discourse (as in 9b-c), following Martins' (2013: 88) definition of an exclamative sentence as one in which "the speaker expresses an emotive attitude towards the content of his/her utterance".[6] Note that we adopt a 'wide' definition of the interpretative contribution exclamative sentences (see Author 2016 for discussion), although our structural definition is relatively narrow. In particular, the class of constructions introduced by exclamative QUE has little overlap with the typology of 'exclamative' insubordinate constructions identified in the recent functional literature (Van linden and Van de Velde, 2014; Gras and Sansiñena, 2017), and only corresponds to a subclass within Biezma's (2008) formal category of expressive QUE constructions that she identifies for Spanish.

---

[6] Due to space constraints, we provide examples of exclamative QUE without the surrounding discourse environment. The reader should therefore assume the illocutionary contribution as a given, where a structure has been explicitly identified as an exclamative QUE construction, even in cases where a disambiguating discourse context has not been provided. The exclamative illocutionary contribution of clauses introduced by exclamative QUE is, however, witnessed by the illocutionary complementiser's frequent collocation with interjections and discourse particles, items which are retained in the examples presented here.

As such, exclamative QUE constructions constitute a grammatically-coherent subset within a wider typology of structurally distinct, but interpretatively similar, sentence exclamations found in Ibero-Romance, which include wh-exclamatives (9a), 'right-dislocate' exclamatives (9b) and non-degree (here, VSO) exclamatives (9c):

(9) a.   ¡Qué guapa   está   la   zona   con   nieve!
            how   pretty be.3SG the   area   with   snow
            "How pretty the area is when it's covered in snow!" (E.Sp.)

b.   Ai,   filla,   que   en   vas,   d'equivocada!
        ohh   daughter que   PART=go.2SG   of=mistaken[[]]SEP
        "Ohh, my girl, how wrong you are!" (Cat.; Laca, 1986: 83)

c.   Convidei   eu   a   Maria   para   jantar   e   ela
        invite.PST.1SG I   the   Maria for   dinner and she
        não   apareceu!
        not   appear.PST.3SG
        "I invited Maria for dinner and she didn't show up!" (E.Pg.; Martins, 2013: 85)

Minimal pair comparison between constructions introduced by exclamative QUE and otherwise structurally identical sentences without exclamative QUE reveals that the unique contribution of exclamative QUE itself is to express the speaker's emotive attitude towards the sentence's proposition. For instance, exclamative QUE sentences, unlike their structurally identical counterparts without the illocutionary complementiser, are non-cancellable (10a-b) and non-displaceable (11a-b):

(10) a.   ¡*Que* hace   un   día   bonito! #Pero me   da
          EXCL   make.3SG a   day   lovely   but   to.me=give.3SG
          igual.
          equal
          "It's [such] a lovely day! #But I don't care."

b.   Hace   un   día bonito.   Pero me   da
        make.3SG   a   day lovely   but   to.me=give.3SG
        igual.
        equal
        "It's a lovely day. But I don't care."

(11) a.   En   aquell   moment, me feia   mal   la   panxa!
          in   that   moment me=make.3SG bad   the tummy
          "At that moment, my tummy hurt!"

b. *En   aquell moment, *que* me feia   mal la
        in   that   moment   EXCL me=make.3SG bad the
        panxa!
        tummy

As such, exclamative QUE fulfils Potts' (2007) criteria for *expressive* items (cf. Biezma, 2008; Corr, 2016), viz. non-displaceability, descriptive ineffability, immediacy, independence, perspective dependence, and repeatability. As originally observed by Biezma (2008) for her 'expressive' QUE in Spanish, exclamative QUE sentences are *non-displaceable* because they predicate something of the utterance situation, as shown by their *descriptive ineffability* – i.e. the impossibility of capturing the exact meaning contribution of the

expressive item, since this is context-dependent – and their *immediacy*: i.e. the performative nature of such items, which "achieve their intended act simply by being uttered" (Potts, 2007: 167). The discourse-initial sentence in (12), for example, has a number of possible interpretations:

(12) Que   arriba   l'avia   aquest   nit!
     EXCL   arrive.3SG   the=grandmother   this   night
     "Granny's arriving tonight!" (Cat.)

The above sentence could mean that the speaker is happy (e.g. they cannot wait for their grandmother to arrive), unhappy (e.g. they are unprepared for their grandmother to arrive so soon), or simply surprised that their grandmother is arriving (e.g. because they had no prior warning she would be coming). That is, the sentence could constitute a positive, negative, or mirative exclamation: we are reliant on the wider discourse and/or extralinguistic context to understand the affective meaning of the sentence, but the contribution of this non-propositional content cannot be precisely pinned down, i.e. it is ineffable. The contrast between (13a-b) demonstrates the property of *immediacy*, insofar as the addition of the exclamative QUE morpheme transforms the assertion into a performative expression of the speaker's emotional state:

(13) a.   Es   casen   la   Joana   i   l'Enric!
         REFL=marry.3PL the   Joana   and the=Enric
         "Joana and Enric are getting married!" (Cat.)
     b.   *Que*   es   casen   la   Joana i   l'Enric!
         EXCL REFL=marry.3PL the   Joana and the=Enric
         "Joana and Enric are getting married!" (Cat.)

In (13a), where exclamative QUE is absent, the speaker asserts the proposition, whereas in (13b), through the contribution of exclamative QUE, the utterance of the sentence *ipso facto* produces an expression of the utterer's attitude.

Indeed, in (13a-b), the difference in interpretation is reducible to the absence versus presence of affectivity, correlating with the absence versus presence of exclamative QUE. The contribution of (13a) is the proposition p = 'Joana and Enric are getting married', whereas the contribution of (13b) is the proposition p = 'Joana and Enric are getting married' plus the speaker's attitude towards p. The minimal pair thus reveals that exclamative QUE's sole contribution to the sentence over the otherwise identical (excepting the absence of exclamative QUE) declarative structure (13a) is the speaker's attitude towards p. In Potts' (2007) terms, exclamative QUE thus exhibits the property of *independence*, since exclamative QUE contributes 'not-at-issue' meaning which is separable from the descriptive (i.e. propositional) content of the sentence.

This is even the case with sentences which are already apparently typed as exclamatives. For example, *prima facie*, wh-exclamatives introduced by exclamative QUE do not involve an extra or independent dimension of affectivity from their regular, non-exclamative QUE counterparts:

(14) a.   Hala, *que*   cómo   me enrollo   a   veces.
         wow   EXCL how   me=go.on.1SG at   times
         "Gosh, I don't half witter on sometimes…" (Sp.)
     b.   Hala, cómo   me enrollo   a   veces.
         wow how   me=go.on.1SG at   times
         "Gosh, I don't half witter on sometimes…" (Sp.)

