Patterns of (in)dependence

María Sol Sansiñena, University of Leuven

Abstract:

Complementizer *que* ‘that’ has a multiple functional load in that it not only marks the finiteness of the clause but also signals a pragmatic meaning to the speech participant when it is used without a matrix verb. This study discusses the interconnectedness of some diverse functions associated with *que* by addressing the phenomenon of ‘semi-insubordination’ (Van linden and Van de Velde 2014) in Spanish, discussing it against the pattern <preface + *que*-clause> and the case of ‘causal’ *que*. Specifically, this chapter focusses on the diverse relations that are established between *que*-clauses and immediately preceding elements in the turn, as well as what types of premodifying elements contribute to the interpretation of the *que*-clause. Based on the interactional-constructional analysis of real conversational data, and mainly taking into account the structure of the turn-intervention, it will be argued that the relation between the *que*-clause and the preceding element is essentially different depending on whether they constitute two turn-constructional units (TCUs) or only one. Moreover, the preceding element is classified according to its function in discourse, either as preface, element with illocutionary force or modal element.

1 Introduction

Spanish *que*-constructions can function as syntactically independent sentences, i.e. as *insubordinate constructions* (see Evans 2007, Evans and Watanabe 2016).¹ However, the empirical evidence shows that there are types and degrees of (in)dependence available for constructions formally marked as subordinate (see D’Hertefelt 2018 for Germanic languages and Sansiñena 2015 for Spanish). Between the traditional ‘dependent’ use of a subordinate clause, i.e. as part of a complex sentence, and the ‘main clause’ use of a formally subordinate clause, i.e. insubordination, there are different intermediate degrees of (in)dependence, including various types of *dyadic* dependence² (see Sansiñena et al. 2015) and semi-insubordination (see Van linden and Van de Velde 2014 as well as other chapters in this volume).

Furthermore, there are also different levels upon which a structure might be dependent (e.g. functional vs. syntactic). Gras & Sansiñena (2015) and Sansiñena (2015), for example, discuss constructions introduced by *que* in Spanish which are not syntactically dependent on any main clause element but are ‘pragmatically’ dependent (in the sense of Lindström and Londen 2008) on preceding discourse. Verstraete et al. (2012) and D’Hertefelt & Verstraete (2014) discuss ‘that’-constructions in Dutch and in Swedish and Danish, respectively, which also have a wide or discursive scope.³

This paper deals with *que*-constructions in Spanish that, in different ways, relate to a previous element in the speaker’s turn, and discusses the wealth of semantic relations found between *que*-

¹ See Gras (2011, 2013, 2016), Gras & Sansiñena (2015) and Sansiñena (2015) for discussions on insubordinate complement constructions in Spanish.

² Dyadically dependent clauses have the complementizer *que* in sentence-initial position and lack an explicit matrix, but can be construed as dependent on a matrix from the previous turn.

³ See Mithun (2008, 2016) for a description and discussion of other types of discourse-organizing constructions in languages indigenous to North America and the process of extension of dependency from sentence to discourse domain.

clauses and the various types of preceding elements, as well as the syntactic status of these constructions within the gradient from syntactic dependence to insubordination.

The term ‘semi-insubordination’ has been coined by Van linden and Van de Velde to refer to a construction type in Dutch in which the *dat*-clause is preceded by one single element which “seems to function at matrix clause level” (Van linden and Van de Velde 2014: 231), as in (1). This preceding element can be adverbial, adjectival or nominal.

- (1) *misschien* ***da’k*** *als* *bob* *stomdrunken* *toch*
 maybe CONJ.I as designated.driver dead.drunk nevertheless
 binnen *zal* *mogen : -))*
 inside will may

‘Maybe [that], as a designated driver I will nevertheless be allowed to get in dead drunk *smile*.’
 (CONDIV, IRC, Brug 1; cited in Van linden and Van de Velde 2014: 231)

Semi-insubordinate constructions are also found in Spanish, as exemplified in (2) to (4). In these constructions, the *que*-clause functions as the propositional content of a modal element and the pattern <element + *que*-clause> constitutes one turn-constructional unit (henceforth abbreviated as TCU).⁴ In (2), B’s first TCU is headed by the evidential adverb *obviamente* ‘obviously’, which intensifies the strength of the assertion.

- (2) [Two senators discuss a law of public ethics at an ordinary session of the Senate]

A: *Quizás, obviamente, usted no lo ignora, señor senador, pero la ley de ética pública que hemos sancionado permite el acceso a cualquier ciudadano a las declaraciones de bienes que hacemos todos los funcionarios públicos.* [...]

B: *Obviamente que no me refiero a la declaración de bienes.*⁵ *Eso lo sabemos todos, porque todos hemos sancionado la ley de ética pública.*

‘A: Maybe, obviously, you do not ignore it, Mr. Senator, but the law of public ethics that we have passed allows any citizen to have access to the asset declarations that all civil servants do. [...]

B: Obviously [that] I do not mean the declaration of assets. We all know that, because we have all sanctioned the law on public ethics.’

(CREA oral, Reunión 65, sesión ordinaria 32, Senado de la Nación, Argentina)

In (3), the adjectival adverb⁶ *claro* ‘clearly, of course’ expresses confidence about the propositional content of the *que*-clause, i.e. the fact that somebody will check whether the IDs of people who signed the petition are real.

- (3) [A group of friends talk about signing a petition]

⁴ A turn-constructional unit (TCU) is the smallest unit which can form a turn at talk (See Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson 1974; Ford and Thompson 1996; Schegloff 1996).

⁵ For the sake of clarity, semi-insubordinate constructions will be completely underlined. Whenever discussing another type of pattern, only the element or structure preceding the *que*-clause is underlined.

⁶ The so-called *adjectival adverbs* or short adverbs often alternate with the corresponding forms in *-mente*, as in *llegar {rápido ~ rápidamente}* ‘to arrive fast’; *hablar {claro ~ claramente}* ‘to speak clearly’.

G03: *es una recogida de firmas para evitar que demuelan unos edificios por aquí*
[...]

G03: *eso no lo comprueban (.) o sea si me invento un DNI ahora
no lo comprueban no/*

G04: *[nada tú firma ahí]*

G02: *[claro **que** lo comprueban Lucas]*

'G03: it's a petition to collect signatures to prevent some nearby buildings to be demolished
[...]

G03: they don't check it (.) I mean if I make up an ID now
they will not check it right/

G04: [nothing you sign there]

G02: *[of course [that] they check it Lucas]'*

(MAESB2-02, COLA M)

Finally, the interjection derived from the noun *lástima* 'pity' used in (4) preceding a *que*-clause in the subjunctive mood develops a factive or evaluative component. This use of *lástima* is created from the structure <*ser una lástima que* + subjunctive> 'to be a pity that + subjunctive', in which the attribute *una lástima* 'a pity' imposes the subjunctive mood to the subordinate noun clause acting as the subject of the sentence (RAE-AALE 2009: §25.14t).

(4) [Two journalists comment on a football match]

A: *¿Lo ha visto animado, ahora?*

B: *Sí sí sí sí. Está muy animado y y muy esperanzado ya pensando en el partido del domingo, que % muy bien.*

A: *Lástima **que** Ronaldo fallara esos dos goles, aunque también marcó uno y otro.*

B: *Sí, además uno muy difícil. El gol de cabeza para mí ha sido muy espectacular y muy bonito.*

'A: Have you seen him lively, now?

B: Yes yes yes yes. He's very lively and and very hopeful already thinking about the Sunday match, that % very well.

A: *Too bad [that] Ronaldo missed those goals*, although he did score one and another one.

B: Yes, besides a very difficult one. The headed goal has been to me very spectacular and very nice.'

(CREA oral, *Supergarcía*, Cadena COPE, Spain)

The purpose of this chapter is to account for the distribution and functional properties of the semi-insubordinate construction <element + *que*-clause>, as in (2)-(4), and to disentangle this construction from other related, but different constructions, such as discourse-connective *que*-clauses preceded by prefaces, as in (5) below, and the so-called 'causal *que*', as in (6) below. In the latter use, the relation linking the two component clauses has been referred to as either 'subordination' (see RAE-AALE 2009: §46.6) or 'parataxis' and 'sociation', a concept used by Lehmann (1988) to refer to relations closer to the left pole of the continuum of hierarchical downgrading (see Aliaga García and Bustos Guadaño 1997; Iglesias Recuero 2000).⁷

⁷ Lehmann considers the parameter of 'hierarchical downgrading' when discussing clause linkage across languages. He argues that at the "starting pole of the continuum, there is no hierarchical relation between the two clauses forming the complex sentence. This is the situation which we call parataxis. At the end pole, there is a clear hierarchical relation between them, the subordinate clause being downgraded to a particular, well-defined constituent within the main clause. This is the situation we call embedding. Between the poles, there

- (5) [An adolescent has fallen in the mud]

J01: *tronco que me da vergüenza ajena*

G01: *qué/*

J01: *que se ha caído en todo en el barro*

'J01: *dude* [QUE] I fell embarrassed for him/her

G01: *what/*

J01: that (s)he has fallen in the mud'

(MABPE2-07, COLA M)

- (6) [An adolescent realizes it is getting late]

J02: *qué hora es que yo me voy*

'J02: *what time is it* [QUE] I'm leaving'

(MAMTE2-02B, COLA M)

The questions to be resolved are the following: First, what is the relation between the preceding element and the *que*-clause? Second, by virtue of those relations, what types of elements can precede the *que*-clause? To answer these questions, it will be necessary to clarify whether the combination of the procedural meaning of *que* with the meaning of a preceding modal element has a compositional or unitary structure. To this end, the analysis will make use of formal and semantic criteria which will be described in Section 3.

The rest of this chapter is organized as follows. Section 2 discusses the phenomenon of semi-insubordination (Van linden and Van de Velde 2014) in more detail. The discussion draws on the evidence attested in some European languages but then homes in on semi-insubordination in Spanish. Section 3 describes the data and methodology followed. Section 4 presents the analysis of *que*-constructions in non-initial turn types preceded by one element which does not have scope over the *que*-clause, i.e. cases of <preface + discourse connective *que*-construction> and cases of 'causal *que*'. Section 5 discusses the results of the analysis of semi-insubordinate constructions in the corpus data, and presents a classification of different types of elements being the end result of the analysis. Finally, Section 6 presents the final conclusions.

