
Are root *que*-sentences in Portuguese as insubordinate as in Spanish?

Nádia Canceiro

Centre of Linguistics, University of Lisbon

 ORCID ID: 0009-0000-2257-3465

nadia.canceiro@edu.ulisboa.pt

Gabriela Matos

Centre of Linguistics, University of Lisbon

 ORCID ID: 0000-0002-2974-0729

mgabrielamatos@yahoo.co.uk



How to cite: Canceiro, Nádia & Gabriela Matos. 2026. Are root *que*-sentences in Portuguese as insubordinate as in Spanish? RLLT 24, eds. Janine Berns & Haike Jacobs. Special Issue of *Isogloss*. *Open Journal of Romance Linguistics* 12(2)/3, 1-27.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/isogloss.534>

Abstract

This paper examines insubordinate *que*-clauses in European Portuguese (EP) and Peninsular Spanish (PS), focusing on their syntactic and discursive properties. The study presents novel data from EP, a language less studied in this context, and contributes to the Syntax/Discourse interface approach. The authors investigate various aspects of insubordination, including contexts of use, pragmatic values, and types of linguistic expressions associated with these structures. The research reveals that EP insubordinate *que*-clauses demonstrate less independence than their PS counterparts, maintaining a strong connection with the standard embedding *que* complementizer. Their discursive value is primarily inferred from situational or pragmatic contexts, often relying on anchors such as juxtaposed preceding sentences or initial interjections. The findings of this work contribute to challenge the strict distinction between syntactic and discourse relations in natural language.

Keywords: Insubordination, European Portuguese, Peninsular Spanish, *que*-clauses, Syntax/Discourse interface.

1. Introduction

Several languages exhibit sentences formally akin to subordinates in root-sentence contexts, often called *insubordinate* since Evans (2007). as those exemplified in (1) – (4) for European Portuguese (EP) and Peninsular Spanish (PS).

- (1) Portuguese
Que se calem todos!
'Shut up, everybody!'
- (2) Spanish, Demonte & Soriano (2014: 225)
¡Que te marches!
'Leave!'
- (3) Portuguese
Olha(.) que me zango!
Look, I'm getting angry!
- (4) Spanish, Etxepare (2014: 520)
¡Eh, que me estás pisando!
'Hey, you stepped on me!'

This work investigates insubordinate *que*-clauses to set their syntactic and discursive properties. Thus, for instance, despite presenting similar discursive functions in both languages – (1)-(2) are *directive* sentences, which express an orders or make a request, and (3)-(4) are expressive expressions, which denote an emotive attitude of the speaker) –, insubordinate *que*-sentences often present different syntactic properties in these languages, or have a more restricted range of occurrence in European Portuguese.

Previous works on Insubordination diverge in the approach adopted: some adopt a pragmatic interactional account to discourse (Evans 2007, Gras 2016) and stress the presence of different insubordination marks across languages (e.g. Evans 2007), or assume the existence of a correlation between syntax and discourse, and distinguish between the complementizer *que* and homonymous discourse oriented markers (Demonte & Soriano 2014; Corr 2016/2018a,b).

Our study diverges in some aspects from these works: despite being centered on non-dependent *que*-clauses (as Corr 2016/2018), it reviews the main functional types of Insubordinate clauses considered in Evans (2007) and attempts to provide a systematic comparative analysis of the most relevant Insubordinate *que*-clauses in European Portuguese and Peninsular Spanish. Thus, our goal with this study is twofold: (i) to confront insubordinate *que*-clauses in European Portuguese and Peninsular Spanish; and (ii) to set their discursive properties, and their similar or distinctive formal characteristics.

This is one of the first studies addressing insubordination in European Portuguese (but see Corr 2016/2018a,b) and aims to provide an overview of the types of root *que*-clauses available in this language. Thus, the analysis of each of these types is not extensively developed. Nonetheless, it opens up important avenues for further

exploration and highlights the unique syntactic and discourse features of insubordination in European Portuguese, enriching our understanding of this phenomenon.

To achieve our goal, we will start with the original definition of insubordination in Evans (2007). The second section addresses the contexts of use of *que*-insubordinates in Peninsular Spanish and European Portuguese and the pragmatic value, and types of linguistic expressions associated with insubordination. The third section contrasts European Portuguese and Peninsular Spanish regarding the kind linguistic expressions required to legitimate the use of *que*-Insubordinates. The fourth section analyzes the grammatical aspects that correlate with the discursive properties exhibited by European Portuguese and Peninsular Spanish *que*-Insubordinates. The fifth section focuses specifically on insubordination in European Portuguese, exploring of the two major types of *que*-insubordinate sentences in this language, those relying on ellipsis/inference of covert material, and those licensed by overt linguistic expressions. The article concludes with final remarks, providing a synthesis of the findings and their implications.

2. Insubordination

In this investigation, we will follow Evans (2007: 367) in considering insubordination as “the conventionalized main clause use of what, on *prima facie* grounds, appear to be formally subordinate clauses”. Evans (2007) characterizes insubordinate constructions as structures in which there is the presence of any of the properties typically associated with subordinate sentences, namely the presence of subordinative connectors (for instance, the complementizers *if* and *that* in English, or *ob* ‘whether’ and *dass* ‘that’ in German), of subordinative verbal morphology (for example, the infinitive in Italian), or of specific word order of subordinate sentences (as, for example, in German). Below, we present some examples from Evans (2009: 1-2) for English, German and Italian, as well as their insubordinate function.

In English, Insubordinates can be free-standing conditionals introduced by *if*, functioning as request (cf. (5)). A felicitous matrix clause could be one as (6), provided by Evans (2009: 1).

(5) If you could just sit here for a while, please.

(6) [..., you would be doing me a favour / I would be happy [etc.]]

In German, Insubordinate clauses occur as free-standing *whether* clauses, representing an imputed question. A canonical embedding sentence counterpart could, according to Evans, correspond to (8).

(7) German, Evans (2009: 1)

Ob wir richtig sind?
whether we right are

(8) [It’s possible/I doubt/you were wondering (etc.)] whether we’re right?

In Italian, the use of the infinitive as a command may be analyzed as an

insubordinate expression, as in (9), whose translation by the author evidences the subordinate structure with the presence of *to* indicate the infinitive verb.

(9) Italian, Evans (2009: 1)

Alza-r-si, porc-i, av-ete cap-ito? rifa-re
get_up-INF-REFL pig-PL have-2PL understand-PSTPTCP make-INF

i lett-i, ma presto! Puli-r-si le scarp-e.
the.M.PL bed-PL but quickly clean-INF-REFL theF.PL shoe-PL
'(To) get up, pigs, understand? (To) make your beds, and hurry! (To) clean
your shoes!' [Source: P. Levi: *La tregua*]

For Spanish, several analyzes have been provided taking into account insubordinate clauses introduced by complementizers *que* and *si* — *si* assimilated to the contrastive use of the conditional complementizer that expresses speaker's disagreement (see Evans 2009: 381), as in (10) —, and *que* 'that', which may introduce insubordinate clauses with different discursive values (cf. Etxepare 2010, Demonte & Soriano 2012, Corr 2016/2018, Sánchez López 2020, Villalba 2024), among which is also disagreement, as shown in Gras & Sansineña (2015):

(10) Spanish, Evans (2007: 381)

(Sisters Q and R are looking at clothes in a shop window)

Q: *¡ Ah, mira qué chaqueta más chula!*

'Hey, look what a great jacket!' R:

¡Si es horrible!