Whilst both sentences contain the proposition p = 'I don't half witter on sometimes', only the former (14a) conveys the attitudinal contribution syntactically, as revealed by attempting to embed sentences (14a-b) in the following examples:

(15) a. *Es   impresionante   *que*   cómo   me enrollo   a
         be.3SG impressive   EXCL   how   me=go.on.1SG   at
         veces.
         times

    b. Es   impresionante   cómo   me enrollo   a   veces.
       be.3SG impressive   how   me=go.on.1SG   at   times
       "It's quite something how much I witter on sometimes." (Sp.)

Embedding under a suitable predicate (i.e. a factive) exposes a syntactic distinction between (14a-b), viz. that only the version *without* the illocutionary complementiser is embeddable. Although (14a-b) is interpreted from the speaker's perspective, this is not as a consequence of the syntax of the wh-exclamative, as illustrated by the contrast between the following non-embedded wh-exclamative (16) and its embedding under a first-person (17a) and third-person (17b) predicate:

(16) ¡Cuántas   molestias   os está   generando!
     how.many   inconveniences   you=be.3SG   generate.PTCP
     "How inconvenient it is for you!" (Sp.)

(17) a. Lamento   cuántas   molestias   os   está
        lament.1SG   how.many   inconveniences   you=be.3SG
        generando.
        generate.PTCP
        "I regret how inconvenient it is for you." (Sp.; forum comment)

    b. Lamenta   cuántas   molestias   os   está
       lament.3SG   how.many   inconveniences   you=be.3SG
       generando.
       generate.PTCP
       "S/he regrets how inconvenient it is for you." (Sp.)

The interpretation of the wh-exclamative from the speaker's perspective in (17a) is a direct result of the sentence's first-person matrix subject, which happens to align with the speaker. However, the switch to third-person in (17b) prevents any interpretation for the wh-exclamative from the speaker's perspective. In other words, despite its clause type, the wh-exclamative itself does not syntactically encode the affectivity associated with exclamative illocutionary potential. On this view, the difference in grammaticality between (17a) and (17b) is that only the former encodes illocutionary force, via the presence of exclamative QUE, and factive predicates disallow illocutionary complements. Exclamative QUE sentences necessarily entail evaluation from a particular perspective (i.e. they exhibit *perspective dependence*), which, by pragmatic default, is that of the speaker.

Finally, expressive items can be repeated without redundancy, unlike descriptive items, which cannot. Exclamative QUE fulfils this criterion of repeatability, as witnessed by the contrast between the felicitous repetition of the complementiser (18a), which *strengthens* its illocutionary contribution; and the degraded repetition of a descriptive substitute, here the wh-exclamative *quina*

emoció 'how exciting' or the declarative *estic emocionada* 'I'm excited' (18b-c):

(18) a.　Que　　ve　　　　l'Afra!　　(Que)　ja　　　　arriba!
　　　　EXCL　come.3SG　the=Afra　EXCL　already　arrive.3SG
　　　　(Que)　ja　　　　ve!
　　　　EXCL　already　come.3SG
　　　　"Afra's coming! She's about to arrive! She's about to get here!"
　　　　(Cat.; examples based on Biezma 2008: 13)

　　b.　{Quina emoció/estic　　emocionada}!　Ve　　　　l'Afra!
　　　　what　emotion be.1SG　excited　　　　come.3SG　the=Afra
　　　　Ja　　　　arriba!　　Ja　　　　ve!
　　　　already　arrive.3SG　already　come.3SG
　　　　"{How exciting/I'm excited!} Afra's coming! She's about to
　　　　arrive! She's about to get here!" (Cat.)

　　c. ??{Quina　emoció/ estic　emocionada}!　Ve　　　　l'Afra!
　　　　what　　emotion be.1SG excited　　　　come.3SG　the=Afra
　　　　{Quina emoció/estic　　emocionada}!　Ja　　　　arriba!
　　　　what　　emotion be.1SG excited　　　　already　arrive.3SG
　　　　{Quina emoció/estic　　emocionada}!　Ja　　　ve!
　　　　what　emotion　　　　be.1SG excited already　come.3SG
　　　　"{How exciting/I'm excited!} Afra's coming! {How exciting/I'm
　　　　excited!} She's about to arrive! {How exciting/I'm excited!}
　　　　She's about to get here!" (Cat.)

In (18a-c), only the illocutionary complementiser can be repeated without redundancy, whereas its descriptive substitutes are rendered superfluous on repetition.

　　　Ibero-Romance exclamative QUE thus fulfils each of Potts' (2007) criteria for expressive items. In all cases, exclamative QUE is the only constituent responsible for guaranteeing via the syntax that a sentence will have an *affective illocutionary interpretation*, i.e. an exclamative reading.[7]

3.2　Quotative QUE

The specialisation of the complementiser *que* as a marker of reported speech in colloquial, spoken registers of Spanish is well-attested (Spitzer, 1942; Gras, 2011; Etxepare 2007, 2008, 2010, 2013; Demonte and Fernández-Soriano, 2013, 2014, *i.a.*), though its descriptive and formal characterisation is disputed (see Corr, 2016 for discussion of these discrepancies in the literature).[8] This section reviews the key features of so-called quotative QUE as reported by our native-

---

[7] See Corr (2016) for arguments and evidence in favour of the analysis of exclamative QUE being the overt morphosyntactic realization of Zanuttini and Portner's (2003) exclamative operator.

[8] For reasons of space, we will not enter into these differences here. The reader is, however, encouraged to consult the various accounts of quotative QUE in the literature, which do not always coincide with the characterisation put forward in the present section. Given that previous works do not agree on the empirical facts, let alone analyses, we suggest that the phenomenon is likely to be an area of considerable microvariation between speakers and/or speech communities. A comprehensive overview or classification of the fine-grained differences in the properties of quotative QUE across Ibero-Romance, and existing accounts thereof, goes far beyond the remit of the present article. We therefore highlight it here as a worthwhile avenue for future research.

speaker consultants for Spanish and Catalan, a specialisation of the complementiser which is not shared by Portuguese, as will be discussed below.