2 Semi-insubordination

This section discusses the phenomenon of semi-insubordination in Spanish and proposes a classification of the preceding element according to the criterion of whether the element forms a separate speech act with its own speech functional value. In turn, a further classification scheme will be presented for the cases in which the *que*-clause and its preceding element constitute two separate TCUs, according to the type of relation linking the two.

2.1 Semi-insubordination as a cross linguistic phenomenon

Van linden and Van de Velde (2014) discuss a range of constructions in Dutch referred to as 'semi-autonomous subordination' which include proper insubordinate constructions, semi-insubordinate

are various constructions in which the subordinate clause is ever more downgraded" (Lehmann 1988:184-185).

ones, ‘cleft-like’ constructions, and a ‘clauseless’ type which has no full subordinate clause following the *dat*-subordinator. They argue that all these types share the common property of expressing interpersonal meaning. This shared property, they suggest, can be accounted for by drawing on Croft’s (2000) concept of ‘hypoanalysis’ or ‘underanalysis’:

In hypoanalysis, the listener reanalyses a contextual semantic/functional property as an inherent property of the syntactic unit. In the reanalysis, the inherent property of the context [...] is then attributed to the syntactic unit, and so the syntactic unit in question gains a new meaning or function. (Croft 2000: 126-127)

As such, Van linden and Van de Velde’s (2014: 229) hypoanalysis proposal is complementary to Evans’ (2007) pathway of change involving diachronic ellipsis, but disagrees with Aelbrecht’s (2006) synchronic ellipsis account of semi-insubordinate construction in that there is no textual evidence that a main clause is present in synchrony in an underlying deep structure. Their study proposes a plausible explanation for the development of semi-insubordinate constructions, explaining its mechanism of change while accounting for the reasons why speakers might have opted to leave the main clause aside. For the semi-insubordinate construction type in particular, they propose a classification of formal subtypes including adverbial, adjectival and nominal subtypes. At the same time, they argue that the semantic nature of the subtypes can be epistemic, evaluative or affective.⁸ In sum, in Dutch the element preceding the *dat*-clause always expresses the speaker’s attitudinal assessment of the content of the *dat*-clause.

Aelbrecht (2006) takes a different approach to the phenomenon, arguing that the semi-insubordinate construction in Belgian dialects of Dutch involves IP-ellipsis. She proposes an analysis of the construction <X + *that*-clause> in which X stands for an adverbial or adjectival phrase. Her analysis of the preceding element is based on Cinque’s (1999) hierarchy of ‘higher’ and ‘lower’ adverbs, and supports the idea that the adverbs attested in the semi-insubordinate construction are the ones found in the ‘higher Mod-nodes’ – Mod_{epistemic}, Mod_{irrealis} and Mod_{necessity} – (Aelbrecht 2006: 3). Yet, her analysis does not seem to uncover the functional motivations for speakers to use the semi-insubordinate construction instead of the complex construction. Moreover, the synchronic ellipsis account is contentious, as pointed out by Van linden and Van de Velde (2014).

Adverbial semi-insubordination has been attested in several European languages, such as Swedish (*kanske att* ‘maybe that’), French (*peut-être que* ‘maybe that’) and Spanish (*tal vez que* ‘maybe that’, *por supuesto que* ‘certainly that’) (cf. Ramat and Ricca 1998; Van linden and Van de Velde 2014: 247). Aelbrecht (2006) also points out the existence of semi-insubordinate constructions in French – restricted to the adverbial subtype – and Beijering (2016) and Beijering & Norde (this volume) have also attested instances of the construction in Norwegian (*bra at* ‘good that’, *flaks at* ‘luck that’) and Swedish (*måhända att* ‘perhaps that’), respectively. Kaltenböck (this volume) offers a discussion on semi-insubordination in contemporary English and argues that insubordination and semi-insubordination should both be treated as a category of theticals. The following subsection presents some previous accounts of the <element + *que*-clause> construction in Spanish.

2.2 Semi-insubordinate constructions in Spanish

Semi-insubordinate constructions in Spanish are constructions in which the *que*-clause is preceded by one element that is not a full matrix clause, i.e. the *que*-clause occurs without a full main clause, but in combination with a complement-taking predicate. For Spanish, there is still no clear description of what type of elements can precede a *que*-clause in a semi-insubordinate

⁸ Note that for the formal ‘adverbial’ subtype there is no semantic ‘affective’ subtype available, while for the formal ‘adjectival’ subtype there is no semantic ‘epistemic’ subtype available.

construction.⁹ Moreover, there is still no account that satisfactorily explains what determines the presence of *que* in those constructions and whether its presence is required by formal features – such as the selection of a lexical piece like *ojalá* –, semantic features, – such as the expression of evidentiality –, or pragmatic features, – such as a formal or informal register. As is discussed below, most previous studies account for the semi-insubordinate construction from a generativist perspective and take as the maximum unit of analysis an extended projection of the sentence, i.e. the left periphery. However, they do not take into account discursive factors, and little attention is directed to the functioning of the construction <element + *que*> in talk-in-interaction.

Rodríguez Ramalle (2008b) presents an analysis of so-called derived interjections such as *anda* lit. ‘go’, *vaya* lit. ‘go’ and *mira* lit. ‘look’, which admit a following clause introduced by the conjunction *que*. According to her, these interjections express a degree reading when they appear in a sentence together with a noun, adjective or verb susceptible to being measured on a scale. Rodríguez Ramalle (2011) compares the construction <interjection + *que*-clause>, such as in *mira que* lit. ‘look that’, to the construction <evidential adverb + *que*-clause>, as in *naturalmente que* lit. ‘naturally that’, and argues that although the first one has a broader range of uses, in some cases, both constructions are used to perform an emphatic reaction. Rodríguez Ramalle contends that whenever the interjection is combined with – occurs immediately before – *que*, “it cannot be separated from it” (2011: 215). However, as will be shown, interjections such as *mira* are attested in the corpus data preceding *que* both (i) as a separate TCU (see example (9) below) and (ii) in constructions expressing a degree reading (see example (10) below).

Demonte and Fernández Soriano (2013) argue that in the cases in which the so-called ‘interjection’ forms a unit with the *que*-clause, the first element actually functions as an adverbial phrase, similar to the cases of *Bien que* lit. ‘well that’ and *Sí que* lit. ‘yes that’ discussed by Hernanz (2007) and Pons (1998). In line with Hernanz (2007), Demonte and Fernández Soriano support the idea that the adverbs occupy the position of specifiers and “typify the sentence as declarative, in relation with a previous speech act” (Demonte and Fernández Soriano 2013: 60).

Following a pragmatic approach, Pons (1998) works on the basis of empirical evidence from corpus data and proposes the label *que soldador* ‘welder *que*’ to refer to the *que* which joins one word to the rest of the utterance, as in the case of *claro que* lit. ‘clear that’, *bien que* lit. ‘well that’, *sí que* lit. ‘yes that’. He suggests that the *que soldador* is related to lexicalization processes that may lead to formal fixation of *que* together with the form which it used to previously ‘weld’ to the rest of the utterance. Pons argues that by means of the *que soldador* units can change from being parenthetical, located to the left of an utterance, to being integrated. This process, according to Pons (1998), involves a reanalysis that in turn implies a categorical change, in line with insights from grammaticalization studies. His account takes into consideration a wide range of elements with a very different syntactic and semantic nature – such as adverbs, adjectives, conjunctions and conjunctive phrases and other expression types – which are analysed according to whether they constitute a discourse unit and what kind of unit. However, he is not particularly concerned with delimiting instances of use of the ‘*que soldador*’ from cases of the so-called ‘causal *que*’.¹⁰

These and other previous studies (see Etxepare 2008, 2010; Serret Lancharez 2012, among others) provide a valuable general characterization of some of the elements that appear in first position in the semi-insubordinate construction. However, they do not explicitly distinguish between cases in which the *que*-clause and the preceding element constitute one construction from cases in

⁹ See Rodríguez Ramalle (2007, 2008a, 2008b, 2011) on the use of interjections and evidential adverbs preceding *que*-clauses.

¹⁰ Pons (1998) provides an example of use of ‘causal *que*’ and comments that in some cases it is difficult to differentiate the ‘*que soldador*’ from the ‘*que inespecífico*’, which coordinates two sequences between which a specific syntactic relation cannot be established.

which the *que*-clause and the preceding element constitute two TCUs and, therefore, enter into a different discourse relation. This paper aims at filling such a gap.

3 Data and methodology

The linguistic data used in this study come from the COLA (*Corpus Oral del Lenguaje Adolescente*) and from the spoken section from Spain of the CREA (*Corpus de Referencia del Español Actual*). The COLA contains conversations among adolescents of both sexes who are native speakers of Spanish from Madrid (Spain), Santiago de Chile (Chile), and Buenos Aires (Argentina). The informants carry minidiscs and record spontaneous interactions among friends, classmates and family members in diverse settings. The original transcripts in the COLA were revised and compared to the original recordings, and the transcripts were adjusted when they did not match the recordings.

The instances of semi-insubordinate constructions under examination were collected by querying the components of the COLA for *que*-clauses constructed with verbs in both subjunctive and indicative mood in non-initial position in the turn, manually selecting the cases with preceding elements (1 or 2 words preceding *que*), and filtering out the noise.¹¹ Some instances of combinations of *que*-clauses with preceding elements are mentioned in the literature but were not attested in the COLA. For these patterns, examples were collected by querying the oral component of the CREA.

The analysis presented here makes use of certain formal and semantic criteria. Attention is paid to the meanings expressed by semi-insubordinate constructions, their near equivalence to plain *que*-clause alternatives – if any –, the restrictions on the meaning of the *que*-clause imposed by the preceding element, the potential for an intonation break between the *que*-clause and the element that precedes it, and the type of syntactic relation between the *que*-clause and the preceding element.

A classification of the type of preceding element was established according to (i) whether the element forms a separate speech act and, therefore, whether it constitutes a separate TCU, as in (6), repeated here as (7), and (ii) taking into account the functional value of the element. These cases are not regarded as instances of semi-insubordination.