'But it's horrible!'

(11) Spanish, Gras & Sansineña (2015: 506)

[Two friends talking about their weight]

J02: *he engordado*

I have gained weight 'I've gained weight'

es que yo me siento más gorda, es que es verdad

it is that I me.CL feel more fat it is that is true

'I feel fatter, it's true'

J01: [*que yo no te veo más gorda*

that I not you.CL see more fat

'I don't see you fatter'

yo te veo perfecta tía como antes]

I you.CL see perfect girl as before

'I see you as perfect as before, girl'

J02: [*no, he engordado]*

no I have gained weight

'No, I've gained weight'

In the examples above, the insubordinate clause is used to express disagreement or contradiction with the content of the previous utterance. Considering

example (11), Gras & Sansineña (2015) remark that J02's statement functions as an independent utterance with its own illocutionary force, and it shows that what traditionally would be considered a subordinate clause marker (*que*, 'that') can introduce independent utterances with specific pragmatic functions.

They also emphasize that the interactional functions of the connector *que*, in insubordinates, are only legitimate when they occur depending on a context (discursive or situational), or when the interpretation of the content of the sentence is evident or is in the *common ground* (Gras & Sansineña 2015: 525). These sentences occur in specific pragmatic-discursive situations that allow them to be well-formed, despite the omission of elements from a root sentence.

Regarding this topic, Evans (2007: 368) mentions that "This will lead back to the issue of how realistic it is to maintain a strict distinction between syntactic (inter-clausal) and discourse (inter-sentential) relations in natural language."

Evans (2007) suggests that insubordinate clauses are the result of a diachronic process that starts with a subordinate sentence and ends in the insubordinate main clause expression. This process is represented in (12):

(12) Evans (2007: 370)

| Subordination | Ellipsis | Conventionalized ellipsis | Reanalysis as main clause structure |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|--|---|
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| Subordinate construction | Ellipsis of the main clause | Restriction of interpretation of ellipsed material | Conventionalized main clause use of formally subordinate clause (Constructionalization) |

According to Evans, the initial stage corresponds to a prototypical complex sentence consisting of a main clause and a subordinate clause. The deletion of the main clause then triggers the process of insubordination. In the second stage, the meaning of the insubordinate clause is inferred by the interlocutor, taking into account the conversational context. In the subsequent stage, there are already some restrictions regarding the reconstruction of the main clause's meaning, as certain constructions are excluded. In the final stage, the insubordinate clause has a defined value, both discursively and pragmatically, and it is no longer necessary or even possible to recover the content of the main clause. The insubordinate clause is thus reanalyzed as a main/independent clause (constructionalization), and it becomes possible to identify uniform functional patterns in its use. In these stages of greater independence, it would be important to analyze the textual and discursive value attributed to the complementizer, whose function is unclear.

Although Evans's (2007) evolutionary perspective may be the most widely accepted, there are alternatives that posit different mechanisms legitimizing the occurrence of these constructions. Among these are Mithun's (2008) and Cristofaro's (2016) proposals. Mithun (2008: 69) argues that insubordinate clauses are legitimized through an *extension* mechanism that allows these clauses to occur independently in the absence of the main clause, due to an extension from the sentence domain to the discourse and pragmatic domain. In turn, Cristofaro suggests that insubordination can

have various origins, with ellipsis being one of them, while also considering the hypothesis of *clausal disengagement*, which is similar to Mithun's concept of extension.

On par of functional pragmatic perspectives of Insubordination (e.g. Evans 2007/2009, Gras 2010/2016, Gras & Sansineña 2015), several authors, based on Rizzi's (1997) pioneering cartographic approach to the C(omp) domain, developed more articulated analyzes of sentence structure to structurally capture the Syntax-Discourse interface relationship. For Spanish and Catalan (among other romance languages), most of these studies focused on *que*-Insubordinate clauses, as, for instance Etxepare (2010), Demonte & Soriano (2013/2014), Corr (2016/2018a,b), Villalba (2024), among others). Taking on the idea of connecting syntax and discourse, Demonte & Soriano (2013/2014), Corr (2016/2018a,b) and Villalba (2024) analyzed the finite complementizer *que* ('that') as being reharnessed to allow the introduction of matrix clauses (i.e., non-embedded), which are discourse-oriented. Corr (2018a: 75) precises that CP not only projects subordinative complementizers, but can also be "repurposed to encode a variety of illocutionary meaning", i.e., which blurs the boundaries between syntax and discourse, and supports the idea that speech acts must be projected in syntactic structures. The same proposal occurs in Demonte & Soriano's (2013/2014) work on reportatives, and Villalba's (2024) work on exclamatives, among others.

3. Discursive situations of *que*-in subordinate clauses in European Portuguese and Peninsular Spanish

According to Evans (2007: 368), in subordinate clauses across languages have three main discursive functions:¹ (a) expression of interpersonal coercion, including commands, permissives, threats and warnings; (b) modal framing, including quotation, belief, evidential and deontic use; (c) signaling presuppositional discourse contexts.

In subordinate *que*-clauses in European Portuguese and Peninsular Spanish are uttered in different, but standardized, interaction conversational situations, which fall into Evans' three major discursive functions. The first discourse function of *que*-in subordinate clauses, related to interpersonal coercion, is present in examples like (13), for EP and PS, respectively, which express an order.

(13) a. Portuguese
Que ninguém saia!
 that nobody leave.SUBJ
 'Nobody leaves!'

b. Spanish, Demonte & Soriano (2014: 225)
¡Que te marches!
 that you leave.SUBJ
 'Leave!'

¹ For an alternative typology, developed in an interactional constructional approach to grammar, see Gras (2016).

The second function of insubordination which, following Evans, conveys different types of modal framing, such as evidentiality, quotation, emotion, or belief, is present in both languages in utterances that transmit evidentiality, as (14a), act as quotatives (Etxepare 2010), or reportative evidential expressions (Demonte & Soriano 2014), as (14b) and (14c), or express the emotive attitude of the speaker, as (15), and its desires, as (16).

- (14) a. Portuguese
Olha(.) que o copo vai cair!
 ‘Look, the glass will fall down!’
- b. Spanish, Etxepare (2014: 520)
Oye, que el Barça ha Ganado la Champions.
 ‘(Listen) that the Barça won the Champion League’
- c. Portuguese
Era a Maria. Que tinha ganho a bolsa!
 it was Maria. That had won the grant
 ‘It was Maria. (She said) that she won the grant.’
- (15) a. Portuguese
Ai(.) que tenho tantas dores!
 oh, that I have much pain
 ‘Oh, I feel so much pain!’
- b. Spanish, Etxepare (2014: 520)
¡Eh, que me estás pisando!
 Hey, that me is stepping
 ‘Hey, you stepped on me!’
- (16) a. Portuguese
Que corra tudo bem!
 that runs everything well
 ‘(I hope/whish) that everything goes well!’
- b. Spanish, Demonte & Soriano (2014: 225)
(Ojalá) que llueva café.
 (I hope) that rain.SUBJ coffee
 ‘May it rain coffee!’

