

Structure beyond Force? Evidence for a ‘speech act’ projection from Ibero-Romance

Alice Corr, University of Cambridge (avc25@cam.ac.uk)

It has been argued that certain clause-initial instances of the Ibero-Romance finite complementizer *que*, as illustrated in (1-3), differ syntactically from the subordinating use of the complementizer in dependent clauses (Biezma 2007, Demonte & Fernández-Soriano 2013, 2014, Colaço & Matos 2015). Descriptively, exclamative *que* (1) introduces a declarative clause with exclamative illocutionary force, involving expressive (Potts 2007) meaning. Conjunctive *que* (2) is used in clause-initial position to link two independent clauses. Quotative *que* (3) allows the speaker to present a sentence without having to commit to the truth of its proposition. Using diagnostics in Krifka (2001, 2003, 2014), Faller (2006), Etxepare (2010), we show that the different interpretations of *que* in (1-3) each correspond to a distinct syntax, data which we claim corroborate recent proposals reviving a ‘performative’ syntax of speech acts (Ross 1970, Speas & Tenny 2003, Haegeman 2014, Wiltschko 2015):

- (1) Ai, **que** non chego a tempo!!!
ai EXCL not arrive.1SG on time
- (2) Fe-lo ya, **que** lebo tó ro diya asperando á que lo remates!
do.IMP=it already for spend.1SG all the day waiting for that it finish.SUBJ.2SG
- (3) [...] B:eh? A: **Que** no ho tenia molt clar tampoc
huh QUOT not it have.IMP.1SG very clear either

Firstly, quotative *que* (3, 4) can introduce all clause types except ‘true’ imperatives, whereas conjunctive *que* (2, 5) and exclamative *que* (1, 6) can introduce only declarative clauses and rhetorical polar interrogatives, with exclamative *que* (7) able to introduce wh-exclamatives and rhetorical wh-interrogatives in a subset of Ibero-Romance varieties:

- (4) **que** {la conèixes? / quants dies t’hi estaràs? / *digue’m!}
QUOT her know.3SG how.many days you=there be.FUT.2SG tell.IMP=me
- (5) fes-ho ara, {**que** et sembla que tinc tot el dia?! / *la conèixes? / *digue’m!}
do.IMP=it now CONJ you seem.3SG that have.1SG all the day her know.2SG tell.IMP=me
- (6) **que** {*la conèixes? /et sembla que tinc tot el dia?! / *què coi fas aquí?!}
EXCL her know.2sg you seem.3sg that have.1sg all the day what on.earth do.2sg here
- (7) joer **que** qué envidia cochina mah grande / **Que** qué diablos te pasa mocosa?!
Fuck EXCL what envy total more big EXCL what devils you happen.3SG snotty.FEM

Secondly, the root *que* sentences show distinct behaviours with respect to conjunction, disjunction and embedding, where compatibility in these environments is taken to be a property of C-heads, and incompatibility is taken as an indicator of operation at the speech-act level. The Ibero-Romance data show that quotative *que* (8) is felicitous in these constructions whereas exclamative *que* (9) and conjunctive *que* (10) are not:

- (8) To madre (dixo) **que** va de compres y/o **que** si quies daqué que la llares
your mother said.3sg QUOT go.3SG of shopping and/or QUOT if want.2SG anything that her call.2SG
- (9) (*disse) **que** isso sai muito caro *e/*ou **que** não tenho seguro!!!
said.1SG EXCL that come.out.3SG very dear and/or EXCL not have.1SG insurance
- (10) No me pises, (*dije) **que** llevo chanclas *y/o **que** soy sensible.
not me step.2SG said.1SG CONJ WEAR.1SG sandals and/or CONJ be.1SG sensitive

Thirdly, each instance of *que* shows a different clausal distribution when tested against left-peripheral elements, including vocatives, (grammaticalised) interjections and discourse particles, items independently argued to encode speech-act information (e.g. Haegeman & Hill 2014, Paul 2014). Conjunctive *que* (11) sentences are incompatible with a sentence-initial vocative or discourse-activating particle, whereas exclamative *que* (12) and quotative *que* (13)

sentences must surface below these items. All instances of root-clause *que* obtain above CP-related discourse elements (e.g. topics, wh-phrases), where such elements are licit (14).