(7) [An adolescent realizes it is getting late]

J02: *qué hora es que yo me voy*

'J02: what time is it [QUE] I'm leaving'
(MAMTE2-02B, COLA M)

Contrariwise, cases in which the <element + *que*-clause> constitute one TCU, as in (3) above, repeated here as (8), are considered instances of semi-insubordination and are classified in semantic subtypes. These cases will be dealt in detail in Section 5.

(8) [A group of friends talk about signing a petition]

¹¹ Noise here includes complex sentences such as *Sabía que allí abajo había dos* 'I knew that there were two down there' (MAESB2-03, COLA M).

G03: *es una recogida de firmas para evitar que demuelan unos edificios por aquí*
[...]

G03: *eso no lo comprueban (.) o sea si me invento un DNI ahora
no lo comprueban no/*

G04: *[nada tú firma ahí]*

G02: *[claro **que** lo comprueban Lucas]*

'G03: it's a petition to collect signatures to prevent some nearby buildings to be demolished
[...]

G03: they don't check it (.) I mean if I make up an ID now
they will not check it right/

G04: [nothing you sign there]

G02: [of course [that] they check it Lucas]'

(MAESB2-02, COLA M)

The present study takes an interactional perspective, mainly taking into account the structure of the turn-intervention and type of turn, and presents an inventory of types of combinations between a *que*-clause and a preceding element. This interactional analysis also integrates other features that contribute to the identification of the structure of the turn, such as intonation breaks and the grammatical category of the preceding element.

First, instances of <X + *que*-clause> are divided according to whether they constitute one or two TCUs, as they reflect different syntactic and discourse relations. Whenever there are two TCUs, the first one can be constituted by (i) a preface which expresses different attitudinal, interpersonal and metadiscursive values, followed by the main component – constituted by the *que*-clause – or (ii) an element with illocutionary force – usually, but not necessarily, directive force – followed by a justification. In the case of <preface + *que*-clause> I will consider the second TCU to be a discourse-connective *que*-construction.¹² In the case of <element with illocutionary force + *que*-clause> the relation between the two components resembles reason clauses in some respects and 'sociation' (in the spirit of Lehmann 1988) in others.¹³ Whenever there is only one TCU, the first position in the unit is occupied by a modal element which resembles a finite modal predicate. In the case <modal element + *que*-clause>, I consider the construction to be semi-insubordinate.

¹² In discourse-connective *que*-constructions, as (a), the complementizer *que* lacks an accompanying matrix clause and it connects the clause it introduces with preceding discourse (see Gras and Sansiñena 2015):

(a) [Two friends talking about their weight]

J02: *he engordado (.) es que yo me siento más gorda es que es verdad*

J01: *[**que** yo no te veo más gorda (.) yo te veo perfecta tía como antes]*

J02: *[no he engordado]*

'J02: I've put on weight (.) it's like I feel fatter it's true

J01: [[QUE] you don't look fatter to me (.) you look perfect to me pal like before]

J02: [no I've put on weight]'

(MABPE2-01B, COLA M)

¹³ The relation between preface and *que*-clause on the one hand and element with illocutionary force and *que*-clause on the other can be explained within the frame of the Val.Es.Co.'s (2014) theory of discourse units, using the notions of *substantive* and *adjacent subacts*. A subact is an immediate constituent of the act which counts as an informative segment, usually identifiable by semantic and prosodic marks (Val.Es.Co. 2014: 55), and which combines with other subacts to convey full propositional meaning (Cabedo 2014). Substantive subacts convey propositional content while adjacent subacts do not convey propositional content.

One methodological side-note is in order at this point. Some elements can appear in more than one of the three patterns just discussed, with changes in meaning. *Mira*, for example, has been attested in multi-unit turns (Ford, Fox and Thompson 1996; Ford and Thompson 1996; Ford, Fox and Thompson 2002), functioning as a preface to a *que*-clause, but also introducing a *que*-clause over which it has scope, in a single TCU within the turn. When it is not used as a full verb, *mira* is an interjection derived from the imperative of the perception verb *mirar* ‘to look’. It shows a lower degree of lexicalization than other interjections derived from imperative verbs such as *toma* ‘take’ or *venga* ‘come’ and therefore it admits some variation in form – *mirá*; *mire* – (RAE-AALE 2009: 2501).

In (9), for instance, *mira* functions as a preface in a multi-unit turn and is used to maintain and to reinforce the interlocutor’s attention, i.e. with a phatic function. It has an independent status with regard to the *que*-clause. The *que* in (9) introduces a clause in the subjunctive mood with directive meaning. In (10), however, *mira* introduces a *que*-clause in the indicative mood and takes the role of external quantifier of an internal component of the predicate. There is a short intonation break between *mira*¹⁴ and the *que*-clause in (9), while there is no intonation break in (10), what nicely reflects two different patterns. The uses of elements as prefaces in multi-unit turns and as introductory elements in a single TCU will be discussed in Sections 4 and 5, respectively.

- (9) [A group of friends watching TV and smoking marijuana]

J01: *ah cállate Pepa y Miguel por favor vete que me duele la cabeza eh/*

G03: *vuela*

G02: *bueno si a ti te duele la cabeza es que*

1[*a mí imagínate*]

J01: 1[*mira* (.) **que** te pires tronco]

G02: 2[*eh/*]

J01: 2[*que te pires que te pires*]

‘J01: oh shut up Pepa and Miguel please go away [QUE] my head aches eh/

G03: fly away

G02: right if you have a headache it’s like

1[*imagine how I feel*]

J01: 1[*look* (.) [QUE] go away man]

G02: 2[*eh/*]

J01: 2[[QUE] go away [QUE] go away]’

(MALCC2-07, COLA M)

- (10) A: *Hola, ¿qué hacéis cavernícolas?*

B: *Hemos inventado la rueda.*

C: *Hemos inventado la rueda.*

D: *Hemos inventado la rueda.*

A: *Mira que sois tontícolas.*

‘A: Hi, what are you doing cavemen?

B: We’ve invented the wheel.

C: We’ve invented the wheel.

D: We’ve invented the wheel.

A: You are so silly!’

(CREA Oral, Magacines, Tariro, tariro, Spain)

According to RAE-AALE (2009), *mira* functions in contexts like (10) as an ‘emphatic particle’ which does not inflect for person or number, i.e. it is strongly grammaticalized, and it cannot introduce a direct complement, which implies the *que*-clause does not function as direct complement either. *Mira* assumes the grammatical role of quantifier and affects the internal components of the predicate, so that ‘*Mira que sois tontícolas*’ means ‘You are very silly!’. Sánchez López (2014) argues that *mira* in this construction is a mirative marker which expresses an intensified quantity and denotes a stronger presence of the expression of the speaker’s subjectivity than in its use as the imperative form of verb *mirar* ‘to look’. In examples like (10) *mira* is indeed used to weigh a fact or event.

4 Two turn-constructual units

This section presents the analysis of *que*-clauses which appear in multi-unit turns preceded by other linguistic elements such as vocatives, primary interjections or expressions derived from lexicalized forms. Any type of a *que*-clause, constructed with a verb either in the subjunctive or indicative, can be used in these complex turns preceded by another element which contributes to the interpretation of the *que*-clause, but does not have scope over it.

4.1 Preface + *que*-clause: attitudinal, interpersonal and metadiscursive values

The preceding elements that express attitudinal, interpersonal and metadiscursive values are address terms (vocatives), interjections, and expressions derived from lexicalized forms. These elements are not syntactically integrated with the following turn-constructual unit, i.e. the *que*-clause, and they differ greatly in their semantic and functional import. Moreover, they can occur in different positions in the turn, such as turn-initial or turn-medial, but also in different positions in the conversational sequence, i.e. in initiating, responsive or closing position, showing diverse functional significance. The following subsections provide an analysis of each type of preceding elements.

4.1.1 Vocative expressions

Vocative expressions can be personal names and nicknames, nouns, pronouns and nominal groups that are used to address somebody or to call somebody else’s attention¹⁵ in order to initiate a conversational sequence and to address a question, a greeting, an order, a request, an apology or a warning to somebody. They are usually constructed without a determiner and are directed to the addressee to elicit a response or reaction (see RAE-AALE 2009: 2485; 3200).

Vocatives attested in the corpus data include names and nicknames (Cris, Pepe, etc.), and many nouns such as *gilipollas* ‘asshole’, *huevo* ‘jerk’, *chaval* ‘kid’, *hijo/a* ‘son/daughter’, *madre* ‘mother’, *tío/a* ‘uncle/aunt’, *tronco/a* ‘friend’, *macho* ‘man’, *colega* ‘friend’. They function as prefaces in complex turns and they can appear initiating first (11) or second (12) parts of adjacency pairs.

- (11) [An adolescent cannot hear his friend talking]

¹⁵ They can also be directed to animals or personified things.

J02: *pero parecéis gilipollas los dos*
 [es que me río de vosotros]
 G01: [venga ahora]
 venga quítasela
 J01: *tío que no te escucho habla un poco más alto*
 G02: *no*

'J02: but you both seem like assholes
 [it's like I laugh at you]
 G01: [come on now]
 come on take it away from her
 J01: *dude* [QUE] I can't hear you speak a bit louder
 G02: *no*
 (MAMTE2-06A, COLA M)

(12) [A group of friends learning how to dye somebody's hair]

J03: *que no sé pintarle el pelo (.) o cómo lo lleva*
 [...]
 J03: *haces así/*
 J04: *gilipollas que es fácil haces así luego para allá*

'J03: [QUE] I don't know how to dye her hair (.) or how she wears it
 [...]
 J03: you do like this/
 J04: *moron* [QUE] it's easy you do like this then to that side'
 (MALCE2-04A, COLA M)

4.1.2 Interjections

Interjections can be classified into 'primary' and 'secondary'¹⁶ according to their grammatical nature, as proposed by Ameka (1992) (see also Nübling 2004 and Norrick 2007, among others). Primary interjections such as *epa* 'whoops' or *oh* 'oh' are only used as interjections¹⁷ and, as Norrick (2007) points out, show little association with a specific pragmatic function. Secondary interjections are derived from nominal (*ojo*, lit. 'eye'), verbal (*venga*, lit. 'come'), adverbial (*fuera*, lit. 'out') or adjectival (*claro*, lit. 'clear') content words. The polyvalent character of interjections makes it possible for them to be used in a wide range of contexts and gives rise to many interpretations which are not always accounted for in reference grammars or dictionaries of the language.¹⁸ In this section, a distinction will be made between primary interjections and secondary interjections, which include one-word expressions and multiword expressions.