Evans’ last function correlates Insubordinate clauses to highly presuppositional discursive contexts, signaling denial or contrastive assertion. The examples below show that *que*-insubordinates in EP and PS may occur as a type of contrastive assertion, expressing disagreement regarding the previous discourse context:

- (17) a. Portuguese, cf. Canceiro (2023: 226)
 [Mary told Peter to tidy up the room he shares with John.]
 Mary: *Arruma o quarto!*
 tidy up the room
 ‘Tidy up your room!’
 Peter: *Que o arrume ele!* / *Ele, que o arrume!*
 that it tidies up he he, that it tidies up
 ‘That he tidies it up!’ / ‘As for him, that he tidies it up!’
- b. Spanish, cf. Gras & Sansineña (2015: 506) [Two friends talking about their weight]
 A: *he engordado*
 have fatten
 ‘I’ve gained weight.’
 B: *que yo no te veo más gorda.*
 that I not you see more fat
 ‘I don’t see you fatter.’

In sum, *que*-Insubordinate clauses in EP and PS are mostly uttered in identical interaction conversational situations. Nevertheless, some differences between these languages may be found, showing that EP has a more restricted occurrence of *que*-insubordination than PS.

4. Kinds of linguistic expressions in European Portuguese and Peninsular Spanish *que*-Insubordinates

The pragmatic functions considered in the previous section may have close grammatical counterparts in the kind of linguistic expressions used, in particular, in the type of sentences activated by the insubordinate clause. It is at the grammatical level that we find most of the differences between the two languages.

However, some similarities may be observed in optative expressions, in reported orders or requests, and, to some extent, in commands and threats. The *que*-Insubordinates clauses in (16) and (18) are characterized as optatives (Brito et al. 2003, for European Portuguese; Sánchez López 2020 for Spanish), and correspond to a sentence type that expresses desires or wishes (Barbosa et al. 2023). In EP and PS, optative sentences are closely linked to the subjunctive mood (cf. (18)), which is used to express desires, wishes, possibilities, and hypothetical situations.

- (18) a. Portuguese
Que o teste corra bem!
 that the exam goes well
 ‘(I hope) that the exam goes well’
- a’. *Oxalá (que) o teste corra bem!*
 May (that) the exam go well
 ‘May the exam go well!’

b. Spanish, Demonte & Soriano (2014: 225)

(Ojalá) que llueva café.

'May it rain coffee!'

Optative expressions present an identical behavior in both languages (cf. (22)). Bearing in mind Evans (2007) analysis, in the examples above, verbs as *desejar* 'to wish' or *esperar* 'to hope' would have been omitted and may be inferred.

Reported orders or requests, illustrated below, involve the use of direct or indirect speech to convey what someone else has said, particularly when they have issued a command or made a request. These are a type of directive speech acts which can be reported using verbs as *dizer* 'to tell' or *pedir* 'to ask'. Assuming Evans (2007) analysis, these reporting verbs would have been omitted. Regarding EP and PS, these *que*-clauses behave similarly, as the examples below show:

(19) a. Portuguese

Que venham!

that come

'Tell them to come'

b. Spanish

¡Que vengan!

that come

'Let them come!'

The sentences in (13), repeated below as (20), and (21), express a command or a threat. They are directive clauses, whose primary function is to get the listener or reader to do something, commonly related to the imperative sentence type. These sentences present the form of embedded imperative clauses, using the subjunctive as the suppletive mood of the imperative.²

(20) a. Portuguese

Que ninguém saia!

that nobody leave.SUBJ

'Nobody leaves!'

² A reviewer inquired why in EP the directive negative request in (13a)/(20a) is available, but its assertive counterpart is not (see (i)):

(i) **Que saia!* / **Que saiam!*
that leave.SUBJ that leave.SUBJ

We find this question very relevant and deserving of a detailed study in the future. For the moment, we assume that the marginality of the sentences in (i) is due to the lack of a generic addressee overtly mentioned, the omitted subject being understood as *você/vocês* 'you'. This would explain the similarity in marginality of the examples (i) and (22b, b') and the acceptability contrasts of (i) and (22a).

b. Spanish, Demonte & Soriano (2014: 225)

¡Que te marches!
that you leave.SUBJ ‘Leave!’

(21) a. Portuguese

Que tu não te atrevas a contrariar-me!
that you not RLF dare.SUBJ to contradict me
‘Don’t dare to contradict me!’

b. Spanish

Que se calle Juan // Juan que se calle
that SE keeps.quiet Juan. // Juan that SE keeps.quiet
‘Let John keep quiet.’

Notice that *que*-clauses expressing an order, differently from those conveying a threat, present a more restrictive behavior in EP, as they are only felicitous when the addressee is generically mentioned (cf. (22a)), and not a singular definite entity, which is possible in PS, as the contrast between (22c) and (22b, b’) shows.

(22) a. Portuguese

Que saiam todos!
that leave everybody
‘Everybody leaves!’

b. Portuguese

**Que te vás embora!*
that you go away
‘(I order) you to leave!’

b’. Portuguese

**Que (você) vá embora!* that (you) go away ‘(I order) you to leave!’

c. Spanish

¡Que te marches!
that you leave
‘(I order) you to leave!’

In contrast with the previous insubordinates, in EP and PS major formal differences, correlated with the context of use, occur in expressive *que*-clauses, as well as *que*-quotative/reportative sentences, *que*-insubordinate disagreement replies, and conjunctive/explicative *que*-clauses.

As for expressive *que*-insubordinates, they are distinct from other types, as expressive clauses primary function is to communicate the speaker's affective stance or emotional state rather than providing information or describing events (Etxepare 2014, Trotzke & Villalba 2021). The insubordinate clauses in (15) and (23) are expressive expressions and are usually related to the exclamative sentence type (Corr 2018a/b, Sánchez López 2020, Villalba 2024). These clauses often include elements such as exclamations or emphatic expressions (cf. (23a, b)).

- (23) a. Portuguese
Ai, que me estás a pisar!
 ‘Hey, you’re stepping on me!’
- b. Spanish, Etxepare (2014: 520)
¡Eh, que me estás pisando!
 ‘Hey, you’re stepping on me!’

Again, EP differs from PS, as in EP this type of insubordinates is not acceptable without the previous linguistic material. This is required so that they do not lose their emotive value (cf. (24a) vs. (24b)). In contrast, in PS, as the example (25) shows, the interjection is optional.

- (24) Portuguese
- a. *Ai, que me estás a pisar!*
 ouch that me are prep step
 ‘Hey, you’re stepping on me!’
- b. **Que me estás a pisar!*
 that me are prep step
 ‘That you’re stepping on me!’

- (25) Spanish
¡(Ay,) que me quemó!
 ouch that me burn
 ‘(Ouch), I’m burning myself!’