In reporting a previous utterance, quotative QUE introduces a non-assertive sentence, where the speaker is only committed to presenting a proposition, but does not commit to taking responsibility for the truth of its content:

(19) A: Necessito reposar una mica.
            "I need to rest a little."
      B: Cómo?
            "What?"
      A: Que   necessito   reposar   una   mica,   *però*   *no*
            QUOT   need.1SG   rest.INF   a   bit   but   not
            és   *cert*.
            be.3SG   true
            "(I said) I need to rest a little, *but it's not true* [i.e. that I need to rest]" (Cat.)

Thus in (19), interlocutor A is able to repeat their earlier utterance that they need rest, marking their second utterance out as a quotation via quotative QUE, and subsequently rescind that claim. In other words, the presence of quotative QUE allows the speaker to cancel the proposition they have just put forward into the shared knowledge between interlocutors, as illustrated by the impossibility of cancelling an otherwise identical utterance where quotative QUE is absent (see also Etxepare, 2010; Demonte and Fernández-Soriano, 2013, 2014; Sansiñena, 2017 on the cancellability of quotative QUE utterances in Spanish):

(20)   Necessito reposar   una   mica,   *#però*   *no*   *és*   *cert*.
       need.1SG rest.INF   a   bit   but   not   be.3SG   true
       "I need to rest a little, *#but it's not true*." (Cat.)

The contrast between the minimal pair in (19-22) in terms of their (non)-cancellability is illustrative of Faller's (2002) distinction between *assertive* and *presentative* illocutionary force: here, whereas the speaker asserts the sentence's propositional content in (19), a quotative QUE sentence only presents it. The contrast in (19-20) demonstrates that assertion, unlike presentation, endorses the truth of a sentence's proposition: only in an assertion does the speaker both bear responsibility for introducing the proposition to the other interlocutor(s), and commit themselves to its truth. Déchaine *et al.* (2015) hold that a presentation is a more basic sentence type than an assertion, since the former involves fewer commitments than the latter,[9] providing evidence that in some languages (e.g. Plains Cree), the basic clause type is a presentative, wherein a discourse participant "publicly commits to the experiential grounding of [a proposition] *p*" (ibid.: 7). As such, presentatives are an *evidential* clause type, providing information on the information source of their proposition. This holds true of quotative QUE, inasmuch as the illocutionary morpheme constitutes a grammatical mechanism by which the speaker can communicate that they are not the source of the propositional content (even in contexts where they are

---

[9] For Déchaine *et al.* (2015: 4-7), the difference between the two types of illocutionary force is a result of the kind of conversational update each involves: a presentation updates the superset *origo ground* (viz. the set of propositions of which all interlocutors are mutually aware (Portner, 2006: 8), but are not committed to), whereas an assertion updates the *common ground* (Stalnaker, 1974), characterised as the set of propositions (both uttered and background information) to which the interlocutors have, additionally, made commitments.

quoting themselves, in which case the speaker is the information source for the original utterance only, not the quotation).

However, as an evidential, quotative QUE is underspecified with respect to the speaker's information source, making no distinction between evidence types. Instead, information source is supplied by secondary strategies such as person/number agreement (21a-c) or an overt information source DP which appears obligatorily to the left of quotative QUE and the clause it introduces (22):

(21) A to B: ¿Bajas al centro?
                "Are you going into town?" (E.Sp.)

a.	A to B:	Que	si	bajas	al	centro
		QUOT	if	go.2SG	to.the	centre

"[I asked if] you're going into town"

b.	B to A:	Que	si	bajo	al	centro
		QUOT	if	go.1SG	to.the	centre

"[You ask if] I'm going into town"

c.	C to A:	Que	si	baja	al	centro
		QUOT	if	go.3SG	to.the	centre

"[You ask if] he's going into town"

(22)

(Tu	madre),	que	(*tu	madre)	si	(*tu	madre)
your	mother	QUOT	your	mother	if	your	mother

bajas	al	centro	(*tu	madre)
go.2SG	to.the	centre	your	mother

"Your mother [asks] if you're going into town"

In (21a-c), the information source – i.e. whether the quotative QUE sentence constitutes a self-report by the speaker (21a), or a quotation of a previous utterance by an addressee (21b), or an interlocutor who is neither the speaker nor the addressee (21c) – is codified not by the illocutionary morpheme but by the person and number marking on the verb. In the latter case, the interlocutor can be specified by lexical means, viz. an overt source DP as in   (22). Note, however, that the grammaticality of realizing an overt information source DP is subject to idiolectal variation across Ibero-Romance speakers for whom quotative QUE is available (so too do authors disagree as to its availability; cf. Etxepare, 2007, *et. seq.*; Gras, 2011; Demonte and Fernández-Soriano, 2013, 2014, *i.a.*).

That the fundamental illocutionary contribution of quotative QUE is to mark out a sentence as a presentative evidential is corroborated by the observation that the clause introduced by quotative QUE does not have to adhere either to the form or content of the original utterance, as in (23):

(23) A: Tio, estava dubtant i això.
          "Mate, I wasn't sure n' stuff."

     B: Eh?
         "Huh?"

A:	Que	no	ho tenia	molt	clar	tampoc
	QUOT	not	it=have.IMPF.3SG	much	clear	neither

"(I said) I wasn't very sure either." (Catalan, COR)

In this regard, quotative QUE clauses can be characterized as *samesaying* constructions, inasmuch as they are "just a channel for a previous utterance" (Etxepare, 2010: 617). By deviating from the form and content of the original

utterance, the only responsibility taken on by the speaker is that of the quotative act. Thus, what counts in a quotative QUE sentence is not its formal similarity to the original utterance, its content or its truth, but solely that the speaker intends for their utterance to be interpreted as a quotation.

It is crucial to note that quotative QUE is only available in a subset of Ibero-Romance varieties; specifically, quotative QUE is ungrammatical in Portuguese according to all native speakers we have consulted. Although superficially 'quotative' constructions are attested in Portuguese – i.e. cases of apparently non-embedded quotations headed by the complementiser *que* –, these are only possible where a *verbum dicendi* is retrievable from the (immediately) surrounding discourse context, as witnessed by the contrast in (24-25):

(24) Sabes   o   que   me disseram?   *Que*   vou   ser   boa
     know.2SG   the   what   me=say.PST.3PL   thət   go.1SG   be.INF   good
     mãe.
     mother
     "Do you know what they told me? [They told me] thət I'm going to be a good mother" (E.Pg.)