The primary interjections that precede *que*-clauses in the COLA data are *ah*, *ay*, *eh*, *hey*, *ja*, *je*, *ji*, *jo*, *oh*, *uf*, *uh* and *uy*. These are syntactically independent, and can be classified in emotive, cognitive and conative classes according to whether they primarily (i) express emotion, (ii) convey the speaker's mental state without expressing feeling or wanting or (iii) are used to attract the interlocutor's attention (see Ameka 1992). Those meanings are largely determined by intonation and context.

¹⁶ These categories also correspond to the classes of *interjecciones propias* and *interjecciones improprias* (Alcina & Blecua 1975, RAE-AALE 2009).

¹⁷ Besides their nominalized uses (RAE-AALE 2009), such as in *el olé profundo* 'the deep olé'.

¹⁸ This problem is also pointed out in RAE-AALE (2009: 2482).

In (13), for example, *hey* signals surprise at the fact that the speaker had not noticed the presence of the interlocutor at the party, while in other contexts it is used as a truly conative interjection, to appeal to the addressee.

(13) [Adolescents leaving a party]

J04: *bueno vamonos*

J01: *sí (.) hasta luego Clara*

<background noise>

J01: *hey que no te vi (..) qué haces aquí*

<pause>

gorroneando eh de fijo porque tienen todos aquí palmera

'J04: ok let's go

J01: yes (.) see you later Clara

<background noise>

J01: *hey [QUE] I didn't see you (..) what are you doing here*

<pause>

scrounging eh for sure because everybody here has money'

(MALCE2-01, COLA M)

In (14) *uf* expresses annoyance at the fact that the person who is supposed to answer the phone is taking a long time to do so. In a different context *uf* is used to signal fatigue.

(14) [An adolescent trying to make a phone call]

J03: *estoy muy inquieta estoy aburrida*

J01: *dale más*

<background music>

uf que se demora en contestar

'J03: I'm very restless I'm bored

J01: turn it up

<background music>

ugh [QUE] (s)he takes so long to answer'

(SCACB8-01, COLA S)

In (13) and (14) the interjections contribute to signal the focus status of the propositional content of the *que*-clause. Primary interjections can also precede optative *que*-clauses, evaluatives, and other discourse connective *que*-clauses (see Sansiñena 2015).

The use of <interjection + vocative + *que*-clause> was also attested in the corpus data, e.g. (15). This type constitutes complex or multi-unit turns, in which each element contributes to the interpretation of the turn. In (15) the iterative use of *eh* expresses a singular value, different from the one that a single *eh* conveys. The repeated interjection is used by the speaker to warn the other discourse participants that they should be careful with what they talk about – given that the recording has already started –, but also to reprehend speaker J01. The single use of *eh* in the corpus data usually signals that the speaker just wants to call the interlocutor's attention.

(15) [A group of classmates talking about the minidisk recorder]

J02: *quién lo ha traído/ eso de quién es/*
 1[*del colegio/*]
 J01: 1[noruegas]
 J03: *eh eh eh tía* (.) **que** ya está grabando

‘J02: who has brought it/ whose is that/
 1[the school’s/]
 J01: 1[norwegians]
 J03: *eh eh eh girl* (.) [QUE] it’s already recording’
 (MAORE2-08, COLA M)

Secondary interjections are derivative uses of other words or locutions which have lost their original conceptual meanings – a process known as semantic bleaching (see Traugott 1988, 2003; Hopper and Traugott 2003, among many others). The secondary interjections that act as prefaces to *que*-clauses in the COLA data are the ones derived from grammaticalized imperative verbs or adjectives. The attested instances include *anda* lit. ‘go’, *mira* lit. ‘look’, *vaya* lit. ‘go’ and *venga* lit. ‘come’, as in (16), and *bueno* lit. ‘good’, as in (17). Again, these interjective expressions form utterances on their own and the meanings that they express change according to the context in which they appear.

In (16) speakers A and B take each other's leave. The first move is a coherent reaction to the previous turn while the second move is an additional expression of a good wish.

- (16) [A presentation on TV greets a colleague]
- A: *Nos vemos. ¡Venga!*
 B: *¡Venga!, que pases una velada sencilla.*
- ‘A: See you. ¡Come on!’
 B: ¡Come on!, have an easy going evening.’
 (CREA oral, Sorteos y concursos, *Un, dos, tres, Madrid*, Spain)

In (17) *bueno* signals that it is what follows in the turn – the warning or admonition – which should be taken into account in the continuation of the interactional sequence (see Portolés 1998).¹⁹

- (17) [A group of friends singing and playing around]
- G05: *pero es que el mono lo puedo hacer rapeando*
 <noise of somebody rapping>
 J01: *ese es Jorge*
 G01: *bueno* (.) **que** quede claro que ese era Jorge eh que no era yo <laughter>
- ‘G05: but I can do the monkey rapping
 <noise of somebody rapping>
 J01: that’s Jorge
 G01: *okay* (.) let it be clear that that was Jorge eh that it wasn’t me <laughter>’
 (MALCC2-01b, COLA M)

Interjective phrases which constitute a single lexical unit have been attested in only very few cases in the COLA. However, some instances of use have been found in the oral component of the CREA.

¹⁹ Portolés (1998) points out that *bueno*, *claro* and *hombre* do not have the same distribution in written texts as in conversations.

These multiword expressions include discourse markers such as *a ver*, lit. ‘to see’ used as ‘let’s see’ (18) and *en fin*, lit. ‘in end’ with the meaning of ‘in short’ (19).

- (18) [A boy talks to his sister and mother about a problem he has with a classmate]

J01: *qué te hace/*
 G01: *pues ya lo he dicho que me hace una cosa que me molesta*
 [...]
 J01: *mamá no le enseñes a ser chivato al pobre*
 V02: *chivato no (.) pero si te molesta díselo*
 J01: *cuéntanoslo a nosotras que nosotras*
 [*no se lo decimos a nadie*]
 V02: [*a ver* (.) **que** *yo se lo digo a*] *a a a*
 J01: *tú no le dices nada*
 V02: *a a él*

‘J01: what does he do to you/
 G01: well I already said it that he does a thing that bothers me
 [...]
 J01: mom don’t teach the poor guy how to be a snitch
 V02: snitch no (.) but if it bothers you tell him
 J01: tell it to us that we
 [don’t tell it to anyone]
 V02: [*let’s see* (.) [QUE] I tell it to] to to to
 J01: you don’t tell him anything
 V02: to to him’
 (MAESB2-06B, COLA M)

- (19) *A: Aprovecho para decir que tanto que habláis del Zaire, que los problemas del Zaire no se van a acabar con esto y van a seguir y seguirán siempre, porque la gente la gente del Zaire tiene un tiene todavía una organización tribal. Se comportan tal y como se comportaban hace un siglo, ¿no? O sea, las etnias, el odio, el odio por simple odio. En fin, que son organizaciones tribales que no han avanzado [...].*

‘A: I take this opportunity to say that you speak so much about Zaire, that Zaire’s problems are not going to end with this and are going to continue and will always continue, because the people the people of Zaire still have a tribal organization. They behave as they behaved a century ago, right? I mean, ethnic groups, hatred, hatred simply for the sake of hatred. In short, [QUE] they are tribal organizations that have not advanced [...].’
 (CREA oral, Grupo G 12: *Biológicas*, Spain)

The interjective phrase *en fin* occupies an internal position within the turn. In (19) it precedes a *que*-clause which functions as a turn increment after a transition-relevance place. Discourse-connective *que*-constructions can occupy non-initial positions in the turn, functioning as increments (see Gras and Sansiñena 2015, 2017). The *que*-clause summarizes and restates the main point put forward before, so it needs to be interpreted in close connection to the preceding discourse. The use of *en fin* is consistent with this recapitulation (see Portolés 1998).

4.2 ‘Causal’ *que*

The so-called ‘causal’ *que* appears in incremental *que*-constructions used to justify the speaker’s previous utterance within the same turn. These incremental *que*-constructions occur in multi-unit turns in which the first TCU can be a directive speech act (20)-(22) or a desiderative utterance (23), an interrogative utterance (24), or a declarative utterance (25).²⁰

The lexicalized form *venga* (20) has lost its referential content and its modality/illocutionary force is its most prominent feature. By using *venga* in (20) G01 expresses not only acceptance and compliance with J01’s offer, but also urges her to perform the act of telling the next joke. The *que*-clause adds a motivation for the first move.

(20) [An adolescent is telling jokes to a group of friends]

J01: *vale* (.) *oye os cuento* \
 1[*os cuento otro*/]
 J03: 1[*je je je je je*]
 J01: 2[*os cuento otro*/]
 J03: 2[*coño*]
 G01: *venga que* *esto ya está aporreándose*
 G02: *esa es la cagada*

‘J01: ok (.) hey shall I tell you\
 1[shall I tell you another one/]
 J03: 1[he he he he he]
 J01: 2[shall I tell you another one/]
 J03: 2[*fuck*]
 G01: come on [QUE] this is dying out
 G02: that's the shit’
 (MAESB2-03, COLA M)

The hearer-oriented interjections *cuidado* lit. ‘care’ (21) and *ojo* lit. ‘eye’ (22), derived from nouns, are used to express warnings. The *que*-clause justifies such an action.