Insubordinate *que*-clauses like (14), repeated in (26), were named reportative or quotative by Etxepare (2010), which assumes that “in Spanish, there are root sentences that present a *que*-complementizer that adds a reportative meaning to the clauses, which is lost in absence of this complementizer” (Etxepare 2010: 604). According to Etxepare (2010: 607), Spanish reportative *que*-clauses can only occur embedded under verbs of saying and thinking which select speech acts, and involve clauses that convey an assertion of someone else different from the speaker. Yet they “may take all sorts of clause types under its scope” (Etxepare 2010: 612), a property that, according to the author, excludes these insubordinates from the evidentiality constructions, which are only compatible with assertive declarative sentences. In addition, he assigns to *que* the status of quotative operator (Etxepare 2010: 619).

- (26) Spanish, Etxepare (2010: 520)
Oye, que el Barça ha ganado la Champions.
 ‘(Listen) that the Barça won the Champion League’

Also, for Demonte & Soriano (2014) quotative-*que* clauses should be better designated as reportatives. They claim that reportative-*que* is an indirect evidential, and define reportative evidentials as “grammatical elements conveying the information that the source of the proposition is indirect, be it because the speaker has heard it or because she has inferred it from a speech event”.

- (27) Spanish, Demonte & Soriano (2014: 233)
Que ha dimitido el decano.
 that has resigned the dean
 ‘The dean has resigned (someone said/I just heard).’

Demonte & Soriano distinguish reportative *que*-clauses, where *que* has evolved to an evidential discourse marker, from echoic *que*-sentences which make use of a true complementizer. For the authors, these kinds of *que*-insubordinates differ concerning the sentence type they may be connected with: reportatives evidentials are exclusively associated to declarative sentences (see the contrast between (26) and (28) above) and the next example in (28a), while echoic-*que* expressions may introduce other sentence types, as shown in (28b) for interrogatives:

- (28) a. Spanish, Demonte & Soriano (2014: 235)
 #*Oye, ¿que hemos ganado la liga?*
 listen that we-have won the league?
- b. Spanish, Porroche Ballesteros (2000: 104, *apud* Demonte & Soriano 2014: 220)
- A: – *No me he acordado de sacar las entradas.*
 not REFL I-have remembered of get the tickets ‘I did not remember to get the tickets.’
- B: – *¿Que no te has acordado?*
 that not REFL you-have remembered
 (Are you saying/do you mean) that you did not remember?’

In contrast with Demonte and Soriano, Corr (2018a/b) considers that insubordinate quotatives are compatible in Spanish and Catalan with diverse sentence types: declaratives and interrogatives:

- (29) a. Spanish, Corr (2018a: 71)
Era el becario... Que le ha tocado la lotería.
 ‘It was the intern... [He said] he’s won the lottery’
- b. Spanish, Corr (2018a: 86)
Que cuántos días vas a estar fuera?
 Quot how.many days go.2SG to be away

Corr (2018a) assumes that European Portuguese does not have true *que*-quotative insubordinates, given that they only occur when a *verbum dicendi* may be explicitly present. Otherwise the resulting *que*-clause is pragmatically odd, in contrast to what happens in Spanish:

- (30) Portuguese, Corr (2018a: 83)
 A: *Não se ouve bem.*
 not REFL hear.3.SG well
 ‘We can’t hear you very well’
 B: *O quê? Hein?*
 ‘What? Huh?’
 A: **Que não se ouve bem.*³
 QUOT not REFL hear.3.SG well

- (31) Spanish, Corr (2018a: 84)
 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.3.SG well
 ‘[I said] we can’t hear you very well.’

Nevertheless, examples like the following one, where no overt *verbum dicendi* of the previous discourse is recovered, show that reportative insubordinate *que*-clauses are available in EP:

- (32) Portuguese
Era a Maria. Que tinha ganho a bolsa.
 ‘It was Mary. (She said) that she won the grant.’

However, EP contrasts with PS in this construction, as the absence of a linguistic context makes the sentence ungrammatical and devoid of a quotative meaning (contrast the previous sentence with (33a). In addition, the presence of an expression with an interjective value does not seem enough to render the clause acceptable as a reportative clause, as shown in (33b).

- (33) a. Portuguese
**Que ganhou a bolsa.*
 that won the grant
 ‘That s/he won the grant!’
 b. #/**Ouve/olha!, que ela ganhou a bolsa.*
 ‘Listen, that she won the grant.’

In fact, reportative *que*-sentences in EP seem to be restricted to declarative evidential sentences and require a previous linguistic context that corresponds to the source of information and may not be reduced to an interjection.

Disagreement insubordinate *que*-clauses also present some differences in their use in EP and PS. Disagreement expressions are linguistic constructions used to

³ Notice that some native speakers of European Portuguese consider the sentence adequate in this context.

challenge a statement made by another person (cf. (17a)) or to express different/contrasting opinions of the addressee. They occur in informal colloquial communicative interaction. In EP, these expressions are related to an exclamative sentence type and express a strong rejection (see (34)), while in PS they may be associated to a declarative sentence type and convey a slight disagreement regarding the content of the previous discourse. (cf. (35)).

- (34) Portuguese, cf. Canceiro (2023: 226)
 [Mary told Peter to tidy up the room he shares with John.]
 Mary: *Arruma o quarto!*
 tidy up the room
 ‘Tidy up your room!’
 Peter: a. *Que o arrume ele!* / b. *Ele, que o arrume!*
 that it tidies up he he, that it tidies up
 ‘That he tidies it up!’ / ‘As for him, that he tidies it up!’
- (35) Spanish, cf. Gras & Sansineña (2015: 506)
 [Two friends talking about their weight]
 A: *he engordado*
 have fatten
 ‘I’ve gained weight.’
 B: *que yo no te veo más gorda.*
 that I not you see more fat
 ‘I don’t see you fatter.’

The elevated presuppositional nature of examples like (34) is intrinsically linked to its linguistic function: they presuppose the content of a sentence that bears significant similarity to the one explicitly articulated, with the crucial distinction that this presupposed content is predicated on a different referent. Essentially, these insubordinates operate by invoking a parallel sentence structure, but apply it to an alternative subject or entity, thereby creating a contrastive effect while maintaining a strong connection to the original proposition. The subject is focalized in post-verbal position (*Que o arrume ele!*) or occurs as a hanging topic in the sentence left periphery (*Ele, que o arrume!*)

However, in EP the use of a *que*-Insubordinate declarative sentence to convey a disagreeing opinion produces an unacceptable sentence:

- (36) Portuguese
 [Two friends talking about their weight]
 A: *Engordei*
 Have fatten
 ‘I’ve gained weight’
 B: #,* *Que eu não te acho mais gorda.*
 that I not you find more fat
 ‘I don’t think you are fatter.’

