

Root *que* in Spanish. Evidentiality vs. Insubordination.

Violeta Demonte (ILLA-CSIC), Olga Fernández-Soriano (Universidad Autónoma de Madrid)

1. Introduction: Evidentials are grammatical categories encoding speaker-oriented qualifications of propositions in terms of the evidence they are based on (Aikhenvald 2006). About a quarter of the world's languages have evidentials. They have been identified for American Indian languages, where their marking is systematized mainly in verb suffixes, as well as for languages like Turkish, Balkan languages, Tibetan, Japanese, Korean, etc., which exhibit elaborated evidential systems (see Chafe & Nichols 1986). In this paper we will propose that one type of Spanish *que* (complementizer "that") has to be incorporated into the crosslinguistically restricted list of evidentials. In particular, it will be shown to encode the (most basic) marks of non-first-hand or *indirect* (reported) evidence.

2. The data. Our point of departure is certain (apparently) independent clauses of Spanish which are headed by an overt complementizer *que*, "that", as in (1) and (2).

- (1) a. (Oye), **que** el Barça ha ganado la Champions. [Etxepare 2010]
Listen that the Barça has won the Champions (league)
b. (Oye), **que** el paquete ha llegado.
Listen that the parcel has arrived
- (2) a. **Que** si me das un kilo de tomates.
That if me you.give one kilo of tomatoes
b. -Se me ha olvidado decírselo.
I forgot to tell her.
-¿**Que** se te ha olvidado?
That you forgot

Both in descriptive and theoretical approaches these (Etxepare 2010, Spitzer 1942) instances of *que* are usually analyzed together. We will show, on the contrary, that the two sets of examples constitute different types of structures with different syntactic and semantic/pragmatic properties.

3. Main proposal. Careful examination of these cases reveals that only those in (1) are root clauses, which can be discourse initial (pronounced out-of-the blue). Furthermore, the presence of *que* involves a speech event heard and reported by the speaker. Our proposal is that *que* here is an (indirect) 'reportative' evidential parallel to what has been proposed for languages like Quechua (Faller 2002).

4. Evidence for the previous claim comes from the fact that *que* in (1) shares, among other, the following properties with reportative evidentials:

a) The speaker/ hearer cannot be the source of the reported information. For example, the president of a nation cannot report his own war declaration as in (3):

- (3) #Ciudadanos, **que** {se ha/ hemos} declarado la guerra.
Citizens, that it-has/we-have declared the war

b) Only declarative sentences are possible in structures like (1). Other clause types (exclamatives, interrogatives) will be shown to be excluded.

c) As it is the case with reportative evidentials (Faller 2002), the presence of 'reportative' *que* allows a conjunction of two different illocutionary acts (two reports), but this is not the case for disjunction, as seen in (4).

- (4) #Oye, que la película es estupenda **o** que aún no la han estrenado. (vs. y que aún no la han...)
'Listen (it was reported that) the film is fabulous **or** (it was reported that) it has not been presented yet.'
(vs. **and** it has been reported that...)

d) *Que* in (1) does not allow for the speech eventuality it implies to be accessed by linguistic operations bearing on propositional truth, such as negation/ dissention.

- (7) - Oye que el Madrid ha ganado la Champions.
Listen that the Madrid has won the Champions
- #No, hombre, no has escuchado eso en ninguna parte. (vs. No pueden haber ganado)
'No, man, you have not heard that anywhere.' (vs. No, they cannot have won)

e) Examples will be provided to prove that ‘reportative’ *que*, like other reportative evidentials, shows so called ‘first person effects’ (Aikhenvald 2004), that is, it develops surprise, unawareness or “unprepared mind” overtones in the context of first person participants.

5. As for the **analysis of evidential *que***, some evidentials have been characterized as epistemic modals encoding presupposition (Izvorski 1997, Chung 2007, Matthewson et al. 2007) and others as illocutionary operators. In particular Faller 2002 proposes such a characterization for Quechuan evidentials. It will be shown that reportative *que* does not encode any features related to epistemic modality (reliability or (im)probability) and we will propose that it is better analyzed as an illocutionary operator, affecting the illocutionary force, including the illocutionary points and sincerity conditions of the sentence: the speaker changes the ‘illocutionary point’ and converts an act of ‘assertion’ into one of ‘presentation’, where the speaker does not ‘commit’ herself to the truth of the prejacent but simply ‘presents’ it as something heard from someone else. With respect to its syntactic properties we claim that it is generated above F(orce)P(hrase), inside the S(peech) A(ct) P(hrase), a syntactic projection above CP that mediates the syntax–pragmatics interface and whose layered structure would host an evidential projection (Speas & Tenny 2003).

5. Evidentiality vs. Insubordination. The proposed account is further supported when sentences in (1) are contrasted with sentences in (2). None of the properties above are shared by the latter. We will describe the syntactic and semantic properties of this second *que* which we will characterize as ***echoic***, in the sense that it introduces structures that are used attributively, not merely to report a particular content (an utterance or thought attributed either to the hearer, to a third person or to the speaker in the past) but also “to show that the speaker [...] wants to inform the hearer of her own reaction to it” (Wilson 2006). We **conclude** that in (2) *que* is a real complementizer (with an extended use with special discourse values) heading a FP, in some cases selected by a silent verbal form. It thus instantiates a special case of “insubordination” (Truckenbrodt 2006), but different from the ones described for German, Scandinavian and other languages since it is not restricted to contexts with particular mood values (exclamatives, interrogative...). This ‘echoic’ *que* could provide certain hints on the internal structure of FP, as well as on the use of subordinators in pragmatic domains.

REFERENCES

- Aikhenvald, Aleksandra Y. 2004. *Evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Aikhenvald, Aleksandra Y. 2006. Evidentiality in Grammar. In *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, 2nd edition, Keith Brown (ed.), vol. 4, 320-325. Oxford: Elsevier.
- Chafe, Wallace L., & Johanna Nichols (eds). 1986. *Evidentiality: the Linguistic Coding of Epistemology*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.
- Chung, Kyung-Sook. 2007. Spatial deictic tense and evidentials in Korean. *NLS*, 15(3): 187–219.
- Etxepare, Ricardo .2010. From hearsay evidentiality to samesaying relations. *Lingua*, 120: 604-627.
- Faller, Martina. 2002. *Semantics and Pragmatics of Evidentials in Cuzco Quechua*. PhD Dissertation. Stanford.
- Izvorski, Roumyana. 1997. The Present Perfect as an epistemic modal. In A. Lawson and E. Cho. (eds.) *The Proceedings of SALT 7*.
- Lim, Dong Sik. 2010. *Evidentials and interrogatives: a case study from Korean*. PhD Dissertation. USC.
- Matthewson, Lisa, Henry Davis, and Hotze Rullman. 2007. Evidentials as epistemic modals: evidence from St’át’imcets. *Linguistic Variation Yearbook* ,7: 201-254.
- Speas, Peggy, & Carol Tenny. 2003. Configurational properties of point of view roles. In *Asymmetry in Grammar. 1: Syntax and Semantics* [Linguistik Aktuell 57], A. M. Di Sciullo (ed.), 315–344. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins.
- Spitzer, Leo. 1942. Notas sintáctico-estilísticas a propósito del español “que”. *Revista de Filología Hispánica* 4: 105–126.
- Truckenbrot, Hubert. 2006. On the semantic motivation of syntactic verb movement to C in German. *Theoretical Linguistics*, 32: 257-306.
- Wilson, Deirdre. 2006. The pragmatics of verbal irony: Echo or pretence? *Lingua* 116(10): 1722–1743.