(21) G01: *cuidado* (.) *que se cae*

‘G01: be careful, [QUE] it will fall’
 (MAESB2-01C, COLA M)

(22) *¡Ojo, que ya vi yo como le cogieron a alguien la cartera!*

‘Be careful, [QUE] I already saw somebody’s bag being stolen.’
 (CREA oral, interview CSC009, Spain)

(23) [Two skiing enthusiasts talking about a ski resort]

²⁰ This class includes declarative proforms, as in (a):

(a) [Two friends cooking. One of them wants the other one to try the ketchup]

G01: *toma mira prueba*

J02: *no no no que* *estoy comiendo chicle Pablo*

‘G01: take it look try

J02: *no no no* [QUE] I’m chewing gum Pablo’

(MABPE2-01, COLA M)

Astur-Con: *En pajares, me comentan que estaba una máquina trabajando en el tubo [...]*
 PUTHAM: *Ojalá, **que** ya estoy harto de esquiar sólo en el valle.*

‘Astur-Con: In Pajares, they tell me that there was a machine working on the tube [...]
 PUTHAM: Hopefully, [QUE] I'm tired of skiing only in the valley.’
 (Forum nevasport, Valgrande-Pajares, Spain)

(24) [An adolescent realizes it is getting late]

J02: *qué hora es* (.) **que** yo me voy

‘J02: what time is it (.) [QUE] I'm leaving’
 (MAMTE2-02B, COLA M)

(25) [An adolescent in a hurry to leave]

J03: *me voy* (.) **que** son menos cuarto

‘J03: I'm leaving (.) [QUE] it's quarter to the hour’
 (MABPE2-01C, COLA M)

In these cases, speakers support their actions by pointing to some evidence that can be observed or inferred from the situational context, e.g. the fact that something is falling or might fall (21), the fact that there are burglars around (22) or the fact that it is late (25). These incremental *que*-constructions are used as a device to justify speaker decisions by means of making explicit a piece of evidence that can be easily accessed from contextual observation (see Gras and Sansiñena 2015, 2017). Constructions like these have been traditionally treated as causal subordinate clauses in Spanish reference grammars (see, for instance, RAE-AELE 2009: §46.6). As subordinate causal clauses, incremental *que*-constructions describe the justification for uttering a previous clause. However, unlike subordinate reason clauses, they cannot be clefted, since they are not syntactic adjuncts of the previous clause (see Verstraete 1998).

Iglesias Recuero (2000: 337-340) points out that the construction *p que q* is formed by two utterances with different illocutionary values and that the value of justification is not associated to *que* but to discourse properties, i.e. to the illocutionary and interactive values of the utterances. In this sense, the relation established between *p* and *q* does not correspond to traditional conceptions of subordination, given that *q* is never a constituent of *p*. Iglesias Recuero also suggests that in order to account for the cases of ‘causal’ *que*, it is necessary to adopt a broader and more “gradual conception of the relation of subordination” (2000: 341), as is clearly the case in (24) above. She follows Aliaga García and Bustos Guadaño (1997) in describing the relation between both sentences in terms of parataxis or ‘sociation’. It is argued here that the case of causal *que* can be understood in connection with the mechanism of *dependency shift*, which describes cases “in which conjunctions that typically mark subordinate dependency on the propositional level can also come to express dependencies on the discursive level” (D’Hertefelt and Verstraete 2014: 97).

4.3 Summary

Whenever there are two TCUs, there is no semi-insubordination. The cases can be classified as either <preface + *que*-clause> or <separate speech act + *que*-clause>.

The meanings expressed by the prefaces or separate speech acts have to do with (i) attention getting, (ii) the expression of speaker's attitude or (iii) discourse organization. Each move would be possible without the other and the preceding TCU is not scoping over the *que*-clause. Tables 1 and 2 summarize the findings for the patterns corresponding to two TCUs.

Table 1: Pattern <preface + *que*-clause>

Phenomenon	Insubordination
TCU	Two TCUs
Pattern	< preface + <i>que</i> -clause>
Types of prefaces	Vocative expressions
	Interjections (primary, secondary, and interjective phrases)
	Interjection + vocative expression

Table 2: Pattern <speech act + *que*-clause>

Phenomenon	Causal <i>que</i>
TCU	Two TCUs
Pattern	< speech act + <i>que</i> -clause>
Types of speech acts (elements with illocutionary force)	Imperative utterance
	Desiderative utterance
	Interrogative utterance
	Declarative utterance

5 One turn-constructual unit: semi-insubordination

This section discusses the cases which can truly be considered as instances of the phenomenon of semi-insubordination, i.e. constructions introduced by an element which has scope over the *que*-clause and which involves some kind of modal qualification of a proposition. These elements can be classified into two broad semantic categories: the ones that express subjective evaluation and imply presuppositionality, and the ones that express epistemic and evidential qualification of a proposition.

5.1 Subjective evaluation, implied presuppositionality

The first semantic category encompasses elements that express a subjective evaluation on the part of the speaker. This evaluation is concerned with the presupposed propositional content of the *que*-clause. The elements in this class are secondary interjections which consist of one-word elements and multi-word elements. One-word interjections are derived from grammaticalized imperative verbs and from nouns, and multi-word interjective expressions are derived from lexicalized forms.

5.1.1 Secondary interjections

As was pointed out in Section 2.2 some of the same elements that can occur in the two-TCUs pattern also occur in the one-TCU pattern. This is the case for secondary interjections, including one-word and multi-word expressions. In the semi-insubordinate construction, *anda* ‘go’, *mira* ‘look’, *vaya* ‘go’²¹ preceding a *que*-clause express degree evaluation related to counterexpectation, as in (26)-(27). It has been pointed out (see RAE-AALE 2009; Rodríguez Ramalle 2008b) that constructions such as (26) – which contains a grammaticalized perception verb and a complement clause – do not admit a degree adverb to measure the quality expressed in the adjective. Sánchez López (2014) considers *mira* a mirative marker which plays a significant role in the exclamative value of the *que*-clause (see Gras and Sansiñena 2017).

(26) [A group of friends having a drink]

J02: *bueno si pues mañana estáis por la plaza por la tarde*

<burp>

G01: *joder mira que eres cerda tronca no tires las cosas*

‘J02: well if tomorrow you are at the square in the afternoon

<burp>

G01: fuck you are so dirty girl don’t throw away the things’

(MABPE2-01C, COLA M)

(27) [A group of friends talking about a scout organization]

J03: *qué coño es eso exactamente*

J04: 1[*una organización*]

J01: 1[*es una cosa*] *es como tipo scouts solo que internacional*

J03: 2[*ah y va de todo el mundo y como habláis/*]

J01: 2[*y van a campamentos de gente y eso*]

J04: *en inglés*

J03: *uy las dos qué guay no/*

J01: *Ana es que está con % está sola de seminar que son en plan con gente de dieciocho años eso todos ahí*

J03: *anda que no sabes*

‘J03: what the fuck is that exactly

J04: 1[an organization]

J01: 1[it’s a thing] it’s like scouts but just international

J03: 2[oh and there’s people from all over the world and how do you talk to each other/]

J01: 2[and they go camping with people and that]

J04: in English

J03: wow both of you how cool right/

J01: Ana is the one who is with % is alone at a seminar which is like with people who are eighteen years old that all of them there

J03: *You know so much!’*

(MAESB2-06A, COLA M)

In (27) the *que*-clause is selected by *anda*. They form a complex construction whose value is that of degree quantification.²² Rodríguez Ramalle (2008b) argues that in this construction the adverb *no*

²¹ See Octavio de Toledo y Huerta (2001-2002) on the grammaticalization of *vaya* as marker and quantifier.

²² These cases have been discussed in Sansiñena (2015) and Gras and Sansiñena (2017) in relation to an insubordinate indicative evaluative construction found in Chilean Spanish.

‘no’ does not negate, but functions as an emphatic polarity element which reinforces the speaker’s assertion. In this sense, it can be understood as a case of ‘expletive’ negation.²³

A special case is the form *ojalá* ‘I wish’, which is considered by some linguists to be an interjection and by others to be an adverb (see Bosque and Demonte 1999: § 32.3.2.3; RAE-AALE 2009: §35.5o-r), given that it shares properties with both interjections and adverbs. With adverbs it shares the property of introducing the subjunctive mood, as illustrated in (28).

(28) [Adolescents talking about their plans for the weekend]

J02: *yo no sé qué voy a hacer (.) el sábado*

<sound of bell>

J02: *ajj ajj ajj ajj (.) ojalá **que** vengan todos a XXX*

‘J02: I don’t know what to do (.) on Saturday

<sound of bell>

J02: *ajj ajj ajj ajj (.) I wish everyone comes to XXX’*

(BABS2-10, COLA BS)

The form *ojalá* comes from the Hispanic Arabic *law sha’a Allah* ‘God willing’ or ‘if Allah wills’. When it introduces a sentence, it admits the conjunction *que*, which is optional, a feature shared by only a few verbs, such as *demandar* ‘demand’ or *pedir* ‘ask’ (RAE-AALE 2009: §43b-j). The *que*-clause that follows *ojalá* in semi-insubordinate constructions expresses the content of what is desired. Its particular historical development – the fact that it derives from an optative sentence – explains the special features of this form.

The secondary interjections derived from nouns have not been attested in the COLA data in semi-insubordinate constructions. However, two of them are attested in the oral component of the CREA: *lástima* ‘pity’ (4, repeated here as 29) and *suerte* ‘luck’ (30). A similar analysis to the one suggested above for *lástima* + *que*-clause (see Section 1) applies to *suerte* + *que*-clause: this use of *suerte* is created from the structure <*ser una suerte que* + subjunctive> lit. ‘to be a luck that + subjunctive’, in which the attribute *una suerte* ‘a luck’ imposes the subjunctive mood to the subordinate noun clause.

(29) [Two journalists commenting a football match]

A: *¿Lo ha visto animado, ahora?*

B: *Sí sí sí sí. Está muy animado y y muy esperanzado ya pensando en el partido del domingo, que % muy bien.*

A: ***Lástima que** Ronaldo fallara esos dos goles, aunque también marcó uno y otro.*

B: *Sí, además uno muy difícil. El gol de cabeza para mí ha sido muy espectacular y muy bonito.*

‘A: Have you seen him lively, now?

B: Yes yes yes yes. He’s very lively and and very hopeful already thinking about the Sunday match, that % very well.

A: *Too bad **that** Ronaldo missed those goals*, although he did score one and another one.

B: Yes, besides a very difficult one. The headed goal has been to me very spectacular and very nice.’

(CREA oral, *Supergarcía*, Cadena COPE, Spain)

²³ The term ‘expletive negation’ is often used for a negative marker that has no negative meaning. For a discussion on ‘expletive’ negation in Romance languages, see Muller (1978), Nocentini (2003) and Pons & Schwenter (2005).