Finally, insubordinate *que*-clauses are involved in Conjunctive-*que* constructions, as designated by Corr (2016, 2018b), which introduce a non-embedded

finite declarative clause that contextualizes utterance information assumed as relevant for the addressee. (cf. Corr 2018b: 80). In Spanish and Catalan, it may appear in isolation, contextualized by a non-linguistic situation, as in (37), or be associated to a preceding clause separated by a prosodic break, as in (38):

- (37) Spanish, Corr (2018b: 80)
Context: the addressee is trying to switch on the light.
Que está estropeada.
conj be.3.SG broken
'It's broken'

- (38) Catalan, Corr (2018b: 80)
Digue'm, que te'ls donaré
tell.imp=me conj you=them=give.fut.1.SG
'Tell me, I'll give you it [the money]'

Conjunctive-*que* recovers the so called causal-explicative clauses that provide an explanation or reason for the utterance of the previous expression, as illustrated for EP below. In example (39) the subordinate [*que o país está em alerta amarelo*] establishes a link to the matrix, which provides information that clarifies it.

- (39) Portuguese, Colaço & Matos (2016: 44)
Hoje vai chover, que o país está em alerta amarelo. Today
will rain that the country is in warning yellow
'Today it will rain, because the country is on yellow warning.'

However, the *out of the blue* use of Conjunctive-*que* is impossible in EP:

- (40) Portuguese
a. Context: the addressee is trying to switch on the light.
**Que está estragada.*
that is broken
'It's broken!'
- b. Context: Rain is falling abundantly in the country.
A: #*Que o país está em alerta vermelho.*
that the country is in alert red.

In EP it is not possible to recover the content of a previous clause from the situational context. In the context of causal-explicative sentences in EP, it is crucial to recover the content of omitted material in order to establish a coherent effect-cause relationship. Colaço & Matos (2016) assign the status of parentheticals to causal-explicative clauses. They claim that the explicative clause establishes a paratactic nexus with the host expression it depends on, but still behaves as a subordinate clause in the local domain headed by the explicative complementizer (cf. Colaço & Matos 2016: 49-50, 53-54). So, in this study, we do not analyze *que*-explicatives in EP as Insubordinate constructions.

In conclusion, insubordinate *que*-clauses in European Portuguese and

Peninsular Spanish are employed in a range of standardized conversational contexts, each generating distinct sentence types with specific pragmatic functions. Nevertheless, in many cases there are differences between the grammatical structures employed. The following table summarizes the similarities and differences between the two languages.

Table 1. Similarities and differences between insubordinates in EP and PS

| Kind of insubordinate | What happens in EP | European Portuguese | Peninsular Spanish |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|--|
| Optative expressions | These insubordinates behave similarly in EP and PS, i.e., <i>que</i> is followed by a verb in the subjunctive mood. | a. <i>Que corra tudo bem!</i> '(I hope) That everything goes well!' | a. <i>¡Que llueva mañana!</i> '(I hope) That it rains tomorrow!' |
| Reported orders/ requests | | a. <i>Que venham!</i> 'Let them come!' | a. <i>¡Que vengan!</i> 'Let them come!' |
| Directive <i>que</i>-clauses | Threats: these insubordinates are possible, even when the addressee is a definite entity. | a. <i>Que não te atrevas a questionar-me!</i> 'Don't you dare question me!' b. <i>Que não voltes muito tarde!</i> 'Don't come back too late!' | a. <i>¡Que no te atrevas a cuestionarme!</i> 'Don't you dare question me!' b. <i>¡Que no vuelvas muy tarde!</i> 'Don't come back too late!' |
| Directive <i>que</i>-clauses | Orders: these insubordinates are possible, when the addressee is generically mentioned, but not when it is a singular definite entity. | a. <i>*Que te vás embora!</i> '(You) Leave!' b. <i>Que saiam todos!</i> 'Everybody leave!' | a. <i>¡Que te marches!</i> '(You) Leave!' b. <i>¡Que se marchen todos!</i> 'Everybody leave!' |
| Expressive <i>que</i>-clauses | These are not acceptable without the previous linguistic material. Also, the emotive value is lost. | a. <i>Ai, que me estás a pisar!</i> 'Hey, that you're stepping on me!' b. <i>*Que me estás a pisar!</i> 'That you're stepping on me!' | a. <i>¡(Ay,) que me quemó!</i> '(Ouch) I'm burning myself!' |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| <p>Quotative / reportative <i>que</i>-sentences</p> | <p>The absence of a linguistic context yields the sentence ungrammatical and the quotative meaning is lost.</p> | <p>a. *<i>Que ganhou a bolsa.</i> 'That she won the grant' b. <i>Era a Maria. Que tinha ganho a bolsa.</i> c. 'It was Maria. (She said) that she won the grant'</p> | <p>a. (<i>Oye,</i>) <i>que el Barça ha ganado la Champions.</i> '(Listen) that the Barça won the Champion League!' b. <i>Que ha dimitido el decano.</i> 'The dean has resigned (someone said/I just heard).'</p> |
| <p>Disagreement replies</p> | <p>These are excluded from contexts where they express slight disagreement regarding the content of the previous discourse.</p> | <p>A: <i>Engordei.</i> 'I've gained weight.' B: *<i>Que não te acho mais gorda.</i> 'I don't think you are heavier.'</p> | <p>A: <i>He engordado.</i> 'I've gained weight.' B: <i>Que yo no te veo más gorda.</i> 'I don't see you heavier.'</p> |
| <p>Conjunctive / explicative <i>que</i>-clauses</p> | <p>It is impossible to recover the content of an insubordinate from the situational context.</p> | <p>[Someone is trying to switch on the light]</p> | |
| | | <p>*<i>Que está estragada.</i> 'It's broken'</p> | <p><i>Que está estropeada.</i> 'It's broken'</p> |

In sum, Portuguese employs insubordinate *que*-clauses more restrictively than Spanish. These clauses appear in fewer discourse contexts, being excluded from causal-explicative *que*-clauses and replies indicating slight disagreement. Furthermore, Portuguese imposes stricter syntactic and semantic requirements on the linguistic expressions that involve insubordinate *que*-clauses, including directives, quotations, and emotive sentences that begin with an interjective expression.

5. The syntactic structure of *Que*-Insubordination in European Portuguese

Given the differences and similarities between insubordinate *que*-sentences in EP and PS, and also the greater dependence of insubordinate *que*-clauses in EP on an overt linguistic expression, we assume, as previously noted, that they are less independent than their counterparts in PS.

In this study, we propose that in EP, insubordinate *que*-clauses are finite sentences that can originate from two distinct processes: they may result from the omission of the lexical material of a selecting matrix sentence (cf. sub-section 5.1), or they may correspond to clauses that are licensed by a linguistic anchor (cf. sub-section 5.2). In this section, we will present these strategies.

5.1. Insubordinate sentences as omission of the selecting matrix sentence

In this section we will consider directive and desiderative sentences, as (41) and (42), which can occur in EP without an overt linguistic expression preceding the *que*-clause:

- (41) Portuguese
Que ninguém saia!
 ‘That nobody leaves!’
- (42) Portuguese
Que corra tudo bem!
 ‘That everything goes well!’

This phenomenon is primarily facilitated by the ability to assign an adequate content of the omitted main clause and its verb, based on the *que*-clause and the situational context. To clarify, in (41), relying on the *que*-clause, which presents a directive content and the syntactic and morphologic structure of the embedded imperatives (the subjunctive being the suppletive mood of the imperative), we know it corresponds to an order, or a vehement request and, thus, we admit the possible omission of verbs like *ordenar* ‘to order’ or *querer* ‘to want’ in the sense of ‘to require’, as in (43). The same analysis applies to (42) and (44), assuming from the content and form of the *que*-clause that it corresponds to a wish.