(25) A: Não se ouve bem.
        "We can't hear you very well"
    B: O quê? Hein?
        "What? Huh?"
    A: *Que   não   se   ouve   bem.
        QUOT   not   REFL=hear.3SG   well

We argue that the difference in grammaticality between (24-26) is due to the presence of a *verbum dicendi* in the antecedent of the quoted sentence in (24), and the absence of a suitable selecting predicate which could introduce the quotation in (25). In the former, we assume the felicitousness of the quotation is a result of the elision of a matrix predicate that selects the quoted clause, i.e. the quotation is in fact a complement clause embedded under a non-pronounced matrix clause, as represented in (26):

(26) Sabes   o   que   me disseram?   [~~Disseram me~~]   [*que*   vou
     know.2SG   the   what   me=say.PST.3PL   say.PST.3PL=me   thət   go.1SG
     ser   boa   mãe]].
     be.INF   good   mother
     "Do you know what they told me? [They told me] *thət* I'm going to be a good mother." (E.Pg.)

By contrast, the lack of a suitable selecting predicate in (27) entails that the quotation is genuinely unembedded, which results in an impossible sentence in Portuguese, but a felicitous one in related varieties like Catalan and Spanish:

(27) A: No se te escucha bien.
        "We can't hear you very well."
    B: ¿Qué?
        "What/huh?"
    A: Que   no   se   te   escucha   bien.
        QUOT   not   REFL=you=listen.3SG   well
        "[I said] we can't hear you very well."

Since the above structure results in ungrammaticality in Portuguese, yet is felicitous elsewhere in Ibero-Romance, we assume that quotative QUE is simply unavailable in Portuguese.

As such, in the varieties in which it is available (as discussed in the present paper for Catalan and Spanish), quotative QUE is the only constituent responsible for guaranteeing via the syntax that a sentence will have a *presentative evidential interpretation*, i.e. a quotative reading. On our view, the systematic exclusion of quotative QUE from European Portuguese signals that the quotative reading of the complementiser in Catalan and Spanish is not inferentially derived or a matter of stipulation, but instead provides indication that quotative/evidential meaning is grammatically encoded in the complementiser system of these varieties.

4. The Ibero-Romance (finite) complementiser system

In Section 2, we observed that complementisers are syncretic items which identify a sentence's clause type (e.g. Romance *si/se* for an interrogative clause), finiteness (compare Romance *de/di*, which introduces a non-finite clause) and/or mood (e.g. Old Portuguese *ca* <Lat. QUIA heads indicative clauses only). In this section, we examine the behaviour of illocutionary QUE across Ibero-Romance with respect to various syntactic operations, viz. clause-typing (Section 4.1), embedding (Section 4.2) and compatibility with conjunction and disjunction (Section 4.3).

4.1 Clause typing

4.1.1 *Exclamative* QUE
As observed in Section 2.1, exclamative QUE typically introduces declarative indicative structures (28a-b):

(28) a. (Ai), que et trobo a faltar!
DM EXCL you=find.1SG to miss.INF
"Oh I miss you!" (Cat.)

b. Ai, que os meus olhos tão a pesar tanto.
ohh EXCL the my eyes be.3PL to weigh.INF so.much
"Ohhh, my eyes are so heavy!" (E.Pg.; Twitter)

Additionally, Catalan and Spanish speakers accept rhetorical questions (i.e. interrogative structures without genuine information-seeking illocutionary force) introduced by exclamative QUE (29a), and a subset of these speakers also accept wh-exclamatives (29b) and rhetorical wh-interrogatives (29c) with exclamative QUE (a bracketed asterisk (*) indicates that some native speakers find the sentence felicitous whereas others judge it ungrammatical):

(29) a. Que et sembla que tinc tot el (puto)
EXCL to.you=seem.3SG thət have.1SG all the effing
dia?!
day
"Do you think I've got all (effing) day?!" (Cat.)

b. (*)Ai que què coi fas aquí?!
ahh EXCL what hell do.2SG here

"Ahh, what the hell are you doing here?!" (Cat.)

c. (*)joer   que   qué   envidia   cochina   mah   grande.
   fuck   EXCL   what   envy   filthy   more   big
"Feck, I'm so flipping jealous!" (E.Sp.)

Despite the compatibility of exclamative QUE with structural interrogatives, these are only licensed if the sentence lacks the illocutionary force of a question, as witnessed by the ungrammaticality of exclamative QUE with genuine information-seeking polar (30) and wh-interrogatives (31):[10]

(30) (Ai)   (*que)   la   conèixes? (Cat.)
      DM   EXCL   her=know.2SG

(31) (Ai)   (*que)   què   fas   aquí? (Cat.)
      DM   EXCL   what   do.2SG   here

In other words, in Catalan and Spanish, there is not a one-to-one relationship between the (exclamative) complementiser and the clause type it introduces. Additionally, the licensing of exclamative QUE constructions is sensitive to the illocutionary force of a sentence.

Conversely, European Portuguese disallows exclamative QUE with clause types other than declaratives (28b), as illustrated here for polar rhetorical questions (32) and wh-exclamatives (33):

(32) Ai (*que)   achas   que   tenho   o   dia   todo?! (E.Pg.)
      ahh   EXCL   think.2SG   thət   have.1SG   the   day   all

(33) Ai (*que)   que   bem *(que)   fala   a   irlandesa! (E.Pg.)
      ahh   EXCL   what   well   thət   speak.3SG   the   Irish.FEM

Other clause types, including imperatives (34), subjunctives (35) and non-finite clauses (36) are ungrammatical with exclamative QUE in all Ibero-Romance varieties:

(34) (Ai) (*que)   fala   baixo! (E.Pg.)
      ahh   EXCL   speak.IMP   low

(35) (*Que) *(que)   fales   baixo! (E.Pg.)
      EXCL   que_jussive   speak.SUBJ.2SG   low

(36) ¡(*Que)   aguantar   a   mi   edad   estas   impertinencias!
      EXCL   put.up.with.INF   at   my   age   these   impertinencies
      (E.Sp.; adapted from Hernanz 1999: 2338)

We thus observe that exclamative QUE is sensitive to clause type, mood and finiteness, licensing only finite indicative sentences with a restricted set of clause types. Whereas in Catalan and Spanish, the relationship between exclamative QUE and clause-typing is indirect, in European Portuguese there is a one-to-one relationship between the licensing of exclamative QUE and clause type, since only structural declaratives are permitted with the illocutionary complementiser.

---

[10] Note that, due to the possibility of the complementiser *que* heading polar interrogatives in Eastern Ibero-Romance, if (30) is uttered with prosody of a polar question rather than – as intended here – an exclamative intonational contour, then the sentence would be felicitious.