- (11) Escúchame, (*oye) (*María) **que** vamos a llegar tarde
listen.IMP=me PRT María.VOC CONJ go.1SG to arrive.INFIN late
- (12) ¡¡¡(***que**) ay (***que**) churri **que** me pongo toa colorada!!!
EXCL PRT EXCL darling EXCL me.REFL put.1SG all red
- (13) (***que**) oye, (***que**) María, **que** el Barça ha ganado la Champions.
QUOT PRT QUOT María.VOC QUOT the Barcelona AUX.3SG won the Champions.league
- (14) Sube'l volumen, **que** Manolo, (***que**) siempre alcuérdome d'el; cuando ponen
raise.IMP=the volume CONJ Manolo CONJ always remind.1SG=me of=him when put.3PL
esa canción
that song

Fourthly, the separate types of root clause *que* discussed here show different availabilities across Ibero-Romance varieties: conjunctive *que* is available in all Ibero-Romance varieties tested, whereas exclamative *que* is permitted in a subset of these varieties, and quotative *que* is available in a distinct subset.

Together, the distinct properties of quotative, exclamative and conjunctive *que* are taken as evidence supporting the hypotheses that i) (certain) speech act information is represented syntactically, and ii) extra syntactic structure is needed to incorporate such information. Using a Cartographic framework, we claim that 'quotative' *que* introduces a presentative (Déchaine et al 2015) sentence, and lexicalises the head of the lower projection of a decomposed Force layer (Coniglio & Zegrean 2012), corresponding to an evidential/clause-typing projection. Exclamative and conjunctive *que* sentences are proposed to surface in distinct projections of a separate, internally-articulated domain dedicated to the encoding of speech-act information (viz. Haegeman 2014's bipartite Speech Act Phrase), located above Force. Moreover, the data support independently-justified meaning-to-structure mappings of the clausal architecture (e.g. Rizzi 1997, Cinque 1999, Coniglio & Zegrean 2012, Haegeman 2014), and provide the empirical impetus to join these together in a unified cartography. Combining pre-existing mappings of the syntactic space allows us to account for the Ibero-Romance facts – and corroborate the theoretical framework already in place – without resorting to the postulation of further functional structure.

References Biezma, M. (2007). An expressive analysis of exclamatives in Spanish. Paper presented at Going Romance 21. Cinque, G. (1999). Adverbs and functional projections: A cross-linguistic perspective. Oxford Studies in Comparative Syntax. New York: Oxford University Press. Colaço, M. & Matos, G. (2015). Specifying coordination and causal explicative clauses in Portuguese. Paper presented at Linguistic symposium on Romance languages 45, Campinas, São Paulo. Coniglio, M., & Zegrean, I. (2012). Splitting up force. Main Clause Phenomena: New Horizons, 190, 229. Déchaine, R., Cook, C., Muehlbauer, J. & Waldie, R. (2015). (De)-constructing evidentiality. ms. ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/002089. Demonte, V., & Fernández-Soriano, O. (2013). Evidentials *dizque* and *que* in Spanish. Grammaticalization, parameters and the (fine) structure of Comp. Revista de Estudos Linguísticos da Universidade do Porto-Vol, 211, 234. Demonte, V., & Fernández-Soriano, O. (2014). Evidentiality and illocutionary force: Spanish matrix *que* at the syntax-pragmatics interface. Left sentence peripheries in Spanish: Diachronic, variationist, and typological perspectives. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 217-252. Etxepare, R. (2010). From hearsay evidentiality to samesaying relations. Lingua, 120(3), 604-627. Faller, M. (2006). Evidentiality below and above speech acts. Special issue of Functions of Language on evidentiality. Haegeman, L. and Hill, V., 2013. The syntactization of discourse. In Folli, R., Sevdali, C. & Truswell, R., Syntax and its limits, Oxford University Press, 370-390. Haegeman, L. (2014). West Flemish verb-based discourse markers and the articulation of the speech act layer. Studia Linguistica, 68 (1), 116-139. 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, 449-526. Krifka, M. (2014). Embedding illocutionary acts. In Recursion: Complexity in cognition, 59-87, Springer International Publishing. Paul, W. (2014). Why particles are not particular: Sentence-final particles in Chinese as heads of a split CP. Studia Linguistica, 68(1), 77-115. Potts, C. (2007). The expressive dimension. Theoretical Linguistics 33:2, 165-197. Rizzi, L. (1997). The fine structure of the left periphery. In Haegeman, L. (ed), Elements of grammar, Springer Netherlands, 281-337. Ross, J. R. (1970). On declarative sentences. Readings in English transformational grammar, 222, 272. Speas, P., & Tenny, C. (2003). Configurational properties of point of view roles. Asymmetry in grammar, 1, 315-345. Wiltchko, M. (2015). The (not so) silent syntax of speech acts. A comparative approach. Paper presented at CamCoS3, University of Cambridge.