- (43) Portuguese
Ordeno /quero que ninguém saia!
 ‘I order/ I want that nobody leaves!’
- (44) Portuguese
Desejo que corra tudo bem!
 ‘I wish/hope that everything goes well!’

The reasoning presented above raises the question of considering whether these *que*-insubordinates derive from ellipsis of the main sentence, as proposed by Evans (2007), or, alternatively, from a highly constrained process involving the recovering of covert lexical material of the matrix clause, by an inference process.

As we mentioned in section 2, for Evans (2007) insubordinate clauses result from a derivational process with several stages, which begins with the complex sentence presenting a matrix and a regular subordinate clause.

- (45) 1) Subordination > (2) Ellipsis > (3) Conventionalized ellipsis > (4) Reanalysis as main clause structure

Thus, according to Evans’ proposal, the sentences in (43) and (44) will be in stage 3, since there is a restriction on the material that can be recovered, which is inferred from the situational context.

In contrast with Evans, Mithun (2008), regarding insubordinates, proposes the concept of *extension*, which allows insubordinates to occur as independent sentences because there is an extension of the sentence domain into the discursive and pragmatic

domains.

In turn, Cristofaro's (2016) developing the inference approach to omitted material in insubordination, emphasizes that the recovered linguistic material is inferred on the basis of the situational context/pragmatic domain. Notice, however, that the author combines several processes, as ellipsis and clausal disengagement (or *extension*, in Mithun (2008)), which can be applied to different types of sentences.

However, the ellipsis hypothesis of analysis presents a problem. If we posit that ellipsis is involved, we must interpret this concept in a broad sense to include inference from the situational context, as there are no linguistic antecedents present to justify the deletion or recovery of the omitted constituents, which may correspond to (and be recovered as) different content-full lexical items, as shown in (43) and (44). Thus, we propose that the speaker assumes that the hearer may rely on an inference strategy to recover the adequate omitted material.⁴ This leads us to assume that a felicitous situational/discursive context is always necessary, as well as an adequate content and form of the linguistic material uttered.

We will accept this idea in approaching *que*-root sentences, presenting omitted grammatical structures, despite adopting a framework that incorporates a strong syntactic component.

Thus, elaborating on Sánchez López's (2020) work on *que/si* exclamatives and optatives in Spanish, we propose that *que*-insubordinate sentences with imperative or optative import in EP, illustrated in (41)-(42), may be represented as in the following simplified structure:

(46) [Discourse] - [ForceP [Force⁰ *que*{imperative/optative}] [{*ninguém saia /corra tudo bem*}]]

5.2. Insubordination and licensing by an overt linguistic expression

Despite the existence of hypotheses regarding the development of insubordinate clauses that suggest that insubordinate clauses can emerge independently as a main clause, most insubordinate *que*-clauses in EP are only available when an overt linguistic expression immediately precedes them. In other words, they require a linguistic anchor to survive. This is the case of reportative clauses, but also of expressive exclamative clauses conveying a warning, or an emotive state of the speaker as in the following examples:

- (47) Portuguese
- a. *Era a Maria. Que tinha ganho a bolsa.* [reportative]
'It was Maria. (She said) that she won the grant.'
 - b. **Que tinha ganho a bolsa.*
that she won the grant.

⁴ Due to space limitations, we will not deal with disagreement replies in this paper.

- (48) Portuguese
Olha, que caís! [expressive evidential - warning]
 ‘Look out, that you will fall!’
- (49) Portuguese
Ai, que me estás a pisar! [expressive emotive]
 ‘Ouch/hey, you’re stepping on me!’

This anchor conveys the primary pragmatic value of the utterance and can take several forms: it may be the linguistic material *Era a Maria* ‘it was Maria’ that enables the recovery of the inferred sentence, such as “she said” or “she shouted” in example (47); it could be an interjection, like *Ai* ‘ouch/hey’ in example (49); or it might be a perceptive verb functioning as an interjection, such as *Olha* ‘Look out’ in example (48).

Note that, although *Olha* seems to behave as an interjection, we admit it behaves differently from a true interjection, as *Ai* ‘ouch/hey’. We follow Norrick (2009: 868) and assume that *Ai* is a primary interjection, as it expresses emotion, and, on the other hand, *Olha* (‘Look out’) is a secondary interjection, as it originates from a word from a lexical class. The examples below show the different behavior displayed regarding their position on the left periphery:

- (50) Portuguese
- a. *Olha, João! Que o copo vai cair!*
 look João that the glass go fall
 ‘Look out, João! The glass will fall down!’
- b. *João, olha! Que o copo vai cair!*
 João, look that the glass go fall
 ‘João, look out! The glass will fall down!’
- (51) Portuguese
- a. *Ai, João! Que me pisaste!*
 ouch João that me.cl step on
 ‘Ouch, João! You stepped on me!’
- b. **João, ai! Que me pisaste!*
 João, ouch that me.cl step on
 ‘João, ouch! You stepped on me!’

Our analysis of EP diverges from those proposed for PS by Etxepare (2010) and Demonte & Soriano (2014), particularly in cases where the root complementizer clause is preceded by the interjective expression *Olha* (‘Look’).

Bearing in mind the evidential value we have associated to these sentences, we believe that it is adequate to analyze them as Krifka (2021: 16), who considers these evidential markers as being “the source of an epistemic attitude”. The author also includes in this category reportative evidentials (as *according to X*) and sentences starting with reportative verbs, which we assume can correspond to utterances as the one presented below. In this case the *que*-sentence is anchored in the previous

linguistic expression *Era a Maria* ‘it was Maria’ that allows us to infer the covert linguistic content of *Ela disse* (‘She said’).

- (52) Portuguese
Era a Maria. *Que tinha ganho a bolsa.*
 ‘It was Maria. (She said) that she won the grant.’

Krifka (2021: 16) states that these constructions commit the speaker to its propositional content, i.e., in this case, the speaker is committed to the truth of the fact that Maria won a grant. Through (52), the propositional content of Maria winning a grant is introduced to the common ground.

In PS, the interjection preceding the *que*-clause is optional (e.g., "¡Oye!"), leading the aforementioned authors to attribute the pragmatic value of the utterance — whether *quotative* (cf. Etxepare) or *evidential* (cf. Etxepare 2010 and Demonte & Soriano 2014) – to the *que* itself.

However, in EP, the obligatory presence of the interjection or perceptive verb acting as an interjection requires a different approach. Consequently, we propose an alternative analysis based on the work of Alonso-Cortés (1999), which takes into account this mandatory linguistic element in EP constructions.

Alonso-Cortés (1999) proposes that interjections are expressive words that indicate the major illocutionary force of an utterance. The examples below demonstrate the potential for interjections to serve as syntactic heads, governing and integrating other phrasal elements within the sentence structure. The author proposes that interjections possess the capability to function as the head of sentential constructions, accommodating either prepositional phrases (PPs, cf. (53)) or adjectival phrases (AdjPs, cf. (54)) as complements.