4.1.2 *Quotative* QUE

Quotative QUE is felicitous with declaratives (37a), wh-exclamatives (37b), wh-interrogatives (37c), and polar interrogatives, with both (originally) genuine information-seeking (37d) as well as rhetorical (37e) illocutionary force:[11]

(37) a. Que   me'n   vaig   de   vacances
        QUOT   me=PART=go.1SG   of   holidays
        "[I said] I'm going on holiday" (Cat.)

 b. Que   quina pallissa   que   els   van   clavar
    QUOT   what   battering   thət they go.3PL   get.INF
    "[I said] what a battering they got" (Cat.)

 c. ¿Que   cuántos   días   vas   a   estar   fuera?
    QUOT   how.many days   go.2PL to be.INF away
    "[I asked] how many days are you going to be away for?" (E.Sp.)

 d. Que   si   vull   un   caramel?
    QUOT   if   want.1SG   a   sweetie
    "[Did you ask] if I want a sweetie?" (Cat.)

 e. ¿¡Que   si   te   quieres   callar   de   una   puta   vez?!
    QUOT   if   you=want.2SG shut.up.INF of   one   effing time
    "[I said] do you wanna effing shut up for once?" (E.Sp.)

Its licensing of a range of clause types thus distinguishes quotative QUE from exclamative QUE, a difference corroborated by the compatibility of quotative QUE with both non-finite (38) and subjunctive clauses (39):

(38) Que   ¡a   terminar   los   deberes!
     QUOT   to   finish.INF the   homework
     "[I said] finish your homework!" (E.Sp.)

(39) Que   a   esa   tienda,   que   no   vayas   más.
     QUOT   to   that   shop   que$_{jussive}$ not   go.SUBJ.2SG more
     "[I said] don't go to that shop anymore" (E.Sp.)

In fact, the only utterances which cannot be repeated in a quotative QUE construction are those involving 'true' imperative clauses:

(40) *Que   digue'm!
      QUOT   tell.IMP=me (Cat.)

4.2   Clause typing

4.2.1 *Exclamative* QUE

Unlike its homophonous subordinating counterpart, exclamative QUE cannot be embedded, as illustrated here by the compatibility of the former (41,48), but incompatibility of the latter (42,49) with embedding under assertive (41-47) and semi-factive (43-(44) predicates (see also exclamative QUE'S incompatibility with embedding under factive predicates in Section 3.1):

(41) Vaig   dir   que   en   Mario va   callar   a   la   fi!
     go.1SG say.INF thət the   Mario go.3SG   shut.up.INF at   the   last
     "I said thət Mario shut up at last." (Cat.)

---

[11] This section excludes data from (European) Portuguese, since quotative QUE is absent in this variety (see Section 3.2).

(42) *Vaig   dir   (que)   que   en   Mario   va   callar   a
      go.1SG say.INF thət   EXCL the   Mario go.3SG shut.up.INF at
      la   fi!
      the   last

(43) Crec   que   es   casen   la   Joana i   l'Enric.
      believe.1SG thət   REFL=marry.3PL the   Joana and the=Enric
      "I believe thət Joana and Enric are getting married" (Cat.)

(44) *Crec   (que)   que   es   casen   la   Joana i   l'Enric!
      believe.1SG thət   EXCL REFL=marry.3PL the   Joana and the=Enric

In (42,49), exclamative QUE is incompatible with embedding, whether or not it co-occurs with subordinating *que* (i.e. exclamative QUE can neither be embedded under another type of *que*-complementiser, nor can it be embedded *tout court*).

4.2.2 *Quotative QUE*

Conversely, quotative QUE clauses are compatible with embedding under a suitable selecting predicate, viz. a *verbum dicendi*, as illustrated here by the felicitous embedding of the Catalan and Spanish examples from Section 3.1.2:

(45) Vaig dir/preguntar {que me'n vaig de vacances/que quina pallissa que els van clavar/que si vols un caramel}
"I said/I asked {thət I'm going on holiday/what a battering they got/if you want a sweetie}" (Cat.)

(46) Dije/pregunté {que cuántos días vas a estar fuera/que si te quieres callar de una puta vez/que a terminar los deberes/que a esa tienda, que no vayas más}
"I told/asked (you) {how many days are you going to be away for/if you'll shut the hell up for once/to finish your homework/not to go to that shop anymore" (E.Sp.)

Embedded quotative clauses are referentially opaque (47a), contrasting with the referential interpretation of embedded interrogatives and wh-exclamatives where the complementiser is absent (47b), a divergence which is well-documented in the literature (González i Planas, 2014 provides extensive discussion and references):

(47) a.   Te   pregunto/repito   *que*   cuáles   eran   sus
          you=ask.1SG/repeat.1SG QUOT which be.IMPF.3PL their
          actores favoritos: #Nicholson y   Depardieu.
          actors favourite   Nicholson and Depardieu
          "I ask/repeat (to) you which their favourite actors were: #Nicholson and Depardieu." (Suñer, 1993: 57)

     b.   (Te) pregunto/repito   Ø   cuáles   eran   sus   actores
          you=ask.1SG/repeat.1SG   which be.IMPF.3PL their actors
          favoritos: Nicholson y   Depardieu.
          favourite Nicholson and   Depardieu
          "I tell/repeat (to you) who his favourite actors were: Nicholson and Depardieu." (ibid.: 57)

The embeddability of quotative QUE aligns this item with the syntax of the subordinating complementiser, and distinguishes it from the (non-embeddable) exclamative illocutionary complementiser.

4.3 Conjunction and disjunction

The clausal complements that the subordinating complementiser *que* introduces can undergo both conjunction (48) and disjunction (49):

(48) Vocês sabem *que* é o ultimo dia de aulas
you know.3SG thət be.3SG the final day of class
do primeiro período *e* *que* passadas duas semanas
of.the first term and thət pass.PST.PTCP two weeks
volta tudo ao mesmo não é?
return.3SG everything to.the same not be.3SG
"You know *thət* it's the last day of class of the first term *and thət* in two weeks everything will be the same again, right?" (E.Pg.; Twitter)

(49) […]sin pensar *que* podía causar perjuicio
without think.INF thət could.IMPF.3SG cause.INF harm
o *que* no se podía hacer.
or thət not REFL=could.IMPF.3SG do.INF

"[…] without considering *thət* it could cause harm *or thət* it was impossible to achieve." (E.Sp.; *Diario Sur*)

4.3.1 *Exclamative QUE*
Unlike clauses introduced by the subordinating complementiser *que*, the conjunction and particularly disjunction of exclamative QUE constructions is degraded:

(50) Ai mãe que isso sai muito caro (??*e*/*ou) que
ah mother EXCL this go.3SG very expensive and/or EXCL
não tenho seguro.
not have.1SG insurance
"Ahh mum, this is turning out to be very expensive [intended: and/or I don't have insurance]." (E.Pg.)