- (30) [A reporter talking about the Spanish athlete Antonio Prieto]

A: *En enero de mil novecientos ochenta y seis se operó, y no pudo volver a los entrenamientos hasta el mes de abril. Suerte **que** Antonio se toma la vida con optimismo. Él dice que los dos años de lesión en el fondo le han venido bien para que el organismo haya podido regenerarse.*

‘A: In January nineteen eighty six he had a surgery, and he couldn’t come back to training until April. Luckily [QUE] Antonio faces life with optimism. He says the two years of injury in essence have been good for the body to be able to regenerate.’
(CREA oral, *Estadio dos*, TVE 2, Spain)

Only one interjective expression derived from a lexicalized form has been attested in the COLA data. It is the complex secondary interjection *menos mal* ‘luckily’ (31)-(32), which expresses the speaker’s subjective evaluation of the propositional content. In (31) the speaker is glad and relieved that she is going to see her friend on the same day given that she misses her, while in (32) the speaker is relieved that they do not have to run on that day, given that she has stiff legs.

- (31) [A girl talking on the phone]

J05: *menos mal **que** hoy ya te veo (.) no sé lo que haría sin ti (.)*
en serio te quiero mazo

‘J05: luckily [QUE] I see you today (.) I don’t know what I would do without you (.) seriously I love you a lot’
(MAORE2-12C, COLA M)

- (32) [A group of classmates at school]

G01: *me voy a tomar un agua con azúcar chavaal (.) porque tengo unas agujetas*
G03: *Pilar*
G01: *menos mal **que** hoy no corremos*
G02: *qué/*
G01: *porque está lloviendo*

‘G01: I’m going to drink water with sugar man (.) because I have such soreness
G03: Pilar
G01: luckily [QUE] we don’t run today
G02: what/
G01: because it’s raining’
(MALCE2-07B, COLA M)

5.2 Epistemic and evidential qualification of a proposition

The second broad class of elements preceding *que*-clauses in semi-insubordinate constructions encompasses sentential adverbs and adverbials expressing epistemic and evidential values. These will be presented in the following subsections: interjective expressions derived from lexicalized forms, affirmative adverbs, adverbs of doubt/uncertainty and evidential adverbs.

5.2.1 Interjective expressions derived from lexicalized forms

The only complex secondary interjection attested in the COLA data is *de verdad* ‘truly’ (33), but *sin duda* ‘no doubt’ (34) has also been attested in the spoken component of the CREA.²⁴ In (33) speaker G02 has already said that he has not scored a goal in two previous turns. The first time he repeats his utterance he uses an insubordinate complement construction introduced by *que* to signal repetition. The second time he repeats his utterance, he uses a semi-insubordinate construction introduced by *de verdad* to strengthen his assertion.

(33) [A group of friends playing football]

G01: *tú has marcado un gol*
 G02: *yo no he marcado*
 G01: *sí has marcado un gol*
 G02: *je je que yo no he marcado*
 G01: *habéis empezado otro/*
 G04: *tú estás gilipollas*
 G02: 1[*de verdad que no lo he marcado*]
 G03: 1[*va por el ochenta y siete*]
 G01: *pero él no no me% (.) yo juraría que he visto que ha metido un gol el Luis*

‘G01: you have scored a goal
 G02: I haven’t scored a goal
 G01: yeah you have scored a goal
 G02: hehe [QUE] I haven’t scored
 G01: have you started another one/
 G04: you are silly
 G02: 1[I really haven’t scored it]
 G03: 1[he’s scoring the eighty seventh]
 G01: but he didn’t didn’t sco% (.) I would swear that I’ve seen Luis score a goal’
 (MALCE4-06, COLA M)

(34) A: *Ser su alumno era realmente un privilegio. Sin duda que exigía, pero sin llegar nunca a la exageración.*

‘A: Being her students was really a privilege. No doubt [QUE] she demanded, but without ever getting to exaggerate.’
 (CREA oral, session of the Senate, Chile)

5.2.2 Sí ‘Yes’

The sentential adverb *sí* ‘yes’ has been attested in semi-insubordinate constructions in the COLA data from different varieties of Spanish, showing different values in different contexts. In (35) it is used to intensify the assertion, as an adverb with *informative* focus or an emphatic adverb, while in (36) it functions as an adverb of *contrastive* focus, which requires a previous negation in the discourse context: *no tenemos a Paco Porras* ‘we don’t have Paco Porras’, *sí que tenéis* ‘indeed you have it’.

²⁴ Even though *sin duda* ‘no doubt’ has traditionally been classified by scholars as an epistemic marker expressing varying degrees of certainty (See Simon-Vandenberg 2007, among many others), it has also been assimilated to one class of evidential adverbs, in that it intensifies the strength of the assertion (see RAE-AALE 2009: §30.11o).

- (35) A: *Otra falta personal. ¡Qué poquito habrá hecho en favor del baloncesto este encuentro!*
 B: *Sí que es verdad, en esto coincido.*

A: 'Another personal foul. How little will this encounter have done for basketball!
 B: *Indeed [QUE] it is true, I agree on that.'*
 (CREA oral, *Televisión*, Madrid, 02/91 F, Spain)

- (36) [A girl wants to watch a film of a popular puppeteer at home]

G01: *puedes poner otra peli que no sea Harry*

J01: *vale cuál quieres/ <steps> (.)*

1[*pareces un pescadero*]

V02: 1[*Paco Porras*]

V01: *eh/*

V02: *Paco Porras/*

2[*no tenemos a Paco Porras*]

J01: 2[*Paco Porras ja ja*]

G01: *sí que tenéis*

V02: *dónde está Paco Porras/*

'G01: can you play another movie that is not Harry

J01: ok which one do you want/ <steps> (.)

1[you look like a fisherman]

V02: 1[*Paco Porras*]

V01: *eh/*

V02: *Paco Porras/*

2[we don't have Paco Porras]

J01: 2[*Paco Porras ha ha*]

G01: *indeed [QUE] you have it*

V02: where is Paco Porras/'

(MAESB2-06B, COLA M)

5.2.3 Adverbs of doubt (uncertainty)

Epistemic modal adverbials are associated with trustworthiness, possibility and uncertainty (see Kärkkäinen 2003; Simon-Vandenberg 2007; Simon-Vandenberg and Aijmer 2007a, 2007b; Cornillie 2010, among many others). The so called 'adverbs of doubt' are contained within this class. The only adverb of doubt attested in the corpus data in a semi-insubordinate construction is *capaz* 'maybe, possibly', which appears in the data from both Buenos Aires (37) and Santiago de Chile (10 hits in total). *Quizás* 'maybe', the functional near-equivalent to *capaz* used in Peninsular varieties of Spanish,²⁵ has not been attested in semi-insubordinate constructions in the COLA and (38) is an *hapax legomenon* in the oral component of the CREA, which suggests that *quizás* + *que*-clause is really odd in Spanish.²⁶

²⁵ See Espejo Muriel & Espinoza Elorza (2012) and Houle & Martínez Gómez (2011) for a discussion on the origins and grammaticalization of *quizás*.

²⁶ I would like to thank one of the anonymous reviewers, who is a native speaker of Northern Peninsular Spanish, for pointing out that example (38) might as well be an unfinished utterance (with suspended intonation) which has been poorly transcribed from the oral recording due to the broad, orthographic transcription system employed for oral sources in the CREA.

- (37) [A group of classmates going back to the classroom after recess]

G01: *ahora hay que correr (..) correr*

G03: *ja ja ahora hay que correr*

J01: *sí (.) capaz que corro hoy*

'G01: now we have to run (..) run

G03: ha ha now we have to run

J01: yes (.) maybe I run today'

(BABS2-06, COLA BS)

- (38) A: *Mari Carmen Quintero, de Barcelona, le pregunta qué efectos secundarios puede tener hacerse la vasectomía.*

B: *Ninguno. Bueno, ¿saben lo que es la vasectomía, en primer lugar? Quizás que aclarásemos este punto. La vasectomía consiste en la esterilización del varón.*

'A: Mari Carmen Quintero, from Barcelona, asks you what secondary effects can cause having a vasectomy done.

B: None. Well, do you know what a vasectomy is, in the first place? Maybe we should clarify that point. The vasectomy consists in male sterilization.'

(CREA oral, *La Luna*, TVE 1, Spain)

Capaz was originally used as an adjective (attribute), whereas this is not the case with *quizás*. The now adverbial expression *capaz que* can be interpreted as a result of the deletion of the verb *ser* 'to be' in the copular construction *es capaz que*. Note that although *capaz que* can be combined with either the indicative or subjunctive mood, the corpus data shows that speakers from Buenos Aires tend to use the indicative mood in the construction <*capaz* + *que*-clause>.

5.2.4 Evidential adverbs and adverbial phrases

Evidential adverbs and adverbial phrases either reinforce or mitigate the assertion, and present the truth or falseness of the propositional content as evident or hypothetical (see Pietrandrea 2007; Brânză and Delbecque 2008; Cornillie 2010, among many others). Only the evidential adverbial phrases *por supuesto* 'of course' (40) and *desde luego* 'of course' have been attested in semi-insubordinate constructions in the COLA data, but several instances of use of evidential adverbs in *-mente* '-ly', such as *evidentemente* 'evidently', *naturalmente* 'naturally', *indudablemente* 'undoubtedly', *obviamente* 'obviously' (2, repeated here as 39) have been attested in the oral component of the CREA. These adverbs in *-mente* belong to a more formal register than the one represented in the COLA, which explains why they do not show up in the latter. In all cases attested in the data, the evidential adverbs intensify the strength of the assertion of the *que*-clause and establish a direct relation to the previous turn.

- (39) A: *Quizás, obviamente, usted no lo ignora, señor senador, pero la ley de ética pública que hemos sancionado permite el acceso a cualquier ciudadano a las declaraciones de bienes que hacemos todos los funcionarios públicos. [...]*

B: *Obviamente que no me refiero a la declaración de bienes.*²⁷ *Eso lo sabemos todos, porque todos hemos sancionado la ley de ética pública.*

²⁷ It is interesting to point out how speaker B mimics the lexical choice of speaker A by initiating his intervention with the adverb *Obviamente*, which could be an effect of syntactic priming.