- (53) [_{INTERP} *Ay* [_{PP} *de mí*]]
 ‘Oh, poor me.’
- (54) [_{INTERP} [_{INTER} *Ah*] [_{ADJP} *loco de mí*]]
 ‘Oh, crazy me.’

Building on this evidence, we consider that in *que*-insubordinates the interjection assumes a dual role: it retains its expressive nature and marks the clause's major illocutionary force, effectively signaling to the listener that the following construction may be interpreted as an independent utterance.

- (55) Portuguese
Ui! Que me magoei!
 ‘Ouch! That I’ve hurt myself!’
- (56) Portuguese
Olha, que caís!
 ‘Look out, that you will fall!’

In these examples, the interjections "Ui" and "Olha" serve to complement and intensify the illocutionary force of the subsequent clauses. Rather than replacing the

inherent assertive or directive nature of the insubordinates, the interjections work in concert with them, amplifying their communicative impact.

Alonso-Cortés (1999) assumes that interjections possess inherent semantic content, such that the omission of *que*-clauses does not interfere with the production of coherent and semantically complete speech acts. Conversely, our analysis for EP demonstrates that the inverse operation – the elision of the interjection while retaining the *que*-clause – results in syntactic ungrammaticality.

- (57) a. *Ui!*
 ‘Ouch!’
- b. **Que me magoei!*
 ‘That I’ve hurt myself!’

Developing Alonso-Cortés’ (1999) ideas, we will consider proposals exploring the connection between Syntax and Discourse that assume the existence of Speech Acts functional projections (see, among others, Speas & Tenny 2003, Hill 2007, Ledgway 2012, Haegeman & Hill 2013, Demonte & Soriano 2014, Corr 2016/2018b, Krifka 2021, Villalba 2024).

Thus, taking into account the existence of Speech Act projections above ForceP, we propose the following simplified representation, where Speech Act is designated as SA.

- (58) [SAP[SA[interjection: exclamative]][FORCEP[FORCE *que* {exclamative/declarative/...}]]

This representation, illustrated for (55) in (59), allows us to capture the idea that the main illocutionary force of the sentence is due to the presence of the interjective expression in SA. This one must be compatible with the illocutionary force of the sentence, codified in Force, to strengthen it:

- (59) [SAP[SA[*Ui*_[exclamative]]][FORCEP[FORCE *que*_[exclamative] [*me magoei*]]]

Notice that the illocutionary force of the interjection and of ForceP may be different. This is, for instance, what happens in reportives in languages like Spanish, in sentences like “*Oye, que el Barça ha ganado la Champions.*” Assuming, as usual, that *Oye* is an interjection, while it displays exclamative illocutionary force, the *que*-clause is interpreted as an indirect reportative evidential, which according to Demonte & Soriano (2014) is only compatible with a declarative sentence. An alternative analysis for these clauses, could be devised along the lines of Krifka (2021), as proposed in Villalba (2024) for Spanish and Catalan.

Connecting Syntax and Semantics, Krifka (2021: 6) proposes three layers in the sentence left periphery:

- (60) [ActP [Act] [ComP [Com] [JP] J] [ForceP [TP]]]]]

In this configuration, ActPhrase hosts the illocutionary force of the utterance, be it an assertion, represented by the dot symbol “.”, a question signalled with “?”, or an exclamation marked as “!”. The CommitP projection, ComP, reflects the speaker’s

commitment regarding the truth value of the utterance, and the JudgePhrase projection, JP, is related to epistemic or evidential markers occurring in the utterance the speaker is committed to. Krifka (2021: 11) recalls that evidentiality is related to the source of evidence for a proposition, and epistemicity is related to the level of certainty.

Notice that, adopting this proposal for EP, JP would be an appropriate place to host an element as *Olha*, ‘look’, as well as linguistic anchors of reportative evidentials, as *Era a Maria* (‘It was Maria’), which also corresponds to the source of evidence of the utterance.

Villalba (2024), based on Krifka, proposes the following representation for *que*-exclamatives in Spanish and Catalan:

(61) [IntP Interjection [ActP ! [ComP † [JP [ForceP *que*...]

In this configuration, ActP turns the utterance into an exclamation, represented as “!”; †, projected in ComP, represents the strong commitment of the speaker; and JP hosts the evidential that anchors the in subordinate in ForceP. Notice that Villalba (2024) considers exclamations to be commitments that, differently from assertions, express the emotion of the speaker.⁵

Despite refining the discourse-syntax correlation of *que*-exclamatives, this representation should be adapted to account for the empirical evidence presented in Alonso-Cortés (1999), which are incorporated in our previous representation in (59). In fact, we would like to capture the fact that the Interjection has an inherent illocutionary (exclamative) force and may correspond to an autonomous Speech Act, and that Force may include sentence-types that codify an (identical or different) illocutionary force. Integrating these changes, as well as the proposals to account for vocatives (see Hill 2007, González López & Schmid 2023), a sentence like (62) below, would be represented as in (63):

(62) Portuguese
Ai, João! (Olha,) que me estás a magoar!
 ouch João look that me.CL are prep hurt
 ‘Ouch, João! Look out, you’re hurting me!’

(63) [_{SAP}[_{SA} *Ai-!* [_{VocP} *João* [_{COMP} _{COM} [_{JP} *Olha* [_{ForceP} *que* [_{declarative} [_{me estás a magoar}]]]]]]]]

Building upon Hill (2007) and González López & Schmid (2023), we elaborate on the syntactic positioning of vocatives in these in subordinates. Their research proposes that initial vocatives must be projected above the ForceP in the syntactic structure.

⁵ The author argues “that when the speaker utters *How expensive this wine is!*, (s)he is making a commitment to the truth of the state that (s)he expresses”, and, thus, exclamations encode “two different commitments: (i) a commitment to the psychological state (expressive content), and (ii) a commitment to the truth of the proposition expressed (propositional content)” (Villalba 2024: 15).

6. Final remarks

European Portuguese exhibits in subordinate *que*-clauses, which occur in non-embedded sentence domains. However, these root *que*-sentences in European Portuguese demonstrate significantly less independence than their Spanish counterparts. They maintain a robust connection with the standard embedding *que* complementizer, and their discursive value is primarily inferred or determined by the situational or pragmatic context.

Two main types of in subordinate *que*-clauses are available in European Portuguese: those that exhibit omission of the lexical material of a selecting matrix sentence, whose content must be inferred; and those licensed by a linguistic anchor, which may manifest as either a juxtaposed preceding sentence or an initial interjection. Despite the distinctive characteristics of in subordinate clauses in European Portuguese, they exhibit properties that suggest they are not fundamentally dissimilar from complex sentences in terms of syntactic structure.

This observation leads us to reconsider Evans's (2007: 368) assertion regarding the feasibility of maintaining a strict distinction between syntactic (inter-clausal) and discourse (inter-sentential) relations in natural language. The analysis of these structures in European Portuguese challenges the notion of a clear-cut demarcation between grammar and discourse, and suggests a cartographic approach to sentence structure, which captures the correlation between Syntax and Discourse.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank the audience of *Going Romance 2023*, especially Caterina Donati, Cristina Sánchez-López, Luis Eguren, Svenja Schmid, and Xavier Villalba, as well as the anonymous reviewers of this paper, for their valuable comments.