In the case of conjoined exclamative QUE clauses, the omission of the second illocutionary complementiser produces a grammatical sentence (the disjunction of exclamative QUE clauses, however, continues to produce an infelicitous sentence; cf. Krifka, 2001, 2003; Corr, 2016 for further discussion).

4.3.2 *Quotative QUE*
Quotative QUE, on the other hand, shows the same behaviour as the subordinating complementiser with respect to these syntactic operations, permitting both the conjunction and disjunction (for further discussion and, in some cases, alternative conclusions, see Etxepare, 2007, 2008, 2010, 2013; Demonte and Fernández-Soriano, 2013, 2014; Corr, 2016):

(51) Y él, que llegábamos tarde, que no
and he QUOT arrive.IMPF.1PL late QUOT not
se podia salir con nosotros *y/o* que
REFL=could.3SG go.out.INF with us and/or QUOT
teníamos que protestarpor el retraso.
have.IMPF.3SG thət complain.INF for the delay
"And he kept saying thət we were late, thət he couldn't go out with us *and/or* that we should complain about the delay." (adapted from Demonte and Fernández-Soriano, 2013: 37)

4.4   Summary

Exclamative QUE exhibits restrictions in the structural characteristics of the clauses it introduces, permitting only a limited set of clause types, and licensing only finite indicative clauses. Quotative QUE is extremely liberal in its interaction with clause-typing, finiteness and mood, introducing a range of clause types, including both finite and non-finite as well as indicative and subjunctive clauses, with the notable exception of 'true' imperatives, which are disallowed with quotative QUE. Whereas exclamative QUE clauses cannot undergo conjunction and disjunction, quotative QUE is compatible with these operations, behaviour which aligns the latter with the syntax of the subordinating complementiser *que*. The one-to-one relation between exclamative QUE and (declarative) clause type in European Portuguese, and the ban on quotative QUE in this language, highlights the sensitivity of European Portuguese complementisers to formal clause type; that is, the complementiser *que* in European Portuguese is strictly reserved for declarative finite clauses (though, as observed in Section 2, the complementiser system does not show sensitivity to mood). This sensitivity to clause type sets the European Portuguese complementiser *que* apart from its European Spanish and Catalan counterparts, which do not exhibit the same degree of restriction in terms of clause-typing.

5.   Multifunctionality of QUE and Ibero-Romance dialectology

The foregoing discussion has revealed both interpretative and syntactic differences between the canonical role of the Ibero-Romance complementiser *que* as a subordinator and the repurposing of this morpheme for the encoding illocutionary meaning in non-subordinate environments via the items we refer to as exclamative and quotative QUE. The multifunctionality of the complementiser *que* and its illocutionary QUE variants, however, does not occur uniformly across Ibero-Romance. The present section summarises the general patterns we can discern across the three major Peninsular varieties, viz. European Portuguese, Spanish and Catalan.

Firstly, the availability of the information-seeking interrogative complementiser QUE is a feature of Catalan (and other Eastern Ibero-Romance dialects) to the exclusion of other Ibero-Romance varieties. Secondly, European Portuguese is the only major Ibero-Romance language in which quotative QUE is ungrammatical. As such, the complementiser *que* in this variety is reserved for introducing declarative finite clauses. Thirdly, the languages vary in terms of the clause types with which illocutionary complementisers are compatible: as detailed above, European Portuguese reserves the complementiser *que* for introducing declarative finite clauses, whereas European Spanish and Catalan allow a wider range of clause types with illocutionary complementisers.

That these behaviours are not simply quirks of the subordinating complementiser *que* in non-canonical environments is verified by the replication of these patterns with the interrogative complementiser *se/si* 'if, whether' in European Portuguese and Catalan varieties. That is, despite the impossibility of

quotative QUE in European Portuguese, this variety permits what we dub 'quotative *se/si*' (52), as does Catalan (53a-b):[12]

(52) A: Vens?
come.2SG
"Are you coming?"

B: O quê?
the what
"What?"

A: Se vens?
if come.2SG
"[I asked] are you coming?" (E.Pg.)

(53) a. Vindran?
come.FUT.2SG
"Are they coming?" (Cat.; Rigau and Süils, 2010: 161)

b. Si vindran?
if come.FUT.2SG
"[Are you asking me if] they are coming?" (ibid.: 161)

Spanish speakers cannot introduce interrogative quotations in this way, but instead require quotative QUE before the interrogative complementiser *si* (though see Escandell Vidal's (1999: 46-7) discussion of her '*si citativo*'):

(54) ¿*(Que) si vienes?
QUOT if come.2SG
"[I asked] are you coming?"

Moreover, in the Ribagorçan and Pallarese varieties of Catalan, the interrogative complementiser can also be used to introduce polar (55a) and wh-interrogatives (55b), analogous to the use of the information-seeking interrogative complementiser QUE in Eastern Ibero-Romance:

(55) a. Se deu ser veritat que hi anirem?
INT might.3SG be.INF truth thət there=go.FUT.1PL
"Is it true that we will go there?" (Ribagorçan/Pallarese; Rigau and Süils, 2010: 154)

b. Se a on deu ser, aquell home?
INT at where might.3SG be.INF that man
"Where might that man be?" (Ribagorçan/Pallarese; ibid.: 154)

Crucially, when embedded, the interrogative complementiser plus wh-constituent constructions involve a non-referential interpretation (56a), contrasting with the referential interpretation of the same construction when the complementiser is absent (56b):

(56) a. Sabeu *se* quan vindran? #Quan puguen!
know.2SG if when come.FUT.3PL when can.SUBJ.3PL
"Don't you know when will they come? #As soon as they can" (Ribagorçan; Süils and Ribes, 2015: 558)

b. Sabeu Ø quan vindran? Quan puguen!
know.2SG when come.FUT.3PL when can.SUBJ.3PL
"Don't you know when will they come? As soon as they can" (Ribagorçan; ibid.: 558)

---

[12] Brazilian Portuguese speakers do not accept this use of the interrogative complementiser.