‘A: Maybe, obviously, you do not ignore it, Mr. Senator, but the law of public ethics that we have passed allows any citizen to have access to the asset declarations that all civil servants do. [...] B: Obviously I do not mean the declaration of assets. We all know that, because we have all sanctioned the law on public ethics.’
(CREA oral, meeting 65, ordinary session 32, Senate, Argentina)

(40) [Adolescents discussing their plans for the day]

G03: *a qué hora va a venir la gente/*
J01: *por supuesto **que** iban a venir a las cinco y media*

‘G03: what time are people going to come/
J01: of course they were going to come at half past five’
(MALCC2-08, COLA M)

Semi-insubordinate constructions introduced by an evidential adverbial tend to occur in turn-initial position of responsive turns, i.e. they function as a reply, either indirect (39) or direct (40), to the previous intervention.

From an intralinguistic perspective, a purely functional explanation is insufficient to account for the varying degrees of acceptability of adverbials + *que*. A diachronic study focusing on the origin and individual development of each form would have to explain their different behaviour in synchrony. As Beijering and Norde (this volume) point out, Ramat and Ricca (1998: 212) argue that adverbs in the semi-insubordinate construction “go against their very nature”, as they function as the main predication. Ramat and Ricca propose a different diachronic account for *univerbated* adverbs, such as *peut-être* ‘maybe’ in French or *quizás* ‘maybe’ in Spanish, and *derived* adverbs, such as *probablement* ‘probably’ in French *claramente* ‘clearly’ in Spanish. They argue that univerbated adverbs have an origin in a morpheme cluster which contains a predicate that takes a subordinate clause, which is why these adverbs can also head a subordinate clause. In the case of derived adverbs, Ramat and Ricca (1998: 214) propose a process of extension of the predicative construction ‘it is + ADJ + that...’ to the adverbial construction ‘it is + ADV + that’, followed by ellipsis. Linguistic elements that are morphologically identical in their adjectival and adverbial use would, according to their proposal, function as bridging forms. This hypothesis is plausible for elements like *peut-être* and *probablement* in French (Ramat and Ricca 1998) or *claro* and *claramente* in Spanish, although the possibility of simple analogical attraction between the elements should also be considered.²⁸ The most appropriate explanation of the development and mechanisms of change for each (type of) adverb can only be uncovered by a detailed study of instances of use of each individual element in diachronic data.

5.3 Summary

Semi-insubordinate constructions constitute only one TCU in which the preceding element is scoping over the *que*-clause. According to their meanings, preceding elements can be classified as expressing (i) subjective evaluation of the content of the proposition and (ii) epistemic/evidential qualification of the truth of a proposition. Some subtypes express interpersonal meaning, which is in line with Van linden and Van de Velde (2014).

²⁸ See Hummel (2012) for a discussion on the diachronic development, polyfunctionality and polysemy of discourse markers in Spanish.

Table 3: Pattern <modal element + *que*-clause>

Phenomenon		Semi-insubordination
TCU		One TCU
Pattern		<modal element + <i>que</i> -clause>
Types of modal elements	Subjective evaluation; implied presuppositionality	Secondary interjections (and interjective phrases)
	Epistemic and evidential qualification of a proposition	Interjective expressions derived from lexicalized forms
		Sentential adverb <i>Si</i>
		Adverbs of doubt
		Evidential adverbs and adverbial phrases

The position of the TCU in the conversational sequence shows that it often appears as an emphatic reaction to a previous turn in direct or indirect responses occurring in turn-initial position. Finally, in order to account for the relative acceptability and optionality of *que* with adverbials, it is necessary to look at the historical development of each form. Yet, such an account exceeds the limits of this study.

6 Conclusion

This chapter sheds light on the types of relations that *que*-clauses can establish with other elements within the same turn. Three syntactic relations have been identified for cases in which a *que*-clause is preceded by one or two linguistic elements: <preface + *que*-clause>, <element with illocutionary force + *que*-clause> and <modal element + *que*-clause>. It has been put forward that it is important to distinguish between the three phenomena, namely insubordination, causal *que*, and semi-insubordination, always bearing in mind that the same element, even in the same position in the turn, may enter into more than one type of relation with a *que*-clause. Criteria to determine which of the three cases we are facing include the number of TCUs in the turn, the potential for an intonation break between the *que*-clause and the element that precedes it, and the function of the preceding element in relation to the *que*-clause. Table 4 summarizes the three broad patterns found.

Table 4: Patterns corresponding to one or two TCUs

TCU	Two TCUs		One TCU
Phenomenon	Insubordination	Causal <i>que</i>	Semi-insubordination
Pattern	<preface + <i>que</i> -clause>	<speech act + <i>que</i> -clause>	<modal element + <i>que</i> -clause>

I described the phenomenon of semi-insubordination and discussed some of the previous studies on semi-insubordination in European languages, to then focus on Spanish. As has been shown, semi-insubordination exists in languages belonging to diverse families and shows some similarities, such as the formal adverbial, adjectival and nominal subtypes.

The phenomenon of semi-insubordination was discussed and illustrated on the basis of the interactional corpus data from the COLA and CREA. It was argued that semi-insubordination involves one TCU (see Table 4 above). The elements preceding the *que*-clause in semi-insubordinate constructions were classified in two broad classes, according to whether they express subjective

evaluation of the content of the proposition – and implied presuppositionality – or evidential and epistemic qualification of the truth status of a proposition. A variety of forms was discussed and it was shown that the degree of optionality of *que* cannot be explained from a purely functional perspective and therefore the particular development of each form should be looked at. This study presents a typology that is in its own right suggestive of a gradient between some semi-insubordinates leaning close to subordination and others approximating insubordination.

I also presented and discussed the data corresponding to the two types of relation that can be established between *que*-clauses and preceding elements whenever there are two TCUs, i.e. whenever there is no semi-insubordination (see Table 4 above). For the class of prefaces documented introducing insubordinate *que*-clauses, it was argued that such elements express attitudinal, interpersonal and metadiscursive values. For the class of elements with illocutionary force which enter into the ‘causal *que* construction’, it was shown that they can be imperative, desiderative, interrogative, or declarative utterances. The *que*-clause in these cases justifies that previous speech act. It was also shown that the relation between the two TCUs cannot be conceived from a traditional conception of subordination. The present study considers ‘dependency shift’ as a complication of the notion of syntactic dependence – the relevance of the latter phenomenon, may lie especially in the cases of what is often referred to as ‘sociation’.

One of the main contributions of this study is the introduction of interactional criteria in the discussion on semi-insubordination and related phenomena. In that sense, one limitation of previous studies that focus on the syntactic structure of the semi-insubordinate construction and which has been overcome here, is accounting for the differences between the types of semi-insubordinate constructions – containing elements expressing subjective evaluation or epistemic and evidential meanings – in relation to the structure of the turn they appear in and what interactional functions they perform.

List of abbreviations

Abbreviations for data sources

COLA	Corpus oral del lenguaje adolescente
COLA BA	Subcorpus from Buenos Aires
COLA M	Subcorpus from Madrid
COLA S	Subcorpus from Santiago
CREA Oral	Corpus de referencia del español actual, oral component

Transcription conventions

[word]	overlap (single)
1[word]	overlap (first pair)
2[word]	overlap (second pair)
XXX	unintelligible
%	truncated/cut-off word
<word>	comment
/	rising intonation contour
\	falling intonation contour
(.)	one-second pause
(..)	two-second pause
<pause>	longer, untimed pause
[...]	omitted excerpt
<u>word</u>	element or structure under analysis

Acknowledgments

The research reported in this study was supported by project GOA/12/007, funded by the Research Council of the University of Leuven. I am very grateful to Bert Cornillie, Hendrik De Smet and Pedro Gras, as well as to the two anonymous reviewers, for their useful comments and suggestions on an earlier version. I would also like to thank all the participants of the workshop '(Semi-)independent subordinate constructions', held in September 2015 at the SLE conference in Leiden, for their valuable contributions.

References

- Aelbrecht, Lobke. 2006. IP-ellipsis in Dutch dialects: X + that-clause. In Jeroen Van de Weijer & Bettelou Los (eds.), *Linguistics in the Netherlands 2006*, 1-14. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Alcina, Juan & José Manuel Blecaua. 1975. *Gramática española*. Barcelona: Ariel.
- Aliaga García, Francisco & Eduardo de Bustos Guadaño. 1997. Acerca de los límites entre gramática y pragmática: de nuevo sobre las oraciones causales. Paper presented at I International symposium of semantics, University of La Laguna.
- Ameka, Felix. 1992. Interjections: The universal yet neglected part of speech. *Journal of Pragmatics* 18 (2). 101-118.
- Beijering, Karin. 2016. Semi-insubordinate at-constructions in Norwegian: formal, semantic and functional properties. *Norsk Lingvistisk Tidsskrift* 34 (2). 161-182.
- Bosque, Ignacio and Violeta Demonte (eds.). 1999. *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*. Madrid: Espasa Calpe.
- Brânză, Mircea. D. & Nicole Delbecque. 2008. Variación modal con los adverbios de duda en español. In Alexandra Cuniță, Coman Lupu and Liliane Tasmowski (eds.), *Studii de Lingvistică și Filologie Romanică*, 58-71. Bucharest: Editura Universității București.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1999. *Adverbs and functional heads: A cross-linguistic perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cornillie, B. 2010. An interactional approach to evidential and epistemic adverbs in Spanish conversation. In Gabriele Diewald & Elena Smirnova (eds.), *The linguistic realization of evidentiality in European languages*, 309-330. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Croft, William. 2000. *Explaining language change. An evolutionary approach*. Harlow: Longman.
- Demonte, Violeta & Olga Fernández Soriano. 2013. El *que* citativo, otros elementos de la periferia izquierda oracional y la recomplementación: Variación inter e intralingüística. In Daniel Jakob & Katya Plooj (eds.), *Autour de que - El entorno de que*, 47-69. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- D'Hertefelt, Sarah & Jean-Christophe Verstraete. 2014. Independent complement constructions in Swedish and Danish: Insubordination or dependency shift? *Journal of Pragmatics* 60. 89-102.
- D'Hertefelt, Sarah, 2018. Insubordination in Germanic. A Typology of Complement and Conditional Constructions. [Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs 318]. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Espejo Muriel, María del Mar & Rosa María Espinosa Elorza. 2012. *Quiçab, quiçá, quizá*. In Emilio Montero Cartelle and Carmen Manzano Rovira (eds.), *Actas del VIII Congreso Internacional de Historia de la Lengua Española*. Vol. 1, 749-760. Santiago de Compostela: Meubook.