The research presented has been developed within Centro de Linguística da Universidade de Lisboa (CLUL), initially by project UIDB/00214/2020 [DOI 10.54499/UIDB/00214/2020 and then by UID/00214: Centro de Linguística da Universidade de Lisboa, funded by Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia (FCT).

References

Alonso-Cortés, Ángel. 1999. Las construcciones exclamativas. La Interjección y las expresiones vocativas. *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, vol 3: 3993-4050.

Barbosa, Pilar, Pedro Santos, and Rita Veloso. 2023. Tipos de frase e força ilocutória. In Raposo *et al.*, *Gramática do Português*, cap 48. Lisboa: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian

Brito, Ana Maria, Inês Duarte, and Gabriela Matos. 2003. Estrutura da frase simples e tipos de frases. In Mateus, Maria Helena Mira; Ana Maria Brito and Inês Duarte, *Gramática da Língua Portuguesa*, Cap 12, 433-506. Lisboa: Caminho.

Canceiro, Nádía. 2023 *Construções de mas em estruturas corretivas e de negação de expectativas*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Lisbon.

(<https://repositorio.ul.pt/handle/10451/63>)

Colaço, Madalena. & Gabriela Matos. 2016. Explicative clauses in Portuguese as a case of parentheses. In *Romance languages and linguistic theory 10: Selected papers from 'Going Romance' 28, Lisbon*, 43-60. Amsterdam/New York: John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/rllt.10.03col>

Corr, Alice. 2016 Matrix complementisers and 'speech act' syntax: Formalising insubordination in Catalan and Spanish. In *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 13: Selected papers from 'Going Romance' 29, Nijmegen*, 75-94. Amsterdam/New York: John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/rllt.13.06cor>

Corr, Alice. 2018a. 'Exclamative' and 'quotative' illocutionary complementisers in Catalan, European Portuguese and Spanish: a study in Ibero-Romance syntactic 'near-synonymy'. *Languages in Contrast: International Journal for Contrastive Linguistics* 18(1): 69-98. <https://doi.org/10.1075/lic.00004.cor>

Corr, Alice. 2018b Matrix complementisers and 'speech act' syntax - Formalising insubordination in Catalan and Spanish. *Romance languages and linguistic theory*, 13. John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/rllt.13.06cor>

Cristofaro, Sonia. 2016. Routes to insubordination: a cross-linguistic perspective. In Evans, Nicholas & Honoré Watanabe (Eds.), *Insubordination—Typological Studies in Language*, 393-422. Amsterdam/New York: John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.115.15cri>

Demonte, Violeta., & Olga Fernández-Soriano. 2013a. El 'que' citativo en español y otros elementos de la periferia oracional. Variación inter e intralingüística. *Autour de 'que'/El entorno de 'que'*, 43-63. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang

Evidentials *dizque* and *que* in Spanish. Grammaticalization, parameters and the (fine) structure of Comp. *Linguistica* 8, 211-234.

Demonte, Violeta., & Olga Fernández-Soriano. 2014. Evidentiality and illocutionary force: Spanish matrix *que* at the syntax-pragmatics interface. In *Left sentence peripheries in Spanish*, 217-252. Amsterdam/New York: John Benjamins.

Etxepare, Ricardo. 2010. From hearsay evidentiality to same saying relations. *Lingua* 120: 604-627

Etxepare, Ricardo. 2014. Coordination and subordination. In J. I. Hualde, A. Olarrea & E. O'Rourke (eds.), *The handbook of Hispanic linguistics*, 503-531. Malden/Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.

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

Evans, Nicholas. 2009 *Insubordination and the grammaticalisation of interactive presuppositions*, Work presented at Methodologies in determining morphosyntactic change, organised by Ritsuko Kikusawa Museum of Ethnography, Osaka, March 2009.

https://www.r.minpaku.ac.jp/ritsuko/english/symposium/pdf/symposium_0903/Evans_handout.pdf

Gras, Pedro. 2010. *Gramática de Construcciones en Interacción. Propuesta de un Modelo y Aplicación al Análisis de Estructuras Independientes con Marcas de Subordinación en Español*. Ph.D. thesis, Uuniversidad de Barcelona.

Gras, Pedro. & María Sol Sansiñena. 2015. An interactional account of discourse connective que-constructions in Spanish, *Text & Talk* 35(4): 505-529.

Gras, Pedro. 2016. Revisiting the functional typology of insubordination: insubordinate que-constructions in Spanish. In N. Evans & H. Watanabe (eds.), *Insubordination*, 113-144. Amsterdam/New York: John Benjamins Publishing Company,

López, Laura González & Svenja Schmid. 2023. Vocative, where do you hang out in wh-interrogatives?. *The Linguistic Review* 40(1): 77-106. <https://doi.org/10.1515/tlr-2022-2106>

Haegeman, Liliane & Virginia Hill. 2013. The syntacticization of discourse. *Syntax and its Limits* 48: 370-390.

Hill, Virginia. 2007. Vocatives and the pragmatics-syntax interface. *Lingua* 117: 2077-2105. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2007.01.002>

Krifka, Manfred. 2021. Layers of Assertive Clauses: Propositions, Judgements, Commitments, Acts. In J. Hartmann & A. Wöllstein (eds.), *Propositionale Argumente im Sprachvergleich: Theorie und Empirie. /Propositional arguments in cross-linguistic research: Theoretical and empirical Issues*, 115-181. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

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

Mithun, Marianne. 2008. The extension of dependency beyond the sentence, *Language* 84(1): 69-119. <https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2008.0054>

Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In L. Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of grammar: Handbook in generative syntax*, 281-337. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands.

Norricks, Neal R. 2009. Interjections as pragmatic markers. *Journal of Pragmatics* 41(5): 866-891. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2008.08.005>

Sánchez López, Cristina. 2017. Optative Exclamatives in Spanish, In I. Bosque (ed.), *Advances in the Analysis of Spanish Exclamatives*, 82-107. Ohio: The Ohio State University Press.

Sánchez López, Cristina. 2020. On the meaning of complementizers: a proposal based on Spanish exclamative sentences. In M. González-Rivera & S. Sessarego (eds.), *Interface-driven phenomena in Spanish: Essays in honor of Javier Gutiérrez-Rexach*, 35-54. London/New York: Routledge,

Speas, Peggy & Carol Tenny. 2003. Configurational properties of point of view roles. *Asymmetry in Grammar* 1: 315-344.

Trotzke, Andreas. & Xavier Villalba. 2021. Expressive insubordination. A cross-linguistic study on that-exclamatives. In A. Trotzke & X. Villalba (eds.), *Expressive meaning across linguistic levels and frameworks*, 108-120. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Villalba, Xavier. 2024. Romance exclamative markers at the syntax-pragmatics interface: A compositional approach to exclamativity, *Journal of Pragmatics* 226: 64-77.