In other words, embedded interrogative complementiser plus wh-constituent constructions in the above varieties show exactly the same syntactic behaviour as quotative QUE plus wh-constituent clauses do when embedded (see Section 3.2.2).

If the illocutionary interpretations of the (ordinarily) declarative complementiser *que* were simply inferentially derived rather than syntactically encoded, we would not expect to see the same properties occurring elsewhere in the complementiser systems of Ibero-Romance. That these behaviours are repeated systematically in parallel but independent contexts is strong evidence for a grammatical, rather than pragmatic, explanation of the multifunctionality of *que* (and its interrogative cousin, *si/se*) in Ibero-Romance. The unexpected parallel between European Portuguese and Catalan – i.e. geographically non-contiguous varieties – to the exclusion of European Spanish constitutes further evidence in support of this conclusion, since the illocutionary functions of the interrogative complementiser occur independently and are unlikely to be a result of contact/transfer between these varieties.

6.   Conclusions

Despite their indistinguishable appearance and pronunciation, the subordinating complementiser *que* in Ibero-Romance does not exhibit the same syntactic behaviour as the *prima facie* identical illocutionary complementisers exclamative and quotative QUE. Whilst the subordinating complementiser is semantically bleached, and is dedicated to encoding 'core' grammatical relations, exclamative and quotative QUE each encode specialised illocutionary content and mark non-trivially distinct syntactic-pragmatic relations from each other and from their subordinating counterpart. The availability of these complementisers differs systematically across Ibero-Romance: European Portuguese shows a strict one-to-one relation between complementiser and clause type, disallowing quotative QUE (though permitting quotative *se*); Spanish and Catalan are much more liberal in the range and syntax of the complementisers they permit, with Catalan additionally licensing interrogative illocutionary complementisers. In other words, near-synonymy can be observed in the syntactic domain, insofar as the lexical item *que* has developed overall relatively similar, yet subtly distinct, functions across this language family, constituting structural differences which only intricate formal diagnostics can tease apart. The various illocutionary nuances encoded in the grammar of complementisers in Ibero-Romance supports the view promoted by Rizzi (1997: 283) that these items are not solely dedicated to a subordinating function, but are also the locus of the interface between a sentence's propositional content and the discourse itself in simple matrix clauses.

References

Biezma, M. 2008. An Expressive Analysis of Exclamatives in Spanish. Ms. University of Massachusetts.

Bresnan, J.W. 1970. On complementizers: toward a syntactic theory of complement types. *Foundations of language* 6(3): 297-321.

Campos, H. 1992. Enunciative elements in Gascon. *Linguistics* 30(5): 911-940. DOI: `10.1515/ling.1992.30.5.911`

Alturo, N., Bladas, Ò., Payà, M. and Payrató, L. (eds). 2004. *Corpus oral de registres. Materials de treball* (COR). Barcelona: Publicacions i Edicions de la Universitat de Barcelona. Available at `http://www.ub.edu/cccub/corpusoralderegistres-cor.html` [last accessed 22 December 2016].

Martins, A.M. (ed.) [2000-] 2010. *CORDIAL-SIN: Corpus Dialectal para o Estudo da Sintaxe.* Lisboa, Centro de Linguística da Universidade de Lisboa. Available at `http://www.clul.ulisboa.pt/en/11-resources/314-cordial-sin corpus-2` [last accessed 26 May 2017].

Corr, A. 2016. Ibero-Romance and the syntax of the utterance. PhD Thesis, University of Cambridge.

Corr, A. 2017. Collecting non-standard dialect data online: a case study. Paper presented at the Rethinking Grammaticality Judgments workshop, University of Cambridge, 11 March 2017.

Corr, A. Forthcoming. Matrix complementizers and 'speech act' syntax: formalizing insubordination in Catalan and Spanish. *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory.*

D'Alessandro, R. and Ledgeway, A. 2010. At the CT boundary: Investigating Abruzzese complementation. *Lingua* 120(8): 2040-2060.

Déchaine, R., Cook, C., Muehlbauer, J. and Waldie, R. 2015. (De)-constructing Evidentiality. Available at `http://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/002089` [last accessed 22 December 2016].

Demonte, V. and Fernández Soriano, O. 2013. Evidentials *dizque* and *que* in Spanish. Grammaticalization, parameters and the (fine) structure of Comp. *Revista de Estudos Linguísticos da Univerdade do Porto* 8: 211-234.

Demonte, V. and Fernández Soriano, O. 2014. Evidentiality and illocutionary force: Spanish matrix *que* at the syntax-pragmatics interface. In *Left sentence peripheries in Spanish: Diachronic, variationist, and typological perspectives*, A. Dufter and Á.S. Octavio de Toledo y Huerta (eds), 217-252. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Demonte, V. and Fernández-Soriano, O. 2009. Force and finiteness in the Spanish complementizer system. *Probus* 21(1): 23-49.

Escandell Vidal, V. 1999. Los enunciados interrogativos: aspectos semánticos y pragmáticos. In *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, I. Bosque and V. Demonte (eds), 3929-3991. Madrid: Real Academia Española/Espasa Calpe.

Etxepare, R. 2007. Aspects of quotative constructions in Iberian Spanish. *Anuario del Seminario de Filología Vasca Julio de Urquijo* 41(2): 25-58.

Etxepare, R. 2008. On quotative constructions in Iberian Spanish. In *Crosslinguistic Studies of Clause Combining: The multifunctionality of conjunctions*, R. Laury (ed), 35-77. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Etxepare, R. 2010. From hearsay evidentiality to samesaying relations. *Lingua* 120(3): 604-627.

Etxepare, R. 2013. Quotative expansions. In *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory*, S. Baauw, F. Drijkoningen, L. Meroni and M. Pinto (eds), 93-123. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Evans, N. 2007. Insubordination and its uses. In *Finiteness: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations*, I. Nikolaeva (ed), 366-431. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Evans, N. 2009. Insubordination and the grammaticalisation of interactive presuppositions. Paper presented at the conference Methodologies in Determining Morphosyntactic Change, Museum of Ethnography, Osaka, Japan, March 2009.

Faller, M.T. 2002. Semantics and pragmatics of evidentials in Cuzco Quechua. PhD Thesis, Stanford University.

Ferreiro, M. (ed). 2014-. *Glosario da poesía medieval profana galego-portuguesa* (GMPG). Universidade da Coruña. Available at `http://glossa.gal` [last accessed 22 December 2016].

González i Planas, F. 2014. On quotative recomplementation: Between pragmatics and morphosyntax. *Lingua* 146: 39-74.