- Etxepare, Ricardo. 2008. On quotative constructions in Iberian Spanish. In Ritva Laury (ed.), *Crosslinguistic studies of clause combining: The multifunctionality of conjunctions*, 35-78. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Etxepare, Ricardo. 2010. From hearsay evidentiality to samesaying relations. *Lingua* 120(3). 604-627.
- Evans, Nicholas. 2007. Insubordination and its uses. In Irina Nikolaeva (ed.), *Finiteness: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations*, 366-431. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Evans, Nicholas & Honoré Watanabe. 2016. *Insubordination*. [Typological Studies in Language 155]. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Ford, Cecilia & Sandra Thompson. 1996. Interactional units in conversation: syntactic, intonational, and pragmatic resources for the management of turns. In Elionor Ochs, Emanuel Schegloff & Sandra Thompson (eds.), *Interaction and Grammar*. [Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics 13], 134-184. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ford, Cecilia, Barbara Fox & Sandra Thompson. 1996. Practices in the construction of turns: the 'TCU' revisited. *Pragmatics* 6. 427-454.
- Ford, Cecilia, Barbara Fox & Sandra Thompson. 2002. *The language of turn and sequence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gras, Pedro. 2011. *Gramática de construcciones en interacción. Propuesta de un modelo y aplicación al análisis de estructuras independientes con marcas de subordinación en español*. Barcelona: University of Barcelona dissertation.
- Gras, Pedro. 2013. Entre la gramática y el discurso: valores conectivos de *que* inicial átono en español. In Daniel Jacob & Katia Ploog (eds.), *Autour de que*, 89-112. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Gras, Pedro. 2016. Revisiting the functional typology of insubordination: *que*-initial sentences in Spanish. In Nicholas Evans & Honore Watanabe (eds.), *Insubordination*. [Typological Studies in Language 155], 113-144. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gras, Pedro & María Sol Sansiñena. 2015. An interactional account of discourse-connective *que*-constructions in Spanish. *Text and Talk* 35 (4). 505-529.
- Gras, Pedro & María Sol Sansiñena. 2017. Exclamatives in the functional typology of insubordination: evidence from complement insubordinate constructions in Spanish. *Journal of Pragmatics* 115. 21-36.
- Hernanz, Maria Lluïsa. 2007. From polarity to modality: Some (a)symmetries between *bien* and *sí* in Spanish. In Luis Eguren & Olga Fernández-Soriano (eds.), *Coreference, Modality, and Focus: Studies on the syntax-semantics interface*. *Linguistics Today* 111, 133-169. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hopper, Paul & Elizabeth Closs Traugott. 2003. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Houle, Leah & Rebeca Martínez Gómez. 2011. A closer look at *quizá(s)*: grammaticalization and an epistemic adverb. In Luis A. Ortiz-López (ed.), *Selected proceedings of the 13th Hispanic linguistics symposium*, 296-304. Somerville: Cascadia Proceedings Project.
- Hummel, Martin. 2012. *Polifuncionalidad, polisemia y estrategia retórica. Los signos discursivos con base atributiva entre oralidad y escritura*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

- Iglesias Recuero, Silvia. 2000. Gramática de la oración frente a gramática del discurso: de Nuevo sobre el llamado *que* causal. In José Jesús de Bustos Tovar (ed.), *Lengua, discurso, texto: I simposio internacional de análisis del discurso*. Vol.1, 333-344. Madrid: Visor.
- Jørgensen, Annette Myre (ed.). *Corpus Oral del Lenguaje Adolescente (COLA)*. http://www.colam.org/om_prosj-espanol.html.
- Kärkkäinen, Elise. 2003. *Epistemic stance in English conversation: A description of its interactional functions, with a focus on I think*. Vol.115. *Pragmatics & beyond*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Lehmann, Christian. 1988. Towards a typology of clause linkage. In John Haiman & Sandra A. Thompson (eds.), *Clause Combining in Grammar and Discourse*, 181-225. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lindström, Jan & Anne-Marie Londen. 2008. Constructing reasoning. The connectives *för att* (causal), *så att* (consecutive) and *men att* (adversative) in Swedish conversations. In Jaakko Leino (ed.), *Constructional Reorganization* [Constructional Approaches to Language 5], 105-152. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Mithun, Marianne. 2008. The extension of dependency beyond the sentence. *Language* 84 (1). 264-280.
- Mithun, Marianne. 2016. Shifting finiteness in nominalization: From definitization to refinitization. In Claudine Chamoreau (ed.), *Finiteness and Nominalization*, 299-324. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Muller, Claude. 1978. La negation explétive dans les constructions complétives. *Langue Française* 39. 76-103.
- Nocentini, Alberto. 2003. La cosiddetta negazione espletiva in italiano. *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 88. 72-90.
- Norricks, Neal R. 2007. Discussion article: pragmatic markers, interjections and discourse. *Catalan journal of linguistics* 6. 159-168.
- Nübling, Damaris. 2004. Die prototypische Interjektion: Ein Definitionsvorschlag. *Zeitschrift für Semiotik* 26. 11-46.
- Octavio de Toledo y Huerta, Álvaro Sebastián. 2001-2002. ¿Un viaje de ida y vuelta? La gramaticalización de *vaya* como marcador y cuantificador. *Anuari de filologia F* 11-12. 47-72.
- Pietrandrea, Paola. 2007. The grammatical nature of some epistemic-evidential adverbs in spoken Italian. *Italian Journal of Linguistics* 2. 39-64.
- Pons, Salvador. 1998. *Conexión y conectores. Estudio de su relación en el registro informal de la lengua*. Valencia: University of Valencia.
- Pons, Salvador & Scott Schwenter. 2005. Polar meaning and “expletive” negation in approximative adverbs: Spanish. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 6 (2). 262-282.
- Portolés, José. 1998. *Marcadores del discurso*. Barcelona: Ariel.
- Ramat, Paolo & Davide Ricca. 1998. Sentence adverbs in the languages of Europe. In Johan van der Auwera & Dónall P. Ó Baoill (eds.), *Adverbial constructions in the languages of Europe*, 187-273. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Real Academia Española: *Corpus de referencia del español actual* (CREA). <http://www.rae.es>

- Real Academia Española & Asociación de Academias de la Lengua Española. 2009. *Nueva gramática de la lengua española*. Madrid: Espasa.
- Rodríguez Ramalle & Teresa Maria. 2007. El complementante *que* como marca enfática en el texto periodístico. *Revista Electrónica de Lingüística Aplicada (RAEL)* 6. 41-53.
- Rodríguez Ramalle & Teresa Maria. 2008a. Estudio sintáctico y discursivo de algunas estructuras enunciativas y citativas del español. *Revista española de lingüística aplicada* 21. 269-288.
- Rodríguez Ramalle & Teresa Maria. 2008b. Marcas enunciativas y evidenciales en el discurso periodístico. In Inés Olza, Manuel Casado Velarde and Ramón González Ruiz (eds.), *Actas del XXXVII Simposio de la Sociedad Española de Lingüística (SEL)*, 735-744. Pamplona: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Navarra.
- Rodríguez Ramalle & Teresa Maria. 2011. La expresión de grado en las interjecciones y la función de la conjunción *que*. Verba. *Anuario Galego de Filoloxía* 38. 191–217.
- Sacks, Harvey, Emanuel Schegloff & Gail Jefferson. 1974. A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language* 50. 696-735.
- Sánchez López, Cristina. 2014. Evidentiality and mirativity in Spanish. Paper presented at EMEL 2014, Madrid, 6-8 October.
- Sansiñena, María Sol. 2015. The multiple functional load of *que*. An interactional approach to insubordinate complement clauses in Spanish. Leuven: University of Leuven dissertation.
- Sansiñena, María Sol, Hendrik De Smet & Bert Cornillie. 2015. Between subordinate and insubordinate: Paths towards complementizer-initial main clauses. *Journal of Pragmatics* 77. 3-19.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1996. Turn organization: One intersection of grammar and interaction. In Elinor Ochs, Sandra Thompson and Emanuel Schegloff (eds.), *Interaction and Grammar*, 52-133. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Serret Lancharez, Silvia. 2012. *Los adverbios oracionales y la periferia izquierda*. Master thesis: University of Barcelona.
- Simon-Vandenberg, Anne-Marie. 2007. *No doubt* and related expressions: A functional account. In Mike Hannay & Gerard J. Steen (eds.), *Structural-Functional Studies in English Grammar: In honour of Lachlan Mackenzie*. [Studies in Language Companion Series 83], 9-34. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Simon-Vandenberg, Anne-Marie & Karin Aijmer. 2007a. The discourse functionality of adjectival and adverbial epistemic expressions: Evidence from present-day English. In Christopher S. Butler, Raquel Hidalgo Downing & Julia Lavid (eds.), *Functional Perspectives on Grammar and Discourse: In honour of Angela Downing*. [Studies in Language Companion Series 85], 419-446. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Simon-Vandenberg, Anne-Marie & Karin Aijmer. 2007b. *The semantic field of modal certainty. A corpus-based study of English adverbs*. [Topics in English Linguistics 56]. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1988. Pragmatic strengthening and grammaticalization. In Shelley Axmaker, Annie Jaisser & Helen Singmaster (eds.), *Proceedings of the fourteenth annual meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 406-416. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 2003. Constructions in grammaticalization. In Brian D. Joseph & Richard D. Janda (eds.), *The Handbook of Historical Linguistics*, 624-647. Oxford: Blackwell.

- Val.Es.Co. Research Group. 2014. Las unidades del discurso oral. La propuesta Val.Es.Co. de segmentación de la conversación (coloquial). *Estudios de Lingüística del Español* 35 (1). 13-73.
- Van linden, An & Freek Van de Velde. 2014. (Semi-)autonomous subordination in Dutch: structures and semantic-pragmatic values. *Journal of Pragmatics* 60. 226-250.