Gras, P. 2011. Gramática de Construcciones en Interacción. Propuesta de un modelo y aplicación al análisis de estructuras independientes con marcas de subordinación en español. PhD Thesis, Universitat de Barcelona.

Gras, P. 2016. Revisiting the functional typology of insubordination: *que*-initial sentences in Spanish. In *Insubordination*, N. Evans and H. Watanabe (eds), 113-144. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Gras, P. and Sansiñena, M.S. 2015. An interactional account of discourse-connective *que*-constructions in Spanish. *Text & Talk* 35(4): 505-529.

Gras, P. and Sansiñena, M.S. 2017. Exclamatives in the functional typology of insubordination: evidence from complement insubordinate constructions in Spanish. *Journal of Pragmatics* 115: 21-36.

Gras, P. and Sansiñena, M.S. Forthcoming. Insubordination and regional variation: discourse-connective insubordinate complement constructions in three varieties of Spanish. In *Different perspectives on convergence and divergence in Ibero-Romance: language contact and contrasting national varieties*, M. Bouzouita, R. Enghels and C. Vanderschueren (eds). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hernanz, M.L. and Rigau, G. 2006. Variación dialectal y periferia izquierda. In *Andolin gogoan. Essays in honour of Professor Eguzkitza*, B. Fernández and I. Laka (eds), 435-452. Gipuzkua: Euskal Herriko Unibersitatea.

Krifka, M. 2001. Quantifying into question acts. *Natural language semantics* 9(1):1-40.

Krifka, M. 2003. Quantifiers in questions. *Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics* 3: 499-526.

Laca, B. 1986. Notes per a un estudi del pleonasme pronominal en català. In *Estudis de llengua i literatura catalanes XIII (Miscel·lània Antoni Badia i Margarit)* 5, 65-88. Publicacions de L'Abadia de Montserrat.

Ledgeway, A. 2005. Moving through the left periphery: the dual complementizer system in the dialects of Southern Italy. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 103(3): 336-396.

Ledgeway, A. 2012. *From Latin to Romance: Morphosyntactic typology and change*. Oxford University Press.

Ledgeway, A. 2016. Clausal complementation. In *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, A. Ledgeway and M. Maiden (eds), 1013-1028. Oxford University Press.

Ludlow, P. 2011. Data, intuitions, judgments. In *The Philosophy of Generative Linguistics*, P. Ludlow (ed), 64-89. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Martins, A.M. 2013. The interplay between VSO and coordination in two types of non-degree exclamatives. *Catalan journal of linguistics* 12: 83-109.

Mascarenhas, S. 2015. Complementizer doubling in European Portuguese. Master's Dissertation, St Catherine's College, Oxford.

Matos, G. and Brito, A-M. 2013. The alternation between improper indirect questions and restrictive relatives. In *Agreement, Information Structure and the CP*, V.

Camacho-Taboada, Á. Jiménez-Fernández, J. Martín-González and M. Reyes-Tejedor (eds), 83-116. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Pons Bordería, S. 2003. *Que* inicial átono como marca de modalidad. *ELUA. Estudios de Lingüística* 17: 531-545.

Porroche Ballesteros, M. 2000. Algunos aspectos del uso de *que* en el español conversacional. *Círculo de lingüística aplicada a la comunicación* 3: 100-116.

Portner, P. 2006. Comments on Martina Faller's paper. Paper presented at the Workshop on Philosophy and Linguistics, University of Michigan, 4 November 2006.

Potts, C. 2007. The expressive dimension. *Theoretical Linguistics* 33(2): 165-197.

Prieto, P and Rigau, G. 2007. The Syntax-Prosody Interface: Catalan interrogative sentences headed by *que*. *Journal of Portuguese Linguistics* 6(2): 29-59.

Rigau, G. and Suïls, J. 2010. Microvariation in Catalan and Occitan complementizers: the so-called expletive *se*. *Catalan Journal of Linguistics* 9: 151-165.

Rizzi, L. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In *Elements of grammar*, L. Haegeman (ed), 281-337. Springer Netherlands.

Rodríguez Ramalle, T.M. 2008a. Estudio sintáctico y discursivo de algunas estructuras enunciativas y citativas del español. *Revista Española De Lingüística Aplicada* 21: 269-288.

Rodríguez Ramalle, T.M. 2008b. Marcas enunciativas y evidenciales en el discurso periodístico. In *Actas del XXXVII simposio de la sociedad española de lingüística (SEL)*, I. Olza, M. Casado Velarde and R. González Ruiz (eds), 735-744. Pamplona: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Navarra.

Rosenbaum, P.S. 1967. *The grammar of English predicate complement constructions*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Sansiñena, M.S. 2017. Eliciting evidence of functional differences: The imperative versus free-standing *que*-clauses in Spanish. In *Imperatives and Directive Strategies*, D. Van Olmen and S. Heinold (eds), 265-289. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Schütze, C. 2011. *The empirical basis of linguistics: grammaticality judgments and linguistic methodology*. Language Science Press.

Spitzer, L. 1942. Notas sintáctico-estilísticas a propósito del español *que*. *Revista de filología hispánica* 4(2): 105-126.

Stalnaker, R. 1974. Pragmatic presuppositions. In *Semantics and philosophy*, M.K. Munitz and P. Unger (eds), 197-213. New York University Press.

Süils, J. and Ribes, S. 2015. Modality markers in Gascon, between grammar and stylistic variation. *eHumanista/IVITRA* 8: 544-576.

Suñer, M. 1999. La subordinación sustantiva: La interrogación indirecta. In *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, I. Bosque y V. Demonte (eds), 2149-2195. Madrid: Espasa.

Villa-García, J. 2015. *The Syntax of Multiple-*que *Sentences in Spanish. Along the left periphery*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Wheeler, M., Yates, A. and Dols, N. 1999. *Catalan: A comprehensive grammar*. Psychology Press.

Zanuttini, R. and Portner, P. 2003. Exclamative Clauses: at the Syntax-Semantics Interface. *Language* 79(1): 39-81.

Alice Corr
Pembroke College
Cambridge
CB2 1RF

avc25@cam.ac.uk

Alice Corr

Abbreviations and glosses

(E.)Pg.	(European) Portuguese
(E.)Sp.	(European/Peninsular) Spanish
Cat.	Catalan
CONJ	Conjunctive QUE
INT	Interrogative complementiser
QUOT	Quotative QUE
SUBJ	Subjunctive
thət	the finite declarative complementiser, orthographically 'that'